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ABSTRACT

The experiment study examined the influences of distributive justice and procedural justice on individual satisfaction. Social capital as moderating variable that influences the relationship among them. The relationship among between distributive and procedural justice and individual satisfaction based on the two factor model. The two factor model is a concept introduced by Sweeney and Mc Farlin (1993) who explained that distributive justice and procedural justice have a different influences on outcomes. In this research, focus on individual satisfaction. Distributive justice will be stronger to predict individual satisfaction compared to procedural justice. In fact that model is not always supported. This research explained that this model should be considered social capital as moderating variable, because social capital reflects subjective perspective.
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INTRODUCTION

There are two form important of organizational justice: distributive and procedural justice. Both of them have specific influence on the employees’ attitude and reaction (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). It is then conceptualized in the two-factor model. The model explains that distributive and procedural justice have different predicting ability to their consequences. The consequences are the results which are referred as personal outcomes, which, in turn, can be proxied with individual satisfaction. According to the theory, distributive justice has stronger predicting ability to individual satisfaction rather than procedural one which has stronger predicting ability to organizational commitment.

The model offers two important issues. The first issue is that there are several empirical results showing that prediction of distributive and procedural justice towards individual satisfaction (Barling & Philips, 1993; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). An assumption came up that it is essential to consider the subjective aspects in justice models (Skarlicky, 2001; Harris et al, 2004).

The second issue is related to the approach used in this research. Generally, research on the influence of organizational justice on attitude or reaction of employees is conducted using survey. The survey research is usually carried out in the context of policy which has negative impacts on the employees (Hartman, Yrle & Galle., 1999). Therefore, the researcher did experiments to find out the influence of organizational justice on the attitude or reaction of the employees (in this case, individual satisfaction). If survey research usually studies the contexts of policy which has negative impacts, this experimental research will be able to obtain some artificial phenomena.

Problem Formulation

Based on the above mentioned background, the research questions are formulated as follows:

1. Does social capital play a role in moderating the model of the influence of organizational justice on its consequences? Specifically, do different social capitals play a role in elaborating the model of the influence of distributive and procedural justice towards the individual satisfaction?

2. Will different contexts of justice situation or different patterns of justice interaction make any different in predicting the individual satisfaction?

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION

Predictions of organizational justice on individual satisfaction

Why is the influence of distributive justice more dominant to individual satisfaction than procedural justice? Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) in the two-factor
model maintain that distributive justice tends to have positive influences on the results which is related with personal evaluation such as individual satisfaction. Conceptually, it is caused by distributive justice which is related with the results gained by the employees from the organization (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

**H1. Social capital moderates the influence of the followings:**

Based on the literature above, the hypothesis are as follows:

- **H1.** Social capital moderates the influence of the distributive justice towards the individual satisfaction. The influence of distributive justice towards the individual satisfaction is stronger in low social capitalized people.

**Roles of Moderating of Social Capital on the influence of organizational justice on individual satisfaction**

According to Akdere (2005), social capital means individual ability in mobilizing the potentials through networks of friends, groups or organization. In the definition, individual ability is prescribed for a long period of time (Nahapiet & Ghosal, 1998), so the social capital is personal property prescribed on someone and not on the social interaction. The self potentials are called as bonding and mobilizing ability as bridging perspectives. They can create patterns of individual’s psychological interaction with his/her social environment. Moreover, Kostova and Roth (2003) cite that social capital will make an individual tend to work harder to maintain their social relationship or focus on financial factors. Those who have low social capital will tend to work on their financial factors. They will be less motivated to get involved in social system, do not prioritize on their social interests and do not strongly identify themselves with their groups (Chua, 2002 and Primeaux, 2003). Hence, low social capitalized people will be more sensitive compared to high social capitalized people in facing their financial problem.

From distributive justice point of view, the low social capitalized people take the focus on their short term needs, i.e., financial. They will be upset easily if the direct results are not as good as they have expected. Thus, the change on perception of distributive justice will receive more sensitive response in forms of change of satisfaction.

Similarly, in procedural justice, the people with low social capital will try to make their interests protected by the procedures of a policy, such as policy of performance appraisal. The phenomena are described in the model of personal interests that people will care more about procedural justice because the procedures accommodate their interests. If the procedures are considered as less fair, the low social capitalized people will be more sensitive in terms of the level of satisfaction change because they focus on their financial aspects.

