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Management Summary

Past decades the economy was rising. In order to keep the economy rising, people have to work hard and have to meet high standards. As a result, people suffer from job stress and are not satisfied with their jobs. If, next to that, the perceived justice in the organization is low, people suffer even more from job stress and are less satisfied with their jobs.

This thesis deals with the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction and if organizational justice has a moderating effect on this relationship.

A literature review is conducted by use of different databases like Science Direct and PsycINFO. The relationship between job stress and job satisfaction is explored and the concept of organizational justice is defined. Next to that, the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction is studied. Last, the moderating effect of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction is researched.

Studies showed a negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Next to that, organizational justice is defined and divided into distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Furthermore, literature demonstrated that organizational justice has a positive influence on job satisfaction, but to what extent is not unanimous. Last, no (empirical) evidence is found for the moderating effect of organizational justice.

To conclude, no statement can be made about the moderating effect of organizational justice. A positive moderating effect can be implied, because the other variables showed a relationship, but this implication has no reasonable grounds conducted from the literature. That is why it is recommended to study this field of organizational behavior.

The area of organizational behavior described above is interesting and new, since no research is done about the relationship. As justice plays a great role in organizations and has an effect on job stress and job satisfaction, it is interesting to study this area. This thesis can be a prelude to subsequent studies.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Problem indication

These days a lot of people suffer from the stress they experience at work. Job stress has become an important problem for employers and employees. People have to meet higher standards and therefore ask more of themselves than what they can give. According to Liu, Spector & Shi (2007) “As the world economy gets more competitive and the workplace more fast-paced, job stress has become a serious threat to employees’ occupational well-being” (p. 209).

Next to that, job satisfaction is also an important issue these days. People have to be satisfied with their job in order to stay at the company. If people are satisfied with their job, they have a higher motivation and ultimately will be loyal to the company. There are several components which lead to job satisfaction. Warr, Cook & Wall (1979) studied some of these components of job satisfaction which are also used by Dormann & Zapf (2001):

The job satisfaction measure used was adopted from Warr et al. (1979). Eight items asked participants how satisfied they were with respect to several aspects of their work. These aspects were ‘Possibilities to develop new skills and knowledge,’ ‘Possibilities to carry out work as it is most suitable to oneself,’ ‘Availability and condition of working resources which facilitate task accomplishment (properties, devices etc.),’ ‘Social recognition,’ ‘Environmental conditions at work (noise, light, temperature etc.),’ ‘Pay and social benefits,’ ‘Trust received by supervisors’ and ‘Promotion opportunities’. (pp. 495)

Furthermore, organizational justice is also an important issue. Loi, Yang & Diefendorff (2009) defined organizational justice as “people’s subjective perceptions of fairness in organizations” (p. 770). People want to be respected and be treated fairly. Justice is important in an organization, because employees feel that they are more respected and more rewarded when they are treated fairly. This will lead to a more peaceful surrounding and the employees will eventually be more loyal to the company.
The focal area that will be researched in this paper is the link between perceived justice in an organization, stress and satisfaction. It seems that a lot of research has been done in these areas, but little is known about how these three areas affect each other. Based on own experience, it can be predicted that more justice in an organization can lead to less job stress and ultimately to more job satisfaction. In this thesis, theoretical evidence is searched for this relationship.

1.2 Problem statement
The problem statement for this thesis is:
‘What is the influence of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction?’

1.3 Research questions
The research questions that will help answering the problem statement are:
1. To what extent does job stress influence job satisfaction?
2. What is organizational justice and which types do exist?
3. What is the influence of organizational justice on job satisfaction?
4. Which types of organizational justice have an influence on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction and how?

1.4 Relevance
From a managerial perspective, the relevance of this research is how important variables of the work environment influence each other. It explains the linkages between the variables, which can be used to adapt the process if that is necessary.
From an academic perspective, the research is relevant because it explains how different theories about each variable are related to each other. During the research the moderator, independent variable, dependent variable and the inter-relation will be explained.

