

Investigating the Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Health of the Staff Working in Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province

Dr. Hossein Sotudeh Arani *¹ and Hamid Reza Mohammad Zadeh Yazdeli²

¹Faculty Member of Islamic Azad University, Naragh Branch, Iran.

²MA Student of Islamic Azad University, Naragh Branch, Iran.

Received: Nov. 2014 & Published: Jan 2015

Abstract

The present study is to investigate the effect of organizational justice on the organizational health from the viewpoint of the staff working in different branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province. The present study is an applied one in terms of objective, and in terms of method, it is a descriptive study which uses a survey research for collecting data. The population of the study is all the employees working in different branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province. To collect the related data to the theoretical basics and extracting the primary factors and indices, library and internet resources were used and to collect data required for investigating the hypotheses, a questionnaire was used. To confirm the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha was used which its coefficient for the variable of organizational justice was obtained 0.856 and for organizational health as 0.855. To investigate the hypotheses, regression coefficient was employed. The findings of the research indicate that the dimensions of organizational justice includes procedural justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice are significantly effective on organizational health.

Key words: organizational justice, organizational health, Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Statement of the problem

Today's organizations need individuals who tend to challenge the present norms and it is not acceptable for them that activities should be done as they have always been done. In addition, they should be individuals who should accept the responsibility of their measures. Nowadays, organizations want to hire employees who are able to have decision making, innovation and creativity in the scope of their activities and supervise their activities and accept the responsibility of their tasks. Paying attention to the issue of organizational health and explaining the effect of justice on this concept as one of the approaches of human resources development in

some recent decades has provided the grounds of positive upheavals in executing the staff's work activities.

In the variable conditions of today, organizations have to utilize appropriately from human resources. Accordingly, the only factor creating balance in an organization is paying attention to employee's health (Baker et al. 2006). In fact, organizational health is an instrument by which personal aims get consistent with organizational ones. It create this belief that organizational development results in employee's interests. Employees' health, in addition to having positive effects on organizations' performance, has positive effects on employees. The results of

different studies clearly indicate its effects on the work process including change in employee's attitudes, the increase in job satisfaction, the reduction in stress, the reduction in ambiguity and etc. (Allen & Meyer, 1991). The independence in work and power and freedom in decision making are its other attitudinal effects. But, among its behavioral effects one can name the increase in employees' self-confidence, the increase in conformity power, the facilitation of responding to customers and cases as such. The access to these characteristics can be feasible by organizational health is among the most important resources and competitive tools (i.e. human resources) of organizations.

Further, investigating the results of different studies indicate the existence of a relative effect organizational justice on decreasing employees' problems in workplaces, in such a way that the studies indicate organizational justice as one of the positive factors affecting these conditions. In fact, organizational justice helps the culture of cooperation and successful performances of employees in organizations. In addition, the tendency to use organizational justice due to increasing global competitions, the importance of innovation, flexibility, productivity, and responsibility to external conditions are continuously increasing (Stanley and Meyer, 2011).

Organizational justice results in reducing conflict and provides the grounds of promotion of the performance productivity in individuals. Among the indices of operationalizing organizational justice one can refer to continuous participation in charitable activities, the involvement in the resentment and suffering of other human beings, having strong faith and the most degree of efforts at work, and etc. as a result, organizational justice causes promotion and improvement of job satisfaction and increase in its efficacy and coordination of parts and social processes of organizations (Collin Verley, 2004).

(DOI: [dx.doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1](https://doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1))

Investigating organizational justice is important due to four reasons: 1. the emphasis on organizational justice can minimize the contradictions due to ambiguity in job expectations. 2. Organizational justice, via emphasis on extra-job behaviors reduces the need to allocation of rare resources. 3. Educational institutions, via determining and investigating the dimensions of organizational justice can create an environment which facilitate the motivation of organizational justice and in this environment, they can increase the facilitators of organizational justice and reduce its barriers. 4. It create chances for managers to have a deeper understanding of factors constructing organizational justice and job and organizational variables related to it (Garros, 1997). Accordingly, the present study is to investigate the effect of organizational justice on organizational health of the staff working in Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province.