Based on the literature above, the hypothesis are as follows:

- **H2.** Social capital moderates the influence of procedural justice towards individual satisfaction. The influence of procedural justice towards individual satisfaction is stronger in low social capitalized people.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**A. Experimental research**

**Respondents**

There were 265 first and second year university students enrolled in management subject of management study program at one private university in Yogyakarta Special Province. The researcher, then, self selected them into high and low social capital and obtained 134 respondents with high and low social capital. Of 268 respondents, 247 or 92.16% were present. Accordingly, they were grouped based on their level of social capital. There were 124 students with high social capital and 123 students with low social capital.

**Design and procedure**

The treatments were categorized in four aspects, i.e., (1) high distributive justice – high procedural justice, (2) high distributive justice – low procedural justice, (3) low distributive justice – high procedural justice, and (4) low distributive justice and low procedural justice.

The selections of the respondents were carried out two weeks before the experiment was executed. The lecturer of management subject asked the respondents to fill in a form. The form contained indicators which described their social capital used for respondent classification. In this research, the variables of social capital were self-selected. The respondents’ average scores were then used to classify them into groups.

Before the experiments were conducted, the lecturer of management subject announced that most students earned bad score for their tests. Accordingly, the lecturer gave opportunities to the students to have assistance/coaching/mentoring which were assisted by lecturer assistant and had make up tests. The make-up tests were conducted by a team of researcher’s assistants who worked as team teaching. The team consisted of 4 Master of Psychological Science students who have taken experimental design subject and one administration staff.

The respondents were taken to the classrooms set by the lecturer of financial management and his team. There were six classrooms designed which described four configurations or interaction patterns of distributive and procedural justice, i.e., (1) high distributive justice – high procedural justice (HDJ – HPJ); (2) high distributive justice – low procedural justice (HDJ – LPJ); (3) low distributive justice – high procedural justice (LDJ – HPJ), (4) low distributive justice – low
procedural justice (LDJ – LPJ). After all respondents were in the configured classrooms, eight groups were obtained. Each group comprised of 29, 30, and 31 people.

After having treatment, the classes were taught by different instructors who pretended to the university’s bureau of human resources and evaluated the class process. The instructor rotation could decrease the level of common method bias. Each respondent was asked to judge whether they thought that they received a fair treatment distributively and procedurally in form manipulation checks. Before starting the appraisal of predictive variables session, it was announced that doorprizes were available. According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), the time breaks may reduce the common method bias. Then, the respondents were asked to fill in the questionnaires in which the statements were related to satisfaction and commitment to measure their reaction to the manipulation. Debriefing was conducted at the end of the process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Experimental research

Manipulation check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Manipulation check of Distributive Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Manipulation check of Procedural Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that manipulation check for the two variables were well carried out.

A.1 Individual satisfaction as dependent variables

The descriptive data of individual satisfaction related to distributive, procedural justice and social capital is shown in the table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Description of Individual Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the significant interaction of distributive justice, procedural justice and social capital, post hoc was conducted.

Test of the influence of justice on individual satisfaction

Table 4. supported that distributive and procedural justice had significant role in explaining the individual satisfaction. The results showed that distributive justice played more important role in explaining the individual satisfaction compared with procedural justice (see eta squared DJ and PJ).

Hypothesis testing moderated social capital on individual satisfaction

The result showed that the interaction between distributive justice (DJ) and social capital (SC) was
significant at (p 0.0001). However, the interaction between procedural justice and social capital was not significant so H2 was not supported. The next investigation was carried out by testing using scenarios and descriptive statistics for significant interactions (DJ and SC) by separating them into subsamples (Walter et al., 2000; Gibson, 2001) out of SC.

SC played an important role as moderating variables on the two factor models of justice, so H1 was supported the empirics. It was explained specifically that the influence of distributive on individual satisfaction was stronger on the low social capitalized people.
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**Figure 1.**

The Post hoc examination of the individual satisfaction

The Post hoc examination of the individual satisfaction showed that:

**Table 5. Post hoc of the individual Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Code</th>
<th>(J) Code</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-4.47</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above post hoc, it can be concluded that the interaction pattern of DJ, PJ and SC differed significantly in the description of the individual satisfaction level.

**Additional study**

A study related to the issue of Hartman et al. (1999)

(a) The interaction pattern of High DJ – High PJ

The result of post hoc study showed the absent role of the social capital moderation in the influence of the distributive and procedural justice on the performance appraisal satisfaction. The significance of the grade showed a minor result (table post hoc code 1 and 5).