1.5 Research design and data collection
The type of research that will be used is descriptive research and the specific method will be a literature review. It will be a research based on secondary sources.
The information that will be used for this research is found in different databases, such as the library of Tilburg University, Wiley InterScience, OvidSP and JSTOR.
Information is found via searching on words like ‘organizational justice’, ‘job stress’ and ‘job satisfaction’.

The main concept that will be investigated is the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction and the moderating influence of organizational justice.

1.6 Structure

Figure one shows the research model that will be used for this thesis.

![Conceptual framework](image)

Legend

+ = positive relationship
- = negative relationship

Figure 1: Conceptual framework

In chapter two the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction will be examined. In chapter three the types of organizational justice will be described and what is commonly understood by organizational justice. In chapter four the elements of organizational justice that have an effect on job satisfaction will be discussed and in chapter five the organizational justice elements that have an effect on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction will be explored. In the final chapter, chapter six, the conclusion, discussion and recommendations will be given.

As said before, it is predicted that organizational justice affects the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, it may be that there is no theoretical evidence for this relationship and that is why also the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction will be investigated. Although there is no moderating effect of organizational justice, there still could be a relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. This relationship is also investigated to make the research more complete.
Chapter 2: The relationship between job stress and job satisfaction

In this chapter, the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction will be investigated and explained.

2.1 Job stress
During the last century, the growth of the economy has been very important. Employers and employees worked very hard to keep the economy going, but growth came at a cost. A lot of people nowadays suffer from stress. Because of the stronger competition due to globalization employees suffer from a high workload. This stronger competition also creates need for change in the organizations. Employees get affected by these changes, because they don’t have security about their jobs, which creates more stress.

The literature shows slightly different definitions of job stress, which is also known as workplace stress or occupational stress. The definition that will be used in this thesis is: “The feeling of a person who is required to deviate from normal or self-desired functioning in the workplace as the result of opportunities, constraints, or demands relating to potentially important work-related outcomes” (Parker & Decotiis, 1983, p. 165). This definition is chosen because it contains the most various aspects of job stress and explains job stress most clearly.

Lazarus (as cited in Crandall & Perrewé, 1995) claims that job stress is frequently measured without the personal variables of the stress process while they are a main factor of stress. Stress is transactional, process and appraisal centered. Stress is transactional centered because the transaction between the person and the environment can make a situation stressful. Stress is process centered because it is subjected to change. Stress is appraisal centered because it arises after an evaluation that does not meet the expectation. It has an individualistic symptom which is dynamic and different for everyone in every situation. It varies with age, type of job, socio-economic variables and personality.

These ideas are in conflict with the Person Environment Fit Model of French, Caplan and Harrison (1982). This model shows two distinct versions of a fit between personal and environmental variables. A good person-environment fit is associated with a good
adaptation in the workplace while a person-environment misfit is associated with a bad adaptation. In this study, job stress is seen as a static process. It underlines stable relationships between the person and the environment. Lazarus (as cited in Crandall & Perrewé, 1995) disagreed with this idea and stated that job stress is not a static process but a process in which job stress constantly changes over time and changes with specific work-related contexts. He found that next to the environment-personal relationship, stress is also caused by personal variables and environmental variables that are all subjected to change. Stress is not a property of a person, but it is a conjunction between a particular kind of person and a particular kind of environment which leads to an appraisal. The primary appraisal is whether or not there is any personal stake in the confrontation. Secondary appraisal is which available coping options there are for dealing with threat, challenge or harm.

Holt (1982) studied job stress and found 57 stressful stimulus conditions, such as work overload, role ambiguity, role conflict and job possibilities. Cartwright and Cooper (1997) summarized these conditions into six sources of stress: factors intrinsic to the job itself, the role in the organization, the relationships at work, career development, organizational structure and non-work factors. Figure two shows the sources, symptoms and effects of work stress.

![Figure 2: Effects of stress (Source: Cartwright & Cooper, 1997)](image-url)
2.2 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important issue for employees and companies. Outcome variables such as absenteeism and organizational inefficiency, counterproductive behavior and sabotage are consequences of low job satisfaction. On the other hand, variables such as job autonomy, satisfaction with pay, training and integration lead to higher job satisfaction (Lambert, Hogan & Griffin, 2007).

