An Assessment Of Exploring The Link Between Organizational Justices And Workplace Friendship

Assegid Demissie Shishigu,
Associate professor, University of Gondar, assegid04@gmail.com;
Minbiyew Mekonnen,
Lecturer, University of Gondar, minbiyew2002@gmail.com

Abstract
The main purpose of this paper is to assess the link between organizational justice and Workplace Friendship in the banking sector. The data was collected from 150 randomly selected employees. Two adapted instruments were used to measure Organizational Justices and Workplace Friendship. The finding of this study reveals that only 20% of respondents confirmed their perception of Organizational Justice in their organization, of which more than half of the respondents (52%) perceived Interactional Justice mainly prevailed in the sector. Regarding Workplace Friendship only 32% of the respondents confirmed their experiences of workplace friendship. Among from components (41%) of respondents are formed collegial peers, the one that offers job-related comment. However, 9 percent variance in the current level of Workplace Friendship is accounted for the manifestation of Organizational Justice.
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1. Introduction
Organizational Justice is one of the key factors associated with the success of an organization. When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organization, they are inclined to show more positive attitude and behaviors like formation of friendship within the organization. In order to keep employees committed, satisfied and loyal to the organization, organization needs to be fair in its system, regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Human resource is the most important resource of an organization to make it profitable. All other resources such as, monetary resources, natural resources etc. are dependent on capable and talented man powers for their optimal utilization. Every employee wants justice to the workplace, in terms of fair procedures used to determine rewards, distribution of rewards, interaction with supervisors to be more satisfied and committed with their work and organization. When employees are treated fairly overall with the organization, they feel need of reciprocal response to the organization of positive manners. Employees spend a large portion of their lives at work place. Employees’ Interpersonal relationships and friendships between/among employees at work are often formed.

Specifically, this study aims to assess the link between perceived organizational Justice (Distributive, procedural and interactional justice) and employees’ workplace friendship.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Organizational Justice:
Organizational justice is associated with the fair treatment of employees (Randeree, 2008). Greenberg (1987) was the first to coin the term organizational justice, by which represents individual’s perceptions and reactions to fairness towards employees in the organization. Justice refers to decision or an action that is ethically and morally right. According to the argument of Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, (2008), Justice/fairness in organizations may include issues associated with the perceptions of fairness in payment, equal opportunities for promotion and selection processes. Organizational justice is directly associated with the workplace as it describes the role of fairness. Particularly, it is linked with the way in which employees determine whether they are treated fairly or not (Moorman, 1991). According to Adams, (1965); Leventhal, (1980) and Bies & Moag, (1986), the three major components of organizational are distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.
Distributive Justice: Distributive Justice is component of Organizational Justice focused on the fairness of outcomes. Conceptually, Distributive Justice is characterized as the fairness associated with the distribution of tangible or intangible resources and decision consequences (Adams, 1965). It is related to Equity theory. Which asserts that employees’ comparing their inputs (what they invest into their job) and outcomes (what they receive in return) with the inputs and outcomes of others employees (McFarlin, & Sweeney, 1992).

Procedural Justice: It focuses on the processes which are used to determine what they receive in return (the outcomes) (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). According to them if employees were given a chance to participate in the process used to reach outcomes they might perceive what they receive in return as fair. According to (Folger and Konovsky ,1989), Procedural justice is the perceived fairness of the means used to determine those amounts. it is the fairness of an organization's formal procedures(Skarlicki & Folger (1997). As to the argument of McFarlin, & Sweeney,(1992), procedures are important predictor of outcomes than distributive justice. Leventhal, (1980) substantiated that procedural justice prevails only when employees feel that the process includes aspects of consistency, precision, ethicality and indiscrimination.

Interactional Justice: it is an element of organizational justice which focuses on employees' perceptions of the interpersonal behavior exercised during the representation of procedures and decisions (Bies, 1986). It involves many sensitive actions, such as supervisors’ respond to employees with respect and dignity (e.g., showing empathy for his predicament providing sufficient explanations for decisions, and paying attention to an employee’s concerns) (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Mikula, Petrik, & Tanzer, (1990) suggested that a significant amount of perceived injustices associated with perceptions of interactional justice instead of distributional or procedural. Employees gave more importance of the way they were treated with their interpersonal relation to their supervisors.

