



## A EMPIRICAL STUDY ON HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT WORKER PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRUCTURE JUSTICE

**Dr.Surendra Kumar** (Assistant Professor)

Department of Business Management, H.N.B. Garhwal Central University,  
Srinagar, Uttrakhand, India.

### ABSTRACT

*The study is essentially empirical in nature. It aims at understanding the worker perceptions concerning structure justice and studies totally different sorts of social control challenges workers expertise relating to structure justice in tiny scale hospitals of Rajasthan. Within the initial sections, a review of literature is finished to urge the abstract clarity on structure justice. Within the later sections it goes in to a chemical analysis of the information and therefore the final section is dedicated to the discussion of the empirical results and discuss about findings.*

*The study found that individuals creating fairness judgments don't build a distinction between procedural and social factors gift at work. Instead, they use any data out there to argue the morality of the management events. It is additionally found that work units tend to share constant perceptions of justice. They additionally reveal that severally created comments mirror collective experiences within the case of structure justice. Further, the results indicate that issues in management and policies are typically old during a advanced approach, and other people creating justice judgments' don't separate procedural and international factors (factors gift among the organization).*

**Keywords:** Hospital Management, Justice, Small Scale Hospital, Stress, Challenges.

## **Introduction**

Organizational justice has been associated with nursing object of intensive discussion on the agenda in organizational analysis throughout the past 10 years. Justice has shown to be related to many outcomes appreciate job satisfaction, job motivation, work commitment (Cropanzano et al., 2001; Moorman, 1991), work performance (Lind et al., 1990; Phillips et al., 2001), and physical and psychological state (Tepper, 2001; Kivimäki et al., 2003) of workers. As justice judgments appear to influence such a lot of vital factors in organizational behavior that area unit relating to workers operating their and well-being, it's crucial to review what concrete problems individuals understand as unfair in organizational life.

Despite a wealth of theoretical analyses that specialize in organizational justice, there are a unit few approaches that describe the content of justice with nonetheless quantitative approaches (Mikula et al., 1990; Miller, 2001; Taylor, 2001). This study aimed to check whether or not employees' unforced written comments during a giant tiny scale hospital survey were related to organizational justice as measured within the same survey with the assistance of a structured form. Another objective was to analyze if the producers of comments manifested their individual experimental interpretations while not connections to broader organizational discourse activities. With these bases, we tend to wished inductively to elaborate on what justice very suggests that for real things of real-world workers. Our set up was to approach the qualitative information with none "a priori" theoretical justice model by suggests that of providing a descriptive analysis of perceptions rising from the employees' written comments (Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Miles and Huberman, 1994).

In this paper, we tend to 1st introduce the theoretical construct and therefore the content enclosed in structure justice. within the empirical half, we tend to describe what quite subjective perceptions the staff of the study organizations created, then however these perceptions were connected to structure justice as measured and compared with the assistance of a structured form scales. Finally, we tend to integrate our findings to current theoretical justice models out there on structure justice

## **Research Methodology**

This searching study of workers performing at totally different levels in little scale hospitals in Rajasthan and examines the conception of structure justice in management with qualitative and quantitative ways. to get new insight into the conception of procedural and relative structure justice, we tend to inductively extracted classes from qualitative knowledge

obtained describing challenges in management, and tested the extent to that these classes were related to the standard self-reported measures of justice. Classes with a robust reference to structure justice were thought-about to mirror the justice conception. The qualitative knowledge comprised spontaneous comments made by little scale hospitals workers within the free-text space at the rear of a survey form sent dead set 2883 workers in thirty little scale hospitals of Rajasthan in 2008. The free-text space was specifically provided for respondents' open comments style of queries, with none indicating queries. The form was completed and came back by 2242 workers, giving the response rate of seventy eight %. Of the came back questionnaires, 641 (15 percent) contained written messages within the free-text space, starting from a handful of words or a para to little stories. additionally to those messages, we tend to used data gettable from the structured section of constant form used, together with scales of procedural and interactive ways of structure justice.

### **Limitation of Study**

Although the commentators manufacturing qualitative information painted at several organizational hierarchy levels gift, the results mustn't be generalized to use to horizontal, informal social relationships operating in several aspects. However, this study shall render insights relating to challenges in human resources management in tiny scale hospitals.