Job satisfaction is “an affective reaction to one’s job typically argued to be a function of situational factors, including the nature of work, human resources elements and the organizational environment” (Boswell, Shipp, Payne & Culbertson, 2009, p. 844). There is a difference between intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction means that factors of doing the job itself e.g. recognition, achievement and responsibility induce job satisfaction (Wernimont, 1966). It tends to be quite similar when there is a change of occupation and/or employer (Tang, Kim & Tang, 2000). Extrinsic job satisfaction means that environment-related factors e.g. company policies and practices, salary and interpersonal relations in supervision induce job satisfaction (Wernimont, 1966).

Job satisfaction is determined by dispositional influences and personality traits and this relation is mediated by working conditions. Dispositional influences and personality traits influence the objective working conditions such as job choice and being selected by the organization. These objective working conditions in turn influence job satisfaction, which explains the mediating role (Dormann & Zapf, 2001).

People tend to have some stability in the level of job satisfaction, but factors can lead it to a higher or lower level. One of those factors is the newness of the job. Research of Boswell, Boudreau and Tichy (2005) showed that feelings about a job vary in accordance to change in a function of a job, which suggests a predictable pattern of an initial peak and a following decline in job satisfaction when you start a new job. Dormann and Zapf (2001) partly agreed with this and argued that this stability is caused by the fact that people often remain in the same branches/occupation. Even when people change their job they often stay in their own occupation or find a job in a related occupation, which means that certain organizational conditions that cause job satisfaction such as job content and job stressors remain constant.
2.3 Relationship job stress and job satisfaction

The literature shows a lot of research about the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. In general, job satisfaction is interpreted as an outcome variable which is closely linked to job stress. Fogarty, Machin, Albion, Sutherland, Lalor and Revitt (1999) investigated the relationship and found a correlation of -.46, which means that stress is highly negative correlated to job satisfaction. Decker and Borgen (1993) studied the relationship among 249 adults in different companies. The study fit the expected pattern whereby higher job stress relates to lower job satisfaction, but not all the factors of stress were equally significant. Role boundary, role insufficiency and role ambiguity had a strong negative effect on job satisfaction while responsibility, role overload and physical environment only had a slightly negative effect.

Guenole, Chernyshenko, Stark, McGregor and Ganesh (2008) agreed with these findings, but next to that they discovered a mediating role of current stress symptoms. The relationship described above is a relationship between stress reaction style and job satisfaction whereby stress reaction style describes “the stress symptoms that will be experienced in the presence of environmental stressors” (Guenole et al., 2008, p. 250). Stressors are the experiences that give rise to stress. The current stress symptoms are symptoms that the respondents experienced in a short time before the interview and stress reaction style influences job satisfaction via these current stress symptoms.

Kelloway, Barling and Shah (1993) already developed a relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, but not only a negative relationship. Kelloway et al. (1993) demonstrated that indeed negative stressors reduce job satisfaction, but positive stressors such as being disciplined and representing others increase job satisfaction. Next to that, Kelloway et al. (1993) found a mediating role of negative or positive mood. Figure three shows the correlations between the variables.

![Figure 3: Effects of stress on job satisfaction (Source: Kelloway et al., 1993)](image-url)
2.4 Conclusion
Different papers show different relationships between job stress and job satisfaction, but they all agree that there is a relationship. Job stress negatively influences job satisfaction, but the relationship may be mediated.

Literature is clear about the direction of the causality between job stress and job satisfaction. To my experience, literature does not pay attention to the reverse causality that job satisfaction influences job stress. Literature does not show that job satisfaction influences job stress, but it also does not show that this direction does not occur.
Chapter 3: Definition and typology of organizational justice

Organizational justice is the research area in which the perceptions of fairness in the workplace are examined. Organizational justice originates from a social-psychology perspective. This perspective, together with the influences of cognitive and legal sciences, transformed justice into its present framework (Cropanzano, 2001). Organizational justice has gone through a few stages, called waves. There are three main waves, which are in order of temporal appearance: the distributive justice wave, the procedural justice wave and the interactional justice wave (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005).

