

Organizational Justices and Employees' Demography: Empirical Evidence from Nepalese Employees

Ganesh Bhattarai

Lecturer (Management), Nepal Commerce Campus, Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

Email: ganesh@ncc.edu.np

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/researcher.v4i2.34625>

Abstract

In the context of controversial empirical evidences regarding the effect of demographic variables on organizational justices, this study was carried out to measure the (a) employees' perceived organizational justice within the different demographic groups, and (b) the impact of demographic aspects (i.e., sex, tenure, and education) on organizational justices. Five hundred forty-six employees working in Nepalese commercial banks were taken as the sample. Perceptual cross-sectional data were analyzed quantitatively using both descriptive and inferential statistics. This study revealed that the average level of perceived justices was more than fifty percentages on five-point Likert-type scales, indicating they did not feel injustice. Females than males, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than bachelor's degree holders perceive less distributive justice. Likewise, female than male, permanent than temporary, master's degree holders than higher or lesser degree holders perceive less procedural justice. Similarly, regarding interactive justice, male than female, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than bachelor's degree holders feel comparatively less honesty, courtesy, respect, and politeness in their working relationship. Some empirical and theoretical implications are suggested.

Keywords: Distributive justice, Employees' demography, Interactive justice, Organizational justice, Procedural justice

Introduction

Human resource managers are facing the challenges of creating and maintaining perceived organizational justice among employees. In general, organizational justices refer to people's perceptions of fairness regarding the decision-making and resource allocation process in organizations (Greenberg, 1987). Empirical evidence from organizational behavior and management research consistently shows that the perceptions of employees of their supervisors are some of the strongest predictors of beneficial and counterproductive work behaviors, perceptions, attitudes, emotions, and orientations (Wolfe & Lawson, 2020). If a specific outcome is considered unfair, it affects the person's emotions, cognitions, and behaviors (Weiss et al., 1999). To achieve the greater results such as productivity, performance, and innovation

that lead to sustainable development, the concept of organizational justice has become popular among organizational justice researchers. Therefore, in addition to reward allocation, the HR practices in any organization should effectively promote and maintain fairness in distributive processes and interaction relationships between managers and employees to achieve desired quality and performance goals. Hence, every organization is strived to maintain justice to its employees.

In particular, staff who believe their supervisors treat them with organizational justice have higher levels of organizational engagement and productivity and are less likely to deviate while at work (Colquitt et al., 2001). They are more likely to be committed to organizational objectives and satisfied with their work and are less likely to be stressed at work when they feel they have been treated in an organizationally just manner (Mesko et al., 2017). Workers critically evaluate their supervisors because their actions and decisions have significant economic and social implications for employees (Colquitt, 2012). Moreover, in any organization, a variety of people are working together with diversified backgrounds and expectations. That is why an organization has to know appropriately how demographic aspects are associated with organizational justice.

Over the past half-century, organizational behavior and management research has shown that the evaluations of their supervisors by employees focus primarily on notions of justice (Colquitt, 2012). But every people's judgment might be different. For the same event, some people feel justice but other might not, because, people react on the basis of their perceptions of truth, not necessarily reality per se (Lewin, 1936). Employees are routinely subject to the decisions of their superiors. These choices often deal with business policies and processes, promotional opportunities, tasks and the interpersonal dynamics of work life (Colquitt, 2012). Employees' attitudes, perception, interest, priority, returns from organization might be different as per their demographic status. Past studies showed, empirically, impacts of demographic variables on organizational justice were controversial. Researchers like Bauer (1999), Erkilic et al. (2018), Turhan et al. (2016), etc., have tested that there is no effect of demographic variables on organizational justice. But, Brockner and Adsit (1986), Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001), Diab (2015), Leventhal and Lane (1970), etc., have tested that demographic variables significantly impact justice perceptions.

Therefore, as the response to aforementioned background and gaps, this study is motivated to know the impact of demographic variables on organizational justice in the context of Nepalese banking employees. Especially, this study aimed to measure the level of employees perceived organizational justices (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactive)

within different demographic groups, and the impact of demographic variables (i.e., sex, tenure, and education) on organizational justices (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactive).