### **The Concept of concerning structure Justice- A Review of Literature**

Organizational justice are often understood as a virtue providing mutual thought and involving each relationships with others and outcomes that have an effect on others' physical, psychological and financial aid (Cropanzano et al., 2001; Meara, 2001). In previous organizational justice analysis, the construct has typically been divided into a minimum of 3 aspects: distributive justice, procedural justice and mutual justice (Leventhal, 1980; Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Masterson et al., 2000). during this paper, we tend to focus on procedural and mutual aspects of organizational justice.

The fairness of procedural aspects by that outcomes area unit allotted and enforced has attracted interest within the field of organizational justice analysis. The domain referred to as procedural justice emphasizes the voice perspective of constant (i.e. chance to be detected and brought into consideration) and therefore the method management perspective of constant (opportunity to influence info employed in decision-making).(Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Leventhal, 1980; soprano and Tyler, 1988; Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Masterson et al., 2000; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Elovainio et al., 2001;

Tepper, 2001). Procedural justice has been understood to be most applicable for reflective the approach staff build their judgments regarding the fairness of practices at organizational level within the tiny scale hospitals. consequently, it's notably been assumed to relate to organizational commitment (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001). mutual justice conjointly referred to as relative justice, (Elovainio et al., 2001) is usually distinguished from procedural justice in organisational justice. It refers to perceptions regarding the approach authorities treat their subordinates at intervals the organization, and the way these subordinates reply to these perceptions (Bies and Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). This response contains mutual likewise as emotional aspects that area unit crystallized in social accounts of politeness, honesty and respect (Bies and Moag, 1986).

In reflective social attributes, mutual justice is understood as addressing psychological feature, emotive and behavioral aspects towards the immediate superior (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001), whereas procedural justice attributes additional to organisation as an entire (Masterson et al., 2000; Cropanzano et al., 2001).

Prior studies on organizational justice have for the most part been conducted as experimental experiments, situation experiments or correlation field studies (Leventhal, 1980; Mikula et al., 1990; Lupfer et al., 2000; Miller, 2001; Van den Bos, 2001). This study aimed toward filling the gap between the various ways by characteristic the factors fully fledged as social control issues within the real operating life context then testing these experiences on the a part of organisational justice.

The 5 integrative frames rising from employees' subjective, impulsive judgments describe the pain spots in organizations. issues in safeguarding employees' equal treatment and well-being, lack of skilled respect, unacceptable qualities and incompetence in administration, and restricted participation in decision-making were the foremost necessary organizational justice factors related to perceived unfair management observe connecting the qualitative information and therefore the quantitative organizational justice-related information. The classes mentioned on top of work well into the theories of justice in giving answers why organizational justice is very important. They demonstrate psychological desires that ar basic to our well being, and violation of that ar fully fledged as injustice (Cropanzano et al., 2001). the requirements termed as management, belonging, vanity, and substantive existence (Williams, 1997) guide our psychological feature associated emotional processes in resounding the standard of happiness to an organization. These dimensions may indicate one

thing extremely necessary for the folks – their standing and price at intervals the organization (Tyler et al., 1996; Lupfer et al., 2000; Miller, 2001).

The researchers of justice have broadly speaking focused on the excellence between numerous kinds of organizational justice judgments, and consequently, several links between these sorts are unnoticed (Lind, 2001). In a sense, procedural organizational justice and mutual organizational justice each is a side of a broader social context (Phillips et al., 2001). in step with our findings, the interface between procedural and mutual justice could also be delineate as volatile (Mikula et al., 1990; polyglot, 1993) since each kinds of justice were connected to social and non-social aspects. Our findings counsel that folks creating fairness process don't clearly separate procedural and social organizational justice connected factors, however they use any info out there to evaluate the morality of the chain of events. we have a tendency to additionally discovered that in employees' comments organizational processes were typically individualized, and conversely, a superior was typically viewed as a representative of the organizational justice method. These findings indicate that the philosophical system of justice is varied and relating to psychological feature, individual process. Further, our findings ar in congruity with the results of Mikula et al. (1990) and Bies and Moag (1986), supporting the concept that mutual factors ar salient in organizational justice judgments. These factors are typically tough to elicit while not diversity of ways. The results scrutiny commentator-units to alternative units incontestable that our findings aren't certain to any special characteristic of the producer of comments, instead, the comments could represent operating units a lot of broadly speaking. once excluding the commentator from the info, the energy unit analysis replicated the findings delineate above: organizational justice perceptions differed within the expected direction between the units of the commentators and alternative units in this justice perception perceived to be socially and jointly created and reciprocally intimate (Degoey, 2000). Consequently, the producers of comments did clearly not show any special temperament traits (e.g. low shallowness, hostility) however they were acting as mouthpieces for the others. Our results were completely different from Taylor (2001) in statements relating to psychological feature biases of individuals' assessments of justice. Especially, our findings weren't parallel with the "martyr bias" (Taylor, 2001), occurring once an individual includes a tendency to hyperbolise perceived justice experiences. Overall, the units manufacturing social control comments were showing symptoms that ought to be thought to be nice social control challenges.