3.1 Distributive justice
Distributive justice “refers to people’s perceptions of the fairness by which resources are distributed” (Greenberg, 2004, p. 353). It has to meet the standards of equity, equality and needs in order to satisfy the employees. Stouffer, Suchman, Devinney, Star & Williams (1949) already experienced many years ago that people’s reactions to outcomes depend more on comparing their outcomes with others than the absolute level. Homans (1961) elaborated on this idea by noting that expectations are dependent of the expectations of a reference group. Blau (1964) demonstrated that there are different kinds of expectations and exchanges which were used to develop the equity theory by Adams (1965). This theory suggested that there is a way to calculate if an outcome is fair by computing the ratio of one’s inputs to one’s outcomes and then compare that ratio with the ratio of someone else with the same personal characteristics. Walster, Berscheid & Walster (1973) revised this theory by framing it as a more general approach to justice. The equity theory of Adams was extended in two ways: the formula to calculate the ratio was changed, because it led to counterintuitive predictions when handling negative inputs and inequity restoration was split into actual equity and psychological equity. Leventhal (1976, 1980) identified other allocation rules next to the equity theory of Adams such as different contexts, different organizational goals and different personal motives.

All these theories did not completely explain people’s perceptions of justice, so the focus shifted to procedural justice and interactional justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).
Distributive justice in organizations manifest when the perceived fairness of the outcomes is important, for example when promotion decisions are made and when there is pay selection. If, for instance, a junior executive is being paid more than a senior, the senior will perceive distributive injustice.

3.2 Procedural justice

Procedural justice is characterized as “the fairness of the process by which outcomes are determined” (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p. 3). Thibaut & Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice by closely viewing third-party dispute resolution procedures divided into a process and a decision stage. The research suggested that the procedure was perceived fair if the disputants had process control. This research virtually equated the control with procedural justice.

Leventhal, Karuza & Fry (1980) extended this research by involving nonlegal contexts such as organizational settings. The investigation showed an elaboration of six criteria that should be met in order to perceive a procedure as fair. These criteria are: consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness and ethicality. Consistency means that the allocation procedures should be consistent over time and across persons. Bias suppression means that decision maker’s personal interest should be excluded during the allocation process. Accuracy means that the allocation process should be based on as much valid information as possible. Correctability means that there has to be the opportunity to change an unfair decision. Representativeness means that needs, values and outlooks of all parties should be represented. Ethicality means that the allocation process should meet the standards of moral and ethical values of the individuals involved (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005).

The perceived fairness of outcomes was no longer the only relevant determinant of organizational justice, also the process by which outcomes were achieved was important. Different from distributive justice is that the injustice perceived is directed to the whole organization instead of to that specific outcome (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In most cases when procedural injustice is perceived also distributive injustice is perceived.

Procedural justice in organizations manifest when the perceived fairness of the process is more important than the perceived fairness of the outcome. For example, if
two co-workers with the same qualifications do not get the same payment distributive injustice will occur. Still, the procedure can be perceived as fair. When the payment is determined in a very systematic, exact and openly manner, it is unlikely that procedural injustice will occur.

### 3.3 Interactional justice

Interactional justice “refers to the fairness of the interpersonal treatment given in the course of explaining procedures and outcomes” (Greenberg, 2004, p. 357). Interactional justice is focused on the communication by the management to the employees (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Bies and Moag (1986) developed a more complete version of organizational justice by adding a focus on the importance of the quality of the interpersonal treatment. This is an important result of their investigation, because it suggests that organizational justice is more than just fairness. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Yee Ng (2001) split interactional justice into interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice refers to the interpersonal respect and sensitivity during organizational procedures. Informational justice refers to the accuracy and quality of the explanations about organizational procedures given to individuals. Greenberg (as cited in Colquitt et al., 2001) split interpersonal treatment into two types: labeled interpersonal justice and labeled informational justice. Labeled interpersonal justice is “the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 427). Labeled informational justice is “the degree to which explanations are provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 427).

Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) argued that interactional justice is different from distributive and procedural justice, because interactional justice is directed towards the supervisor instead of the outcome (distributive justice) or the organization as a whole (procedural justice). In most cases when interactional injustice is perceived also procedural injustice and distributive injustice is perceived.

Interactional justice in organizations manifest when the interpersonal treatment is more important than the process or the outcome of the process. For example, if an employee gets paid less than an employee with the same qualifications he/she will perceive distributive injustice. If the procedure is not systematic and open, the
employee will also perceive procedural injustice. The employee can go to his supervisor and ask why this division of salary is chosen. If the supervisor does not have a good explanation, does not take the employee serious or is unlikely to help, the employee will perceive interactional injustice.

3.4 Relationship types of organizational justice
Via a meta-analysis, Colquitt et al. (2001) studied, among others, the dependence between the dimensions of organizational justice. The analysis showed a correlation between the dimensions, but this correlation is low enough that the dimensions of organizational justice can be seen as three distinct constructs. However, the research also proved that some sub-dimensions of procedural justice (process control and Leventhal criteria) are not that highly correlated that they can be exchanged for each other. Also some sub-dimensions of interactional justice (interpersonal and informational justice) are not that highly correlated that they can be used interchangeably.
Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) showed via a meta-analysis that distributive, procedural and interactional justice are closely related, but yet distinct. In figure four the relationship between the types of organizational justice is presented.

![Figure 4: Relationship types of organizational justice](image)

3.5 Conclusion
Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of outcomes. Procedural justice is the perceived fairness of the procedures to get the outcome. Interactional justice is the perceived fairness of the decision maker’s behavior. Interactional justice can be split into interpersonal justice and informational justice. Concluding from the research, these types of organizational justice are distinct from each other.
Chapter 4: The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction

Organizational justice may have an impact on job satisfaction. Most employees have career aspirations that they want to achieve over time. If this is not possible by the organization, employees will see their job as a dead-end and will be less satisfied. Next to that, if there are unjustified procedures and outcomes employees will be more resented and this will lead to lower job satisfaction. Low job satisfaction is harmful for the organization since it may lead to negative employee behaviors such as absenteeism.

Viswesvaran and Ones (2002) studied the influence of organizational justice on job satisfaction and argued that all dimensions of justice could be placed in the context of just distributive and procedural justice. This means that, in their opinion, interactional justice is not a distinct type of justice, but it is a form of procedural justice. That is why only the influence of distributive and procedural justice is studied. Their results showed that both justices have an effect on job satisfaction.

The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction is explored a few times, but the relationship is not investigated for all the types of organizational justice. Especially research about the relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction is scarce, but research between the other two types of organizational justice and job satisfaction is explored more frequently.

4.1 Distributive justice and job satisfaction
Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007) predicted that distributive justice would have an effect on job satisfaction. If there are feelings of being treated unfairly, it is unlikely that the job stays satisfying. In their research they demonstrated that distributive justice did not have a direct relationship with job satisfaction, but an indirect relationship through job stress. It appears that the outcome is not the most important part of the justice perception.

In contrary, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) predicted that distributive justice would be a more important influence on job satisfaction than the other forms of justice. Their research supported their prediction. They showed that distributive justice is a more
important predictor of personal outcomes, such as job satisfaction, while procedural justice is a more important predictor of organizational outcomes, such as organizational commitment.

Lambert (2003) disagreed with these findings and his results showed that procedural justice had a larger magnitude of effect than distributive justice. He claimed that distributive justice affects individual attitudinal states such as satisfaction, while procedural justice affects individual level affective states such as job satisfaction. Unlike Lambert et al. (2007), here a positive relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction was found.