Literature Review

Organizational Justice

The extent to which staffs perceive the treatment received from an organization or managers as fair is concerned with organizational justice (Colquitt et al., 2005). Organizational justice is defined in an overall way as "the rules and social norms governing how outcomes (e.g., rewards and punishments) should be distributed, the procedures used for making such distribution decisions (as well as other types of decisions), and how people are treated interpersonally" (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, p.13). Colquitt (2001) has classified organizational justice as an individual level of the workplace phenomenon into three general types (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice). Early research on organizational justice was based on the equity theory of Adams (1965). A person formulates the perception of justice by making a comparative calculation of one's contributions and rewards from a decision-making system (Crawshaw et al., 2013). The theory predicts that employees who believe that outcome distributions are unfair will restore balance by modifying their inputs to the ratio of input and output of rewards (Colquitt et al., 2005). Organizational justices categorized as distributive justice, procedure justice, and interactive justice) are discussed in the following section.

Distributive Justice

First, distributive justice refers to an individual's perception of the extent to which the results obtained are fair (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). It deals with a comparison of the expectations and actual results of individuals, and if the received reward at least meets or exceeds the expected level, an individual will perceive distributive justice (Wang & Yi, 2012). Due to its focus on the fair distribution and distribution of rewards and resources by equalizing the input-output ratio, distributive justice has been the central focus of economic and political theories (Gilliland, 1994). Distributive justice is predicted to be mainly linked to cognitive, affective, and behavioral reactions to specific outcomes because of its focus on results.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice, which refers to the fairness of allocation decisions that assign results, is the second dimension of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001). The procedural justice component concerns the perceived fairness and transparency of the procedures used to make employee-related decisions. The concept of procedural justice was expanded by Thibaut

and Walker (1975) by indicating that people also judge the fairness of the procedures by which the results are established. This indicates that staffs are not only concerned about how much they get, but also about how the decision was made. Leventhal (1980) suggested that people use different criteria to evaluate decision-making procedures to determine whether the processes are fair or unfair. Procedural justice is experienced when these processes or systems are perceived as fair and coherent, and when the decision-making process has a voice and influence (Greenberg, 1990). The theory of procedural justice focuses on six principles that encourage procedural justice perceptions: consistent application of criteria, elimination of bias, use of precise information, the opportunity for error, representativeness, and ethical treatment (Konovsky, 2000). The focus, therefore, shifts from what has been decided (distributive justice) to how the choice has been made (Cropanzano & Wright, 2003).

Interactional Justice

Organizational justice researchers developed the concept of interactional justice beginning in the 1980s. Interactional justice, an extension of procedural justice, relates to the human side of organizational practices, that is, to the behavior of management (or those controlling rewards and resources) towards the justice recipient. Interactional justice is characterized by the workplace's respect and honesty, where the quality of an individual's interpersonal treatment is reflected. This idea was derived from the unfair treatment reports of employees, which often focused on interpersonal rather than structural factors (Greenberg, 1993). Since interactional justice is determined by the interpersonal behavior of the representatives of management, interactional justice is considered to be linked to these representatives' cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses, i.e., the direct supervisor or source of justice (Masterson et al., 2000). Interactional justice is an expectation that subordinates should be treated with honesty, courtesy, respect and politeness (Cropanzano & Stein, 2009). Therefore, when an employee perceives interactional injustice, he/she is expected to respond negatively to his/her supervisor, which eventually hampers the organization.

Demographic Aspect and Organizational Justice

People are different in term of their backgrounds, attitudes, opinion behaviours as well as expectation in life, but they might have similarities among the analogous nature of groups. Therefore, employees' perceived justice from the organization differs among the demographic groups (e.g., male and female). However, empirical evidence shows a controverting causal relationship between the demographic variable and organizational justice. Bauer (1999) has tested no effect of gender on fairness, but Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) have tested the significant effect of demographic variables on justice perceptions. Likewise, Diab (2015) has

revealed that organizational justice is affected by gender, age, marital status, experience, qualifications, and job tenure. There are significant differences in the feeling of organizational justice due to stated demographic factors. Moreover, Erkilic et al. (2018) and Turhan et al. (2016) have concluded that in the context of Europe there was no statistically significant difference among gender, age, education level and marital status to predict organizational justice.