2.2 Workplace Friendship

Friendship is intentional, personal relationship that provides closeness and support (Fehr, 1996). While, Workplace Friendship is deliberate associations that involve shared trust, give-and-take likes common interests and values rather than being only reciprocated friends (Berman et al., 2002).

According to Fine (1986), Workplace friendship increases support that helps people realize their task, lessen work stress, and offer bigger cooperation and energy. Hamilton (2007) also pointed that if workplace friendship prevails, people might feel at ease with their workplace friends and reduces feelings of nervousness and uncertainty. Another positive consequence of friendship is its innate character to be a career-boosting relationship which offers work more fun, and enhances the individual creativeness (Sias & Cahill, 1998). According to Kram and Isabella (1985) friendship has three categories: (a) informational peer that considered possessing some motivational character being the one that shares information contributing to doing good work performance, (b) collegial peer, the one that offers job-related comment and (c) special peer that provides emotional support and personal feed. (Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Nielseet al., 2000) also mentioned that friendship with the workplace has two dimensional constructs of prevalence and opportunity. However, for the sake of this study, components of work place friendship proposed by Kram and Isabella (1985) are used.

2.3 Organizational Justice and Workplace Friendship

A number of empirical studies have been conducted to investigate the predictive roles of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment, turnover, attitudes etc.( such as ,Greenberg, 1990;Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Lind and Tyler, 1988; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992 and (Schminke, Ambrose, and Noel, 1997). However, there very few studies that focus their objective on the association with Organizational Justices and Workplace Friendship. That is why this study tried to address it.
3. Research Method

The study aimed at identifying the link between organizational justice and workplace friendships of the employees working in the banking sector in seven Gondar, Ethiopia. The information was gathered from employees that work in different branches of Commercial bank of Ethiopia.

It was a primary research therefore data was collected through a questionnaire. 150 employees were selected randomly. Questionnaires were distributed over and the response rate was 100%. Two standard research instruments adapted to measure organizational justice and workplace friendship.

The first instrument used to measure Organizational Justice and its elements are measured adapted from instrument developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). This instrument has 20 items (Distributive Justice: 5 item, Procedural Justice with 6 items, and Interactional Justice =9 items.. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree). In order to test the reliability of the instrument used, Cronbach Alpha was applied. The reliability test score in this study was 0.872. The second research instrument used to measure Workplace Friendship was Adapted from Nielsen, et al. (2000). The instrument has 12 items remaining after Morrison’s (2006) factor analyses. The Cronbach’s Alpha test result of this tool is 0.835.

4. Results Analysis
4.1 Demographics Analysis

Following Table 1 shows the demographics of the sample size taken for the study. Out of the 150 respondents, 72 were single, while 77 were married. 101 respondents consisted of male while 49 were female. 91 were of 25 to 34 years of age. Almost all of the respondents were educated up to Bachelors or Masters Level.

4.2 Result of Organizational Justice

In order to achieve the first objective of this study, table 1, reveals the perception of organizational justice and its three dimensions.

Organizational justice: -As Table 1, below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 65(43%) of respondents disagree with the prevalence of Organizational justices in their organization. The other 56 (37%) did not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 29 (20%) of respondents agreed with prevalence of organizational justices of their sector.

Distributive Justice: Table 1 displays the below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 64(43%) of respondents disagree with the prevalence of Distributive Justice in their organization. The other 50 (33%) does not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 36 (24%) of respondents agrees with prevalence of Distributive Justice in their organization. Employees have negative attitudes to their workload, and level of pay, they showed positive attitudes to work schedule, rewards and job responsibilities.

Procedural Justice: Table 1 displays the below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 70(47%) of respondents indifferent with the prevalence of Procedural Justice in their organization. The other 54 (36%) does not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 26 (17%) of respondents agree with prevalence of Procedural Justice in their organization.

