

Research Article

The influence of organizational justice on job performance

Khalilurrahman Sarwary^{1*}, Mohammad Rafee Banayee¹, Zekruallah Faiq², Abdul Wasi Azimi³

¹ Department of Education Management, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science, Kabul University, Kabul-Afghanistan

² Department of Counseling, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science, Kabul University, Kabul-Afghanistan

³ Department of Education, Faculty of Educational and Professional Sciences, Kabul Education University, Kabul-Afghanistan

*Corresponding Author: sarwary.khalil2018@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was an attempt to investigate the influence of organizational justice on the job performance of academic members in Kabul University. This research is a mix method integrated both quantitative and qualitative. The total number of populations at Kabul University is 500 persons. Of those, 219 persons were selected as sample population using simple random sampling. This research performed using questionnaires adapted from Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) and Hersey and Goldsmith's (1981). The scoring technique was performed using Likert approach. The reliability of the questionnaires was evaluated employing Cronbach's alpha coefficient method. Data were analyzed at the inferential level. For this, Pearson's correlation coefficient was employed. The SPSS/25 software was applied for data analysis. The Cronbach's alpha value for the first and second questionnaires were 0.937% and 0.958%, respectively. The findings revealed that organizational justice with its dimensions have a positive and significant influence on job performance. This means by increasing the dimensions of organizational justice and attention to them the job performance improved to an acceptable level.

Keywords: justice; organizational justice; job performance; questionnaires;

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational justice is considered as the study of fairness and equality at workplace (Zainalipour, Kalay, 2016). It is the perception and evaluation of compliance with organizational practices and related procedures and consequences (Indahyati and Sintaasih, 2019). Organizational justice refers to the perceived fairness of the exchanges taking place in an organization can be either social or economic involving the individual his or her relations with superiors, subordinates, peers, and the organization as a social system (Kılıç, Bostan & Grabowski, 2015). According to Plato, justice obtains when everyone in the government does what they deserve (Kazemi, 2003). According to Aristotle, justice having equal treatment with equal people (Marami, 1999). Plato understood justice as "putting everything in its place". Organizational justice potentially creates enormous benefits for employees within a certain organization such as more trust, good performance, and commitment. Organizational justice has three dimensions; distributive justice which includes work-related outcomes, procedural justice which includes procedures that determine work-related outcomes and interactional justice which includes treatment with employees. Distributive justice emphasizes the equality of the results of a particular decision. Procedural justice emphasizes the equality of processes that lead to a specific result, and relational justice emphasizes the equality of personal interaction in relation to organizational procedures. Organizational justice increases the attitudes and behaviors includes commitment, trust and performance (Sarwary and Adel, 2022).

Another importance of organizational justice is increase in productivity of individual, activities, attitudes and behaviors of employees as well as the performance of employees (Ashtiani, 2017). Human performance in the organization reflects his knowledge, skills and values. The performance of employees is one of the goals of improving human resources in management. This is based on measuring the knowledge, ability, motivation, work behavior, and performance of employees. The organization success in achieving to its goals depend on human resources performance in organization setting. In many cases, human performance caused by the reflection of mood and perception of the universe (Rezaian, 2010). Considering the aforementioned importance, this study was conducted to evaluate the influence of organizational justice on work performance of academic members in Kabul University. Faculty members are considered as the main body of every university. Therefore, they are one of the most important components of the educational system and hence for development of any country. In universities, the quantity and quality of the higher education system is relied on the performance of each individual of academic members (Soltani, 2019).

Organizational justice

Justice is the highest human value and a key parameter to the realization of human rights (Ashtiani, 2017). It is the main concept of moral and political issues. Justice acts as a glue to holds societies together. It came from the Latin word “just” meaning right or law. From Ancient Greek philosopher viewpoint justice is contradicting to injustice. It refers to the actions, behavior, and decisions they are ethically right. People always concerned about the fairness of events happens every day (Noor-ul-Ain,2020). Justice make unity among people and keeps them together, while Injustice torn them apart. It is a key element of building up and keeping up an unwavering culture. Organizational justice reflects the ethical treatment of individuals in an organization. Justice is fair treatment of people and the highest human value to the realization of human rights (Sarwary & Adel, 2022). Justice is one of the main factors influence the performance of the employees in an organization, while injustice will cause dissatisfaction of man force and then negatively affects their performance (Kalay,2016). Justice is a core value in enhancing decision, assigning tasks, allocation of rewards or any other type of social exchange and fairness matter in any organization. The terms “justice”, “fairness” and “equity” have been used synonymously in literature (Leventhal, 1980; Moorman, 1991 and Lee, 2021).