(b) Interaction Pattern of High DJ – Low PJ

The result of post hoc study identified the absence role of social capital moderation in the influence of distributive and procedural justice on the performance evaluation satisfaction, indicated by the low grade of significance (table post hoc-code 2 and 6).
(c) Interaction Pattern of Low DJ and High PJ

The result of the post hoc study demonstrated the presence of the role of the social capital moderation in the influence of distributive and procedural justice on satisfaction (0.001). The satisfaction level on the sub-sample group of the high social capitalized was higher than that of the low social capitalized people (mean difference of 2.72 – table post hoc-code 3 and 7).

(d) Interaction Pattern of Low DJ and Low PJ

The result of the post hoc study showed that the social capital took its role of moderating the influence of distributive and procedural justice on satisfaction (significance level of p.01). In this interaction pattern, the high social capitalized people would be more satisfied than that of the lower ones (mean difference of 1.63 – table post hoc-code 4 and 8).

Discussion

The research showed that both distributive and procedural justice took significant role in explaining the satisfaction (see table 4.4, and 4.7 showing significance level of 0.001). The prediction conceptualization of each type of justice was in line with the views shared by Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) and in empirical way, it obtained several supports (Colquitt et al., 2001). However, some of the previous researches were not supportive to the two-types model (Barling & Philips, 1993; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996; Pareke, 2002). Sweeney dan McFarlin aware of some shortages in their research. The main point they criticized was that the model they proposed required more complex variables. The research opportunity were opened at studying the moderating variables, which was also sharpened by Harris et al. (2004) that the perspective of individually subjective appraisal should be further examined in the model designing. The heuristic theory stated that people could not obtain a total information in the appraisal of a policy’s justice. The unavailability of objective information resulted in the subjective appraisal of justice. Subjective appraisal relates to the personal characteristics of the reviewers.

The research is relatively supporting to the perspective of individual subjective appraisal. The role of the social capital obtained support at hypothesis 1, while hypothesis 2 did not obtain any empirical support. The discussion of each moderating hypothesis is following.

The research showed that hypothesis 1 obtained a support, meaning that the social capital moderated the influence of distributive justice on the individual satisfaction. The influence of the distributive justice on the individual satisfaction was stronger on those with low social capital. The empirical study showed that when the distributive justice was high, there were no difference of satisfaction level between the sub sample of high and the low social capital. Meanwhile, when the distributive social capital was low, those with high social capital received the higher level of satisfaction than those with low social capital. The mean of satisfaction of those with high social capital was (M=7.71) while low social capital was (M=5.50). The regression line at Figure 4.1 showed that the low social capitalized people were more sensitive. It was influenced by the distributive justice, thus it can be said that the influence of distributive justice to the individual satisfaction is stronger at the low social capitalized people. This is in line with the theoretical study that the low social capitalized people are more oriented to maximizing the efforts of the individual interest and welfare (Chua, 2002; Kostova & Roth, 2003; ADJere, 2005). They are very concerned about distributive justice as it is related to the individual welfare received from the organization (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Therefore, if the distributive justice posed low position, consequently, the level of satisfaction of those with low social capital would also be low.

The regression line on Fig. 4.2 showed that the low social capitalized people were more sensitive to the influence of distributive justice. In other words, the influence of distributive justice on the individual satisfaction was stronger at the low social capitalized people. When the distributive justice posed a lower point, they would be more sensitive at the commitment level. The commitment level to the organization declined and it was due to the personal interest and welfare was on critical point. It was in contrary to those who have higher social capital. They want to establish good relationship with many people and develop focus on the emotional bound such as friendship (Granovetter dalam Chua, 2002; Primeaux, 2003; Kostova & Roth, 2003).

Hypothesis 2, on the other hand, identified the moderating role in the influence of procedural justice on the individual satisfaction and this was stronger at those with low social capital. The research showed the absence of empirical study in supporting the hypothesis. It might relate to the fact that procedural justice itself was not quite dominant in explaining the individual satisfaction. The difference between the high and low social capital would be better in describing individual satisfaction when it was related to distributive justice since the main difference between those with high and low social capital and procedure is dealing with the level of commitment instead of the individual satisfaction. The relatively tiny difference between the high and low social capital difference made the variations hard to statistically describe.

Interaction Pattern of DJ dan PJ (Hartman et al., 1999)

Individual Satisfaction
The research also further revealed the relation between the distributive justice, procedural justice and social capital, which significantly related each other in explaining the individual satisfaction (school subject assessment of satisfaction). The pattern of interaction could be described as followings:

- The interaction pattern of (3) LDJ – HPJ and (4) LDJ – LPJ; the role of the social capital as the moderating variable was quite significant in explaining the individual satisfaction.
- The interaction pattern of (1) HDJ – HPJ and (2) HDJ – LPJ; the role of the social capital was not significant in explaining the individual satisfaction.