## **Strength of Study**

The strengths of our study were massive information combining qualitative and quantitative info, triangulation, and therefore the use of well-validated survey instruments. additionally, throughout the qualitative information analysis the authors command discussions and evaluated the info. Following Miles and Huberman (1994) formula for deciding qualitative agreement, we have a tendency to took often a random sample of the coded material for re-coding. Wherever disagreements occurred, the coders mentioned their choices till they reached agreement (Silverman, 1993; Berg, 1998; Dutton et al., 2001).

Reliability during this reasonably method approach happens to the degree that there's correspondence between the info and its assimilation to rising integrative frames. However, evaluating the results as reliable doesn't guarantee that the categorisation method would result in wholly similar classes ought to another analysis team perform it in future. Thus, validity of the tactic has a lot of to try and do with the significance of the findings (Frontman and Kunkel, 1994; Hunter et al., 2002).

## **Qualitative Study**

In the 1st section, associate inductive analysis of the open comments was conducted following the principles of content analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Berg, 1998; Punch, 1998; Labianca et al., 2000). the most objective was to get a abstract description grounded within the knowledge get from the form. Moreover, content analysis allowed North American nation to use each qualitative and quantitative ways at the same time and to render the image of the development as broad as potential (Berg, 1998).

The hand written messages were 1st transcribed verbatim from the communication questionnaires and joined to the quantitative knowledge and respondents interests. Then, the matter material was written out and also the authors browse the fabric fastidiously through many times for correct interpretation.when this scrutinising method, a writing theme following Miles and Huberman (1994) was developed, adding new content analytic parts (codes) as they emerged from the matter material.when the section of writing, referred to as open writing (Strauss and Corbin, 1990), the ideas were unionized and integrated into descriptive classes that served as retrieval and organising devices concerning a selected construct or theme (Carney, 1972; Berg, 1998; Punch, 1998).

The descriptive class tagged as "challenges in hospital management" subsumed eighty seven (38 percent) of all things coded from the form. Being clearly larger than the opposite frames,

it came upon the super-ordinate class (Berg, 1998). Further, the codes during this super-ordinate class we tend to be subsumed into 5 integrative frames with that we wished to figure towards a condensed, rising interpretation of what was central within the knowledge (Berg, 1998; Punch, 1998).

### **Integrative frames**

The five emerging integrative frames as mentioned in Table I all reflect challenges in hospital management. There were few positive statements among the messages coded.

The most salient frame in the final analysis, labelled as "Attitude towards personnel" mentioned in Table I, Category I, dealt with insufficiencies in management's concern and support perceived to be unfair. The categories within the frame can broadly be interpreted to symbolize shortcomings of interpersonal processes and deficiencies in the main areas of leadership praxis. This integrative frame was composed of eight categories that concentrated around the feeling of avoidance and indifference using descriptions such as "nobody cares for us" and "our well-being is not a goal" were used. They also called for equality, recognition and respect, seen as an inseparable part of dignity.

The second integrative frame, named as "Personnel policy procedures" mentioned in Table I, Category II, consisted of four descriptive categories aggregated around processes related to challenges in human resources management in small scale hospitals of Rajasthan. The commentator messages demonstrated contradictions experienced between available resources and existing needs, eliciting exhaustion and moral anxiety such as incapability to do the work properly in small scale hospitals. These messages also reflected a lack of security and fear for the unknown future, describing the vulnerable position of the non-permanent personnel working in these small scale hospitals.