### 4.2 Procedural justice and job satisfaction

Lambert et al. (2007) predicted that procedural justice would have an effect on job satisfaction. As said before, unfairness may lead to job dissatisfaction. In their research they showed that procedural justice indeed has a positive impact on the job satisfaction. Increased perceptions of procedural justice created positive feelings about the job. Lambert (2003) agreed with this finding and on top of that he showed that procedural justice is a more important factor to predict job satisfaction than distributive justice.

As mentioned earlier, research of McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) contradicts with research of Lambert (2003), since they predicted that procedural justice would be a less important factor than distributive justice for influencing job satisfaction. Their research underpinned this idea, but this finding is not in accordance with the referent cognitions theory. This theory means that “individuals evaluate their work experiences by reflecting on ‘what might have been’ under different circumstances and conditions” (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992, p. 627). Cropanzano and Folger (1989) suggested that this theory could give an explanation about the interactive effects of distributive and procedural justice and this would mean that positive evaluations would be expected when procedural justice is high, regardless of the level of distributive justice. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) demonstrated that this is only true for organizational outcomes, not for personal outcomes, so the theory does not stand firm for the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.
4.3 Interactional justice and job satisfaction

As shown in chapter two, interactional justice is divided into interpersonal justice and informational justice. Both forms of justice have a different relationship with job satisfaction. Greenberg (1993a) developed a taxonomy which distinguishes structural and social attributes of justice. People can perceive justice based on relatively stable aspects of the environment as well as event level occurrences each day at work. Van den Bos, Lind and Wilke (2001) introduced the fairness heuristic theory which states that people use the most readily available fairness information to guide their job attitudes and behaviors.

Loi, Yang and Diefendorff (2009) integrated Greenberg’s taxonomy and the fairness heuristic theory and argued that the social forms of justice (i.e. interpersonal and informational justice) directly impact job satisfaction and that the structural forms of justice (i.e., distributive and procedural justice) may constrain or enhance this influence. So, distributive and procedural justice have their influence, but at the between-individual level while interpersonal and informational justice have their influence on a within-individual level. Next to that, they believed that distributive justice interacts with interpersonal justice, because interpersonal justice represents the social aspect of distributive justice. Accordingly, procedural justice interacts with informational justice, because informational justice reflects the social aspect of procedural justice. As a consequence it can be predicted that when distributive justice is low, people rely more on interpersonal justice, so that interpersonal justice has a more important influence on job satisfaction. Likewise, when procedural justice is low, people rely more on informational justice so that informational justice has a more important influence on job satisfaction. Loi, Yang and Diefendorff found evidence for their predictions that all types of justice have a relationship with job satisfaction. Distributive justice has a moderating influence between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction and procedural justice has a moderating influence between informational justice and job satisfaction. The interaction between distributive justice and interpersonal justice is shown in figure five. The interaction between procedural justice and informational justice is shown in figure six.
Leung, Smith, Wang and Sun (1996) demonstrated that interactional justice did not have an effect on job satisfaction in China. This may be explained by the higher acceptance of hierarchy and authority figures in China. The research shows that valid research in one culture should not be indiscriminately accepted as valid research in other cultures.
4.4 Conclusion

There is a relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, but to what extent is different among the studies. Studies differ about the influence of distributive justice on job satisfaction, but are unanimous about the relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction. Next to that, the relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction is supported, but not in all cultures. A valid research in one culture does not proof that the research is also valid in another culture.

As research shows, organizational justice is important for employees to be satisfied with their jobs. That is why it is important for companies to develop specific rules and regulations and create an ethical climate where organizational justice is carefully developed.
Chapter 5: The role of organizational justice with regard to the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction

Research shows that organizational justice has an impact on the areas job stress and job satisfaction. In this chapter the influence of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction will be explained.

5.1 Types of organizational justice
The literature shows no explicit information about the moderating effect of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. According to Lambert et al. (2007) a mediating effect can be implied, but only distributive and procedural justice have their influence. No information is found for interactional justice.

Lambert et al. (2007) showed that procedural justice has a positive impact on job satisfaction. Striking is that they did not find a direct relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction, while other research shows that there is indeed a relationship.