Likewise, Leventhal and Lane (1970) predicted and found that males and females differently adhere to justice's equity rule. Specifically, whereas males' major concern in reward allocation was protecting their own interests, females' major concern in reward allocation was maintaining the welfare of all group members. Brockner and Adsit (1986) found gender differences in the saliency of distributive justice such that males reacted more strongly than females to inequitable outcomes. Considering these controversial empirical evidences representing from different context, this study raised the number of research question in the context of employees working in Nepalese commercial banks. What are the levels of organizational justice within the demographic groups? How demographic variables are associated with organizational justice?

Methods

Measures

Organizational Justices

Three sub-variables of organizational justice, like distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactive justice, have been measured separately. Two sub-variables of organizational justice, i.e., *distributive justice and procedural justice*, have been measured with the scales developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). There is a five-item scale and a six-item scale to measure distributive justice and procedure justice, respectively. In that order, the sample items for each sub-subscale are: 'I feel that my job responsibilities are fair, my general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees'. *Interactive justice* has been measured with a five-item scale developed by Farth et al. (1997). A sample item of interactive justice is 'my supervisor lets me know my appraisal outcomes and provides justification.' Participants have been asked to respond to the five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The computed Cronbach's alpha (reliability values) of the constructs in this study are- distributive justice = .89, procedural justice = .90, and interactive justice = .85. Cronbach's coefficient alpha is the most widely used estimator of the construct's reliability (Peterson & Kim, 2013). Besides this, for statistical

analysis, demographic variables have been coded as using dummy variable (e.g., female = 0, male =1).

Sampling Design

Employees working in the Nepalese commercial banks were the respondents of the study. As per the study's convenience, samples were selected into two-stage, i.e., firstly, nine commercial banks were identified from the list published by Nepal Nepal Rastra Bank. Secondly, 546 employees were selected from the identified nine banks. Selected respondents were employees working in different hierarchies (e.g., assistants, officers, managers) and departments (e.g., marketing, credit, finance, etc.) of their banks.

Administration of the Questionnaire

There are 33 items in the questionnaire, including three demographic details. Except for demographic details, perceptual responses were obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale for all items. A total of 700 questionnaires were distributed individually to each respondent with the reference person's help, the concerned bank's contact person. Of the 700 questionnaires distributed, 577 were filled in and returned. But only 546 (78 %) questionnaires were completed and usable for the analysis.

Data Analysis

The mean value of each variable as a whole, and the demographic variable were calculated. The mean difference of the variables within different demographic groups was calculated. ANOVA test was calculated to measure the mean differences for the demographic variable with three or more groups (i.e., education). Similarly, the t-test was calculated to measure the mean difference for those demographic variables with only two groups (i.e., gender and tenure). Post-hoc analysis was computed, in the ANOVA test case, to know where the mean difference occurs within different sub-groups.

Results

Distributive Justice and Demographic

As depicted in Table 1, overall mean distributive justice of the employees working in the Nepali commercial banks was 3.64 with a standard deviation of .67, which has been measured on 5 point Likert-type scale. As depicted in Table 1, within the different groups of employees based on their academic qualification, mean distributive justice of these groups were ranging from 3.44 to 3.79 with a standard deviation of .44 to .71. Comparatively, employees having academic qualifications of up to bachelor degree had highest (i.e., 3.79), master's degree

had second highest (i.e., 3.62), and MPhil and PhD degree holder had the lowest (i.e., 3.54) level of distributive justice. There was a reverse relationship between employees' level of education and their level of distributive justice.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Study Variables According to Educational Groups

Group	Number	<i>Distributive justice</i>		<i>Procedural justice</i>		<i>Interactive justice</i>	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Up to Bachelor	101	3.79	.44	4.13	.57	4.05	.43
Master's Degree	432	3.62	.71	3.87	.72	3.67	.74
MPhil or PhD	13	3.44	.68	4.33	.53	3.86	.55
Total	546	3.64	.67	3.93	.70	3.81	.74

As depicted in the Table 2, distributive justice of the male and female were represented by the mean value 3.82 and 3.37 with a standard deviation of .63 and .64, respectively. Male employee' distributive justice was more than their female counterparts. Likewise, permanent and temporary employees' mean distributive justice were 3.70 and 3.56 with a standard deviation of .66 and .67, respectively. Permanent employees' distributive justice was greater than temporary employees.

