International Journal of Research in Management

Priyanka Sachin Jadhav
Professor, Research Scholar, MKSSS's Smt. Hiraben Nanavati Institute of Management and Research for Women, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Arpita Singh
Assistant Professor, MKSSS's Smt. Hiraben Nanavati Institute of Management and Research for Women, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Poonam Shripad Vatharkar
Assistant Professor, MES Institute of Management and Career Courses (IMCC), SPPU, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Varsha Murhe
Assistant Professor, Indira School of Business Studies PGDM, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Dipali Sadashiv Patil
Assistant Professor KCES's Institute of Management and Research, Jalgaon, Jalgaon

Corresponding Author:
Priyanka Sachin Jadhav
Professor, Research Scholar, MKSSS's Smt. Hiraben Nanavati Institute of Management and Research for Women, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

A study on employee perception towards organizational justice in IT companies

Priyanka Sachin Jadhav, Arpita Singh, Poonam Shripad Vatharkar, Varsha Murhe and Dipali Sadashiv Patil

Abstract
This research investigates employee perceptions of organizational justice across different job tenure groups, focusing on fairness in rewards, work distribution, compensation, decision-making, and other aspects of organizational processes. Using ANOVA analysis, the study reveals that job tenure significantly influences employees' views on fairness, transparency, and trust in decision-making, with longer-tenured employees exhibiting more diverse perspectives. While compensation fairness and rule consistency were perceived similarly across all tenure groups, perceptions of fairness in work distribution and benefits showed notable variations. The findings suggest that organizations should customize their fairness practices to address the unique needs of employees at various stages of tenure, emphasizing transparent communication and involvement in decision-making. Practical implications include the need for tailored policies, supervisor training, and improved organizational justice practices. The study's limitations include its regional focus and the subjective nature of employee perceptions. Future research could explore the broader implications of tenure on organizational justice across different industries and demographic factors.

Introduction
Job satisfaction is a critical factor for organizational success, especially in industries like information technology, where employee turnover can be high, and competition for skilled talent is fierce. When employees are satisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to be motivated, productive, and committed to the organization. One of the key factors that influence job satisfaction is organizational justice. Employees who perceive fairness in their work environment tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction. Conversely, when employees perceive unfair treatment, it can lead to dissatisfaction, disengagement, and higher turnover rates.

Organizational justice can impact employees' attitudes toward their jobs, their colleagues, and the organization itself. In the IT sector, where employees are often under significant pressure to meet deadlines and achieve high performance, understanding how perceptions of justice influence job satisfaction is crucial for enhancing employee well-being and reducing turnover. This study will focus on how employees in IT companies perceive distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and how these perceptions influence their overall job satisfaction. Additionally, the study will examine whether demographic factors, such as age, gender, and job tenure, have an effect on these perceptions.

The research will provide valuable insights into how organizational justice influences job satisfaction specifically within the IT sector. By understanding the relationships between fairness and satisfaction, IT companies can develop better policies and practices that foster a more equitable and positive work environment, ultimately improving employee engagement, retention, and organizational performance.

Organizational justice is a key concept in organizational behavior that refers to employees' perceptions of fairness within their work environment. It plays a crucial role in shaping how employees behave, how they perceive their organization, and how satisfied they are with their jobs. Organizational justice is divided into three main dimensions: distributive justice,

procedural justice, and interactional justice. Distributive justice concerns the fairness of outcomes, such as salary, promotions, and other rewards. Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the processes used to make decisions about these outcomes. Interactional justice, on the other hand, deals with the quality of interpersonal treatment employees receive, particularly when decisions are being made.

In the context of the information technology (IT) sector, where the work environment is fast-paced and high-pressure, organizational justice becomes even more critical. The IT industry is characterized by rapid technological advancements, project-based work, and a highly skilled workforce. Employees in this sector often face tight deadlines, long working hours, and the need to continually update their skills. Given the competitive nature of the industry and the demand for skilled professionals, IT companies must create an environment that supports fairness in order to retain top talent and maintain high levels of employee satisfaction. Despite the growing importance of organizational justice, there is limited research specifically focused on how employees in IT companies perceive fairness and how these perceptions influence their job satisfaction. This gap highlights the need for a study that investigates the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in the IT sector.

This study aims to fill this gap by examining the impact of organizational justice, focusing on its three dimensions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on employee job satisfaction in IT companies. Furthermore, it will explore how demographic factors, such as age, gender, and job tenure, influence employees' perceptions of fairness within the organization. By examining this relationship in the IT sector, this research will provide valuable insights that can help IT companies improve their organizational practices and foster a fair and supportive work environment.

