Organizational Justice Enhancing Managerial Effectiveness in Terms of Activity of His Position, Achieving Results and Developing Further Potential

Geeta Rana[1*]   Prof. Renu Rastogi[2]

1.Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, I.I.T. Roorkee, India

2.Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, I.I.T. Roorkee- India

* E-mail of the corresponding author: geetaphd@rediffmail.com

Abstract

The management discourse has increasingly focused on the performance of the organizations to meet the challenges of global competition. The performance can be enhanced when organizations tend to restructure the process and policies through increased managerial effectiveness in terms of their activities and potential. Infact, managerial effectiveness is an important factor for the accomplishment of organizational goals. This study was carried out to determine the effect of justice perception on managerial effectiveness factors activity of his position, achieving results and developing further potential. A survey questionnaire was used as the main and most appropriate tool for data collection. The respondents randomly selected were at managerial position in different sectors. The sample size of the study is 300 managers whose responses were taken for analysis. Step wise multiple regression analysis was conducted to find the results. The results revealed that the distribution of rewards, organizational policies and procedures and interpersonal treatment determines the positive behavior patterns along with emotional and cognitive balances while perceiving the jobs calling and enjoying.

Keywords: organization justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, managerial effectiveness

Introduction

The growth of international business has drawn increasing interest in managerial effectiveness in the context of a revolutionary organizational change process. Over the last decades, managerial effectiveness is appearing as an important factor for the accomplishment of organizational goals and has been conceptualized in terms of competence, satisfaction, conflict resolution, need fulfillment, value realization and recognition (Srivastava & Sinha, 2007). Managerial effectiveness has been identified through three factors. First, it involves an individual's competencies, which includes a set of knowledge, skills and abilities (Shipper et al. 2003). Second, this encompasses motivation to do the job and third entails factor related to the work environment which facilitate in performing the job effectively (Sethi & Nicholson, 2001).

Gupta (1996) support the definition of managerial effectiveness as "the ability of a manager to carry out the activities required of his position while achieving the results both current and its terms of developing further potential". Earlier, factors such as organizational structure, reward system, occupational variables, safe working conditions, job satisfaction and commitment had a significant motivational factor which influenced managerial effectiveness. But in the present scenario these aspects have become mundane and can be highlighted that perception of justice as the demand of the present scenario to meet the competitive edges while considering managers as human beings and developing potential to exercise to attain effectiveness. The importance of perceived fairness and its effect on managerial effectiveness cannot be overlooked. Managerial effectiveness and organizational effectiveness both are interlinked because performing well is prerequisite for today global managers within an organizational dynamics. When managers perceive an organization to be fair, they may react positively to the organization and would be more willing to work effectively which also improve both organization's effectiveness and performance. Greenberg (1993) has defined organizational justice that refers to the fairness of decisions made by authorities, in respect to the outcomes and implementation of the procedures. In a more comprehensive manner, we can say that perception of justice within organizations (Distributive justice, Procedural justice and Interactional Justice) leads to high levels of job satisfaction, commitment, reduced turnover intentions and attenuation of counterproductive behavioral and cognitive dissonance.

A substantial body of research has examined the impact of justice perceptions on outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour, productivity, and withdrawal behaviours that consistently illustrate the importance of justice in the workplace (Charash & Spector, 2001). The purpose of this investigation is to explore the relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and managerial effectiveness dimensions. If modern managers focus on justice issues, they will be healthier and more productive at workplace and will create long term performance cultures which lead to sustainability. Implications from this research can help organizations advance processes and prepare managers to facilitate organizational decision that impact policies and procedures to maximize their competencies.

Concept of Organizational Justice (OJ)

Cropanzano et al. (2001) defined organizational justice as the fairness perceptions of employees in organizational decision making. They linked the justice perceptions to commitment level of employees, job performance, withdrawal and organizational citizenship behavior. Fairly treated employees, compared to the ones who are unfairly treated, demonstrated organizational citizenship behavior, show higher job performance, are more committed and have fewer turnover intentions (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). Folger (1994) linked justice to moral and ethical standards and explained in his studies that individuals prefer to be part of organizations that behave morally and ethically than those that do not. Justice is considered to be socially constructed which means that an act is considered to be just if it is perceived so by the individuals on the basis of empirical research (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Organizational justice researchers have consistently identified three different types of fairness perceptions as: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004; Erdogan et al. 2006; Zhang et al. 2009; Klendauer & Deller, 2009). Brief introductions of the three dimensions of organizational justice have been discussed below.