Integrative frame Descriptive categories	Frequency	
	¥	%
<b>I Attitude toward personnel</b>		
Unequal treatment	47	20
Unconcerned about employees' wellbeing	45	19
Lack of professional respect	29	12
Mistreatment	9	4
Insufficient acknowledgement	6	3

Lack of social support	6	3
Lack of feedback	5	2
Lack of motivating practice	5	2
II Personnel policy procedures		
Insufficient staffing	28	12
Acting as substitute	19	8
Lack of employment security	18	8
Poor administrative policies	6	3
III Qualitative attributes of management		
Unsatisfactory qualities of administration	38	16
Incompetent administration	18	8
Untrustworthy management	14	6
Bullying superior	12	5
Superior's problematic personality	7	3
IV Decision-making practices		
Lack of participation in decision making	49	21
Insufficient information	25	11
V Implementation of changes in the organization		
Structural changes	32	14
Economical steering	28	12
Total = 59		

Table I. Contents of the comments

The third enclose Table I, class III collective around qualitative aspects within the management primarily attributed to general properties equivalent to "bad management" or "unsubstantial social control skills". This integrative frame was named as "Qualitative attributes of management". It contained messages addressing trust or mistrust related to experiences of unfairness within the operating of organizational systems. The fourth frame mentioned in Table I, class IV, named as "Decision-making practices", involved the perceived fairness of decision-making procedures and therefore the expertise of involvement in these processes. Moreover, it for bidden the probabilities to be detected before choices were much enforced. just like the third frame, these comments additionally contained a part

of uncertainty, however this uncertainty originated in voice-less cape and perceptions of being unnoticed in matters of organizational regarding vital things within the subjects' lives exploitation descriptions equivalent to "things simply return . . . ".

The fifth frame enclosed in Table I, Category V, likewise, followed the trail of uncertainty describing factors that were practiced as unmanageable factors within the organizational operating of tiny scale hospitals of Rajasthan. The frame, named as "Implementation of amendment within the organization" and containing expressions equivalent to "continuous changes in operating community generate overwhelming uncertainty", reflects the turbulent nature of the operating life and therefore the pressures addressing these changes involving within the organizational justice. Money objectives and frames were seen as a threat that created negative impressions conflicting with the values and morale of workers (see McArthur and Moore, 1997).

### **Qualitative Study discussion and Result**

The dimensions within the integrative frames could represent totally different parts on the correlates of organizational justice. For this reason, we tend to needed to check the extent to that qualitative classes within the integrative frames were related to the responses to the procedural and mutual justice scales within the structured form (Moorman, 1991).

First, we tend to used two-tailed analysis of variance to check whether or not the authors of the comments differed in terms of background factors and organizational justice perceptions from people who failed to write comments. Background factors enclosed psychological distress as assessed by the 12-item version of General Health form (GHQ-12,  $\alpha = 0.89$ , response scale from zero = not in any respect to 3= rather more than usual, Goldberg et al., 1997), job satisfaction as indicated by Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, fourteen things with seven-point response scale (from one = extraordinarily discontent to seven = extraordinarily glad,  $\alpha = 0.86$ ), and health standing as inquired by self-rated five-point health scale (from one = poor to five = excellent) indicating poor health by health ratings not up to smart (Idler and Angel, 1990). These background factors we tend tore chosen as a result of we needed to analyze whether or not personal options, appreciate poor health, have an impact on justice evaluations (Taylor, 2001).

To test organizational justice, we tend to used the analysis scale developed by Moorman (1991), consisting of seven items' procedural justice issue ( $\alpha = 0.90$ ) and 6 items' as well as

mutual justice issue ( $\alpha = 0.92$ ). Responses were obtained on a five-point scale starting from one (totally disagree) to five (totally agree).

To eliminate contradictory because of potential variations in coverage organisational justice between the producers and non-producers of comments, we tend to assigned the comments to any or all members of the work units within which the comment producers worked and excluded all producers of comments from the info. Variations between units with producers of comments and alternative work units were tested exploitation two-tailed analysis of variance for the offered information from the form used for survey proposes. As shown in Table II, the producers of messages were over 3 years older than non-producers, they worked a lot of doubtless in central than in regional little scale hospitals, and that they a lot of typically belonged to nursing like nurse, LPN or comparable, supporting services like technical, nutrition or cleansing or doctors' occupations than non-producers of comments. Further, they a lot of oft appraised their health standing as failing as those not manufacturing comments, and fully fledged a lot of mental distress than alternative staff (also Tepper, 2001). Finally, it's clear that persons UN agency wrote comments were a lot of doubtless to be unhappy with their work than alternative staff UN agency haven't given their answers within the type of comments.