Organizational justice research backed to 1960s centered on distributive justice. In the mid-1970s, procedural fairness has attracted attention of researchers. Instead in the mid-1980s, interactional justice was a hot topic. At present, organizational justice and its application is a well-accepted and widely studied theory to different domestic organizations including job security, layoffs, trust in the top management teams and trust in the supervisor (Kalay,2016). Justice affects the attitude and behavior of employees and hence their performance and the organization’s success. Organizational justice is used to illustrate functioning of fairness that directly effects the employee’s performance. It especially deals with the situation that employees perceive treatment in their jobs and such a perception affects their work-related performance (Moorman, 2009). It can be confidently said that the overall performance of an organizations is the product of employee’s performance (Gracia, et al., (2015).

Several researchers have explained that observing of justice by employees can have a positive effect on various aspects of organizational behavior particularly high level of job satisfaction (McCain et al., 2010), organizational commitment (Wang et al., 2010; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013), organizational trust (McLean, 2009), organizational citizenship behavior (Muhammad, 2004), employee performance (Wang et al., 2010) and customers’ satisfaction and loyalty (sarwary & Adel, 2022). Therefore, understanding how people make judgments about justice in their organizations and how they respond to perceived justice or injustice is a vital. Scholars generally believe fairness and justice is about who gain and what (distributive justice), how goods are assigned (procedural justice), and the interpersonal treatment received along the way (interactional justice). Organizational justice is term commonly used by organizational psychologists to describe the just and fair manner that organizations treat their employees (Yadav and Yadav, 2017). It is one of the most important driving factors effecting the job performance, behavior and emotion of manpower (Scott et al., 2015). Justice leads to higher productivity, organizational responsibility and employees' physical and mental health which in turn increases performance. It is already proven that employees appraise three families of workplace events. They examine the justice of consequences (distributive justice), the justice of the allocation processes (procedural justice) and the justice of interpersonal transactions (interactional justice). These components are summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Elements of organizational Justice

(1) Distributive Justice	Appropriateness of outcomes
1.1 Equity	Rewarding employees based on their contributions
1.2 Equality	Almost equal pay for each employee in the organization.
1.3 Need	Pay according to the person's needs
(2) Procedural Justice	Appropriateness of the allocation process
2.1 Consistency	All employees should be treated in the same manner
2.2 Lack of Bias	No person or group are excluded or discriminated or ill-treatment
2.3 Accuracy	Decisions are taken based on accurate information
2.4 Representation of All Concerned	Appropriate stakeholders are included in a decision-making process
2.5 Correction	There is an appeal process or other mechanism for solving errors.
2.6 Ethics	Norms of professional conduct are not violated
(3) Interactional Justice	The appropriateness treatment one receives from authority figures
3.1 Interpersonal Justice	Treating an employee with dignity, courtesy and respect
3.2 Informational Justice	Sharing relevant information with employees