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice concern people's perceptions of the fairness of the distribution of resources between people (Greenberg & Baron 2003). Furthermore, Rahim et al. (2001) found that when perceptions of distributive justice were high, employees used more cooperative conflict management styles when interacting with their supervisor. Managers is concerned about the equity aspect of work loads, working hours, working condition, incentives, remuneration, promotions, career development. The manager's perception of whether the outcome is fair or unfair is the basis of the concept of distributive justice.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine the amount of benefits (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). These procedures should be consistent, bias free and take into account the concerns of all parties and be morally acceptable (Leventhal, 1980). Here the managers are concerned about whether the decision process is fair and the process used to determine the outcome is just. It is mainly concerned with the fairness of the means that an organizations uses to determine outcomes. Importantly, the view of managers about whether procedural justice should be reflected in a decision-making process plays a crucial role .We expect that procedural justice perceptions will enhance the level of managerial effectiveness. Procedural justice in the workplace helps to managers which they operate same set of rules, regulation and procedure to maintain equity and harmonious environment for achieving organization excellence.

Interactional Justice

Justice research began to focus on interactional justice that focus on the fairness of the interpersonal treatment the individual receives from the decision maker (Ambrose et al. 2007). The perception of the supervisor as supportive and respectful of subordinates' dignities in the interaction process will improve perceived interactional justice and positively influence subordinates' trust in supervisor (Wat & Shaffer, 2005). If managers perceive the interactional justice perception their morale, trust, respect among the coworkers lead to a greater satisfaction. Interactional justice (interactional and informational justice) which help the managers to perceived equity, strengthen peer group cohesion and feel some recognition lead to the managerial effectiveness.

Concept of Managerial Effectiveness

For any successful business organization issue of managerial effectiveness is very important, although managerial effectiveness varies organization to organization and it is also vary to different job position and hence the topic of effectiveness needs to be studied carefully. Balarman (1998) defined managerial effectiveness in behavioral terms which evaluated managers on selected job oriented criteria such as communication, cost awareness, delegation of work, labour relation, planning and scheduling, securing interdepartmental cooperation, training subordinates and utilizations of capacity. Nair & Yuvaraj (2000) defined managerial effectiveness is to analyze organizational design, cultural imperatives, people problems and performance systems that produce results.

In the present scenario of mergers and acquisitions, downsizing, layoffs, restructurings, up-gradation of technology are examples of fundamental organizational change which need to focus and restore on the issue of managerial effectiveness. Rastogi & Dave (2004) defined managerial effectiveness is not only a personality characteristic but it is related to performance and output. Tyler & Lind (1992) proposed that managers care about justice within the organization criteria because depending on justice perception managers will arrive at different conclusions about their recognition, standing, and trust by management. A number of studies have focused on the characteristics and skills of the individual managers (Katz et al. 1978; Balaraman, 1989). Gupta (1996) suggested three important aspects of effectiveness: *activities of the position* (communication and task assignment,

networking, colleagues management, informal communication ,management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, motivating, delegation, welfare management and consultative) *achieving the results* (such as discipline, client management and image building) and *developing further potential* (confidence in subordinates, and inspection and innovation).

With the above discussion a lacuna has been observed in the management discourse, where managerial effectiveness at workplace has always been an agenda. An urge has been expressed to provide work environment which leads to managerial effectiveness while delineating major behavioral pattern as organizational justice within organizations while establishing managers to be marked as fully functioning and flourishing towards their roles. Thus, it can be hypothesized that perception of justice (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) leads to managerial effectiveness in terms of activities of the position, achieving the results and developing further potential.

Methodology
Sample
The present study was carried out on a randomly selected sample of 300 managers belonging to the government, public and private sectors. Majority were from the middle level of management. However, there was a general mix when it came to the functional areas, age groups, years of experience, educational background and income groups.

