

Organizational Justice, Personality Types and Turnover Intentions

***Shazia Hasan**

University of Central Punjab, Pakistan

and

Muhammad Waqas

University of Lahore, Pakistan

Objective of the present study was to find out the relationship of organizational justice with turnover intentions and also the difference in turn over intentions in Type A and type B personality style. After literature review following hypotheses were formulated 1) Organizational justice would be positively correlated with turnover intentions, 2) There would be a significant difference in turnover intentions of type A and type B personality. Sample size of the study consisted on 90 male and female teaching staff of universities in Lahore. Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979) questionnaire to measure Turnover Intentions, organizational justice measure by Joy and Witt (1992) and personality test by Glazer (1985), was utilized to identify the types of personality in A and B categories. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and t-test were applied to examine the data. Results (Mean = 3.48, $\sigma = .92$, $r = -.288$, $P < .01$) showed the negative and significant association among distributive justice and turnover intentions and procedural justice found to have a negative and insignificant relation with turnover intentions (Mean = 3.46, $\sigma = .94$, $r = -.187$, $P > .01$). According to the result (Mean Type A= 2.79 & Mean Type B= 2.40, $t = 2.241$, $P < .05$), further, personality type "A" was found to have more turnover intentions as compared to type "B" personality.

Keywords: Distributive justice, procedural justice, personality type, turnover intentions

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Shazia Hasan, PhD, University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: dr.shaziahasan@ucp.edu.pk

Organizational behavior and human resource management consider employee turnover as an important phenomenon. The presence or absence of this variable acts a significant part in determining individual, groups and organizational effectiveness. Greenberg (1987) illustrated that organizational justice stems from equity theory. Equity theory was presented by Adams (1965) which explains the relational satisfaction in the expressions of insights of just/unfair allocations of resources inside interpersonal dealings (Sheppard, Lewicki, & Minton, 1992). Another study by Lambert et al., (2010) explained that both distributive and procedural justice had a statistically substantial opposing relationship with turnover intentions.

Organizational Justice–Intent to Turnover

Poon (2004) has defined the term intent to turnover as one's thoughts about leaving his/her job and is a form of psychological departure. Turnover is "intended and unintentional permanent departure from an organization" (Robbins, Judge, & Sanghi, 2008). Different scholars have narrated that job involvement inside and outside the organization; cognitive behavior prior to departure is the part of quitting (Farrell & Rusbult, 1992). It is analyzed that turnover intentions are connected to distributive and procedural justice, according to Daly and Geyer (1994); Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991). Employee will be inspired to stay in the organization if distribution and procedures are perceived to be fair in the organization and on the other hand procedural justice may be linked to turnover intentions because this describes the organizational customs of decision making which are outside the outcome (Dailey & Kirk, 1992). As long as the procedures are fair, negative outcomes may not be influencing the employees to leave the organizations. Procedural justice is measured as a healthier forecaster than the interactional justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Collins, Mossholder, & Taylor 2012) which stated that negative connection is present between Process fairness (i.e. procedural justice) and turnover intentions of employees. Dailey and Kirk (1992); Konovsky and Cropanzano(1991) have found negative relationship

between the procedural justice and turnover intentions. Moreover, distributive justice has also been found related to the turnover intentions in different studies (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Personality Types and Turnover Intentions

According to the Stagner (1948), the organization inside the individual of those perceptual, emotional, motivational and cognitive systems which identify the unique responses of an individual to the environment is known as the personality. Now a days organizations are working to invest in their employees because employees are considered as the valuable asset for the organizations. An organization has to invest on the employees in order to get them prepared according to the procedures and policies of an organization. Cascio (1991) and Mobley (1982) have analyzed that the cost associated with the quitting of an employee and then subsequent hiring of replacement employees is significant in terms of personal, work-unit and organizational readjustments.

Personality can be defined as “the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustment to the environment” Allport, (1937). Two common and contrasting personality types have been described by the Type A and Type B personality theory. Cascio (1991) and Mobley (1982) have provided prominence to turn over intentions in their studies. A study conducted by Bernardin (2006) analyzed the relationship of personality variables with organizational turnover. Results indicated that conscientiousness and anxiety accounted for the majority of the expected difference in organizational withdrawal. Further, there was no direct relationship found between the personality types and intent to leave so far but Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, and Brymer (2000) showed the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Here it can be concluded that if personality has the relationship with job outcome i.e. job satisfaction, organizational withdrawal, then relationship of personality with other job outcome of intent to

leave can also be judged. Ahmed (2010), Steers and Mowday (1981) concluded that some employees take the intention to quit or stay as actual quitting or staying and some employees take intention to leave as activation for the job search.

Few researchers have given the relationship of type A/B with the perception and experience of stress. Some researchers have studied the relationship of personality with other job outcomes (Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, & Brymer, 2000) have seen the negative relationship of job satisfaction with the turnover intentions, so, it could indirectly help this study to make the direction between the personality types and turnover intentions. Further, Goodstein and Lanyon, 1999; Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) have suggested that personality predicts the other work-related criteria, like job satisfaction.