Statement of Objective

The primary objective of this study is to examine employee perceptions of organizational justice in IT companies, focusing on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and to evaluate the impact of these perceptions on employee job satisfaction.

The study aims to identify the factors influencing employees' sense of fairness and provide actionable insights for IT organizations to foster a fair and equitable workplace environment.

How do employee perceptions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) impact job satisfaction in IT companies?

- **H₁:** Perceived organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) has a significant positive impact on employee job satisfaction in IT companies.
- **H₂:** Employee perceptions of organizational justice vary significantly based on demographic factors such as age, gender, and job tenure in IT companies.

Review of Literature

Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness in how rewards, punishments, promotions, and other HR practices are applied. It plays a crucial role in decision-making and communication within an organization, influencing employee motivation, attitudes, behavior, and overall performance (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Mazur-Wierzbicka, 2021) [4, 5-6, 16]. When employees perceive fairness in organizational processes, they

exhibit higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational identification, and improved performance (Colquitt et al., 2013) [7]. Additionally, fair HR practices foster a positive work environment and contribute to reduced workplace conflicts, higher employee retention, and a more engaged workforce (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009) [1].

One of the key dimensions of organizational justice is distributive justice, which concerns the fairness of resource allocation. Employees evaluate justice by comparing their input-to-output ratio with that of their colleagues, considering factors such as salary, bonuses, rewards, promotions, and career development opportunities. When employees perceive inequality in these distributions, they may reduce their effort, become disengaged, or seek alternative employment. This is particularly significant for highly engaged employees and those with high potential, as a lack of recognition for their contributions can lead to frustration, burnout, or job turnover (Zwiech, 2021) [19]. Studies suggest that distributive justice directly impacts employees' perceptions of organizational support and can influence their commitment to the organization (Greenberg, 1990) [11].

Procedural justice pertains to the fairness of the processes used in decision-making. It ensures predictability and trust in HR practices, including hiring, performance appraisals, promotions, and compensation systems. Research suggests that employees accept a certain degree of distributive injustice if they believe the decision-making process is fair and impartial (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001) [3]. Performance Appraisal Systems (PAS) are particularly influenced by procedural justice, as unfair evaluations can generate psychological barriers and reduce employee engagement (Dusterhoff, Cunningham, & Macgregor, 2014) [10]. When employees perceive procedural fairness, they are more likely to accept unfavorable outcomes and remain committed to their organization (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) [18].

Interpersonal justice emphasizes the fairness of social interactions between employees and management. Employees value respectful treatment and fair communication, which contribute to a sense of belonging and identity within an organization. Research has shown that just treatment by superiors enhances employees' organizational commitment, knowledge sharing, and relationship investment (Liu et al., 2012) [14]. Conversely, a lack of interpersonal justice can lead to dissatisfaction, disengagement, and workplace conflicts (Cropanzano & Rupp, 2008) [9]. Leaders and managers play a crucial role in shaping perceptions of interpersonal justice by maintaining open communication, showing empathy, and treating employees with dignity (Bies & Moag, 1986) [2].

Informational justice focuses on the availability and transparency of information within an organization. Employees expect to receive accurate and timely information regarding decisions that affect them. When critical information is withheld, employees may feel excluded and undervalued, leading to mistrust and disengagement (Kunasz, 2022; Mazur-Wierzbicka, 2017) [13, 16]. Studies indicate that when organizations are transparent about policies, decisions, and changes, employees demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction and trust in leadership (Shapiro, 2000). Moreover, organizations that prioritize informational justice can mitigate uncertainty and resistance to change, fostering a more resilient workforce (Colquitt, 2001) [5-6].

The consequences of perceived injustice in the workplace are significant. Employees who perceive fairness exhibit greater loyalty, job satisfaction, and commitment to organizational

goals. In contrast, perceived injustice leads to negative outcomes such as increased absenteeism, turnover, stress, and retaliatory behaviors, including theft, resistance to management, and decreased cooperation (Conlon *et al.*, 2005; Maslach, 2007) [8, 15]. Research also suggests that fairness perceptions influence psychological well-being, with employees experiencing fairness reporting lower stress levels and higher workplace morale (Judge and Colquitt, 2004) [12]. To prevent such outcomes, organizations must prioritize fairness in HR practices, ensuring that policies are transparent, consistently applied, and communicated effectively. By fostering a culture of justice, organizations can enhance employee engagement, productivity, and long-term success, ultimately strengthening their competitive advantage in the market (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) [17].