Measurement
Two questionnaires were used for the present study. These were:

(1) "Managerial Effectiveness Questionnaire (ME)"developed by Seeta Gupta (1996). It consists of 45 items, which describes managerial behaviours, incorporating 16 factors with three dimensions of managerial effectiveness, mainly activity of his position, achieving result and developing further potential. This is a 5-point likert scale. The reliability of the scale is .73

(2) "Organizational justice Questionnaire (OJ)" by perception of justice within organizations was measured by using three scales, which purports to identify the three dimensions of organizational justice as distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Distributive justice was measured with the 5-item scale Index, developed by Price and Muller (1986). The reliability of the scale is .90. Perception of procedural justice was measured by using 15-item scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The scale has reported reliability for .90. Perception of interactional justice was measured by using a 9-item scale developed by Moorman (1991).This 9-item scale measures the interpersonal treatment that the employees receive during the enactment of organizational procedure. This is a 7-point scale and the scores on the scale ranges from 1=strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree. With the reliability reported as .98.

Result
Table 1 presents the mean, standard deviation and intercorelation for all the variables. It can be observed that our hypotheses is generally supported by the strong correlations between each of the independent variables and the dependent variables, the strength of this relationship varies widely between .57 (lowest) and .90 (highest). However, these are only zero order correlations and, moreover, some of the independent variables are highly correlated among themselves. It is, therefore, not possible to say whether or not all of the observed correlations are indeed genuine as some of them might be spurious.

To identify the genuine and most critical predictors of managerial effectiveness, therefore, it is necessary to go beyond the zero order correlations and undertake multivariate analysis. This was done with the help of stepwise multiple regression technique. The dimensions of organizational justice were entered for the stepwise multiple regression equation and it was found that all the dimensions of justice i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice were significant for the activity of his position, achieving the results and developing further potential. On the basis of table 2, the results of stepwise multiple regression reveal that among all the dimensions of organizational justice, distributive justice predicted activity of his position, with multiple R as .60 (F=167.86**, p<.01, β =.60, R^2=.36); procedural justice with multiple R as .64 (F=105.95**, p<.01, β =.41, R^2=.41); interactional justice multiple R as .67(F=80.34**, p<.01, β =.44, R^2=.44) and jointly explained 44 % variance in the prediction of activity of his position. And as a whole, distributive justice has been found as the strongest predictor of activity of his position with the calculated Beta value as .60.

For achieving the results, distributive justice predicted achieving the results with multiple R as .57 (F=144.54**, p<.01, β =.57, R^2=.32), procedural justice with the multiple R as .61(F=91.88**, p<.01, β =.38, R^2 =.38); interactional justice with the multiple R as .64 (F=68.71**, p<.01, β =.41, R^2=.41) and jointly explained 41 % variance in the prediction of achieving the results. And as a whole, distributive justice has been found as the strongest predictor of achieving results with the calculated Beta value as .57. On the basis of the table we can say that distributive justice is the strongest predictor of achieving the result.

Lastly, developing further potential has been predicted on the basis of dimensions of organizational justice and has been found that distributive justice predicted developing further potential, with multiple R as .58 (F=157.39**, p<.01, β =.58, R^2=.34); procedural justice with multiple R as .62 (F=91.17**, p<.01, β =.39, R^2=.39); interactional justice with multiple R as .65 (F=72.56**, p<.01, β =.41, R^2=.42) and jointly explained 42 % variance in the prediction of activity of his position. And as a whole, distributive justice has been found as the strongest predictor of developing further potential with the calculated Beta value as .58. Among all the dimensions of justice distributive justice has strongly support the managerial effectiveness dimensions followed by interactional justice and procedural justice. Hence, we can say that our hypothesis has been retained at .01 levels while predicting managerial effectiveness dimensions on the basis of justice dimensions.

Discussion

On the basis of the obtained results, it can be suggested that there is a significant relationship between perception of justice and managerial effectiveness. The findings have indicated that positive perception of justice (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) leads to managerial effectiveness. It can be stated that distributive, procedural and interactional justice related to the fulfillment of the cognitive needs (thinking, growth and decision making) and also affects task performance and contextual performance of managers (Harrison et al. 2006). It is also evident from the results that perception of justice at workplace plays a significant role in determining the activities of the position, achieving the results and developing further potential among managers, which in combination increases managerial effectiveness. It can be suggested that satisfaction of being treated fairly at workplace generates positive emotions as self-respect, pride, contentment and happiness (Burne, 2008) along with personalize relationship increase job satisfaction and effectiveness of managers which directly contribute to the success of an organization (Tripathi & Tripathi , 2001). When managers perceive their organization as fair they are more likely to improve their skills, gain expertise on competencies and proactive behaviors (Acquaah & Tukamushaba , 2009), and are more willing to perform effectively, which in turn increases managerial effectiveness (Rana et al. 2011). Thus, organizational justice is one of the most important factors for increasing competency and individual's performance (Fathy & Tony, 2010).