Next to that, Lambert et al. (2007) found only a relationship for distributive justice and job stress. They showed that higher distributive justice will lead to lower job stress. This outcome is remarkable, since other research showed only a relationship between procedural justice and stress. For example, Judge and Colquitt (2004) found a negative relationship between procedural justice and job stress. Lack of participation, manager’s inability to delegate and lack of autonomy are examples of procedural injustice that causes job stress.

Above-mentioned shows that literature is not unanimous about the relationships between organizational justice, job satisfaction and job stress. Furthermore, no information is found about the moderating effect of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.
5.2 Degree of influence

As shown before, there is a relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, organizational justice and job stress and organizational justice and job satisfaction. In general, more job stress will lead to lower job satisfaction, more organizational justice will lead to less job stress and more organizational justice will lead to more job satisfaction.

Because all variables have their influence on each other, it can be implied that organizational justice has an influence on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, but there is no proof for that in the literature. It is likely that organizational justice has a positive influence on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction since evidence showed that organizational justice leads to less job stress and more job satisfaction. But again, no (empirical) research can underpin these predictions. A visualization of the relationships is shown in figure seven.

Figure 7: Overview of the relationships between organizational justice, job stress and job satisfaction

Legend
+ = positive relationship
- = negative relationship
→ = proven relationship
→ = implied relationship
5.3 Conclusion
Research showed that there is a relationship between organizational justice and job stress and between organizational justice and job satisfaction, but there is no proof that underpin the idea that organizational justice acts as a moderator between job stress and job satisfaction.
Chapter 6: Conclusion, discussion & recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

In previous chapters the relationship between organizational justice, job stress and job satisfaction is explained. Based on these findings it is tried to answer the main question: “What is the influence of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction?”

Job stress is related with job satisfaction. Both positive and negative relationships are discovered. Job stress has a positive effect on job satisfaction when the job stressors are positive such as being disciplined and representing others. Job stress has a negative effect on job satisfaction when the job stressors are negative such as high workload and low career development. The relationships are mediated by positive moods, negative moods and current stress symptoms.

Next to that, organizational justice can be divided in distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of outcomes. Procedural justice is the perceived fairness of the procedures to get the outcome. Interactional justice is the perceived fairness of the decision maker’s behavior. These three types of organizational justice are distinct from each other.

Furthermore, organizational justice has a positive relationship with job satisfaction, but which types and to what extent is not unanimous in the literature. Research agrees about the positive influence of procedural justice and interactional justice on job satisfaction, but is divided about the relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction.

Moreover, combining all research shows that the variables organizational justice, job stress and job satisfaction have an influence on each other. That is why a positive moderating effect of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction can be implied, but no (empirical) evidence is found for this relationship.

Concluding, answering the main question is not possible, since there is no (empirical) evidence for the relationship.
6.2 Discussion
A bias in this literature review is the lack of (empirical) research of the influence of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Therefore, the relationship could only be implied instead of supported with (empirical) evidence.

This research shows the relationship between organizational justice, job stress, and job satisfaction. During the research it appeared that there are other mediators of the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction such as organizational commitment and turnover intent. Those mediators are not included in this literature review, because of the limited space for the research.

For the same reason, some types of organizational justice such as systemic justice and configural justice are not included in this research.

The literature showed discrepancies between the effects of the variables on each other. These discrepancies are caused by the difference in respondents that are used for the investigations. Organizational justice, job stress and job satisfaction are subjects that are interpreted differently among the employees of various businesses or industries. That is why research did not always agree about the strength of some relationships.

In this literature review, only one way relationships are explained. Most relations could be the other way around, but are not explained because at this moment it is irrelevant to the research.

6.3 Recommendations
A limitation of this research is that there is no (empirical) evidence for the influence of organizational justice on the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. It is an interesting area to research, so it is recommended to study this area. It could be a contribution to the current literature base.

Another limitation of this research is the discrepancy between some suggested relationships, such as distributive justice and job satisfaction. It is recommended to search for additional information to get a clear, unanimous answer to these questions.
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