Hypotheses

1. Organizational justice (distributive justice and procedural justice) would be negatively correlated with turnover intentions
2. There would be a significant difference in turnover intentions of type A and type B personality

Method

Sample

Male and female Lecturers, Assistant Professors and Professors of higher education institutions of Lahore Pakistan are the sampling frame for this study and convenience sampling method was used to draw the sample from the population. Total 150 questionnaires were floated to the faculty members of 3 universities in Lahore and 90 questionnaires were received and consumed by this study.

Measures

Turnover Intentions. Intent to quit refers to one's feelings of leaving one's job and is a type of psychological departure (Poon, 2004). 3-item measure by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and

Klesh (1979) was utilized to measure Turnover Intentions. The measure used 5 point Likert scale which was 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. The Cronbach alpha value among the questionnaire items was found to be .712.

Distributive Justice. Distributive justice measure consisted of 3-items. A justice measure by Joy and Witt (1992) was used to gauge the distributive justice. The measure used 5 point Likert scale which ranged from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Cronbach alpha value for reliability was .812 for the data.

Procedural Justice. Folger and Greenberg (1985) defined this term as an interpretive assessment of personnel systems. The Joy and Witt (1992) 3- item scale was used to measure Procedural justice. E.g. (1) Most of my job assignments have been fair. The measure used 5 point Likert scale which was also from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree and reliability analysis showed the Cronbach alpha value .871.

Type A/B Personality. A test developed by Glazer (1985) was utilized to identify the types of personality in A and B categories. Cut off point of this test is score above 80 was type A personality and an individual who scored below 59 was considered as type B personality.

Procedures

For the purpose of data collection, University of the Punjab Lahore, COMSAT Institute of Information Technology Lahore and University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences Lahore were approached. Before the collection of data consent form was signed by the respondents of universities and they were assured that the information they provided will be kept confidential. Data collection was completed in 30 days.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive, Pearson correlation analysis and t-test were performed to analyze the data by using the Statistical Package for

Social Sciences (SPSS).

Results

Table 1

Reliability for the Procedural and Distributive Justice and Turnover Intentions

Dimensions	α
PJ	.871
DJ	.812
TOI	.712

Note: PJ= Procedural Justice; DJ= Distributive Justice; TOI= Turnover Intentions

Cronbach's alpha is a coefficient of reliability which is used to assess internal uniformity of psychometric test score for given sample under examination. Above table shows Cronbach alpha value of variables under study.

Table 2

Demographic Variables

Variables	Group	F	%
Gender	Male	63	70
	Female	27	30
Age range	Under 36	37	41.1
	36 to 45	33	36.7
	46 and above	20	22.2
Marital status	Single	21	23.3
	Married	69	76.7
No of children	0 (n=24)		26.7
	1-3 (n=46)		51.1
	More than 3 (n=20)		22.2

According to the gender 63 respondents from the total of 90 (70%) were males and 27 (30) were females. The age ranges of the respondents was 37 (41.1 %) respondents out of 90 were below 36 years.33 (36.7) were within the range of 36-45 years and 20 (22.2%) were in the range of 46 years and above. There were 21(23.3%) single and 69 (76.7%) married respondents. 24 (26.7%) faculty members didn't have children and out of the rest 66, 46 respondents had 1-3 children, and 20 respondents had more than 3 children.

Table 3
Demographic Variables

Variables	Group	F	%
Qualification	16 years	15	16.7
	17-18 years	29	32.2
	Above 18 years	46	51.1
Experience	Less than a year	10	11.1
	1-3 years	17	18.9
	Above 3 years	63	70
Income/Salary	36000-45000	17	18.9
	46000-60000	17	18.9
	Above 60000	56	62.2

The qualification levels of the respondents were: 15 (16.7%) respondents with 16 years of education, 29 (32.2%) respondents with 17 to 18 years of education and 46 (51.1%) respondents with above 18 years of qualification. For working experience of the respondents: 10 (11.1%) had less than a year's experience, 17 (18.9%) had 1-3 years and 63 (70%) respondents had experience above 3 years. For income, 56 (62.2%) respondents

fell under the category of above Rs. 60,000 and the rest i.e. 17 (18.9%) respondents each under the category of Rs. 36,000 – 45,000 and Rs. 46,000 – 60,000.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviation and Correlations for Procedural, Distributive Justice and Turnover Intentions

	M	SD	TOI	PJ	DJ
TOI	2.60	.84	1	-	-
PJ	3.46	.94	-.187	1	-
DJ	3.48	.92	-.288**	.677**	1

Note: PJ= Procedural Justice; DJ= Distributive Justice; TOI= Turnover Intentions

**p<.01

Pearson correlation was used to test the hypothesis. The results (Mean = 3.46, σ = .94, r = -.187, P >.01) in table 4 showed negative insignificant relationship between procedural justice and turnover intentions. Results (Mean = 3.48, σ = .92, r = -.288: P <.01) have further proven negative and significant relationship between the distributive justice and turnover intentions.