Table 2 reveals that activities of his position have been predicted by distributive justice with the joint effect of procedural justice and interactional justice. The findings suggest that if managers perceive fair treatment at workplace which provide material motivation (monetary incentives) (Jamaludin, 2009) and encourage managers to voice their concern in the decision making process while interactional justice facilitates managers' positive attitude toward information sharing and bring feeling of recognition within organization (Jerusalim & Hausdorf, 2007). This improve manager's activity towards professional front. Further, achieving results has been predicted by distributive justice with the joint effect of procedural justice and interactional justice. The results suggest that positive perception of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) at workplace provides feelings of deservedness which reduces turnover intentions (Lambert et al. 2010) and counterproductive work behavior among managers. This make managers disciplined and develop achievement orientation (Barrick et al. 2005), and push them for achieving the results. Lastly, developing further potential has been predicted by distributive justice with the joint effect of procedural and interactional justice. Perception of justice at workplace lead to positive outcomes, and these positive outcomes may either be tangible (e.g., money, services) or non-tangible in nature (social rewards, such as status and respect) (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001) which further fosters personal values and identity to managers. This creates meaning in manager's work life and establishes standards of excellence, and promotes high ideals.

Overall perception of distributive justice has a greater impact on work-related outcomes including pay satisfaction (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), job satisfaction (Dailey & Kirk, 1992), job security and supervision (Oldham et al. 1986), which make managers harmonious, synergistic and efficient towards work (Orlitzky et al. 2003) and fosters integrity and communication for reducing personal bias and conflict. It is suggested that procedural justice and interactional justice develop the feelings of respect and pride and fosters group cohesiveness (Janssens et al. 2003; Kickul & Troth, 2003) while reducing communication gap and managers displaying social sensitivity, respect, honesty, dignity, and politeness (Konovsky, 2000) with increased effectiveness.

Conclusion

The present study initiated a more in-depth analysis by highlighting the psychological framework of managers in terms of perception of justice at workplace, which is not only a cognitive construct but also an affective and highly personal for managers. It has become increasingly clear that fairness, integrity, and sensitivity at work place create organizational systems that are welcoming, inclusive, and congruent while increasing self-esteem(competence and worth) and feeling of achievement as a key criterion to judge one's total potentialities and capabilities (Joshi & Srivastava, 2009) among managers. The present findings indicate that perception of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice generates a strong sense of affiliation with

organization and acknowledge managers' personal responsibility for the outcomes such as clear communication for resolving problems, with increased managerial effectiveness in terms of activities of the position, achieving the results and developing further potential. It can be concluded from the present study that work is a pervasive aspect of one's life, where manager expects more than materialistic gain and experience progress and momentum marked by a sense of learning (greater understanding and knowledge) in the stimulated market environment (Johnson et al. 1996) and help them to develop in a positive direction and finally spurt one's self development, emotional literacy and emotional alchemy and enable them to realize their full potential towards organizational goal (Adekola, 2006; Williams & Warrens, 2003; Ajaja, 2003). Thus, perception of justice enhances the managers, skills, commitment, effectiveness and productivity.

References

1. Acquaah, M., & Tukamushaba, E. K. (2009). Human factor, organizational justice and perceived organizational effectives: An empirical analysis from Ghana and Uganda repositioning. *African Business and Development for the 21st century, Simon Sigue (Ed.).*

2. Adekola, K. A. (2006). Gender differences in the experiences of burnout at work place among the teachers of Ogun State, *Journal of Labour and Trade Unionism*, 1, 36-45.

3. Ajaja, A. A. (2003). *Gender factors as determinants of managerial efficiency in work organizations in Oyo State, Nigeria.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

4. Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 947-965.

5. Balarman, S. (1989). Are leadership styles predictive of managerial effectiveness? *Indian Journal of Industrial Relation*, 24(4), 399-415.

6. Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationship between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58 (3), 745-767.