Table 2

Result of the Mean Difference of Study Variables According to Sex and Tenure

		N	<i>Distributive justice</i>			<i>Procedural justice</i>			<i>Interactive justice</i>		
			Mean	SD	t - value	Mean	SD	t - value	Mean	SD	t - value
Sex	Male	333	3.82	.63	8.23**	4.07	.75	6.29**	3.55	.74	-
	Female	213	3.37	.64		3.72	.54		4.05	.53	9.15**
Tenure	Temp.	205	3.56	.67	-2.33*	4.01	.67	2.04*	3.72	.51	-.64
	Perm.	341	3.70	.66		3.89	.71		3.76	.80	

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, there were mean differences in distributive justice levels among groups within every tested demographic variable. But such a difference may or may not be statistically significant. That is why the ANOVA test, for the demographic variables with three or more groups (i.e., education), has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of distributive justice. Similarly, the t-test, for

those demographic variables with only two groups (i.e., gender and tenure) has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of distributive justice.

Table 3

ANOVA Outputs of the Educational Groups for the Study Variables

Variables	F – Value	Significance
Distributive Justice	3.57*	.03
Procedural Justice	7.90**	.00
Interactive Justice	12.61**	.00

*, **, the mean difference is significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

As depicted, ANOVA result in Table 3, a p-value of the F-test of demographic variable 'education level' regarding distributive justice was less than .05 ($p < .05$, $F = 3.57$). This indicates that the mean difference of employees' distributive justice within the various educational groups was statistically significant. Then, the next step was to know the pairs of groups which have the mean differences of distributive justice. Therefore, post-hoc analysis was computed to know which groups have the mean differences regarding distributive justice within the different levels of educational groups of employees.

As shown in Table 4, mean distributive justice differences between the employees having educational qualifications up to bachelor's degree and master's degree was .18, and its level of significance was .02 ($p < .05$). This indicates that mean differences of distributive justice between up to bachelor's degree and master's degree holder were statistically significantly different. Remaining groups of the educational level of employees were not statistically significant in terms of distributive justice.

Table 4

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Difference According to Educational Group

Dependent Variable	Education group (I)	Education group (J)	Mean diff. (I-J)	Significance
Distributive Justice	less than Bachelor	Masters	.18*	.02
Procedural Justice	MPhil and PhD	Masters	.46*	.02
	less than Bachelor	Masters	.25*	.01
Interactive Justice	less than Bachelor	Masters	.38**	.00

*, **, the mean difference is significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

As depicted in Table 2, t-value of sex and tenure regarding distributive justice were 8.23 ($p < .01$), and -2.33 ($p < .05$) respectively. These t-value and level of significance indicate that there were statistically significant mean differences in employees' distributive justice between males and females as well as between permanent and temporary employees.

Procedural Justice and Demographic

As depicted in Table 1, overall mean procedural justice of the employees working in the Nepali commercial banks was 3.93 with a standard deviation of .70, which has been measured on 5 point Likert-type scale. As depicted in Table 1, within the different groups of employees based on their academic qualification; mean procedural justice of these groups were ranging within 3.87 to 4.33 with a standard deviation of .53 to .72. Comparatively, employees having academic qualification of MPhil and PhD degree had a higher (i.e., 4.33), up to bachelor's degree had second highest (i.e., 4.13), and master's degree holder had the lowest (i.e., 3.87) level of procedural justice. There was a U-shaped relationship between employees' level of education and level of procedural justice.