Interactional Justice: As it is displayed the table the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 77(52%) of respondents disagrees with the prevalence of Interactional Justice in their organization. The other 47 (47%) do not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 26 (17%) of respondents agree with prevalence of Interactional Justice in their organization. According to
treating employees, managers are treating them with respect and dignity, and are sensitive to their personal needs, and they deal with them in a truthful manner, and when making decisions concerning their job, they discuss the implications with them (Table 1).

from this data we more half of the respondents (52%) perceived Interactional Justice, employees’ perceptions of the interpersonal behavior exercised during the representation of decisions and procedures. supervisors do not respond employees with dignity and respect, do not providing sufficient explanations for decisions, paying attention to an employee’s concerns, and showing empathy for his predicament

4.3 Result of Workplace friendship

In order to achieve the first objective of this study, Table 1, reveals the perception of Workplace friendship and its three dimensions.

Workplace friendship: As Table 1, below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 64(43%) of respondents disagreed with the prevalence of Workplace friendship in their organization. The other 48 (32%) of respondents agrees, while the remaining 38 (25%) of respondents does not dare to voice their perception with prevalence to Workplace friendship.

Informational peer: Table 1 displays the below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 90(60%) of respondents disagree with the prevalence of Informational peer in their organization. The other 43 (29%) of respondents agree with prevalence of in their organization Informational peer do not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 17 (11%) of respondents are neutral to agree or disagree with prevalence of Informational peer their organization.

Collegial peer: Table 1 displays the below also reveals the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 61(41%) of respondents agreed with the prevalence of Collegial peer in their organization. The other 60 (41%) disagreed the prevalence, while the remaining 28 (19%) of respondents are indifferent with prevalence of Collegial peer in their organization.

Special peer: As it is displayed the table the information obtained from the data analysis shows that 73(48%) of respondents disagreed with the prevalence of Special peers in their organization. The other 47 (47%) do not dare to voice their perception, while the remaining 43 (29%) of respondents agreed with prevalence of Special peer (Table 1).

From these data we can conclude that the majority of respondents are experienced collegial peer,( the one that offers job-related comment). A significant number of respondents’ are neutral (25%). They do not express their agreement or disagreement.

Table 1: frequency distribution of Organizational justices and Workplace friendship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>distributive</th>
<th>procedural</th>
<th>Interactional</th>
<th>Organizational justices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>informational peer</th>
<th>collegial peer</th>
<th>special peer</th>
<th>Workplace friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Correlation Analysis

As shown in Table 2, Organizational justice has positive and statistically significant association with Workplace friendship (r=.314), special peer (r=.368) at (p<0.01), but has not significantly association with informational peer and collegial peer. On the other hand procedural significantly related to (r=.214) at (p < .05) and with special peer (r=.239), (p < .05) . The results from Table 2 also reveal that the relationship with dimensions of Organizational justice, interactional (r=316) with Workplace friendship and (r=, 378) at (p<0.01), level with special peer.

| Table 2: correlation between Organizational justice and Workplace friendship variable |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | WORKPLACE FRIENDSHIP            | informational peer              | collegial peer                  | special peer                    |
| ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE           | .314**                          | .143                            | .207                            | .368**                          |
| distributive                    | .114                            | .121                            | -.052                           | .182                            |
| procedural                      | .214*                           | .088                            | .163                            | .239*                           |
| Interactional                   | .316**                          | .157                            | .198                            | .378**                          |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.5 Variance Explained in workplace friendship by organizational Justice

Results of the regression analysis in Table 3 show that (R^2 = .099, adjusted R^2 = .089) at P < .003. That is, only 9 percent variance of the current level of workplace friendship is accounted for the manifestation of organizational Justice. The stepwise algorithm chooses procedural (in terms of workplace friendship variables). The result of the Beta analysis in Table 3 also reveals that procedural behavior, emerged as the first significant predictor (β =.302, P < .004).

| Table 3: regression Analysis and beta Analysis |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Model                                         | R                                             | R^2                                          | Adjusted R^2                                  | Sig.                                          |
| 1                                             | .314                                          | .099                                         | .089                                         | .003                                          |

Coefficients of the beta Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>procedural</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>2.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational Justices; b. Dependent Variable: workplace friends

5. Conclusion

This study explores employees’ perceptions of organizational justice in the form of (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and to assess how these perceptions associate with their workplace friendship formation. The findings revealed that respondents perception of the prevalence of organizational justices and exercising of workplace friendship is low. However, There is a positive association organizational justice and workplace friendship. Also this finding suggests that organizational justice is one of the antecedents to workplace friendship and indicate cultivating employees’ sense of organizational justice is important to the development of workplace friendship between/among employees.
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