Research hypotheses

Main hypothesis: organizational justice has a significant effect on organizational health form the viewpoint of the staff working in branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province.

Alternative hypotheses:

Procedural justice has a significant effect on organizational health form the viewpoint of the staff working in branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province.

Interactional justice has a significant effect on organizational health form the viewpoint of the staff working in branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province.

Distributive justice has a significant effect on organizational health form the viewpoint of the staff working in branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province.

Conceptual model of the research



Nihoff and Mormon theory (1993)

Literature review

The study of Barren et al. (2003) indicated that factors such as personal responsibility, work repeatability, opportunity for job promotion, the existence of alternative job opportunities, age, years of service, gender, and satisfaction with supervisors are factors affecting organizational commitment. In addition, they concluded that organizational commitment is more among women than men.

In addition, Gellatly (2004), to investigate the degree of commitment, used eight groups and designed a questionnaire for determining the degree of individuals' tendency to staying in organizations and citizenship behavior. Gellatly concluded that the tendency to staying and citizenship behavior can be observable in a high degree in groups with high emotional commitment. Therefore, no evidence was for supporting the ideas of Meyer & Herscovitch (2001). Gellatly (2006), by applying regression analysis, investigated the interaction among commitment parts and other variables. Further, in another research, Vasti found out that individuals with high emotional or normative have more commitment and more citizenship behavior. In another study, with emphasis on emotional or

continuous commitment, Claire found out that the degree of performance and citizenship behaviors among the staff with moderate normative commitment and low emotional commitment is lower. In addition, a few number of studies investigated the degree of welfare (Meyer and Stanley, 2011: 25).

Bazargadi (2006), in his investigation on organizational commitment of nursing society and factors affecting it, pointed out the effects of job security, the degree of payments and training on nurses' organizational commitment. In another research, Hoseinian (2007), to identify intra-organizational factors affecting the staff's organizational commitment of police station in Tehran, the effect of work nature, consistency of aims the staff and organizations, previous demand, providing conditions for achieving success and welfare measures on organizational commitment were pointed out (Hoseini, 2009: 10).

Research theoretical framework

Organizational justice firstly was applied by Greenberg (1987). According to Greenberg, organizational justice is related with employees'

perception of work fairness. He used this term for explaining and interpreting the role of fairness in workplaces and after that different scholars presented different theories regarding its types which in this section, regarding the investigation of different ideas, it can be divided into three distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

Injustice and unfair distribution of achievements and inputs of organizations result in the weakness of spirit of the staff and their efforts and activities. Therefore, the observance of justice is the code of survival and endurance of development flows of organizations and their staff. The trace of organizational justice in the theories of organizations and management can be found in Fayol's fourteen principles in which one principle is equality and justice. According to this principle, if employees are treated justly and fairly, they would follow organizational objectives as seriously as possible and they would be more loyal to their organizations. According to the model of Porter and Lawler, there is a positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction and when employees feel that they have received fair rewards, they will be more satisfied (Seyyed Javadin et al. 2008).

In general, there are many disagreements about what indices and criteria organizational justice has and to what groups it can be divided. Bies and Moag (1975) and many other researches divided it into three groups of distributive, procedural and interactional justice and believed the existence of a distinction between interaction and procedural justices, but some scholars such as Cropanzano and Byrne (1999) and Taylor and Bies (1990) questioned this distinction.

Regarding the investigation of different ideas, justice can be divided into three general groups as follows:

Distributive justice:

The literature of distributive justice is extracted from Adams' Equity Theory (1965) which is related to the perception of justice (equity) based on the ratio of inputs to outputs. Distributive justice can be defined as the perception of the fairness of inputs of an individual in social interactions. People perceive fairness based on the comparison of inputs and outputs and also the comparison of their ration with standards based on which they perceive something. This theory considers the mode of individuals' responses to the unjust interventions and behaviors of the managers and supervisors in distributing facilities and awards in organizations. In addition, distributive justice is equivalent to the principle of compensating employees' services, which states that: per doing a job, all individuals who have effectively exerted to realize this objective, should have receive fair rewards and some money should be fair from the perspective of employees and employers (Ali Ziaeeian, 2009).