As depicted in Table 2, procedural justice of the males and females were represented by the mean value 4.07 and 3.72 with a standard deviation of .75 and .54 respectively. Male employees' procedural justice was more than their female counterparts. Likewise, permanent and temporary employees' mean procedural justice were 3.89 and 4.01 with a standard deviation of .71 and .67, respectively. Permanent employees' procedural justice was lesser than temporary employees.

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, there were mean differences in procedural justice levels among groups within every tested demographic variable. But such a difference may or may not be statistically significant. That is why the ANOVA test, for the demographic variable which belongs three or more groups (i.e. education), has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of procedural justice. Similarly, the t-test for those demographic variables with only two groups (i.e., gender and tenure) has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of procedural justice.

As depicted, ANOVA result in Table 3, the p-value of the F-test of the demographic variable' education level' regarding procedural justice was less than .01 ($p < .01$, $F = 7.90$). This indicates that the mean difference of employees' procedural justice within the various educational groups was statistically significant. The next step was to know the pairs of groups that have the mean differences in procedural justice. Therefore, post-hoc analysis was computed to know which groups have the mean differences regarding procedural justice within the different levels of educational groups of employees.

As shown in Table 4, the mean procedural justice difference between the employees having educational qualifications up to bachelor's degree and master's degree was .25, and its level of significance was .01 ($p < .05$). Similarly, mean procedural justice differences between the employees having educational qualification of MPhil and PhD, and master's degree was .46, and its level of significance was .02 ($p < .05$). These indicate that mean differences of procedural justice between up to bachelor's degree holders and master's degree holders, as well as between MPhil and PhD degree holders and master's degree holders, were statistically significantly different. The remaining groups of the educational level of employees were not statistically significant in terms of procedural justice.

As depicted in Table 2 t-value of sex and tenure regarding procedural justice were 6.29 ($p < .01$), and 2.04 ($p < .05$) respectively. These t-value and level of significance indicate that there were statistically significant mean differences in employee's procedural justice between male and female as well as between permanent and temporary employees.

Interactive Justice and Demographic

As depicted in Table 1, overall mean interactive justice of the employees working in the Nepali Commercial banks was 3.81 with a standard deviation of .74, which has been measured on 5 point Likert-type scale. As depicted in Table 1, within the different groups of employees based on their academic qualification, the mean interactive justice of these groups ranged from 3.67 to 4.05, with a standard deviation of .43 to .74. Comparatively, employees having academic qualifications of up to bachelor's degree had a higher (i.e., 4.05), MPhil and PhD degree had second highest (i.e., 3.86), and master's degree holder had the lowest (i.e., 3.67) level of interactive justice. The relationship between employees' academic qualification and their level of interactive justice was U shaped.

As depicted in Table 2, interactive justice of the males and females were represented by the mean values 3.55 and 4.05 with a standard deviation of .74 and .53, respectively. Male employees' interactive justice was lesser than their female counterparts. Likewise, permanent and temporary employees' mean interactive justice were 3.76 and 3.72 with a standard deviation of .80 and .51, respectively. Permanent employees' interactive justice was lesser than temporary employees.

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, there were mean differences in interactive justice levels among groups within every tested demographic variable. But such a difference may or may not be statistically significant. That is why the ANOVA test, for the demographic variable which belongs three or more groups (i.e., education), has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of interactive justice. Similarly, the t-test for

those demographic variables with only two groups (i.e., gender and tenure) has been computed to measure the statistical significance of the mean difference of interactive justice.

As depicted ANOVA result in Table 3, a p-value of the F-test of the demographic variable education level regarding interactive justice was less than .01 ($p < .01$, $F = 12.61$). This indicates that the mean difference of employees' interactive justice within the various educational groups was statistically significant. The next step was to know the pairs of groups that have the mean differences of interactive justice. Therefore, post-hoc analysis was computed to know which groups have the mean differences regarding interactive justice within the different levels of educational groups of employees.