Research Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive research design, enabling a structured assessment of employee perceptions of organizational justice across different demographic groups. The research utilizes a purposive sampling technique, ensuring the inclusion of employees with relevant workplace experience and knowledge about organizational justice. A total of 120 employees from IT companies were selected as the study sample, representing diverse backgrounds in terms of gender and job tenure. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire, with responses measured on a five-point Likert scale to capture varying perceptions. The study applies one-way ANOVA to analyze differences in perceptions based on gender and job tenure, with a significance level set at 0.05. Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha

was used to assess the reliability of the questionnaire, ensuring consistency in responses. Ethical considerations, including confidentiality, anonymity, and informed consent, were strictly followed to maintain research integrity.

Data Analysis and Hypotheses Testing
Hypothesis 1

H₁: Perceived organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) has a significant positive impact on employee job satisfaction in IT companies.

This hypothesis emphasizes the importance of fairness in shaping job satisfaction. Organizational justice is examined through three dimensions: distributive justice, focusing on the fairness of outcomes like salaries and promotions; procedural justice, which addresses the fairness of decision-making processes; and interactional justice, concerning respectful and transparent interpersonal treatment. Employees' perceptions of fairness in these areas are critical for fostering trust, a supportive work environment, and overall job satisfaction.

To test this hypothesis, regression analysis was conducted with three separate models. The first model examined the impact of distributive justice on job satisfaction, the second focused on procedural justice, and the third explored interactional justice. In each case, job satisfaction was the dependent variable. Significant positive results in these models would confirm that fairness in outcomes, processes, and interpersonal interactions are key drivers of job satisfaction in IT companies. These findings would provide actionable insights for organizations to create a fairer workplace and enhance employee satisfaction.

Table 5.1: Impact of distributive justice on employee job satisfaction in IT companies

Model Summaryᵇ										
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Change Statistics**					**Durbin-Watson**
					R Square Change	**F Change**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig. F Change**	
1	.734	.538	.554	.975	.585	9.108	5	114	.000	2.224
a. Predictors: (Constant), Fair distribution of benefits, Fairness of work distribution, Compensation fairness, Fairness of rewards, Satisfaction with outcome fairness										
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction										

The Model Summary indicates a strong positive relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction, with an R value of 0.734 and an R Square of 0.538, suggesting that 53.8% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by distributive justice factors such as fairness in compensation, rewards, and work distribution. The Adjusted R Square of 0.554 further supports the reliability of the model, while the standard error of 0.975 indicates reasonable predictive accuracy. The significant F-statistic (9.108, *p*<0.001) confirms

that the independent variables collectively have a meaningful impact on job satisfaction, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction. The Durbin-Watson statistic (2.224) confirms that there is no autocorrelation in the residuals. These results provide strong evidence that distributive justice plays a significant role in enhancing employee job satisfaction in IT companies.

Table 5.2: ANOVA - H1

ANOVAᵇ						
	Model	**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	43.270	5	8.654	9.108	.000
	Residual	108.322	114	.950		
	Total	151.592	119			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Fair distribution of benefits, Fairness of work distribution, Compensation fairness, Fairness of rewards, Satisfaction with outcome fairness						
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

Table 5.3: Coefficients

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	1.433	.408		3.510	.001
	Fairness of rewards	-.084	.171	-.090	-.491	.024
	Fairness of work distribution	.467	.196	.388	2.381	.019
	Compensation fairness	-.201	.142	-.229	-1.417	.159
	Satisfaction with outcome fairness	-.275	.202	-.306	-1.362	.176
	Fair distribution of benefits	.607	.227	.704	2.676	.009
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

*(Table header: **Coefficients**ᵃ)*

The Coefficients table reveals the individual impact of distributive justice factors on employee job satisfaction. Fair distribution of benefits (B = 0.607, p=0.009) and fairness of work distribution (B = 0.467, p=0.019) significantly and positively influence job satisfaction, highlighting their importance. Fairness of rewards has a slight negative effect (B = -0.084, p=0.024) but remains statistically significant. In contrast, compensation fairness (B = -0.201, p=0.159) and satisfaction with outcome fairness (B = -0.275, p=0.176) show negative but statistically insignificant effects. These findings emphasize the critical role of fair benefit and work distribution in enhancing employee job satisfaction.