In the interaction pattern of high distributive and procedural justice, there was no significantly different attitude and behavior between those with high and low social capital when responding the pattern of interaction in explaining the satisfaction. It was reasonable as there was no significant justice problem at both sampling groups. Thus, the role of social capital as a moderating variable did not receive any support. Related to the research setting it showed that there was no problem with the assessment phenomenon of the teachers team of management study program. The students perceived that the distributive and procedural justice posed on the high level; Or, it could be said that the appraisal policy to the student in either distributive and procedural way were fair enough. Thus there was no unfairness existing as both individual with high and low social capital did not show any different respond to the distributive and procedural justice they perceived. In the interaction pattern of high distributive justice – low procedural justice, the role of social capital as a moderating variable did not receive and support in describing the individual satisfaction. It showed that the distributive was more dominant in explaining satisfaction (Sweeney dan McFarlin, 1993). The concept explained that each individual in the organization was very concerned about their welfare allocation or their interests, thus when the allocation did not match or even beyond their expectation, the respond given was quite positive (Tyler, 1994). Therefore, either individual with high social capital or low social capital would show positive response on the similar level, thus the role of social capital as a moderating variable was not significant. In this research setting, distributive justice was perceived as fair by the students, meaning that the perception on the fairness of the final score on the subjects they took, however, the procedural justice (related to the score allocation process) was perceived as unfair. At this point, the distributive justice was perceived as clear so the individual response which either with high or low social capital was not any different in responding the justice condition. However, the main problem lied more on the problematic procedural justice without differentiating individual response of those with high and low social capital. It could be explained in 2 types of justice as described by Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) that the distributive justice took more dominant role in explaining satisfaction. The above conception was not against the competition theory that the domination of distributive justice influenced the other types of justice and satisfaction. This view was deeply studied by Skitka (2003) that the individual attention to the justice was related to outstanding identity (Skitka and Crosby, 2003). In the research context, students would assume that a school subject’ final score became their focus of attention (outstanding identity) instead of the procedure of where the score came from. The students’ neglecting attitude toward the procedural justice was reflected on the data at a private university in Yogyakaratta, showing that the level of undergraduate students’ attendance on the first day of the class was relatively low whereas the first day was the in fact the learning contact that should be agreed by both students and teachers. The contract included how the assessment system conducted. Their being absence indicated that the students did not pay attention to the procedural justice related to the scoring.

It indicated that the individual characteristic difference such as the social capital will show a different attitude and behavior when the individual is facing a justice problem.

The interaction pattern of low distributive justice – high procedural justice showed that the role of the social capital as a significant moderating variable in explaining the individual satisfaction. It showed that the different individual characteristics, as the social capital, would reflect a different attitude and behavior when those individuals were exposed to some problems of justice. When they perceived that the low distributive justice would cause them dissatisfied, their dissatisfaction relatively decreased when the process or the procedural justice is perceived as fair. The high social capitalized people will respond more positively dealing with the satisfaction compared to the low social capitalized ones. It is because the high procedural justice perception is closely related to the continuation of the individual long-term relationship in a group or organization. Dealing with the research setting, the students felt that the assessment in the team teaching class was not fair so that they felt disappointed or responded in low satisfaction. The dissatisfaction urged the students to put forward a question on how the score allocation was done after they got the score from the team teaching. The explanation of the process and procedure which they perceived as fair would reduce their dissatisfaction level. The students with the high social capital tended to have a long-term orientation so that their satisfaction level was better than those with the low social capital. They tended to be able to press their dissatisfaction due to their personal interests which were unfulfilled, compared to those with the low social capital.
In addition, the social capital role is also seen on the interaction pattern of low distributive justice-low procedural justice. It indicated that the individual with high and low social capital responded the condition negatively or on the low satisfaction level in a different degree with one another. The negative respond was understandable, because as stated by Deutch (1975) basically, the individuals in the organization cared for the goods and services distribution affecting the individual prosperity (Faturochman, 2002). The students became more dissatisfied when perceiving that the allocation process was unjust. However, the dissatisfaction level of the high social capitalized students related to their personal interests can be decreased more, compared to the low social capitalized ones. Those having the high and low social capital were on the different attitude level in responding the interaction pattern.
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, LIMITATION, AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

In general, the distributive and procedural justices still play an important role as the main components of the organizational justice. Both of them are good predictor to individual satisfaction.