It can be concluded that the basis of the concept of distributive justice in Adam's Equity Theory and Lundahl Fair Judgment Model. Here, briefly, these two bases are discussed:

1. Equity Theory: the main structural parts of this theory are inputs and outcomes.

Equity Theory named by Adams is based on this idea that individuals want to be treated fairly and justly. In this theory, first of all, an individual evaluate the quiddity of the behavior of an organization with himself and then, the quiddity of the behavior of the organization with another person in other sections and units of the organization or even a group of individuals all over the organization. After the evaluation, the mode to the treatment of the organization with the person and others and at last, the results of evaluations with each other are compared and the person compares his state with that of other persons. The outcome of this comparison for the person may be the feeling of equity or inequity.

Adams describes the process of comparing equity based on the ratios of inputs and outputs. Inputs are what an individual gives an organization such as education, experience, efforts and loyalty. The outputs are what an individual receives from an organization such as salary, fame, social relations and internal rewards. Some part of evaluating inputs and outputs of oneself and others are based on objective observations such as one's salary and some other part is based on one's perception.

2. Lundahl Fair Judgment Model: distributive justice mostly from the viewpoint of individuals who receive outcomes are discussed.

Lundahl (1976) discussed distributive justice from the viewpoints of individuals who conducted allocation. Lundahl Fair Judgment Model is considered as a more active attitude towards Equity Theory. In this theory, Lundahl states that individuals make judgment about the amount of their salaries using some different justice laws. He states that basically, there are three laws of distributive justice which are as follows: a) Assistance Law, b) Equity Law, and c) Needs Law. Fair Judgment Model is a four stage sequence by which an individual evaluate the justice of outcomes in such a way that the individual decides which one of the justice laws should be used and who they should be weighted. The individual, based on the justice law, evaluate the degree and types of outcomes which he deserved. The individual combines the outcomes which he deserved regarding the discussed law, in a final evaluation. He evaluates the observed equity in real perceived outcomes in comparison with what he has really deserved. Therefore, fair judgment mode presumes that individuals' judgment regarding equity is only based on the law of their assistant, but equity law and needs law have important roles in these judgments. Based on this model, individuals make judgments about procedures used by decision makers for (DOI: [dx.doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1](https://doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1))

allocation based on situation and apply different justice such as equity, needs and equality. The main concept of fair judgment model is that an individual applies the laws of distributive justice selectively in the sense that in different times, he pursues different laws; therefore, the basic criteria of an individuals may change in different situations.

Distributive justice is basically based on the principle of exchange. Individuals look at what they have brought to their organization as an exchange to what they have received. It should be considered that distributive justice is not only limited to the fairness of payments, but it covers an extensive set of organizational outcomes such a promotions, rewards, punishment, work plans, advantages and performance evaluations (Lambert, 2003).

The limitations of distributive justice theory

Concentration on the fairness of outcomes, while it has been a dominant attitude in the researches on organizational justice for long years, has basic limitations including as follows: individuals tend to over-evaluate the importance of their assistant and as a consequence, the presentation of outcomes which are fair to the individuals is difficult, and this issue has been proven that individuals in organizations do not merely pay attention to their outcomes; therefore, however outcomes are considered as the starting point in research on organizational justice, the problems with this attitude motivate the researchers to concentrate on other affairs (Belder and Taylor, 2003). Another point is that most of the studies on this issue have short-term ideas and their scopes are limited to equally unique such as the ratio of less or more payment of hour and contract works for the quality or quantity of activities (Rezaeian, 2009).