As shown in Table 4, the mean interactive justice difference between the employees having educational qualifications up to bachelor's degree and master's degree was .38, and its level of significance was 0.00 ($p < .01$). This indicates that the mean difference of interactive justice between up to bachelor's degree holders and master's degree holders was statistically significantly different. The remaining groups of the educational level of employees were not statistically significant in terms of interactive justice.

Table 2 depicts the t-value of sex regarding interactive justice was -9.15 ($p < .01$). This t-value and level of significance indicate that there was a statistically significant mean difference in employees' interactive justice between male and female employees. Likewise, t-value of tenure regarding interactive justice was .64 ($p > .05$). These t-value and level of significance indicate that there was a statistically insignificant mean difference between permanent and temporary employees.

Discussion

Demographics and Distributive Justice

The average level of distributive justice of the employees working in the Nepali commercial banks was more than 50%, which indicates Nepali commercial banks have employees who feel they were not treated in a biased manner in the distribution of resources.

This study has indicated the reverse relationship between employees' level of education and their perceived distributive justice level. It would be possible because of employees' level of expectation from the organization. With the increment of education level, they will have more expectation, but there will not be possible to get everything as they expected. Therefore, ultimately, they feel less justice in the distribution of limited resources.

This study revealed that male employees' perceived distributive justice was significantly higher than their female counterparts. Leventhal and Lane (1970) predicted and

found that males and females differently adhere to justice's equity rule. Specifically, whereas males' major concern in reward allocation was protecting their own interests, females' major concern in reward allocation was maintaining the welfare of all group members. Brockner and Adsit (1986) found gender differences in the saliency of distributive justice such that males reacted more strongly than females to inequitable outcomes. According to Major and Adams (1983), there are two additional explanations for gender differences in justice perceptions. Firstly, self-presentation perspective, according to which there are normatively different expectations of males and females for reward allocation, with women expected to be generous and men expected to be equitable. Secondly, cognitively oriented perspective, according to which the genders differently evaluate their inputs. According to this explanation, females are expected to perform more poorly than males and attribute their success to external rather than internal factors. Therefore, the findings of the study are consistent with the prior theoretical logic and empirical evidence.

Regarding the employees' tenure, this study tested that temporary employees' perceived distributive justice was significantly lesser than their permanent counterparts. A plausible cause can be the practice of tenure-based benefits. There can be additional benefits (e.g., grade, provident fund, and gratuity) for permanent employees based on provisions in current human resource policy. If temporary employees are not getting all the benefits like their permanent counterparts (but are taking the same responsibilities), it is normal human behavior that they perceived less distributive justice.

Demographics and Procedural Justice

The average level of procedural justice of the employees working in the Nepali commercial banks was more than 50%, which indicates employees working in Nepali commercial banks have perceived fairness in decision-making to distribute resources.

This study revealed that the relationship between education and perceived procedural justice was like a U shaped. Master's degree holder employee's procedural justice was less than MPhil and PhD degree as well as up to bachelor's degree holder. Plausible cases can be the position occupying in the banks: MPhil or PhD holder employees are more engaged in research, and developmental issues, bachelor's degree holder are more engaged in an operational level of jobs, but master's degree holder, due to holding managerial position, are somehow engaged in the decision-making process, though they are not final decision-makers. If someone involves in decision making process without holding full decision making authorities, it is possible to perceive less justice in decision making process to distribute rewards.

Like distributive justice, this study revealed that male employees' perceived procedural justice was significantly higher than their female counterparts. Kulik et al. (1996) have examined whether females, being more sensitive to interpersonal issues, will perceive procedures that favor social harmony (e.g., neutrality) as fair, and males, being more sensitive to material outcomes, will perceive procedures that reflect contributions (e.g., control) as fair and will be more influenced by outcome favorability. These arguments were functioning in Nepali commercial banking industries; therefore, male employees were comparatively experiencing higher distributive justice than their female counterparts.