The first columns in Tables III and IV gift the variations in organizational justice for the producers and non-producers of comments of staff. For every descriptive class, we tend to compared levels of procedural and mutual organizational justice variables between comment producers and alternative staff people who haven't given any comment.

In this analysis, the primary and largest integrative frame, "Attitude towards personnel", gave the impression to be considerably a lot of regarding mutual organizational justice than procedural organizational justice. However, there have been 3 classes that were considerably related to procedural organizational justice furthermore. The second frame, "Personnel policy procedures", was additionally related to each procedural organizational justice and mutual organizational justice scales. Classes signalling insecurity, appreciate "acting as substitute" and "lack of employment security", were a lot of related to mutual organizational justice factors instead of procedural organizational justice factors on scale. "Insufficient staffing" class differed considerably in each scales indicating the Multi-dimensional nature of each of those factors.

	Producers of the comments (n = 59)	Non-producers of the comments (n = 1974)	Difference
1. Sex			NS
Men	13.1	11.9	
Women	86.9	88.1	
2. Mean age	47.6	44.2	¥ 0.001
3. Occupational group			¥ 0.01
Physicians	12.7	7.0	
Nurses	58.2	53.2	
Other professionals	3.4	5.2	
X-ray, laboratory	4.2	7.1	
Administration	6.8	11.6	
Supporting services	14.8	15.9	
4. Place of work			¥ 0.05
Central hospital	75.5	68.4	
Regional hospital	24.5	31.6	
5. Self-rated health status			¥ 0.001
Good on average	92.8	96.7	
Rather poor or poor	7.2	3.3	
6. Job satisfaction (mean score)	4.5	4.9	¥ 0.000
7. Mental distress (mean score)	2.1	1.9	¥ 0.000
Note: Numbers are percentages unless otherwise stated			

	Perceived procedural justice among										
Content of comment	Producers of the				Non-producers of				Units with producers of		Other units-b P for difference
Integrative frame	comments				comments				the comments-a		
Descriptive categories	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	P for difference	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
<b>I Attitude towards personnel</b>											
Unequal treatment	2.7	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	3.1	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	
Unconcerned about employees' wellbeing	3.0	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	3.3	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.007	
Lack of professional respect	2.9	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.001	3.1	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	
Mistreatment	2.6	(1.4)	3.6	(1.0)	0.002	2.7	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	
Insufficient acknowledgement	3.1	(1.3)	3.6	(1.0)	0.231	3.2	(1.4)	3.6	(1.0)	0.272	
Lack of social support	3.2	(1.5)	3.6	(1.0)	0.290	3.4	(1.4)	3.6	(1.0)	0.605	
Lack of feedback	2.7	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.034	3.0	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.102	
Lack of motivating practice	3.0	(1.3)	3.6	(1.0)	0.177	2.3	(1.3)	3.6	(1.0)	0.027	
<b>II Personnel policy procedures</b>											
Insufficient staffing	3.2	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.027	3.3	(1.0)	3.6	(1.0)	0.048	
Acting as substitute	3.1	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.037	3.2	(1.0)	3.6	(1.0)	0.055	
Lack of employment security	3.0	(1.3)	3.6	(1.0)	0.016	3.3	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.020	
Poor administrative policies	2.9	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.091	3.2	(1.0)	3.6	(1.0)	0.256	
<b>III Qualitative attributes of management</b>											
Unsatisfactory qualities of administration	2.7	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	3.1	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	
Incompetent administration	2.6	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	3.0	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.001	
Untrustworthy	3.0	(0.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.030	3.2	(1.1)	3.6	(1.0)	0.072	