Procedural justice

Primary researches had not the ability to explain and predict individuals' reaction to justice. Therefore, researches tended to procedural justice. The results of these studies indicate that individuals do not only react to their inputs, but they react to the procedures which result in their outputs (Lind and Taylor, 1988). Procedural justice is related to the perception of justice towards the procedures applied in adopting decisions. This type of justice emphasizes the procedures of doing activities; namely procedural justice refers to the quality and fairness in relations between individuals, the society and government. Procedural justice means the justice perceived from a process used for determining distributing rewards. Here, this questions can be presented whether it is possible that an employee who has received less rewards than others, never feels injustice and inequality?

Paying attention to procedural justice is the positive answer to this question. This issue can be clarified with an example; imagine two employees with equal quality and competence, but one of them has been paid a little more money. The policies and strategies of payments of organizations cover legal factors such as the length of activity, work shift and etc. these two employees are totally aware of the policy of payments and have the same opportunity. Considering these factors, one of these two may receive money more than another one; however, the other employee may feel that this payment is not fair because the compensation policy of the organization is an open one and it has been applied accurately and unbiasedly.

Therefore, the payment due to applying this procedure probably is considered fair, even if it is very low, by increasing the perception of procedural justice, employees positively view their superordinate and the organizations. Even if they are dissatisfied with the payments,

promotions and other personal outcomes (Greenberg, 2004).

Baron and Greenberg believe that procedural justice investigates this issue that how decisions should be made to be considered fair. Paying attention to this issue is important that this aspect does not investigate the issue that what decisions should be, but it investigates this issue that how they should be made.

Factors constructing procedural justice

According to procedural justice theory, two factors have important roles in shaping individuals' perception of fairness or unfairness of procedures. The first factor is the individuals' treatment in personal mutual relations and that how managers and authorities of distributing incomes and rewards treat with individuals. Another factor which is relatively effective on the perceptions of procedural justice is that managers at the organization level and statesmen at the society level explain their decisions for people.

1. The quiddity of the evaluation of employees' efforts and the time they spend
2. The quiddity of the evaluation of individuals' performance by determining the grounds of responding and qualitative, quantitative, temporal and cost standards
3. The quiddity of decision making regarding compensating individuals' efforts

Thibaut & Walker believe that the fairness of decision-making processes from the viewpoint of individuals depends on the degree of control which the procedures provide the possibility of their adoption. This attitude is called the control model of procedural justice and emphasizes the

structural and official aspects of Decision-making processes (Belder and Taylor, 2002).

In a research, Lundahl describes the characteristics which cause that the procedures be perceived fairer: procedures should be stable, namely they should have durability among different persons and during time. Procedures should be without bias and dogmatism, namely decision makers should not intervene his personal interests, outcomes and benefits in decisions related to allocation processes. Procedures should be amendable, namely opportunities for changing unfair decisions should be provided for individuals. Procedures should be representatives of all parties, namely needs, values and ideas of all parts influenced by allocation processes should be provided in processes. Moral standards should be observed in procedures in such a way that allocation procedures should be compatible with individuals' moral and ethical values. In addition, Greenberg mentions two other points: procedures should provide chances for individuals for selecting a decision maker. Procedures should specify the power structure of decision making (Greenberg, 1987).

Interactional justice

Interactional justice covers aspects in the process of communication such as courtesy, honesty, and respect among the resource and receiver. This type of justice emphasizes the quiddity of the behavior of a society with people based on honesty, respect and loyalty. Interactional justice refers to the degree of behavior with people based on respect and honesty (Adams, 1963). This dimension of social justice is related to good, respectful and honest behaviors which are obvious in social interactions (Adams, 1965).

Interactional justice emphasizes individuals' perceptions from the quality of interpersonal behaviors during executing procedures. Two

factors have key roles in perceiving interactional justice:

1. Are the main reasons of decisions related to allocating resource honestly and sufficiently explicated clearly for affected individuals?
2. Do individuals who are responsible for executing decisions have respectful behaviors with those influenced by these decisions?

Positive behaviors with individuals in organizations can reinforce the observance of organizational procedures without any change in official decisions or its fundamental process. In general, the mode of executing procedures by organizational agents in determining reactions to these procedures and determining outcomes of procedures are important (Belder and Taylor, 2002).