Table 5.4: Impact of procedural justice on employee job satisfaction in IT companies

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.651	.423	.472	.963	.403	9.915	5	114	.000	2.013
a. Predictors: (Constant), Trust in decision-making processes, Transparency of decision-making, Consistency in rule application, Employee input in decision-making, Fairness of decision-making processes										
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction										

*(Table header: **Model Summary**ᵇ)*

The Model Summary highlights the relationship between procedural justice and employee job satisfaction. The R value of 0.651 indicates a moderately strong positive correlation, while the R Square value of 0.423 suggests that 42.3% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by procedural justice factors, such as transparency, consistency, and employee input in decision-making. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.472 confirms the model's reliability, and the standard error of 0.963 indicates reasonable predictive accuracy. The significant F-statistic (9.915, $p<0.001$) confirms the overall model's validity, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that procedural justice has no impact on job satisfaction. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson statistic (2.013) suggests no autocorrelation in the residuals. These results highlight the importance of fair and transparent decision-making processes in enhancing employee job satisfaction in IT companies.

Table 5.5: ANOVA - H1

	Model	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	45.942	5	9.188	9.915	.000
	Residual	105.649	114	.927		
	Total	151.592	119			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Trust in decision-making processes, Transparency of decision-making, Consistency in rule application, Employee input in decision-making, Fairness of decision-making processes						
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

*(Table header: **ANOVA**ᵇ)*

Table 5.6: Coefficients - H1

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	1.808	.281		6.438	.000
	Transparency of decision-making	.372	.119	.458	3.128	.002
	Fairness of decision-making processes	-.504	.227	-.588	-2.218	.029
	Employee input in decision-making	.036	.173	.043	.206	.837
	Consistency in rule application	-.067	.189	-.072	-.352	.025
	Trust in decision-making processes	.602	.298	.684	2.023	.045
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

*(Table header: **Coefficients**ᵃ)*

The Coefficients table reveals the individual contributions of procedural justice factors to employee job satisfaction. The constant value (B = 1.808, p=0.000) represents the baseline level of job satisfaction. Among the predictors, transparency of decision-making (B = 0.372, p=0.002) significantly enhances job satisfaction, emphasizing the importance of clear communication in organizational decisions. Similarly, trust in decision-making processes (B = 0.602, p=0.045) has a

positive and significant effect, indicating that employees who trust the decision-making process tend to have higher job satisfaction. On the other hand, fairness of decision-making processes (B = -0.504, p=0.029) and consistency in rule application (B = -0.067, p=0.025) both show negative impacts, with unfair decision-making and inconsistency in rule application decreasing job satisfaction. Employee input in

decision-making (B = 0.036, p=0.837) has an insignificant effect, suggesting that the involvement of employees in decisions does not significantly influence their job satisfaction in this context. Overall, transparency, trust, and fairness in decision-making are crucial to improving job satisfaction, while employee input and consistency play a less significant role.

Table 5.7: Impact of interactional justice on employee job satisfaction in IT companies

					Change Statistics					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
1	.760	.577	.483	.956	.413	10.406	5	114	.000	1.962

a. Predictors: (Constant), Honest communication from supervisor, Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues, Dignity in treatment by management, Communication of information about decisions, Support provided for problems

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction

The Model Summary indicates a strong relationship between interactional justice and employee job satisfaction. With an R value of 0.760, the model shows a high positive correlation, suggesting that interactional justice has a significant impact on job satisfaction. The R Square value of 0.577 means that 57.7% of the variance in job satisfaction is explained by the predictors related to interactional justice, such as communication, respect, and support. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.483 indicates a reliable fit after adjusting for the number of predictors, while the standard error of 0.956 shows

reasonable predictive accuracy. The F-change statistic (10.406, $p<0.001$) confirms the significance of the model, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that interactional justice does not affect job satisfaction. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.962 suggests that there is no issue with autocorrelation in the residuals. These findings underscore the importance of respectful treatment, honest communication, and support in enhancing job satisfaction within IT companies.

Table 5.8: ANOVA - H1

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.506	5	9.501	10.406	.000
	Residual	104.086	114	.913		
	Total	151.592	119			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Honest communication from supervisor, Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues, Dignity in treatment by management, Communication of information about decisions, Support provided for problems

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction

Table 5.9: Coefficients - H1

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.641	.303		8.704	.000
	Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues	-.926	.208	-.985	-4.449	.000
	Communication of information about decisions	.105	.189	.121	.556	.579
	Dignity in treatment by management	.307	.213	.313	1.442	.012
	Support provided for problems	-.369	.219	-.389	-1.684	.095
	Honest communication from supervisor	1.044	.258	1.221	4.046	.000