management										
Bullying superior	2.88	(1.6)	3.6	(1.0)	0.004	3.0	(1.4)	3.6	(1.0)	0.011
Superior's problematic personality	2.2	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000	2.9	(1.4)	3.6	(1.0)	0.010
IV Decision-making practices										
Lack of participation in decision making	2.92	(1.3)	3.59	(0.9)	0.000	3.2	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.000
Insufficient information	3.02	(1.3)	3.59	(1.0)	0.003	3.4	(1.2)	3.6	(1.0)	0.190
V Implementation of changes in organization										
Structural changes	3.35	(1.2)	3.58	(1.0)	0.178	3.4	(1.0)	3.6	(1.0)	0.224
Economical steering	3.40	(1.1)	3.58	(1.0)	0.316	3.4	(1.0)	3.6	(1.0)	0.294
Notes: n = 7; 897; a Employees who work in the same unit as the producers of the comments (note, the producers of the comments are excluded from the analysis); b Employees who work in the other work units										

**Table IV.** - Means (standard deviations) of perceived interactional justice for producers of the comments and other employees. Group difference tested by analysis of variance.

These results support conclusions that staff typically considers organizations as representing the folks behind the procedures of the organizational systems. The third integrative frame, "Qualitative attributes of management", emphasized perceptions addressing trust and social aspects of organizational management, and was notably bolstered inside the interactive organizational justice scale. All classes during this frame differed considerably from the non-producers of matter material. Not with standing, all classes except "bullying superior" did identical inside the procedural organizational justice scale. identical development may be understood to prevail inside the integrative frame "Decision-making practices". Additionally here the distinction between procedures and treatment is volatile as becomes apparent in each variety of scales. Voiceless-ness, per the matter comments, reflects the unfairness and lack of trust knowledgeable in each social interactions and procedural factors concerning organizational justice of impotency. The fifth frame, "Implementation of changes in the organization", was substantially limited to describing the procedural aspects of organizational justice only. The categories considered in this frame were powerlessness and voiceless-ness, yet without any interpersonal or interactional associations indicating that policies connected to organisational changes were somehow depersonalized and elusive.

To eliminate confounding due to potential differences in reporting organizational justice between producers and non-producers of comments, additional analyses were conducted. We assigned the values of the descriptive categories of comment producers for all employees working in the same unit, and then excluded the comment producers from the data generated. The second columns in Tables III and IV show that the results of comparison between employees in units with comment producers and units without comment producers mainly replicated the results of the first analysis, namely that in connection with management there was more experienced injustice in wards producing textual comments. In other words, the judgment of justice seemed to be socially and collectively shared and experienced, indicating that the textual comments did not exclusively reflect individual ways of perceiving management systems in the case of organizational justice.

### **Major Finding of Study**

The major finding of this study is that folks creating fairness judgments' don't build a distinction between procedural and social factors gift at work. Instead, they use any data out there to evaluate the morality of the management events.

However, AN inductive content analysis of the comments disclosed 5 integrative frames describing challenges in tiny scale hospital management at respondents' workplaces. These frames ought to be considered major social control challenges in tiny scale hospitals of Rajasthan. These findings illustrate vital antecedents of organizational justice and counsel that job units tend to share an equivalent perception of justice. They additionally reveal that one by one made comments replicate collective experiences within the case of organizational justice. Further, the results indicate that issues in management and policies are usually veteran during a complicated means, and other people creating justice judgments don't separate procedural and interactive factors (factors gift among the organization).

Our analysis describing the scope of organizational justice in social control comments focused on the case wherever the commentators had less authority than the perceived sources of injustice. The formal and unequal nature of power relationship was a motivating feature poignant the core findings of this study. Though the commentators depicted several organizational hierarchy levels, the results shouldn't be generalized to horizontal, informal, social relationships styles of levels. Within the future, it looks necessary to pay a lot of attention to the discourse and relative options of organizational justice to see the horizontal characteristics of organizational factors. Eventually, it'd even be appreciated to approach the social world of the superiors to disentangle the injustice judged to originate from the

subordinates. With all the constraints, this paper serves to guide little scale hospital managers towards a far better understanding of the importance of organizational justice and its collective nature.