Interactional justice, according to Bies and Moag (1986) and Meyer et al. (1995) are constructed by two elements including explication and justifications related to decisions and the sensitivity level of behaviors and benevolence for individuals influenced during making of decisions (Pilia et al. 2001). From the perspective of Blader and Taylor, the perceptions of observing interactional justice should be considered under the light of personal differences and unique nature of the correlations of employees with organizations and authorities. Interactional justice emphasizes the discussions about supervisors' behaviors and their roles in observing organizational justice and conceptually, it is similar to unofficial quality of behaviors. On the other hand, procedural justice is conceptually similar to official decision making (Belder and Taylor, 2002).

The nature and concept of administrative health

Corruption means ruination. In the Holy Quran, in Anbia' Verse, Gods says that "if there were gods other than Allah, they would be corrupted. Corruption is the result of immoral, illegal and deceitful performance which with the objective of attaining illegitimate benefits is conducted by one or a group of natural and legal persons. Dante in 14 century AD, in the book the Devine Comedy, has paid attention to the issue of corruption and considered the status of corrupts in the worst place of the Hell. This issues indicate the hatred of people in the Middle Age towards the issue of corruption (Tavakoli, 2010: 30).

Corruption, according the definition of Webster's dictionary, is "an illegitimate rewards given to a person for making him deviate from his tasks". Corruption is a relative issue and in fact, it is related to values of a society. Referring corruption to a specific behavior is related to social and cultural values and the degree of tolerance of the society. An individual is called a corrupt when his behaviors are deviated from those acceptable for his society (Zahedi, Mohammad Nabi and Shahbazi, 2009: 32-33).

The nature and concept of administrative corruption

Illegal use of administrative-state authorities for personal benefits: there are three main motivations for an employee when he participates in corruption:

1. Direct personal benefits
2. Receiving cash or non-cash bribe from a third party
3. Assisting friends and relatives (Zahedi, Mohammad Nabi and Shahbazi, 2009: 32-33).

Administrative corruption refers to individuals' violation of honesty and loyalty in doing state tasks, illegal or inappropriate behaviors of the officials in public and private units in line with personal benefits or their relatives or motivating

and directing others to do such measures via misusing job situations which they have received (Dadashi, 2011: 209).

In general, the mentioned definitions from different researchers regarding administrative corruptions, we can attain a comprehensive definition of a healthy organization of administrative anti-corruption: a healthy organization refers to that organization in which social objectives have priority over personal objectives, self-control culture is available, disorder and slowness are reducing and etc.

Methodology

Because the results of the present study can introduce the nature and importance of organizational health as one of the most important aspects of management in organizations and the degree of influencing organizational justice; it is an applied one. Further, regarding the existence of variables considered in the present study, and that it investigates the effect of justice on organizational health; therefore, it is a descriptive-survey study. The population of the study is all employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank in Isfahan Province. They were 150 individuals. The sample size of the present study, based on sampling methods used in the study at the error level 0.05, included 97 participants. The sampling method was stratified random sampling. To collect the data, and to investigate research hypotheses, Nihoff and Mormon Standard Questionnaire (1993) was used. The results of Cronbach's alpha indicated that the alpha value of organizational health is 0.85 and that of the variable organizational justice was 0.85; therefore, the reliability of Cronbach's alpha was acceptable.

Inferential analysis of the data

The main hypothesis: organizational justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in different branches of

Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Table 1: the results of regression analysis

Mode 1	Index Variation resources	The sum of squares	df	The mean of squares	Fisher's statistics	df
1	Regression	28.177	1	28.177	3.581	0.000
	Remaining	0.747	95	0.008		
	Total	28.492	96			

The results obtained from the regression analysis in the above table indicate that organizational health can be explained by procedural justice and its value is statistically significant, and this variable explains some part of the variance of organizational health. In other words, this results indicate that regression coefficient is significant and there are sufficient evidence for confirming hypothesis.

Table 2: the results of regression analysis

Criterion variable	Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient of beta	Determinin g Coefficient	t- statistic	Sig.
		Beta	Non- standard error of coefficients	Beta			
Organizational health	Fixed impact	0.090	0.059		-	1.530	0.129
	Justice	0.986	0.016	0.987	0.974	59.482	0.000

Regarding t-statistic (59.484) whose absolute value is more than 2.33 and whose significance level is less than 5%, it can be concluded that organizational justice has 0.987 significant impact on organizational justice. Therefore, it can be said that organizational justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Secondary hypothesis: procedural justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Table 3: the results of regression analysis

Model	Index	The sum	df	The mean	Fisher's	df
-------	-------	---------	----	----------	----------	----

	Variation resources	of squares		of squares	statistics	
1	Regression	22.463	1	22.463	330.273	0.000
	Remaining	6.461	95	0.068		
	Total	28.492	96			

The results obtained from the regression analysis in the above table indicate that organizational health can be explained by procedural justice and its value is statistically significant, and this variable explains some part of the variance of organizational health. In other words, this results indicate that regression coefficient is significant and there are sufficient evidence for confirming hypothesis.

Table 4: the results of regression coefficient

Criterion variable	Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient of beta	Determining Coefficient	t-statistic	Sig.
		Beta	Non-standard error of				
Organizational health	Fixed impact	0.918	0.148		-	6.200	0.000
	Procedural	0.751	0.041	0.881	0.777	18.173	0.000

Regarding t-statistic (18.173) whose absolute value is more than 2.33 and whose significance level is less than 5%, it can be concluded that procedural justice has 0.881 significant impact on organizational justice. Therefore, it can be said that organizational justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Secondary hypothesis: interactional justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Table 5: the results of regression analysis

Mode 1	Index	The sum of squares	df	The mean of squares	Fisher's statistics	df
1	Regression	26.707	1	26.707	1.144	0.000
	Remaining	2.217	95	0.023		
	Total	28.492	96			

The results obtained from the regression analysis in the above table indicate that organizational health can be explained by interactional justice and its value is statistically significant, and this variable explains

some part of the variance of organizational health. In other words, this results indicate that regression coefficient is significant and there are sufficient evidence for confirming hypothesis.

Table 6: the results of regression coefficient

Criterion variable	Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient of beta	Determining Coefficient	t-statistic	Sig.
		Beta	Non-standard error of	Beta			
Organizational health	Fixed impact	0.980	0.048		-	12.564	0.000
	Interactional	0.741	0.022	0.961	0.923	33.826	0.000

Regarding t-statistic (33.826) whose absolute value is more than 2.33 and whose significance level is less than 5%, it can be concluded that interactional justice has 0.961 significant impact on organizational justice. Therefore, it can be said that organizational justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Secondary hypothesis: distributive justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

Table 7: the results of regression analysis

Model	Index Variation resources	The sum of squares	df	The mean of squares	Fisher's statistic	df
1	Regression	12.437	1	12.437	1.144	0.000
	Remaining	16.488	95	0.174		
	Total	28.492	96			

The results obtained from the regression analysis in the above table indicate that organizational health can be explained by distributive justice and its value is statistically significant, and this variable explains some part of the variance of organizational health. In other words, this results indicate that regression coefficient is significant and there are sufficient evidence for confirming hypothesis.

Table 8: the results of regression coefficient

Criterion variable	Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient of beta	Determining Coefficient	t-statistic	Sig.
		Beta	Non-standard error of coefficients	Beta			
Organizational health	Fixed impact	0.300	0.388		-	0.771	0.442
	Interactional	0.910	0.107	0.656	0.430	8.456	0.000

Regarding t-statistic (8.456) whose absolute value is more than 2.33 and whose significance level is less than 5%, it can be concluded that distributive justice has 0.565 significant impact on organizational justice. Therefore, it can be said that organizational justice is effective on organizational health of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Bank of Isfahan Province.