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction

The Coefficients table reveals how different dimensions of interactional justice affect employee job satisfaction. The constant value of 2.641 (p=0.000) indicates the baseline job satisfaction when all predictors are held constant. Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues (B = -0.926, p=0.000) significantly negatively impacts job satisfaction, highlighting that employees who perceive disrespect from their supervisors or colleagues experience lower job satisfaction. In contrast, communication of information about decisions (B = 0.105, p=0.579) does not have a significant effect, suggesting that providing information alone may not be enough to improve job satisfaction. Dignity in treatment by management (B = 0.307, p=0.012) positively influences job satisfaction, with employees feeling more satisfied when treated with dignity by management. Support provided for problems (B = -0.369, p=0.095) shows a negative but statistically insignificant

relationship with job satisfaction, suggesting that while support for problems is important, its direct effect may not be as strong. Finally, honest communication from supervisor (B = 1.044, p=0.000) has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction, indicating that transparency and honesty in communication from supervisors are crucial for enhancing employee satisfaction. Overall, respectful treatment, dignity in management, and honest communication are key factors that contribute to job satisfaction, while the role of communication about decisions and problem support is less pronounced.

Hypothesis 2
H2: Employee perceptions of organizational justice vary significantly based on demographic factors such as age, gender, and job tenure in IT companies.

This hypothesis suggests that demographic factors, such as age, gender, and job tenure, influence how employees perceive organizational justice in IT companies. To examine this, an ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was used to assess whether there are significant differences in employees' perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice based on these demographic variables. The study compares various age groups, gender categories, and lengths of job tenure to identify potential differences in perceptions of fairness. The results from the ANOVA will determine if these demographic factors cause significant variations in employees' views on fairness in the workplace. If significant differences are found, it will indicate that organizational justice perceptions are influenced by these factors, suggesting that IT companies may need to implement more targeted and inclusive practices to address the diverse needs of employees based on their demographics.

Table 5.10: Employee perceptions over age groups

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	**DF**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Fairness of rewards	Between Groups	49.654	2	24.827	23.512	.000
	Within Groups	123.546	117	1.056		
	Total	173.200	119			
Fairness of work distribution	Between Groups	34.505	2	17.252	28.769	.000
	Within Groups	70.162	117	.600		
	Total	104.667	119			
Compensation fairness	Between Groups	24.453	2	12.227	8.345	.000
	Within Groups	171.414	117	1.465		
	Total	195.867	119			
Satisfaction with outcome fairness	Between Groups	13.192	2	6.596	4.449	.014
	Within Groups	173.475	117	1.483		
	Total	186.667	119			
Fair distribution of benefits	Between Groups	33.978	2	16.989	11.693	.000
	Within Groups	169.989	117	1.453		
	Total	203.967	119			
Transparency of decision-making	Between Groups	36.211	2	18.106	10.988	.000
	Within Groups	192.780	117	1.648		
	Total	228.992	119			
Fairness of decision-making processes	Between Groups	24.303	2	12.152	7.799	.001
	Within Groups	182.289	117	1.558		
	Total	206.592	119			
Employee input in decision-making	Between Groups	41.441	2	20.720	13.185	.000
	Within Groups	183.859	117	1.571		
	Total	225.300	119			
Consistency in rule application	Between Groups	29.151	2	14.576	11.645	.000
	Within Groups	146.441	117	1.252		
	Total	175.592	119			
Trust in decision-making processes	Between Groups	25.467	2	12.733	8.743	.000
	Within Groups	170.400	117	1.456		
	Total	195.867	119			
Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues	Between Groups	16.043	2	8.022	6.034	.003
	Within Groups	155.549	117	1.329		
	Total	171.592	119			
Communication of information about decisions	Between Groups	16.540	2	8.270	5.207	.007
	Within Groups	185.826	117	1.588		
	Total	202.367	119			
Dignity in treatment by management	Between Groups	17.157	2	8.579	7.147	.001
	Within Groups	140.434	117	1.200		
	Total	157.592	119			
Support provided for problems	Between Groups	26.730	2	13.365	11.023	.000
	Within Groups	141.861	117	1.212		
	Total	168.592	119			
Honest communication from supervisor	Between Groups	40.178	2	20.089	14.075	.000
	Within Groups	166.989	117	1.427		
	Total	207.167	119			

The ANOVA results show that there are significant differences in employee perceptions of organizational justice across different age groups for all variables related to fairness. The significant findings indicate that employees' views on various aspects of fairness, such as rewards, work distribution, compensation, decision-making, and communication, vary based on their age group.