7. Buren, H. J. V. (2008). Fairness and the main management theories of the twentieth century: A historical review, 1900-1965. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 633-643.

8. Charash, C. Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.

9. Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (2001). Procedural and distributive justice are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in Organizational Justice*, 119-151. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

10. Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *Interactional Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 317-372. New York: Wiley.

11. Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z.S., Bobocel, D.R., & Rupp, D.E. (2001). Self-enhancement biases, laboratory experiments. George Wilhelm Friendrich Hegel and increasingly crowded world of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 58, 260-272.

12. Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations,* 45(3), 305-318.

13. Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, L. M. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 395-406.

14. Fathy, M., & Tony, M. (2010). Organizational justice and its relation with occupational pressures and level of ambition for sport specialists at youth and sport. *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 3, 947-955.

15. Folger, R. (1994). Workplace justice and employee worth. *Social Justice Research*, 7, 225-241.

16. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on actions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32 (1), 115-130.

17. Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behaviour in organization: Understanding and managing the human side of work.* edisi 8. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

18. Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.

19. Gupta, S. (1996). Managerial effectiveness: Conceptual framework and scale development. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31(3), 392-409.

20. Harrison, D., Newman, A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta analytic comparisons of integratie behavioural outcome and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal,* 49, 305-325.

21. Jamaludin, Z. (2009). Perceived organizational justice and its impact to the development of commitment: A regression analysis. *World Journal of Management,* 1(1), 49-61.

22. Janssens, M., Sels, L., & Brande, D.V I. (2003). Multiple types of psychological contracts: A six-cluster solution. *Human Relations*, 56, 1349-1378.

23. Jerusalim, S. R., & Hausdorf, A. P. (2007). Manager's justice perceptions of high potential identification practices. *Journal of Management Development*, 26, 933- 950.

24. Joshi, S., & Srivastava, R. (2009). Self-esteem and academic achievement of adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35, 33-39.

25. Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. Willey, New York, NY.

26. Kickul, L., & Troth, M. A. L. (2003). The meaning behind the message: Climate perceptions and the psychological contract. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, 18(2), 23-32.

27. Klendauer, R. & Deller, J. (2009). Organizational justice and managerial commitment in corporate mergers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 24(1), 29-45.

28. Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 489-511.

29. Lambert, E., Hogan, N., Jiang, S., Elechi, O., Benjamin, B., Morris, A., Laux, J., & Dupuy, P. (2010). The relationship among distributive and procedural justice and correctional life satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intent: An exploratory study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 7–16.

30. Leventhal, G .S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships'', in Gergen, K., Greenberg, M. and Willis, R. (Eds), Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research, Plenum Press, New York, NY, pp. 27-55.

31. McDowall, A., & Fletcher, C. (2004). Employee development: An organizational justice perspective. *Personnel Review*, 33(1), 8-29.

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

33. Nair, S. K. & Yuvaraj, S. (2000). Locus of control and managerial effectiveness: A study of private sector managers. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36(1), 41-52.

34. Niehoff, B. P., Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationships between methods of monitoring and psychological well- being. *Academy of Management Journal,* 527-56.

35. Oldham, G. R., Kulik C. T, Ambrose, M. L., Stepina, L.P., & Brand, J. F. (1986). Relations between job fact comparisons and employee reactions. *Organizational Behaviour, Human Decision Process*, 38, 28-47.

36. Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: *A Meta Analysis. Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403–440.

37. Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.

38. Rahim, M. A., Magner, N. R., Antonioni, D., & Rahman, S. (2001). Do justice relationships with organization-directed reactions differ across U.S. and Bangaladesh employees? *The International Journal of Conflict Management,* 12 (4), 339-349

39. Rana, G., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2011). Effect of justice perception on managerial effectiveness. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 10(2), 7-20.

40. Rastogi, R. and Dave, V. (2004). Managerial effectiveness: A function of personality type and organizational components. *Singapore Management Review,* 26, 79-87.

41. Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 925–936.

42. Sethi, R., & Nicholson, C.Y. (2001). Structural and contextual correlates of charged behaviour in product development teams. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 18, 154–168.

43. Shipper, F., Kincaid, J., Rotondo, D. M., & Hoffman, R. C. (2003). A cross-cultural exploratory study of the linkage between emotional intelligence and managerial effectiveness. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 171-191.