Concerning the employees' tenure, this study tested that temporary employees' perceived procedural justice was significantly higher than their permanent counterparts. Temporary employees have just entered the career, and they are not expecting much involvement in the decision-making process. Their main concern is to have a permanent appointment. Therefore, they have perceived justice on how they are getting right now from the organization. In comparison, permanent employees are secured in the job and working since long for the organization. As explained by social exchange theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), based on their long contribution to the organization; it is natural that permanent employees expect more involvement on decision making process to distribute reward. Therefore employees' degree of their interest to be participated in the process of decision making to distribute rewards can be the causes behind having less perceived distributive justice of the permanent employment than their temporary counterpart.

Demographics and Interactive Justice

In-terms of interactive justice, this study indicated that the average level of interactive justice of the employees working in Nepali commercial banks was more than 50%, which indicates that they perceive their working relationship as honesty, courtesy, respect, and politeness (Cropanzano & Stein, 2009).

This study revealed that perceived interactive justice of employees having academic qualification of up to bachelor's degree was statistically significantly higher than master's degree holder. Less-educated employees hold comparatively junior positions; being less educated and holding the junior position, they don't expect much honesty, courtesy, respect, and politeness from their senior. But, educated employees (master's degree holders) are holding higher position and they expect much trustworthiness, courtesy, respect, and politeness from their juniors. Therefore, the possible cause of perceiving a comparatively higher level of interactional justice by less-educated employees than higher educated employees could be their little expectation from their seniors.

Likewise, this study uncovered that female employees perceived a higher level of interactive justice than their male counterparts. A plausible cause for such differences could be the behavior exhibited to the female by male counterparts. In Nepali culture, females are more respected, forgiven, and loved by everyone in the workplace, even in society. Such behaviors may perceive a higher level of interactive justice by female employees compared to their male counterparts. Similarly, this study tested no significant differences in the level of interactive justice between permanent employees and temporary employees. It can be possible because of the collaborative culture among all the Nepali commercial bank employees without segregating who is permanent. Moreover, interactional justice is perceived based on behaviors of others at workplace like trustworthiness, courtesy, respect, and politeness. Such behaviors may be reflected in the similar way throughout the organization without isolating the tenure of the employees.

Implications of the Study

Practical Implication

Among the employees, females than males, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than up to bachelor's degree holders have perceived less justice in the distribution of resources. Therefore, organization can pay special attention for these groups (females, temporary, and master's degree holders) to improve the feeling of distributive justice. Because, feeling of employees' distributive justice strongly impacts on wellbeing of the employees themselves as well as of organization like career satisfaction, commitment, performance, work engagement, etc. (Maslach et al., 2001).

Females than males, permanent than temporary, master's degree holders than higher or lesser degree holders have perceived less procedural justice, which means they felt less justice on how the decisions are made to distribute rewards. Therefore, the organization should adopt a mechanism (e.g., participation in decision making, two-way communication systems, etc.) focusing on these groups so that their perception of justice on the decision-making process to distribute rewards will be increased. As a result, increased procedural justice will contribute to employees' job satisfaction, commitment, performance, and retention (Fatt et al., 2010).

Regarding interactive justice, males than females, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than up to bachelor's degree holders were comparatively felt less honesty, courtesy, respect and politeness in their working relationship. Therefore, organization can intervene the program (e.g., training about interpersonal behavior) focusing these people so that everyone feels interactive justice at work place which ultimately lead positive impacts for employees themselves as well as organizations.

Theoretical Implication

Impacts of employees' sex, tenure, and level of education on distributive justice, procedural justice, interactive justice, careerism, and work engagement have been tested in the Nepali commercial banking industry. These findings can be used to compare with the findings from other contexts so that researchers make themselves aware of its contextualization.

Conclusion

The average level of perceived justices (distributive, procedural, and interactive) of the employees working in the Nepali commercial banks was more than fifty percentages. This indicates that employees working in Nepalese commercial banks feel they were not treated in a biased manner in the distribution of resources, as well as in the process of decision making to distribute resources. Moreover, they perceive their working relationship as honesty, courtesy, respect, and politeness. Among the employees, females than males, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than up to bachelor's degree holders perceive less justice in distributing resources. Similarly, females than males, permanent than temporary, master's degree holders than higher or lesser degree holders perceive less procedural justice, which means they feel less justice on how the decisions are made to distribute rewards. Regarding interactive justice, males than females, temporary than permanent, and master's degree holders than up to bachelor's degree holders feel comparatively less honesty, courtesy, respect and politeness in their working relationship.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267–299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Bauer, T. N. (1999) Perceived Mentoring Fairness: Relationships with Gender, Mentoring Type, Mentoring Experience, and Mentoring Needs. *Sex Roles*, 40, 211-225. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018846904722>
- Brockner, J., & Adsit, L. (1986). The moderating impact of sex on the equity–satisfaction relationship: A field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 585–590. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.585>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>

- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- 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*(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Scott, B. A. (2005). Organizational justice: Where do we stand? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 589 – 619). Erlbaum
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Zapata, C. P., & Rich, B. L. (2012). Explaining the justice–performance relationship: Trust as exchange deepener or trust as uncertainty reducer? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025208>
- Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational justice: New insights from behavioural ethics. *Human Relations, 66*(7), 885-904. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713485609>
- Cropanzano, R. & Stein, J. H (2009). Organizational justice and behavioral ethics: promises and prospects. *Behavioral Ethics Quarterly, 19*(2), 193–233. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq200919211>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Cropanzano, R., & Stein, J. (2009). Organizational Justice and Behavioral Ethics: Promises and Prospects. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 19*(2), 193-233. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27673272>
- Diab, S. M. (2015). The Impact of organizational justice on the workers performance and job satisfaction in the ministry of health hospitals in Amman. *International Business Research, 8*(2), 187. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v8n2p187>
- Erkilic, E., Gazeloğlu, C., & Aytakin, E. (2018). Organizational Justice Perceptions of Hospitality Business Employees in the Scope of Demographic Characteristics: A Study in Rize. In: Genç, V. and Önver, M.Ş., Eds., *Issues in Tourism, Human Rights & Sustainable Environment*, IJOPEC Publication, London.
- Farth, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for extraordinary action: A cultural analysis of justice and extra-role behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*, 421-444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713485609>

- Fatt, C. K., Khin, E. W. S., & Heng, T. N (2010). The impact of organizational justice on employee's job satisfaction: The Malaysian companies perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration* 2(1), 56-63.
<https://doi.org/10.3844/ajebasp.2010.56.63>
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. London: SAGE.
- Gilliland, S. W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 691–701. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.691>
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(1), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.1.55>
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 561–568. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.561>
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54(1), 81–103. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1993.1004>
- Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 489-511.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F014920630002600306>
- Kulik, C. T., Lind, E. A., Ambrose, M. L., & MacCoun, R. J. (1996). Understanding gender differences in distributive and procedural justice. *Social Justice Research*, 9(4), 351-369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02196990>
- 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* (pp. 27–55). Plenum
- Leventhal, G. S., & Lane, D. W. (1970). Sex, age, and equity behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 15(4), 312–316. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029611>
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.
- Major, B., & Adams, J. B. (1983). Role of gender, interpersonal orientation, and self-presentation in distributive-justice behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(3), 598–608. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.3.598>

- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422. <https://doi:10.1111/1467-8721.01258>
- 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(4), 738–748. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556364>
- Meško, G., Tankebe, J., & Fields, C. (2017). Self-legitimacy, organisational commitment and commitment to fair treatment of prisoners: An empirical study of prison officers in Slovenia. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 25(1), 11-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1477370818764831>
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527–556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>
- Peterson, R. A., & Kim, Y. (2013). On the relationship between coefficient alpha and composite reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 194–198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030767>
- Thibaut, J. W. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Turhan, M., Köprülü, O., & Helvacı, I. (2016). The relationship between academic staff's perception of organizational justice and demographic factors: A case study in Foundation Universities in Turkey. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(4), 1406-1412.
- Wang, S. & Yi, X. (2012). Organizational justice and work withdrawal in Chinese companies: The moderating effects of allocentrism and idiocentrism. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 12(2), 211–228. <https://doi:10.1177/1470595812439871>
- Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(5), 786–794. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.786>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Lawson, S. G. (2020). The organizational justice effect among criminal justice employees: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12251>