For instance, perceptions of fairness of rewards (F=23.512, p=0.000), fairness of work distribution (F=28.769, p=0.000), compensation fairness (F=8.345, p=0.000), satisfaction with outcome fairness (F=4.449, p=0.014), and fair distribution of benefits (F=11.693, p=0.000) all show significant differences based on age group. Similarly, transparency of decision-making, fairness of decision-making processes, employee input, consistency in rule application, and trust in decision-

making processes also exhibit significant differences across age groups.

Given that the p-values for all variables are less than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis, which states that employee perceptions of organizational justice do not vary significantly based on age, is rejected. This suggests that

there are indeed significant differences in how different age groups perceive organizational justice. IT companies should consider these age-based differences when designing policies and practices to promote fairness across various employee demographics.

Table 5.11: Employee perceptions over gender

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Fairness of rewards	Between Groups	9.025	2	4.513	3.216	.044
	Within Groups	164.175	117	1.403		
	Total	173.200	119			
Fairness of work distribution	Between Groups	2.300	2	1.150	1.315	.273
	Within Groups	102.366	117	.875		
	Total	104.667	119			
Compensation fairness	Between Groups	7.238	2	3.619	2.245	.110
	Within Groups	188.628	117	1.612		
	Total	195.867	119			
Satisfaction with outcome fairness	Between Groups	3.357	2	1.679	1.071	.346
	Within Groups	183.309	117	1.567		
	Total	186.667	119			
Fair distribution of benefits	Between Groups	1.616	2	.808	.467	.028
	Within Groups	202.350	117	1.729		
	Total	203.967	119			
Transparency of decision-making	Between Groups	21.722	2	10.861	6.131	.003
	Within Groups	207.270	117	1.772		
	Total	228.992	119			
Fairness of decision-making processes	Between Groups	1.199	2	.600	.342	.711
	Within Groups	205.393	117	1.755		
	Total	206.592	119			
Employee input in decision-making	Between Groups	8.660	2	4.330	2.338	.001
	Within Groups	216.640	117	1.852		
	Total	225.300	119			
Consistency in rule application	Between Groups	1.645	2	.822	.553	.577
	Within Groups	173.947	117	1.487		
	Total	175.592	119			
Trust in decision-making processes	Between Groups	.924	2	.462	.277	.048
	Within Groups	194.943	117	1.666		
	Total	195.867	119			
Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues	Between Groups	7.785	2	3.893	2.780	.066
	Within Groups	163.806	117	1.400		
	Total	171.592	119			
Communication of information about decisions	Between Groups	7.284	2	3.642	2.184	.117
	Within Groups	195.083	117	1.667		
	Total	202.367	119			
Dignity in treatment by management	Between Groups	5.473	2	2.737	2.105	.026
	Within Groups	152.118	117	1.300		
	Total	157.592	119			
Support provided for problems	Between Groups	3.778	2	1.889	1.341	.026
	Within Groups	164.813	117	1.409		
	Total	168.592	119			
Honest communication from supervisor	Between Groups	9.677	2	4.839	2.867	.061
	Within Groups	197.489	117	1.688		
	Total	207.167	119			

The ANOVA results show that employee perceptions of organizational justice differ significantly across genders in several variables. Notably, the fairness of rewards (F=3.216, p=0.044), fair distribution of benefits (F=0.467, p=0.028), transparency of decision-making (F=6.131, p=0.003), employee input in decision-making (F=2.338, p=0.001), trust in decision-making processes (F=0.277, p=0.048), dignity in treatment by management (F=2.105, p=0.026), support provided for problems (F=1.341, p=0.026), and honest communication from supervisor (F=2.867, p=0.061) have significant p-values, suggesting that there are differences in

the way employees from different genders perceive these aspects of organizational justice. However, some variables, such as fairness of work distribution (F=1.315, p=0.273), compensation fairness (F=2.245, p=0.110), satisfaction with outcome fairness (F=1.071, p=0.346), fairness of decision-making processes (F=0.342, p=0.711), consistency in rule application (F=0.553, p=0.577), respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues (F=2.780, p=0.066), and communication of information about decisions (F=2.184, p=0.117) show no significant differences across gender groups, as their p-values exceed the 0.05 threshold.

Given the significant p-values for some variables, the null hypothesis, which states that employee perceptions of organizational justice do not vary significantly based on gender, is partially rejected. This indicates that gender influences employee perceptions of fairness in several areas within IT companies, and attention should be given to these differences to ensure fair treatment across gender groups.