The results of Friedman's variance analysis

Regarding the output of SPSS, the significance value was 0.710 and the standard significance level was more than 5% and 1%. Therefore, it can be said that there is a similar ranks among the different dimensions of organizational justice. The following table are related to these results.

Table 9: the mean ranks in Friedman test for investigating the dimensions of organizational justice

Organizational justice dimension	Mena ranks
Distributive	2.07
Preceudural	1.96
Interactional	1.97

Table 10: the significance of Friedman test

Statistical indices	Calculated values
No.	97
χ^2	0.684
df	2
Sig.	0.710

As observed in table 1, the no significant difference is observed among the dimensions of organizational justice.

Conclusion and suggestions

(DOI: [dx.doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1](https://doi.org/10.29253/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1))

In general, in the present study whose objective is to investigate the effect of organizational justice on organizational health, all research hypotheses were confirmed, therefore, it can be said that from the perspective of the employees working in the branches of Cooperative Development Banks in Isfahan Provinces, paying attention to the concepts of organizational justice and health is very important and paying attention to observing justice and equity among the staff surely results in increasing organizational health. Therefore, the authorities in the bank should consider the observance of justice and equity for all organizational forces seriously when they appointing future decision making.

Considering that distributive justice are significantly effective on administrative health from the perspective of the staff, it is suggested that the management system of this organization should adopt meritocracy in appointments and promotion and try to conduct the degree of payments based on individuals' quality. In addition, it should consider the participation and cooperation of the staff in organizational decision makings in order that these decision making can be more legitimate, be closer to the justice and equity for all organizational individuals, supervision system be executed more accurately in the organization to effortful individuals can be identified from effortless and less qualified ones. This issue helps the health of the system in considering that observing moral principles and commitment to The Code of Ethics of the organizations can be effective for administrative health. Accordingly, installing a table containing the organization's Code of Ethics is necessary for all employees and customers. Serious commitment and attention of managers with higher statuses in organizations should view fighting the concept of administrative corruption necessarily and vitally. They also provide the adoption of decisions related to employees and their salaries. These issues surely helps the institutionalization of fighting the concept of corruption.

The existence of effective motivational mechanism for paying salaries and motivations to organizational staff is a factor which can surely results in more
(DOI: dx.doi.org/14.9831/1444-8939.2015/3-1/MAGNT.1)

health in the administrative system. The existence of accurate and clear policies in relation with organizational justice is another factor which should be considered by the managers of Cooperative Development Bank.

Regarding the section of interactional justice in realizing administrative health, the management system of the branches should observe the status of their organizational forces and acknowledge active and effortful individuals in sessions and conferences. They should provide proper chance for the staff to state their suggestions and viewpoints for the advancement of activities. These issue can help greatly the administrative health of the organization.

The management system should act in its decision making in such a way that making decisions should be more collective than personal. Further, it can institutionalize a self-control (self-supervision) in the staff because if each the individuals working in organization is a self-control employee, the organization enjoys appropriate health.

References

- Adams, J.S, (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- Adams, J.S, (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L.Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299, New York, Academy Press.
- Gellatly, I. R., Meyer, J. P., & Luchak, A. A. (2006). Combined effects of the three commitment components on focal and discretionary behaviors: A test of Meyer and Herscovitch's propositions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, No.69, pp. 331-345.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, (1), 55-61.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource*

- Management. In R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and Informational Classes of Organizational Justice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hoesseini, S. M. and Mahdi Zadeh Ashrafi, A. (2009). Identifying factors affecting organizational commitment. *Management Quarterly*. 7th year. No. 18.
- Lind, E.A & Tyler, T.R, (1988). *The social Psychology of procedural justice*, New York, Plenum Press.
- Rezaeian, A. (2012). *Justice expectation and justice in organizations*. Tehran: SAMT.
- Seyyed Javadin, S. R., Farahi, M. M. and Taheri Attar, Gh. (2008). Identifying the influence of dimensions of Organizational Justice on different aspects of job and organizational satisfaction. *Journal of Business Management*. 1 (1).