Table 5

t-Test for Comparison of Type A and Type B Personality and Turnover Intentions

Types of Personality	n	M	SD	t	p
Type A	47	2.79	.82	2.241*	.028
Type B	43	2.40	.83		

*P<.05

Independent sample t-test indicated significant results between personality type and turnover intentions. Mean for type A was found to be higher as compared to type B personality.

Discussion

Purpose of this particular study was that perception of distributive justice and procedural justice is negatively related to the turnover intentions. Moreover, it was also proposed to see the difference in personality types (A & B) with respect to turnover intentions of faculty members of universities in Lahore, Pakistan. Drawing on the basis of equity theory results were received and as expected, distributive justice was negatively and significantly correlated with the turnover intentions as predicted by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) and procedural justice was found negatively and insignificantly correlated with the turnover intentions as predicted by Karatepe and Shahriari (2012). This indicated that when faculty members perceive more fairness of university in rewarding them then their intentions to leave the university is lesser. As positive reinforcements contribute towards desired behaviors, so if organizations are providing sufficient reinforcements to the employees, their turnover intentions would be low. As living in a developing country and a collectivist culture, resources are very important factors for employees to support the family members. This shows that their needs if fulfilled would have an influence on their turnover intentions. Further, perception of fairness in processes used for the allocation of resources was not given significant importance by the faculty members of universities.

Personality type A showed the behavior towards intent to leave as compared to the type B personality. Previously, Goodstein and Lanyon (1999); Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) have showed that personality can predict the work related criteria's like job satisfaction; this study was intended to see the connection of personality types with intent to leave. Here, faculty members with type A personality showed more intentions for leaving the organization as compared to type B. As they are more idealistic,

motivated and have multitasking style of work, they would enjoy changing jobs and handling new challenges.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation for this study may be the cross sectional study which was conducted due to cost and time constraints. Better way of collection of data may be the longitudinal study. Moreover, data was collected from only one city of Pakistan; data collection should be done from all over the country. The small sample size can also be the most obvious limitation of this study and this raises a question on the generalizability of the results to further population. Nonetheless, small sample size helps in duplication of results significance.

References

- Adams, J. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic press.
- Ahmed, R. (2010). *Direct and interactive effects of organizational justice and perceptions of politics on personal and organizational outcomes* (Doctoral dissertation), International Islamic University, Islamabad.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Bernardin, H. (2006). The relationship of personality variables to organizational withdrawal. *Personnel Psychology*, 30(1), 17-27.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cascio, W. F. (1991). *Costing human resources*. South-Western Educational Publishing.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.

- Collins, B. J., Mossholder, K. W., & Taylor, S. G. (2012). Does process fairness affect job performance? It only matters if they plan to stay. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(7), 1007-1026.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45(3), 305-317.
- Daly, J. P., & Geyer, P. D. (1994). The role of fairness in implementing large-scale change: Employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(7), 623-638.
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1992). Exploring the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect typology: The influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5(3), 201-218.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3, 141-183.
- Glazer, H. (1985). *Stress management for the executive* (pp. 244-245). New York: Berkeley Books.
- Goodstein, L. D., & Lanyon, R. I. (1999). Applications of personality assessment to the workplace: A review. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(3), 291-322.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 9-22.
- Joy, V. L., & Witt, L. A. (1992). Delay of gratification as a moderator of the procedural justice distributive justice relationship. *Group & Organization Management*, 17(3), 297-308.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.

- Karatepe, O. M., & Shahriari, S. (2012). Job embeddedness as a moderator of the impact of organisational justice on turnover intentions: A study in Iran. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(1), 22-32.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 698-707.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Jiang, S., Elechi, O. O., Benjamin, B., Morris, A., Laux, J. M., & Dupuy, P. (2010). The relationship among distributive and procedural justice and correctional life satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intent: An exploratory study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 7-16.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Mobley, W. (1982). *Employee turnover*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Mobley, W., & Fisk, M. (1982). *Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control*. Addison-Wesley Publishing, Reading, MA.
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33-41.
- Poon, J. M. L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 322-334.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Sanghi, S. (2008). *Organizational behavior* (12th ed.). India: Saurabh Printers.

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

- Sheppard, B. H., Lewicki, R. J., & Minton, J. W. (1992). *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the workplace*. Lexington Books/Macmillan.
- Stagner, R. (1948). *Psychology of personality*: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and the post decision accommodation process. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 235–281). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Susskind, A. M., Borchgrevink, C. P., Kacmar, K. M., & Brymer, R. A. (2000). Customer service employees' behavioral intentions and attitudes: An examination of construct validity and a path model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 19(1), 53-77.