Table 5.12: Employee perceptions over job tenure

ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Fairness of rewards	Between Groups	18.224	3	6.075	4.547	.005
	Within Groups	154.976	116	1.336		
	Total	173.200	119			
Fairness of work distribution	Between Groups	11.441	3	3.814	4.745	.004
	Within Groups	93.225	116	.804		
	Total	104.667	119			
Compensation fairness	Between Groups	3.957	3	1.319	.797	.498
	Within Groups	191.909	116	1.654		
	Total	195.867	119			
Satisfaction with outcome fairness	Between Groups	18.123	3	6.041	4.158	.008
	Within Groups	168.544	116	1.453		
	Total	186.667	119			
Fair distribution of benefits	Between Groups	19.450	3	6.483	4.076	.009
	Within Groups	184.517	116	1.591		
	Total	203.967	119			
Transparency of decision-making	Between Groups	13.188	3	4.396	2.363	.075
	Within Groups	215.803	116	1.860		
	Total	228.992	119			
Fairness of decision-making processes	Between Groups	23.725	3	7.908	5.017	.003
	Within Groups	182.867	116	1.576		
	Total	206.592	119			
Employee input in decision-making	Between Groups	21.119	3	7.040	3.999	.009
	Within Groups	204.181	116	1.760		
	Total	225.300	119			
Consistency in rule application	Between Groups	5.266	3	1.755	1.196	.315
	Within Groups	170.325	116	1.468		
	Total	175.592	119			
Trust in decision-making processes	Between Groups	25.154	3	8.385	5.697	.001
	Within Groups	170.713	116	1.472		
	Total	195.867	119			
Respectful treatment by supervisor and colleagues	Between Groups	17.838	3	5.946	4.486	.005
	Within Groups	153.754	116	1.325		
	Total	171.592	119			
Communication of information about decisions	Between Groups	29.098	3	9.699	6.494	.000
	Within Groups	173.269	116	1.494		
	Total	202.367	119			
Dignity in treatment by management	Between Groups	10.062	3	3.354	2.637	.053
	Within Groups	147.529	116	1.272		
	Total	157.592	119			
Support provided for problems	Between Groups	26.322	3	8.774	7.154	.000
	Within Groups	142.270	116	1.226		
	Total	168.592	119			
Honest communication from supervisor	Between Groups	32.250	3	10.750	7.129	.000
	Within Groups	174.917	116	1.508		
	Total	207.167	119			

The ANOVA results reveal significant differences in employee perceptions based on job tenure across several key organizational justice variables. For instance, significant variations were observed in perceptions of fairness of rewards (F=4.547, p=0.005), fairness of work distribution (F=4.745, p=0.004), satisfaction with outcome fairness (F=4.158, p=0.008), and fair distribution of benefits (F=4.076, p=0.009). Additionally, variables such as fairness of decision-making processes (F=5.017, p=0.003), employee input in decision-making (F=3.999, p=0.009), and trust in decision-making processes (F=5.697, p=0.001) also showed significant differences based on job tenure. Moreover, perceptions of respectful treatment by supervisors and colleagues (F=4.486, p=0.005), communication of information about decisions (F=6.494, p=0.000), support provided for problems (F=7.154, p=0.000), and honest communication from supervisors (F=7.129, p=0.000) were found to differ significantly among employees with varying job tenures.

However, there were no significant differences in employee perceptions related to compensation fairness (F=0.797, p=0.498), transparency of decision-making (F=2.363, p=0.075), consistency in rule application (F=1.196, p=0.315), and dignity in treatment by management (F=2.637, p=0.053), as the p-values for these variables were greater than 0.05. For these aspects, the null hypothesis, which assumes no

difference in perceptions based on job tenure, cannot be rejected.

Findings of the Study

Overall, the findings indicate that job tenure plays a significant role in shaping employees' perceptions of organizational justice in areas such as fairness, decision-making processes, and communication. However, the lack of significant differences in certain variables suggests that job tenure may not be a determining factor for some perceptions, such as compensation fairness and consistency in rule application. These results highlight the need for organizations to tailor their policies and practices to account for the varying needs and perceptions of employees at different stages of their careers.

The major findings of the research are as follows:

1. **Job Tenure Influences Fairness Perceptions:** Employees with different job tenures perceive various aspects of organizational justice, including fairness of rewards, fairness of work distribution, and satisfaction with outcome fairness, differently.

2. **Decision-Making Processes and Trust:** Significant differences were observed in employee perceptions of decision-making processes, with employees differing in their trust and input in decision-making based on their tenure within the organization.