## References

- Berg, B.L. (1998), *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.
- Bies, R.J. and Moag, J.S. (1986), "Interactional justice: communications criteria of fairness", in Lewizki, R., Sheppard, B. and Bazerman, M. (Eds), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 43-55
- Carney, T.F. (1972), *Content Analysis*, University of Manitoba Press, Winnipeg.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. and Spector, P. (2001), "The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 86, pp. 278-321.
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z., Bobocel, D.R. and Rupp, D. (2001), "Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 164-209.
- Degoey, P. (2000), "Contagious justice: exploring the social construction of justice in organizations", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22, pp. 51-102.
- Dutton, J., Ashford, S., O'Neill, R. and Lawrence, K. (2001), "Moves that matter: issue selling and organizational change", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 716-36.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M. and Helkama, K. (2001), "Organizational justice evaluations, job control, and occupational strain", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 418-24.
- Folger, R. and Cropanzano, R. (1998), *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Frontman, K.C. and Kunkel, M.A. (1994), "A grounded theory of counselors' construal of success in the initial session", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 4, pp. 492-9.
- Goldberg, D.P., Gater, R. and Sartorius, N. (1997), "The validity of the two versions of the GHQ in the WHO study of mental illness in general health care", *Psychological Medicine*, Vol. 27, pp. 191-7.
- Greenberg, J. (1993), "The social side of fairness: interpersonal classes of organizational justice", in Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 79-103.
- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1975), "Development of the job diagnostic survey", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp. 159-70.
- Hunter, A., Lusardi, P., Zucker, D., Jacelon, C. and Chandler, G. (2002), "Making meaning: the creative component in qualitative research", *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 388-98.
- Idler, E.L. and Angel, R.J. (1990), "Self-rated health and mortality in the NHANES-I epidemiological follow-up study", *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 80, pp. 446-52.

- Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., Vahtera, J., Virtanen, M. and Stansfeld, S.A. (2003), "Association between organisational inequity and incidence of psychiatric disorders in female employees", *Psychological Medicine*, Vol. 33, pp. 319-26.
- Labianca, G., Gray, B. and Brass, D. (2000), "A grounded model of organizational schema change during empowerment", *Organization Science*, Vol. 11, pp. 235-57.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980), "What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships", in Gergen, K.J., Greenberg, M.S. and Willis, R.H. (Eds), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*, Plenum Press, New York, NY, pp. 27-55.
- Lind, E.A. (2001), "Thinking critically about justice judgments", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 220-6.
- Lind, E.A. and Tyler, T.R. (1988), *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, Plenum Press, New York, NY.
- Lind, E.A., Kanfer, R. and Earley, P.C. (1990), "Voice, control, and procedural justice: instrumental and non-instrumental concerns in fairness judgements", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 59, pp. 952-9.
- Lupfer, M., Weeks, K., Doan, K. and Houston, D. (2000), "Folk conceptions of fairness and unfairness", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 405-28.
- McArthur, J.H. and Moore, F.D. (1997), "The two cultures and the health care revolution. Commerce and professionalism in medical care", *JAMA*, Vol. 277, pp. 985-9.
- Masterson, S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M. and Taylor, M.S. (2000), "Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment of work relationships", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 738-48.
- Meara, N. (2001), "Just and virtuous leaders and organizations", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 227-34.
- Mikula, G., Petri, B. and Tanzer, N. (1990), "What people regard as unjust: types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 20, pp. 133-49.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Miller, D.T. (2001), "Disrespect and the experience of injustice", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 527-53.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991), "Relation between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: does fairness perception influence employee citizenship?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 845-55.
- Phillips, J., Douthitt, E. and Hyland, M. (2001), "The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 316-25.
- Punch, K. (1998), *Introduction to Social Research. Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Sage, London.
- Silverman, D. (1993), *Interpreting Qualitative Data, Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*, Sage, London.
- Strauss, A. (1987), *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Taylor, S. (2001), "Reflections on fairness: continuing the progression of justice research and practice", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 243-53.
- Tepper, B.J. (2001), "Health consequences of organizational injustice: tests of main and interactive effects", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 86, pp. 197-215.
- Thibaut, J. and Walker, L. (1975), *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Tyler, T.R., DeGoey, P. and Smith, H.J. (1996), "Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: a test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 913-30.
- Van den Bos, K. (2001), "Fundamental research by means of laboratory experiments is essential for a better understanding of organizational justice", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 254-9.
- Williams, J.Q. (1997), "Social ostracism", in Kowalski, R.M. (Ed.), *Aversive Interpersonal Behaviors*, Plenum Press, New York, NY, pp. 133-70.