Second, the theoretical assumption of justice heuristics that the people in the organization did not have enough information in evaluating justice caused the people to do cognitive “shortcut” in conducting the evaluation on the justice phenomenon in the organization. The perspective role of individual subjective assessment emerged in explaining the assessment phenomenon and attitude towards the organization policies. From the researcher’s point of view, the existence of the individual subjective assessment perspective did not mean that the objective perspective became “passé”. The condition was also influenced by the situation or interaction pattern of distributive and procedural justices in the organization. When the phenomenon of organizational justice, both the distributive and procedural justices, were assessed to be good, the phenomenon of the subjective assessment was not dominant in explaining the attitude and behavior. The social capital is an individual subjective assessment variable which plays a role in explaining the assessment and the individual attitude towards the justice phenomenon in the organization. The experiment results showed that the social capital role as the moderating variables towards the distributive and procedural justices on the individual satisfaction and the organization commitment getting the support on the justice situation was considered to present problems. Based on the theory understanding and the research discussion, some factors playing the role in creating the social capital role into the model are the following. (1) the information limitation, that is, the people did not get enough information to evaluate the justice phenomenon they faced. The lack of information would urge the emergence of a subjective assessment. The social capital is a variable which get the empirical support in this research; (2) in the perspective of the social identity theory, those with the high social capital tend to identify themselves with the organization so that it will differentiate how they behave. Those having the high social capital will be more sensitive to the social aspects than the economic aspect; (3) the justice principles applied will be different among those who have the high social capital and those with the low social capital. Those things were identified by the prior researchers in describing the differences of perception and attitude of those who own low and high social capitals; (4) the new thing in this research is a finding that the justice situation factor or the distributive justice interaction, the procedural justice and the social capital have a role in explaining the social capital existence on the justice model. As the justice situation is in trouble, the role of the social capital moderating occurs.

The discussion of the distributive and procedural justice interaction pattern was described from the result of the experimental research. The result showed that the role of the social capital moderating towards the effect of the distributive and procedural justices on the individual satisfaction and was also determined by the interaction pattern of the second type of justice. When the problem phenomenon happens in perceiving justice, the role of the social capital moderating will be observable. Those owning the high social capital will differ from those with the low social capital when responding the low justice (the organization policies which are perceived less or not fair). The result of the empirical examination in the survey research showed that the role of the social capital moderating on the distributive and procedural justice relationship with the individual satisfaction was not much supported on the high justice situation (the organization policies which were perceived as fair). It is in line with the result of the experimental research on the high justice artificial situation showing that on the situation, the role of the social capital did not get the support. Therefore, the role of the social capital or the individual subjective differences was not seen when the people thought that there was not justice in their organization.

The Research Implication

The findings in this study bring about some good implications in the theories focusing on the organizational justice and on the methodological and practical aspects. The implications of the research findings are, among others:

Theoretical implication

Firstly, the distributive and procedural justices in general have different effects on the individual satisfactions. The distributive justice plays a more dominant role compared with the procedural justice in explaining the individual satisfaction. Secondly, in an injustice condition, the effects of the distributive and procedural justices consequently, both on the individual satisfaction and organization commitment are important in consideration of the individual subjective assessment variables. On the other hand, the study on the social capital moderating does not show any dominant roles in the situation which is considered as fair.

Thirdly, the research gives some supports to the subjective perspectives for studying the effects of the complicated distributive and procedural justices on the consequences as well as explaining some conceptions such as the model of the two types of justice which do not always get the empirical support. The context factors or the justice interaction pattern become a very important thing to consider.
Methodological implication

The experiment gave supports to the internal validity. Secondly, the problem of pattern differences in the distributive and procedural justice interactions with the consequences as stated by Hartman et al., (1999) can be studied comprehensively using the experimental research through creating the artificial environment dealing with the built situation. The experiment result can help interpret why in a certain situation the role of the social capital moderating get the supports empirically.

Practical implication

First, in the research setting, the distributive justice was dominant in explaining the satisfaction or the result referred by individuals, because the individuals have attention and desire on the allocation of goods and services for their prosperity. Therefore, the organization is required to study deeply the allocation aspects related to the attention and desire of the staffs.

Second, the management is required to understand the characteristics of each staff. In this case, it is their social capital property so that the responses to the management policies also vary. Therefore, the leaders or management need to identify their staffs’ characteristics such as the social capital they have.

The limitations of the research and the suggestions

In general, experiment study have limitation such as low of external validity. In the future, combination of the experiment and survey research will be able to develop a strong conceptual foundation.

The split of the subjects into the low and high social capitals in an experimental research should be based on certain standards and not relative, so that it will indicate strongly the individuals having the low and high social capitals. In the future research, how to categorize the low and high social capitals more clearly should be put in mind.
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