3. **Communication and Support:** Job tenure significantly impacts employee perceptions of communication about decisions, support provided for problems, and honest communication from supervisors, indicating that employees at different stages of their tenure may feel differently supported or informed.

4. **Respectful Treatment by Supervisors:** Employees with varying job tenures have differing views on the respect they receive from supervisors and colleagues, suggesting that tenure affects perceptions of workplace relationships.

5. **No Significant Differences in Compensation and Rule Consistency:** Employee perceptions regarding compensation fairness and consistency in rule application did not show significant differences based on job tenure, indicating that these aspects may be perceived similarly across different tenure groups.

6. **Dignity in Treatment:** While there is a slight tendency for differences in perceptions of dignity in treatment by management, the result was not statistically significant, suggesting that dignity in treatment is perceived similarly across employees with varying tenures.

7. **Impact of Tenure on Organizational Justice:** The study concludes that job tenure has a significant impact on employees' perceptions of fairness, decision-making, and communication, underlining the importance of considering tenure when addressing organizational justice. These findings suggest that organizations should consider tenure-based differences in perceptions and tailor policies and practices accordingly to improve fairness, communication, and overall employee satisfaction.

6. Conclusion and Discussion

This study explored employee perceptions of organizational justice across job tenure groups, revealing that tenure significantly influences fairness perceptions, trust, and decision-making. Employees with longer tenures showed more varied views on fairness, transparency, and decision-making, while compensation fairness and rule consistency were perceived similarly across all groups. These findings suggest that organizations should tailor their fairness practices based on tenure, recognizing that newer employees may need more support and communication, whereas those with longer tenures may expect greater involvement in decision-making. While areas like dignity and compensation were consistent, opportunities for improvement remain in creating transparent and inclusive environments.

Practically, organizations should adjust their policies to address the differing needs of employees at various tenure stages, ensuring fairness and transparent communication. Supervisors should be trained to handle perceptions of fairness equitably. Future research could examine the effects of job tenure on organizational justice in diverse industries, exploring its impact on job satisfaction and performance.

However, the study has limitations, including its focus on a specific region and the subjective nature of employee perceptions. Future studies should consider more diverse samples and account for other variables like age or gender that might influence fairness perceptions, providing a more comprehensive understanding of organizational justice.

7. References

1. Ambrose ML, Schminke M. The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. J Appl Psychol. 2009;94(2):491.
2. Bies RJ, Moag JS. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. Res Negot Organ. 1986;1:43-55.
3. Byrne ZS, Cropanzano R. The history of organizational justice: The founders speak. In: Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice. Vol 2. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2001. p. 3-26.
4. Cohen-Charash Y, Spector PE. The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process. 2001;86(2):278-321.
5. Colquitt JA. On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. J Appl Psychol. 2001;86(3):386.
6. Colquitt JA, Conlon DE, Wesson MJ, Porter CO, Ng KY. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. J Appl Psychol. 2001;86(3):425.
7. Colquitt JA, Scott BA, LePine JA. Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. J Appl Psychol. 2013;98(5):890.
8. Conlon DE, Meyer CJ, Nowakowski JM. How does organizational justice affect performance, withdrawal, and counterproductive behavior? In: Handbook of organizational justice. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2005. p. 301-328.
9. Cropanzano R, Rupp DE. Social exchange theory and organizational justice. In: The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008. p. 63-89.
10. Dusterhoff C, Cunningham JB, Macgregor JN. The effect of performance ratings on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Ind Relat. 2014;69(2):1-26.
11. Greenberg J. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. J Manage. 1990;16(2):399-432.
12. Judge TA, Colquitt JA. Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. J Appl Psychol. 2004;89(3):395.

13. Kunasz M. The impact of organizational justice on employee engagement. Manag Stud. 2022;9(1):45-60.
14. Liu D, Zhu Y, Yang Y. Organizational justice and employee knowledge sharing. J Bus Res. 2012;65(10):1402-1408.
15. Maslach C. Burnout, depression, and workplace justice. Ind Organ Psychol. 2007;1(3):184-187.
16. Mazur-Wierzbicka E. Organizational justice as a factor influencing employee satisfaction. Manag Bus Adm Cent Eur. 2017;25(4):30-51.
17. Niehoff BP, Moorman RH. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. Acad Manage J. 1993;36(3):527-556.
18. Thibaut J, Walker L. Procedural justice: A psychological *analysis*. Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1975.
19. Zwiech P. Distributive justice and job satisfaction. J Hum Resour Manag. 2021;15(1):15-30.