44. Srivastava, M., & Sinha, A. K. (2007). *Individual characteristic for managerial effectiveness in a competitive environment: An exploration* paper presented in conference on global competition & competitiveness of Indian corporate , IIM Khozikode, May 18-19.

45. Tripathi, S., & Tripathi, N. (2001). Influence strategies and organizational success. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36 (3), 283- 300.

46. Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups". In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*,5(2), 115-191. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

47. Wat, D. dan Shaffer, M.A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Personnel Review***, 34(4), 406-422.

48. Williams, K. H., & Warrens, C. T. (2003). Work on family conflict among the female managers in organization. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9 (1), 36-47.

49. Zhang, L., Nie, T., & Luo, Y. (2009). Matching organizational justice with employment modes strategic human resource management perspective. *Journal of Technology Management in China, 4*(2), 180-187.

1. Ms. Geeta Rana

India Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee-247 667

Roorkee, India (www.iitr.ac.in)

D.O.B-1-1-1980, Roorkee

She is a doctoral student in Department of Management Studies at IIT, Roorkee. She is fellow member of International Society of Management (FISM). AIMS International (The Association of Indian Management Scholars International, USA) and ISTD, Delhi. Her research examines the perception of justice on how employees think, feel, and behave in their work organizations. She is UGC-NET qualified and has several years of experience as faculty in Management Institutes. Her work has appeared in several major journals, including the International Journal of Management Decision, South Asian Journal of Management, International Journal of Organizational Behaviour. She is the corresponding author of this paper.

2. Prof. Renu Rastogi

Department of Humanities and Social sciences

Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee-247 667

Roorkee, India (www.iitr.ac.in)

D.O.B-23-6-1954, Kanpur

Prof. Renu Rastogi is working as professor in Department of Humanities and social sciences, IIT, Roorkee, India. She is fellow member of Indian Women Scientists Association (IWSA), member of centre of continuing education and society for psycho-lingua. She is Ph.D from IIT Kanpur, in Psychology (OB). Her major area of interest is organizational justice, values, personality and managerial effectiveness. She has published a number of articles in various journals such as International Journal of Management Decision, Global Business Review and International Journal of Computer Applications, among others.

Table 1

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Intercorrelation between Organizational Justice and Managerial Effectiveness Dimensions (N=300)

Variables	Mean	S.D	ACTP	ACHR	DFP	DJ	PJ	IJ
1.ACTP	54.78	19.21	1	.88**	.90**	.60**	.62**	.66**
2.ACHR	16.17	5.80	.88**	1	.86**	.57**	.60**	.63**
3.DFP	19.52	6.63	.90**	.86**	1	.58**	.61**	.64**
4.DJ	23.11	8.05	.60**	.57**	.58**	1	.82**	.86**
5.PJ	41.50	15.28	.62**	.60**	.61**	.82**	1	.88**
6.IJ	41.09	14.36	.66**	.63**	.64**	.86**	.88**	1

**Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

ACTP -activity of his position, ACHR-Achieving the results, DFP-Developing further potential, DJ-Distributive justice, PJ-Procedural justice, IJ-Interactional justice

Table-2
Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis showing Managerial Effectiveness as Dependent variable with the Dimensions of Organization Justice as Predictor Variable (N=300)

Independent variable	R	R^2	SEm	F-value	D.F	β Value
1.D.V. ACTP						
DJ	.60	.36	15.39	167.86	1,298	.60
DJ,PJ	.64	.41	14.72	105.95	1,297	.25,.41
DJ,PJ,IJ	.67	.44	14.33	80.34	1,296	.07,.17,.44
2.D.V:ACHR						
DJ	.57	.32	4.75	144.54	1,298	.57
DJ,PJ	.61	.38	4.58	91.88	1,297	.23,.41
DJ,PJ,IJ	.64	.41	4.48	68.71	1,296	.06,.18,.41
3.D.V:DFP						
DJ	.58	.34	5.37	157.39	1,298	.58
DJ,PJ	.62	.39	5.17	91.17	1,297	.26,.39
DJ,PJ,IJ	.65	.42	5.06	72.56	1,296	.09,.16,.41

ACTP : Activity of his position, ACHR: Achieving the results, DFP: Developing further potential, DJ: Distributive justice, PJ: Procedural justice, IJ: Interactional justice

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Academic conference: http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar