

Exploring the Role of Organizational Justice in Predicting Job Performance

Noor-ul-Ain¹

Abstract

Job performance is a major concern of organizations, because it plays a key role in organizational productivity. Employees perform better when they have perceived organization as fair. Thus, this article examines the role of organizational justice in predicting job performance in the context of faculty members of public owned institution in Karachi. It has involved a total of 312 respondents including lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor for conducting this research. This research identified significant association of organizational justice including its two dimensions namely distributive justice and interactional justice with that of job performance including its two-dimension task performance and contextual performance. This study also discovered that distributive justice is a major predictor of task performance and contextual performance than interactional justice. Theoretical context, future directions, recommendations and limitation of the study were also been discussed.

Keywords: Organizational justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice, Job Performance, Task Performance, Contextual Performance.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Justice is a main component in building up and keeping up an unwavering culture. According to Kavanagh, Brown and Benson (2007), the rise in individual productivity will result in organizational productivity. In recent times, after the advancement of science and innovation; the phenomenon of justice has taken into consideration by many researchers and various studies have been conducted to explore that how organizational justice is linked with individual's outcomes in business world nowadays. Organization plays a crucial role for the society. Therefore, individuals considered to establish justice as one of the significant predictor of individual's job performance. Hafiz, Ishaq, and Shaheen, (2015), mentioned that after studying the impact of justice to that of job satisfaction and job performance, researchers are bound to plan a theory to explore what individual's perception of justice is and how it is related to job performance.

¹ Noor ul Ain was a dedicated and hardworking student at Indus University. She has done her MBA from Indus and currently associated with a reputable firm in HR field.

Kaplan and Norton (2004) concluded that after revolutionary transformation of trade and commerce industry since mechanical era to enlightening era resulted in organization to rely more on human resource that outperform when fairly treated. In recent years when employees have been considered as resource, human asset got more acknowledgment (Zehir et.al, 2010). In earlier studies, it has been uncovered that organizational justice and job performance has consequential relevance (Ohana, 2014). In fact, it has been identified in various studies that organizational justice has significant relevance on job performance. Researches also witnessed significant relationship in different settings. Moreover, employing Social exchange theory presented by Blau (1964) and Adam's Equity theory (1965), these researches also explained the significant association of organizational justice dimensions on job productivity hypothetically.

Studies on various aspects of justice and the influence of the phenomenon of justice on communal relationship, particularly within a workplace, firstly presented in the writings in the discipline of social psychology crafted by Homans (1961) and Adams (1965). Research scholars taken term justice into consideration as it is considered to be a significant component in understanding people's conduct within the workplace (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Zhang et al., 2014)

Justice is identified as main focus of attention to both associations and workforce Aryee et al. (2015). Utilizing social exchange theory depicted the corresponding link among organizational justice and individual's work attitude (blau, 1964; organ, 1988). Overall, organizational justice urges individuals to collaborate, cooperate with other employees and follow organizational decisions. (Bies and Tripp, 2001) concluded that unjust treatment more likely would result in job burnout and turnover intentions. Using social exchange approach by Gouldner (1960) and Blau (1964) became a significant methodology in describing the impacts of equity in the work setting.

(Müller and Djuatio, 2011; Doucet, 2004) mentioned that various researches by French research scholars, organizational justice has been utilized as a key forecaster of individual's conduct and work attitudes in the work setting. Our research proceeds in the similar direction as in earlier researches to investigate the relevance that organizational justice has on job performance. Research scholars have observed both the hypothetical as well as experiential link among organizational justice and job performance. An employee's work productivity possibly will get better or get worse based upon their perceived fairness of justice (Adams; 1965). Researchers termed job performance as accomplishment of the role and duties of a specified job (Borman and Motowidlo; 1997). Scholars defined job performance as outcomes evaluated through formal performance appraisal method and mentioned in an individual's job roles (O'Reilly and Chatman; 1986). Researchers explained performance as employee's outcomes resulting in accomplishment of organizational productivity (Campbell and Mc Henry; 1990). Nasr et al., 2009) mentioned prior investigating, separate impacts of different aspect of equity on organizational outcomes. Ambrose and Arnaud (2005) introduced a methodology dependent on assessment of justice as whole. According to Lind

(2001), this new methodology depends on heuristic theory of fairness and related to justice as whole and its impact on job engagement and work related outcomes. This research serves the purpose to identify finest way to comprehend the phenomenon of organizational justice (specified aspects of justice or justice as whole) to know the effect on job performance.

1.2 Organizational Justice

The notion of organizational justice is presented by research scholar Green berg which is termed as, the employee's perception of fair treatment within the workplace. It is regards to how an employee perceive about the decision and actions taken by the organization resulting in forming employee's own behavior and attitudes towards work. Justice or fairness refers to the concept that the actions, behavior and decisions taken are ethically right. People are always concerned about the fairness of events taken place every day. Individual react to these actions, behavior and decisions of the organization on daily basis. Individual's perception as unfair or fair regarding the decision of the organization can impact employees work attitudes within the workplace which will have direct impact on their productivity. In organizational settings, managers are always concerned as if their behavior and decision are perceived fairly by the employees. Owing to the fact that employee's performance and commitment could not be achieved until fairness and fair treatment prevails within the workplace. Hence justice and fairness of perception is of great importance resulting in crucial outcomes for the society and work settings. Therefore it is really important to practice fair treatment in all human practices to enhance productivity and to establish stable society especially in under developed and developing countries where there are rarely few studies on this significant phenomenon in the work settings.

1.3 Introduction

Organizational justice considered as significant phenomenon to research on besides other human resource management practices. The relationship among fair perception and other work related outcomes has also been critically researched. According to researchers, Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, Ahmad, Hadi, and Hamid (2011) found out that there is strong affirmative association among organizational justice and job fulfillment, the study was conducted in manufacturing industry. Research scholars laid their emphasis on productivity of the faculty members. Mamiseishvili and Rosser (2011) concluded that there is notable negative relation on job productivity of faculty with that of organizational justice. Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Jacob & Winslow, 2004 mentioned that, it is presumed from the faculty to educate, carry out their research work and provide their contributions to improve productivity and overall educational practice. According to Schuster & Finkelstein (2006), it has been observed that there is notable discrepancy in productivity of faculty members from organization to organization and from field to field, though educators are always thoughtful towards organizational practices, policies and procedures regardless of working environment and nature of the organization. Khan & Habib; (2011) mentioned that the fair

perception of faculty members of public owned institution is like a stimulus which will play a role in boosting up organizational commitment, job fulfillment and job productivity. Therefore, phenomenon of organizational justice considered and studied as an important forecaster to both job fulfillment and job performance.

Hence the motive of this research is to apprehend that how fair perception in the work setting could affect job performance. The research is empirical in nature to investigate the significant relationship among organizational justice and job performance within the perspective of faculty members of public sector universities.

1.4 Factors Influencing Perception

1.4.1 Perception

It's a procedure through which an individual interprets to give meaning about its surrounding by using its intuition and insights. Though, what an individual perceive could be entirely different from its reality. Therefore, people may look at same thing but their perception could be different about it due to numerous factors which may shape or distort perception.

1.4.2 Characteristics in the Perceiver

Perception can shape due to numerous attributes of the perceiver. When a person looks at something and tries to interpret about it. It can be massively influenced by its own characteristics which reside inside a person. Among those internal characteristics, few important are

Attitude: for instance: an individual having optimistic approach would perceive things differently than the one having pessimistic approach.

Motives: it plays a crucial role in shaping perception .an individual desire at a specific time can influence individual's percipience.

Interest: individual perceive things faster which he has interest in. therefore, interest play a significant role in influencing perception.

Experience: successful or unsuccessful experiences have an impact on ability to perceive things. Successful experiences would lead to enhancing perceptive ability.

Expectations: an individual see what they expect to see. Those individuals who accept themselves and have a positive approach would see favorable aspects in other people and vice versa.

1.4.3 Characteristics in the Target:

Attributes in the target which is being observed can influence perception. Therefore, physical appearance plays a crucial role in shaping perception.

1.4.4 Characteristics in the Situation:

Perception can be influenced when communication among the perceiver and the target occurs. For instance: time, work setting and social setting.

1.5 Research Problem:

In Pakistan, where educational sector has become a rapidly growing industry and investors have identified the potential of this industry. Due to this fact, investors are paying more attention to capitalize their investment and keep looking for the opportunities available in the industry. Hence, the widening in the privately-owned institution not only opened doors of opportunities of quality education but also magnetize qualified educationist from public sector. The enormous progress in privately owned institution is witnessed in Karachi, The hugest and immensely populous city of the country. Thus, public owned educational institution of government in Sindh should take initiative on this sensitive issue as it is highly needed to keep the balance of competition between the private and public owned education sector and can further help in retention of highly qualified and skilled educationist of public sector. Thus, the role of motivation and other human resource practices has significance to make sure the faculty remain loyal and use their full potential in transmitting the knowledge.

The average output of the workforce in the educational institution will result in decreased performance of institutions in Karachi. Therefore, one of the most important factors besides other factor is organizational justice that can boost the productivity of faculty of public owned institutions. The research will contribute in uplifting the motivational level of university faculty. Hence, a factual research is carried out to find out the effect of organizational justice inclusive of its two aspects termed as distributive and interactional justice on job performance and its two allied aspects termed as task and contextual performance with specific focus on university faculty of public owned institutions in Karachi.

1.6 Research Aim:

The factual research performed to investigate relevance of organizational justice on job performance of university faculty appointed in different public sector universities of Karachi. This empirical study also exhibits the relationship among aspects of organizational justice and job performance. Particularly, motive of this research is explained below;

The study is specifically conducted to examine the effect of organizational justice on job performance which includes respondents of university faculty appointed in different public sector universities.

1.7 Research Question:

What is the relevance of organizational justice on job performance of teaching staff of public owned universities in Karachi?

1.8 Research Focus:

The main focus of this study is as under:

(a) Thematic Focus:

The thematic emphasis of this study is to empirically investigate the impact of perception about outcome of fairness and the ways of executing outcomes on job performance of faculty of university.

(b) Geographic Focus:

The research assimilated the responses of university faculty members appointed in different government universities of Karachi.

1.9 Research Gap:

Research scholars referred organizational justice as percipience of people of fair treatment in organization (Greenberg; 1987). According to Magista & Peret (2013), the process to outcome distribution is massively affected by the people's perception. Hassan, Khatak & Rajput, (2014) explained that the input of workforce towards organizational performance is a result of such percipience. Malik & Naeem (2011) examined and summed up the powerful effects of percipience as a result of organizational justice and its effect on job performance of faculty members of university on demographic groups in Karachi .Though, the percipience of faculty members of government institution and its analytical connections with job performance examined very rarely. Hence the empirical attempt is expected to add value to the existing dearth in organizational justice literature.

1.9.1 Significance of the Study:

This research will contribute to educational institutions in many ways in terms of hypothetical and administrative point of view. The exploration of this study is of more importance as under: To begin with, the study will enhance our understanding of different aspects of organizational justice. The discoveries of this study have identified the association of organizational justice on job performance leading towards better understanding of employee perception of fairness within the work place.

A better understanding regarding the different aspects of organizational justice will lead to enhance knowledge of how this fairness of perception is linked with outcomes related to work including motivation, job fulfillment, and job commitment and how this will result in professional efficiency and job performance. Secondly, the research which broadens the implication of justice perception within the workplace other than material benefits has a potential comprehending a variety of previously undiscovered impacts. This research exploration may increase substantial value of the writings in the context of outcomes related to work including task performance and contextual performance. Lastly, this research has tried to provide educational department officials better understanding into perception of fairness patterns of faculty members and how to manage university faculty through utilizing perception of justice perception to anticipate hopeful work related results from university faculty.

1.9.2 Limitations of the Study:

Following are the limitations of this study;

1. While reviewing the writings, it was uncovered that limited hypothetical or observational examinations on organizational justice have been researched, especially in Pakistani setting. Henceforth the jumping furthest reaches of this examination is full-time and lasting employees of Government universities in Karachi.
2. The research is conducting in Karachi only.
3. The respondents of this research are limited to five universities i.e: Karachi University, N.ed University, Wafaqi urdu university, Dow University and Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University.
4. We couldn't reach each and every faculty member as the sample size is limited.
5. Research has to be completed in a certain time period which led time constraints.

2. Literature Review:

Organizations are social systems where workforce is significant variable for sustainability and proficiency. Organization requires compelling supervisors and managers for achieving their targets. As depicted by Rad & Yarmohammadian (2006), Organization couldn't sustain without their faculty dedication, efforts and commitment. Administrators must clarify to their assistants about their duties at work and the related advantages received by the organization so as to inspire subordinates effectively engaged with the work environment along these lines which result in improving job and performance altogether Sinh, Dorner and Gorman (2011). Essentially, work includes commitments, obligations, and tasks which are defined and specific, and could be accomplished, assessed, estimated and evaluated. As indicated by Campbell (1990).

Performance can be described as the accomplishment of a assigned task completed by the individual and estimated through the standards set to complete assigned task. As mentioned by Okoyo (2013), Inefficiency will cause loss to the organization and will result in low productivity. Researchers have identified two important components of employee performance termed as contextual performance and task performance (Motowildo; 1993). Contextual performance is individual's endeavor which has no prompt relationship with fundamental task and methods that forms the organization. As depicted by Katz (1964), analyzing earlier practices to achieve organizational success can be attained through going far beyond the expected set of duties whereas, contextual performance comprises of two components including job commitment and interpersonal facilitation. Motowildo and Van Scotter (1996), Work commitment is to complete your task in a poised and disciplined manner such as to work harder and abide by rule and regulations. Contrary to, interpersonal facilitation is to motivate your coworkers and help them deliberately in completing their assigned duties. While, Griffin, Neal and Parker (2007) depicted that, Task performance is the capability of an individual to finish assigned job timely which an organization has specified. Katz (1964), employees has to achieve certain degree of necessary job related outcomes which has desired value and quantity. Employees who fail to complete their assignments as per the standards set, might not get proper job benefits or more likely to lose their job. Task performance is probably going to vary dependent on the ability of an employee to complete their assigned task.

(Fernandes and Awamleh, 2006) indicated that, individual's job productivity and job satisfaction are presumed to be the main factors which influence performance of an organization. In a fast paced, highly competitive and ever changing global business scenario; organization must undertake great efforts to determine the aspects that influence job satisfaction and job performance of the workforce. One major factor is organizational justice; which explains fair perception of treatment from management and in response their reaction to such treatment. Workforce feel contented when they have a perception that they are fairly rewarded for the efforts they have made and they are genuinely rewarded according to the organizational policies for fairly contributing to achieve organizational goals. The rewards should combine a number of different forms of compensation excluding the pay they receive. Individuals having higher occupation fulfillment are significant as they have a perception that the firm upholding a great future and values their employee's efforts; therefore they are increasingly loyal with the firm, having higher degrees of consistency and will in general having greater productivity (Fatt, Khin and Heng 2010).

2.1 Organizational Justice:

Researches have been conducted on organizational justice and its impact on employees has been critically examined as employee's perception of organizational justice impacting work related attitudes. Bank, Engelbrecht, & Strumpher indicated that, employees usually cogitate organizational policies as unfair that results in emotional stress whereas when workforce perceives

that organization is fairly treating them then it led to delivering more to their customers and results in positive relationship among employees and customer (Ashar & Shahbaz, 2013).

Greenberg (1987) referred; Organizational justice alludes to view of reasonableness in organization. Tremblay, Sire and Balkin (2000) explained distributive justice in compensation perspective as the reaction of employees responding to the amount of money they receive. According to Adams (1965) and Deutsch (1985), earlier studies on organizational justice emphasized on distributive justice. But in recent researches, researches have covered procedural justice (e.g. Lind and Tyler 1988; Greenberg 1990), and interactional justice e.g (Bies 1987; Tepper 2000). Cropanzano and Folger 1991 depicted that, organizational justice scholars have emphasized primarily on distributive and procedural justice. Tyler and Caine (1981) observed that dimensions of organizational justice are significant predictor of various work related outcomes, including fulfillment with leaders, responses to performance evaluation, the chances of candidate to accept a job, and the chances of management to utilize new systems.

Chan (2000) mentioned that working environment where justice is missing have always been related with negative consequences. for instance low productivity, high turnover, low organizational commitment, increased misconduct, and decreased job loyalty attitudes, low job performance ,increased distress, reduced support from colleagues co-workers ,lowers work standards , decreased self-worth and un ethical conduct .Furthermore, perceived injustice have been related to other human resource programs ,selection systems and pay-raise choices (Folger and Konovsky 1989). The fairness related with human resource practices has been linked with various work attitudes including organizational commitment, job burnout and turn over intentions (Aquino,Griffeth, Allen and Hom 1997). As a result, of these numerous outcomes, it has been proposed that study of organizational justice has a significant societal value (Sabbagh, Yechezkel and Nura 1994). Masterson, Lewis, Goldman and Taylor (2000) identified notable proof that fair perception is a significant construct influencing employee's work attitude in the organization.

The impact of fairness of perception of the workplace on numerous employees work related attitudes have gained attention in recent years (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Therefore, research on fair treatment by organization and work related attitudes have increased tremendously. It is also been identified that distributive justice might be a significant forecaster of work related outcomes than procedural justice perceptions (Lind & Tyler, 1988)

According to Greenberg (1990), Fundamental theories of social equity were created to examine the standard of justice as whole societal interactions, as opposed to organization in particular. Therefore, the preliminary researches have seen fragmentary achievements to an effort to briefly understand different dimensions of organization behavior. In past, theoretical systems have been defined that conveys features and problems straightforwardly related to hierarchical practices. Using this conceptual framework into practice equity researchers has conducted researches to examine the importance of perceived fair treatment in workplace (Greenberg, 1987).

Decisions relating to perceived fair treatment are executed in simple manner. Sheppard, Lewicki & Minton (1992) mentioned that, in such manner two standards to pass judgment on the equity choice, system and activity have been displayed. The main rule of equity requests a decision of harmony. This standard utilizes to set up an examination between the present choices with the choices prior made in comparative cases. Examinations of balance are attempted by analyzing the exhibitions of two or a few people and comparing those exhibitions to the value of the commitments they made for association. Accuracy is the consequent judgment guideline through which activities, choice and methodology are analyzed. Accuracy can be seen as the greatness which settles on the choice saw legitimized.

Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler & Schminke, (2001) explained that, people embrace choice with respect to the perceived fairness of different activities which issues or recompenses, by passing judgment on the choice regarding both adjusted and right. In addition representatives alongside money related essentialness of results, additionally offer respect to socio-economic worth. The socio-economic worth indicates the greatness of communication with individuals in workplace. The idea of the interactional justice spearheaded by Bies and Moag (1986).

As per Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997), hierarchical equity studies have drawn attention on three primary issues: people groups' response to the reward they get, techniques implemented to receive benefits and the way they are treated within the workplace. Those broad research discoveries have been finished up with respect to conveyance of financial results, and other business related advantages got from value hypothesis Greenberg (1987). The hypothesis of Adam's equity includes just the responses of individuals over getting the results as a pay of their data sources; it ignores the methodology through which closures are set up. Greenberg (1990) indicated that, it propelled the equity researchers to divert concentration from distributive equity to procedural equity. Truth be told, rather utilizing distributive equity as methods for deciding the representative execution, procedural and interactional aspects are worthy to be studied and considered as indicator of employment execution. As per Martin & Bennet (1996), Ahmadi, (2011), more essentially the methods and ways applied to decide explicit prizes can be organized over dissemination based on inputs.

In a research paper analyzing the status of exploration on organizational justice suggested that organizational justice study could significantly describes a wide range of work related outcomes (Greenberg, 1990). The term organizational justice explains the significance of fairness as it legitimately recognizes within the working setting. Moorman (1991), in specific, organizational justice emphasizes to determine the ways that shapes work related attitudes. Alsalem and Alhaiani (2007) explained that, organizational justice can aid in understanding why workers fight back against unfair results or improper techniques and links. Perception of employees is related to three aspects of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice and organizational justice. In this article, following aspects of organizational justice has been covered including distributive and interactional justice.

Recognizing the importance of distributive, interactional and procedural justice a factual study was direly required. As per Greenberg, (1990), it is of great significance to assess how these aspects of organizational justice are interlinked with other organizational practices. Numerous factual discoveries identified the importance of distributive, procedural and interactional justice for organizational productivity. According to Wesson, Porter & Ng (2001), the findings of the researches in common summed up that distributive, procedural and interactional justice are significant predictor of numerous work related outcomes. For the most part distributive justice might be presumed as progressively fundamental predictor of distinctive results, for example, fulfillment with compensation (McFarlin& Sweeney, 1992), contrary to the justice which impacts the work related attitudes in organization, highs up organizational commitment and loyalty in management. Interactional justice has its own impact on employees work related outcomes, it is related to the treatment people getting and reasoning provided for judgments taken. Individuals response to distributive, interactional and procedural justice differs from person to person based upon the perception they have in their mind for those organizational practices.

2.2 Distributive Justice:

Distributive justice has been related to Adam's theory of equity (1965). As per Grover (1991), this methodology has been exceptionally prevalent and influenced organizational justice studies. According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), Distributive justice has been described as the "perceived fairness of the result or rewards that an individual gets". Furthermore, It has been characterized as "an individual's evaluation of the fairness of the outcomes received in result of its contribution" (Mueller, Iverson and Jo; 1999). As indicated by Adams (1965), Cook and Hegtvedt (1983), the main emphasis of distributive justice studies majorly linked to responses against unfair pay.

It has been observed that distributive justice is not only related to rewards and desired results but it is also related to punishment in a reasonable and appropriate way (Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, Pasupuleti, Hall and Jenkins 2005). Thus, distributive justice could be attained if the reward system treats and rebuffs over-and under-performers fairly. So, the emphasis is on decency and not generally whether this is implemented emphatically. It has been recommended that distributive justice refers to individual making judgment on fairness by comparing their inputs and outputs with other fellow workers (Adams and Freeman 1976). For instance, a worker may compare their salary and other benefits with other fellow workers by comparing their efforts which they have made to accomplish organizational goals. Due to this comparison, employee takes decision to put more efforts or lessen inputs or modify their thoughts about justice prevalent in firms. Perception of fairness is developed where the ratio of input and output of the employee is equivalent to the employees to whom it compared with. An individual who thinks that the management is unfair and failed to treat fairly would more likely to be disappointed. For instance; a worker who ruminates that reward system is unjust may look for other employment opportunities.

As explained by Alsalem and Alhaiani ;(2007), Distributive justice could be described as fair percipience in terms of rewards which an employee gets from its firm. Rewards might be allocated on the basis of fairness, necessity or participation and individual decide the reasonableness of appropriation through correlation with others. According to Adams (1963), Distribution of work rewards comparative with work related inputs make pressure inside an employee and the employee is influenced to overcome the pressure. In short, identifying the ways which determines outcomes is of more importance than the outcome itself. Therefore, the focus moved towards procedural justice from distributive justice.

According to (Deutsch, 1985; Kabanoff 1991; Skitka & Tetlock, 1992) the distributive justice depends on three rules (equality, need and equity). Because people do not divide their work in an organization that's why outcomes were produced.

2.3 Social Exchange Theory:

It has been observed that there are notable similarities in hypothetical methodology in organizational justice researches due to its wide-ranging focus and rapidly increasing fame. Most of this research was extracted from Adam's initial work (1965), utilizing social exchange theory to investigate the phenomenon of justice. As indicated by Cropanzano, Prehar and Chen; 2002, in that context, the connections among organizational justice theories and social exchange theory have been endorsed. As per Blau (1964), Social exchange theory affirms that exchanges among supervisor and worker can prompt felt commitments and fulfilling these commitments can bring out positive responses, while unfulfilling commitments likely to prompt negative results. This theory recommends that workers feel committed to respond positively when they are benefitted from their employee's behavior, for example; fairly compensated and rewarded by their organization. It has been observed that focal though of social exchange theory is the standard of correspondence (Dyne and Ang 1998), which is global culture dependent on give and take relationship, which leads to mutual support and cooperation for each other's behavior (Gouldner 1960).

It has been proposed that workers expect from the beginning socially responsible exchange from their firm which proceeds until unfair treatment is seen, which changes the relationship from social exchange to economic exchange Organ (1990). As per Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997), this describes a firm as a work setting where long term social exchange between management and workforce prevailed. According to Masterson et al. (2000) under social exchange theory, equity is esteemed a contribution of the organization to the exchange relationship that can emerge out of either organization or employer. Compensation and benefits distribution is exchange relationship of organization - explicitly how the organization conveys to pay and remunerates, and in that capacity, we would presume employees who view the reward system as reasonable and just to respond these felt commitments with positive work dispositions.

2.4 Distributive Justice and Work Attitudes:

Extensive writings in organizational behavior recommend that, perception of fairness exert great impact on responses of employees to organizational life, specifically organizational reward system Welbourne et al. (1995). Researcher mentioned that the Personal outcomes model presumed that employees emphasized on distributive fairness in order to increase their Productivity, because they have a belief that distribution justly leads to desired rewards (Clay-Warner et al. 2005). It has been identified utilizing this model; Distributive justice is the major phenomenon forecasting work related outcomes, for example: job satisfaction (McFarlin and Sweeney 1992). As per McFarlin;Sweeney (1992) and Martin and Bennett(1996), this model has discovered empirical evidence through which distributive justice found to be main forecaster of job satisfaction in different researches of employees relating to bank and financial services. It proclaimed that it is quite reasonable expectation of employees to be fairly treated in their workplace and this is

obviously implying to organization's reward system (Deutsch; 1985). Without just and fair treatment within the workplace, it would be crucial to motivate employees Lambert et al. (2005). Further, added that efficient functioning of organization requires having organizational justice for employee's satisfaction subsequently, understanding the connections among organizational justice and distribution of reward system is essential for propelling human resource Greenberg (1990). As per Clay-Warner, Reynolds and Roman (2005), distributive justice is a significant predictor of work-related attitude and actions. According to Alexander and Ruderman (1987); Konovsky, Folger and Cropanzano (1987), distributive justice has great influence on employee's satisfaction with their reward system and on turn over intentions. There is also empirical support for fairness perception being identified with job satisfaction, and job retention (Konovsky and Cropanzano 1991; Ball Trevino and Sims 1993; Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001; Ramamoorthy and Flood 2004). According to Hendrix, Robbins, Miller and Summers 1998; Fields, Pang and Chiu 2000), most of the distributive justice researches recommend that in response to lack of distributive justice, job turnover would likely to increase to quit injustice. In longitudinal research of sales representatives, it has also been observed that there is connection between fairness perception and job retention (Sager; 1991). It has been noticed that organizational justice could influence future job turn over intentions (Ambrose; Cropanzano, 2003). At last, Colquitt et al. (2001), in their meta-analysis, it has been identified that justice perception is a consistent significant forecaster of job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Therefore, we may say that individuals having fair perception of organization would have greater job satisfaction which would definitely result in better job performance.

2.5 Procedural Justice:

As per Nabatchi; et al (2007), Procedural equity refers to members' realization about the fairness of the procedure and methodology that directs a process. Though, distributive justice proposes that fulfillment is a component of outcome. Whereas, procedural justice that fulfillment is a component of process. According to Bayles (1990), Procedural equity is unprejudiced nature, voice or chance to be heard, and justification for choices. Procedural issues, for example, neutrality of the procedure, treatment of the members, and the reliability of the basic leadership authority are acute to upgrading impression of procedural equity (Tyler and Lind, 1992). Broad writing bolsters up procedural equity speculations of fulfillment. Generally, research presumed that if organizational processes are considered to be fair, then employees will feel more contented and will be ready to acknowledge the goals of that technique and bound to shape positive work attitude within the workplace. Procedural justice is that notion of fair treatment in the organization and process to resolve disagreements and distribute incomes. In procedural justice decision is made, it may contrast with distributive justice. In these organizations management take decision and all employees of the organization follow that decision.

2.6 Interactional Justice:

Equity scholars presented the phenomenon of interactional justice characterized as the nature of interpersonal treatment got during the order of authoritative methods (Bies and Moag, 1986). As per Folger and Cropanzano (1998), generally interactional justice discusses about the fairness of non-procedurally managed parts of interaction. Therefore, research has recognized two sub categories of interactional justice: informational justice and interpersonal justice. These sub categories of interactional justice coincide significantly. As indicated by, Colquitt et al. (2001), study recommends that it should be presumed separately as both of the categories have different impact on justice perception. Interaction justice covers many actions showing social sensitivity. for instance; when manager shows respects and dignified behavior towards their subordinates. It has been announced that an impressive portion of perceived unfair treatment did not concern distributional or procedural matters in narrow sense (Mikula et al, 1990). Though rather referred to the approach in which employees were treated interpersonally during communication and interactions.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design:

The study is conclusive by nature which has investigated the impact of organizational justice in predicting job performance. This study has intended to investigate the entire situation to produce outcomes which are generally helpful in generating conclusions. Conclusive research design is descriptive and casual in nature. Casual research is used to study cause and effect relationship. The research is quantitative in nature which involves the implementation of quantitative method of data collection and data analysis.

In this study primary data collection is conducted through survey-based data collection which is a close ended, structured questionnaire and secondary data collection is done through online published articles and utilizing e-books. Deductive approach has been used which means theory that is already established has been tested and examined. It is single cross-sectional study that analyzes data from population or representative subset in a specific time period.

3.2 Population:

The university faculty working in different universities in Karachi constituted the population. The target population of the study is faculty members of public sectors universities in Karachi with age group from 25 to 56 & above along with 4 categories of sample including lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor belonging to five universities including Karachi

University, N.ED University of Engineering and Technology, Wafaqi Urdu University, Benazir Bhutto Shaheed University and Dow University Of Health Sciences.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Method:

For identifying sample size to be true representative of target population the rules of thumb proposed by Roscoe (1975) were taken into consideration. Roscoe explained that “when samples are broken into sub samples, the minimum sample size 30 is necessary for each category” (Sekaran, 2015, p.269). For this research, we have four categories of sample including lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor. In implementing the rule proposed by Roscoe, 30 times 4 equal to 120. For multivariate analysis, sample size should be 10 times bigger than the number of variables. We have 4 variables in this study. Hence four times ten equal to 40. At 95% confidence interval, the sample size was 300+ respondents. However, the sampling technique used was stratified random sampling.

3.4 Instrumentation:

For data collection, primary and secondary sources were used. Primary source for assessing justice perception among the faculty member of public owned universities in Karachi; organizational justice scale was used for collecting responses for this research proposed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The technique utilized for data collection was survey technique and structured questionnaires with 5-point likert scale were utilized. Data was gathered from the target population which was faculty members of public owned institution in Karachi. Whereas, secondary data has been gathered from already published articles.

3.5 Variables:

Independent variable:

Distributive justice

Interactional justice

Dependent variable:

Task performance

Contextual performance

3.6 Hypothesis:

The relationship among job performance and organizational justice was significant. As indicated by, (Jankingthong & Rurkkhum, 2012); the Literature Review provided ample proof that the organizational justice has positive and significant effect on task performance. Interactional justice had direct impact on task performance. Hence organization is a communal management who would continue to excel, if fueled through fair treatment within the workplace. As mentioned by (Nejadirani, Rasouli, & Mosaf, 2013), injustice and unfair treatment would be harmful to the organization as it affects the activities and performance of employees.

The association among organizational justice and other human resource practices has already been investigated by various educationists. As per (Aslam, Shumaila, Sadaqat, Bilal, & Intizar, 2012), organizational justice resulted in showing significant impact on job satisfaction among the faculty members of Punjab university. As explained by Aslam and Sadaqat (2011), organizational justice found to have significant and positive relationship with organization citizenship behavior (OCB). The organizational justice was also researched as significant predictor of organizational commitment and provided with significant evidence as a strong predictor (Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009). Despite various researches conducted on organizational justice, the studies on this phenomenon are hardly researched in the context of results from teaching staff of public owned universities in Karachi.

The study suggested following hypothesis to be tested:

H1: Organizational justice predicts job performance

Distributive justice found to have notable positive association with job performance (Muhammad; 2014). Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott, and Livingston, (2009), concluded that procedural justice and interactional justice have prominent effect on feelings. Hence, the perception can influence performance of the workforce. Researchers found to have significant positive association among all three aspects of organizational justice and two aspects of job performance including task and contextual performance (Devonish and Greenidge, 2010). Hence, following study suggested these hypotheses.

H1 (a): Distributive justice predicts task performance.

H1 (b): Interactional justice predicts task performance.

H1 (c): Distributive justice predicts contextual performance.

H1 (d): Interactional justice predicts contextual performance.

3.7 Analysis Plan & Software Used:

The analysis has been carried out by utilizing both descriptive and inferential statistics. The statistical techniques and models used are descriptive statistics, reliability test, normality test, skewness and kurtosis, correlation matrix and by utilizing multiple linear regression model. The software utilized are excel and spss.

4. Data Analysis & Interpretation

4.1 Reliability Statistics:

Reliability statistics is overall consistency of the constructs. This means if tests are repeated with the group of test takers, same results will be obtained. In order to assess the reliability of the primary data, we use cronbach's alpha. The data is said to be reliable if alpha is greater than 0.6. Higher the alpha, the more reliable the data. If the data is less than 0.6 then this indicate data isn't reliable and further analysis would result in producing false results. In that case when data isn't reliable, researcher has to review the target population or review the sample size, it can either be low or high or review the training of investigator or lastly review the questionnaire.

4.2: Reliability Analysis:

Research study has analyzed all the variable of interest namely distributive justice, interactional justice, task performance and contextual performance. 4.2.1 Table indicates overall reliability of all the four constructs. From the results, cronbach's alpha is 0.97 which is greater than the benchmark of 0.6. Therefore, the data is said to be reliable and fit for further analysis. Whereas, table 4.2.2 indicates the reliability of each construct individually, values of all the variables of interest showing values greater than 0.90 which depicts excellent consistency and reliability.

4.2.1 Reliability Statistics Table:

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.968	4

4.2.2 Reliability Statistics:

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Distributive Justice	11.9904	9.489	.936	.953
Interactional Justice	11.8494	9.408	.919	.957
Task Performance	11.8462	9.558	.887	.966
Contextual Performance	11.8526	9.342	.934	.953

4.3. Demographics Analysis:

The survey was conducted from faculty members of public owned institution. The total numbers of respondents were 312. The first question asked was about their gender. The above graph shows that, out of 312 respondents, 49% of the respondents were female and 51% of the respondents were male.

The second question asked from the respondents was about their age. This question was important because through it we could reach our target population. The above graph shows the age group division of the respondents. The first option that was given to the respondents was 25 to 35 years and 54% of the respondents were from that group. Second option was 36 to 45 years and 41% of the respondents were from that age group.

Third option was 46 to 55 years and 4% of the respondents were from this group. Last option 56 years and above, only 1% was from this group.

The respondents were asked about marital status and found to have 71% of married respondents and 29% of single respondent.

When asked about designation, it was uncovered that 48% of the respondents were lecture, 25% were professor, 17% were assistant professor and 10% were associate professor. When inquired about job experience, it was revealed that 45% of the respondents having 5 to 10 years of job experience, 30% of the respondents having 1 to 4 years of experience, 22% of the respondents having 11 to 20 years of experience and only 3% having 21 years and above job experience.

4.4. Descriptive Analysis:

The below mentioned table indicates the analysis of descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics which has been measured are mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. We have utilized mean to indicate the central value of data. Mean is measure of central tendency of data distribution. From the analysis of mean, it has been observed that all the variables of interest are greater than 3.85 which represent that most of the respondents have agreed towards the studied variable. Whereas, the standard deviation analysis indicates that the values are close to ± 1.5 which means that there is less variation that depicts data isn't scattered and follows the normality pattern. Furthermore, the values of skewness remained in the range of ± 1.5 , depicted the normality of the pattern. Moreover the values of kurtosis remained in the range of ± 3 which further indicates normality of the data. Hence, all the requirements are fulfilled in descriptive analysis as shown in table 4.3.1.

4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error	Std. Error
Distributive Justice	312	1.00	5.00	3.8558	1.04637	-.962	.138	.547	.275
Interactional Justice	312	1.00	5.00	3.9968	1.07440	1.027	.138	.558	.275
Task Performance	312	1.00	5.00	4.0000	1.07590	1.029	.138	.552	.275
Contextual Performance	312	1.00	5.00	3.9936	1.07289	1.025	.138	.563	.275
Valid N (listwise)	312								

4.5 Regression:

In statistical procedures, regression analysis is a measure to investigate relationship among dependent variable and one or more dependent variable. Regression analysis is utilized to forecast and predict.

4.5.1. Regression Analysis:

(a) Dependent Variable: Task Performance

In multiple linear regression, when you have more than one independent variable. We report to adjusted r square and there should be negligible difference between R and R square. The value of adjusted r square in the below mentioned table is 0.779 which demonstrate that 77.9% of the variance of dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Moving down to anova which is analysis of variance mentioned below in table which indicates p-value which is less than 0.05 demonstrate statistical significance. Whereas, coefficients table demonstrated that t value is greater than 2 and p value is less than 0.05 which indicates statistical significance of the model and H_0 is rejected which indicates that distributive justice and interactional justice has significant influence on task performance. Individually, 63.9% change in task performance is being occurred due to distributive justice and 28.1% change is occurred in task performance due to interactional justice.

(b) Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance:

Adjusted r square is 0.836 which demonstrate 83.6% of the variance of the dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Whereas anova i.e. analysis of variance indicates p- value which is less than 0.05 demonstrated statistical significance and coefficients table demonstrated that t value is greater than 2 and p value is less than 0.05 which indicates statistical significance of the model and H_0 is rejected which indicates that distributive justice and interactional justice has significant influence on contextual performance. Individually, 0.159 (15.9%) change in contextual performance is being occurred due to interactional justice and .805 (80.5%) change in contextual performance is being occurred due to distributive justice.

Regression Analysis

Dependent variable – Task Performance

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Interactional Justice, Distributive Justice ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.882 ^a	.779	.777	.50775

a. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional Justice, Distributive Justice

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	280.338	2	140.169	543.697	.000 ^b
	Residual	79.662	309	.258		
	Total	360.000	311			

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional Justice, Distributive Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.414	.113		3.659	.000
	Distributive Justice	.639	.063	.621	10.097	.000
	Interactional Justice	.281	.062	.280	4.555	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

Regression Analysis:

Dependent variable – Contextual Performance

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.915 ^a	.837	.43429

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	299.707	2	149.853	794.515	.000 ^b
	Residual	58.280	309	.189		
	Total	357.987	311			

a. Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.275	.098		2.796	.005
	Interactional Justice	.159	.038	.157	4.162	.000
	Distributive Justice	.805	.039	.785	20.798	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance

4.6. Correlation:

Correlation is a statistical technique to assess strength of relationship among two variables. This specific type of statistical measure is used to evaluate possible connections and links between two variables.

4.6.1. Correlation Analysis:

In Correlation analysis, r- Pearson's correlation should be with $-1 < r < +1$ and p value should be less than 0.05. The correlation analysis table indicates r is close to 1 and p-value is than 0.05 which show it is statistically significant at 0.01 levels. Whereas positive sign depicts that distributive justice and interactional is positively correlated with contextual and task performance. This demonstrates that if distributive and interactional justice increases then contextual and task performance will also increase and vice versa.

Correlation Analysis

Correlations

		Distributive Justice	Interactional Justice	Task Performance	Contextual Performance
Distributive Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.901**	.874**	.910**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	312	312	312	312
Interactional Justice	Pearson Correlation	.901**	1	.840**	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	312	312	312	312
Task Performance	Pearson Correlation	.874**	.840**	1	.864**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	312	312	312	312
Contextual Performance	Pearson Correlation	.910**	.907**	.864**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	312	312	312	312

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.7. Hypothesis Summary:

Hypothesis Statements	Status
H1: Organizational justice predicts job performance	Supported
H1 (a): Distributive justice predicts task performance	Supported
H1 (b): Interactional justice predicts task performance.	Supported
H1 (c): Distributive justice predicts contextual performance.	Supported
H1 (d): Interactional justice predicts contextual performance.	Supported

5. Findings, Conclusion, Recommendation & Future Research Directions:

5.1. Findings:

From the data analysis, following findings have been concluded;

- The overall reliability statistics are 0.968 and individual values of all the variables of interest showing values greater than 0.90 which depicts excellent consistency and reliability of the construct of scale.
- Majority of the respondents demonstrated positive belief over organizational justice in predicting job performance as the mean values are greater than 3.85 which depicts that most of the respondents have agreed on the studied variable. Whereas, the standard deviation analysis indicates that the values are close to ± 1.5 which means that there is less variation that depicts data isn't scattered and follows the normality pattern.
- The model used in this study is robust and perfect with F- statistics values above 4 and p-value less than 0.05, showing that all the variables studied are fit for forecasting.
- It is found that there is significant and positive relationship among variable of study. Therefore distributive justice and interactional justice has a direct positive relationship with contextual and task performance having t-statistics greater than 2 & p-value less than 0.05.
- It has also been observed that distributive justice is a major predictor of contextual and task performance than interactional justice.
- Individually, 0.159 (15.9%) change in contextual performance is being occurred due to interactional justice and .805 (80.5%) change in contextual performance is being occurred due to distributive justice.
- Individually, 63.9% change in task performance is being occurred due to distributive justice and 28.1% change is occurred in task performance due to interactional justice.

5.2. Conclusion:

It is concluded that research has accomplished its purpose to predict job performance through organizational justice. After studying and analyzing both the independent variable i.e. distributive justice and interactional justice along with dependent variable termed as contextual performance and task performance, it has been uncovered that organizational justice is a major and significant phenomenon in predicting job performance. Without considering and implementing organizational justice, it is impossible for organization to motivate their employees, push them forward to outperform, retain their employees and to increase overall organizational productivity. Moreover, after the analysis it has been observed that distributive justice is a major predictor of job performance than interactional justice. Therefore, distributive justice should be center of attention to increase organizational productivity.

5.3. Recommendations:

After studying and analyzing the variable of interest, we would like to recommend the following:

It has been found out through literature review and by studying and analyzing the variable of interest that organizational justice has a direct positive relationship with job performance. Therefore, it is recommended to consider organizational justice a major factor when trying to increase individual performance as well as organizational performance. Moreover distributive justice found to be the major predictor of job performance than interactional justice. Hence, it is recommended to pay more attention on distributive justice when considering the factors which can boost not only individual performance but can also help in retention of employees which is major concern of organization. Furthermore, it is also advised to study impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior, decreasing turn over and establishing a positive and productive environment which can play a major role in organizational success.

5.4. Future Research Directions:

There is a significant impact of organizational justice on job performance. Every organization strives to flourish and to be successful and to achieve that human resource management is a major factor. To increase organizational productivity, you need to increase individual performance and to accomplish this you want workers who can outperform and it cannot be done until they have fair perception of justice within the workplace. It is highly advised to consider this phenomenon of organizational justice in terms of job performance. It is recommended to study it further as there is limited work on this significant phenomenon which can do wonders in terms of productivity and there are other factors that can also be dealt with by utilizing and incorporating organizational justice within the workplace. In future, this study can be carried out with other variables and with different target population to explore more about this significant phenomenon.

References

- Aslam, R., Shumaila, S., Sadaqat, S., Bilal, H., & Intizar, M. (2012). Organizational Justice As A Predictor of Job Satisfaction . *2nd International Conference on Business Management* (pp. 1-17). Lahore: University of the Punjab .
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154.
- Essays, UK. (2013, November 13). *Impact Of Organizational Justice On Teachers Outcomes Psychology Essay*. Retrieved from <http://www.ukessays.com/essays/psychology/impact-of-organizational-justice-on-teachers-outcomes-psychology-essay.php?cref=1>: UKESSAYS.com
- Jankingthong, K., & Rurkkhum, S. (2012). Factors Affecting Job Performance: A Review Literature. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 12(2), 115-127.
- Jankingthong, K., & Rurkkhum, S. (2013). Antecedents and Consequences of Work Engagement: A Literature Review. *The 6th Silpakorn University International Conference on Academic Research and Creative Arts : Integration of Art and Science* (pp. 57-64). Nakhon Pathom: Silpakorn University, Thailand.
- Mark Harcourt, M. H. (2012). Distributive Justice, Employment-at-Will and Just-Cause. *Springer Science+Business Media*, 311-325.
- Mohd, A., Nasurdin, & Khuan, S. L. (2007). Organizational Justices as an Antecedent of Job Performance. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 9(3),335-353.
- Nejadirani, F., Rasouli, R., & Mosaf, L. (2013). Studying the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Creativity: The Case Study. *Contributions to conservation in Switzerland*, 34(1),10-25.
- Spell, j. M. (august,2009). how does distributive justice affect work attitudes? The moderating effects of autonomy. *The international journal of human resource managemnet*, 1827-1842.
- Aslam, R., Shumaila, S., Sadaqat, S., Bilal, H., & Intizar, M. (2012). Organizational Justice As A Predictor of Job Satisfaction . *2nd International Conference on Business Management* (pp. 1-17). Lahore: University of the Punjab .

- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154.
- Essays, UK. (2013, November 13). *Impact Of Organizational Justice On Teachers Outcomes Psychology Essay*. Retrieved from <http://www.ukessays.com/essays/psychology/impact-of-organizational-justice-on-teachers-outcomes-psychology-essay.php?cref=1>: UKESSAYS.com
- Jankingthong, K., & Rurkkhum, S. (2012). Factors Affecting Job Performance: A Review Literature. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 12(2), 115-127.
- Jankingthong, K., & Rurkkhum, S. (2013). Antecedents and Consequences of Work Engagement: A Literature Review. *The 6th Silpakorn University International Conference on Academic Research and Creative Arts : Integration of Art and Science* (pp. 57-64). Nakhon Pathom: Silpakorn University, Thailand.
- Mark Harcourt, M. H. (2012). Distributive Justice, Employment-at-Will and Just-Cause. *Springer Science+Business Media*, 311-325.
- Mohd, A., Nasurdin, & Khuan, S. L. (2007). Organizational Justices as an Antecedent of Job Performance. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 9(3),335-353.
- Nejadirani, F., Rasouli, R., & Mosaf, L. (2013). Studying the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Creativity: The Case Study. *Contributions to conservation in Switzerland*, 34(1),10-25.
- Spell, j. M. (August,2009). how does distributive justice affect work attitudes? The moderating effects of autonomy. *The international journal of human resource managemnet*, 1827-1842.