Performance

Performance is an efficient, effective and meaningful action. Performance is the interrelationship between seven issues includes effectiveness, efficiency, quality, productivity, quality of work life, innovation, and profitability/budget-ability. It can be understood as the degree of stakeholder satisfaction. Performance is the level of attainment achieved by individual, team, organization or process (Ghalem, et al, 2016). It is about achieving the goals given to you in convergence of enterprise orientations (Kiragu, Paul; John Muhoho and Paul Omato Gesimba, 2020). Performance is the qualitative or quantity outcomes of an employee with respect to duties or responsibilities they have. There are six criteria for measuring employee performance namely: quality, quantity, timeliness, cost effectiveness, need for supervisor and interpersonal impact (Iaturochmah, Sudjadi, Anggraeni, 2019). Performance is a result of work achieved by someone in carrying out tasks given to him/her based on their skills, experience, sincerity and time. It can be an action, the result of action and or a process. In particular, performance is effectiveness and efficiency (effectiveness + efficiency = performance) (Kiragu, Paul; John Muhoho and Paul Omato Gesimba, 2020). Performance leads to success, action, competitiveness, effort and progress because it refers to the capacity of individual to achieve and even overcome to the established Destination and purpose (Mirela-Oana and Monica-Violeta, 2010). Generally, performance influenced by three factors affects the individual, group and organizational performances. These factors are explained in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Factors affecting individual, group and organizational performance

Individual performance	Group performance	Organizational performance
1. Ability	1. Communications	1. Organizational structure
2. Personality	2. Leadership	2. Organizational environment
3. Learning	3. Power and politics	3. Organizational policies and procedures
4. Perception	4. Group behavior and conflict	4. Organizational culture
5. Motivation		
6. Stress		

Achieve Model

The ACHIEVE model primarily proposed by Hersey & Goldsmith (1980) helps managers to identify the factors that cause performance issues and then resolve these problems. Those factors are ability, clarity, help, incentive, evaluation, validity and environment.

Table 3. The elements of Goldsmith's Achieve model

Ability	The ability component includes the knowledge related to the task (formal and informal training that will facilitate the completion of certain tasks), the experience relevant to the job (previous work experience that helps complete successful tasks), and the functionality related to the assignment (potential abilities or traits that strengthen successful completion) (Sulistiowati and Nurul Komari,2020).
Clarity	The clarity of role involves understanding and accepting work procedures; where and how the task is done. Employees are required to fully understand organizational problems, main objectives. They must know how to achieve goals and objectives. In addition to that, organizational priorities must be quite clear to manpowers (Sulistiowati and Nurul Komari,2020).
Help	Help refers to organizational encouragement which is support to employees in carrying out their work or tasks (Hersey, et al, 2001). Organizational assistance includes; equipment, budget, and facilities to fulfil commitments.
Incentive	Motivation is a factor that encourages employees to do more and better work. Many people are motivated to complete certain tasks when they receive rewards. People have economic and social needs. The provision of social and economic demands can increase employees' motivation to achieve the organization's goals and plans (Yaghoubi, Rakhsh, Javadi, & Bahadori, 2013).
Evaluation	Evaluation refers to performance appraisals and feedback for performance. The cause of many performance problems is the lack of performance feedback needed. The ongoing feedback process allows employees to find out how they work (Rajaei & Arghavani, 2016).
Validity	Validity refers to the suitability and legality of managers' decisions regarding human resources. Everything related to employees must be accompanied by evidence and based on performance-oriented policies and laws (Sulistiowati and Nurul Komari,2020; Bakhshi et al., 2017).
Environment	Environment refers to external factors that influence performance. Person-environment fit occurs when the individual and work environment characteristics consisted of jobs, co-working, and organization is appropriate (Hersey, et al., 2001).

Research hypotheses

The following hypothesis were constructed in this research:

Main hypothesis

1. Organizational justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

Sub-hypotheses:

1. Distributive justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.
2. Procedural justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.
3. Interactional justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is practical in terms of purpose and descriptive in terms of data analysis method. The statistical population of this research was 500 persons including staffs and academic members of Kabul University. Of those numbers, 219 persons selected as sample by simple random sampling adapted from Morgan (Table 2). Standard questionnaires were prepared to collect the data. For this purpose, Niehoff and Moorman (1993) organizational justice questionnaire and Hersey and Goldsmith's (1981) job performance questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale were used.

Data analysis: The data were analyzed at the inferential level using Pearson's correlation coefficient and employing SPSS/25 software.

1. **Niehoff and Moorman's organizational justice questionnaire:** Organizational Justice Questionnaire: This questionnaire was compiled by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) with three components (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) and (19) questions. The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's alpha at 0.936%. The questions were ranked using Likert scale method includes totally disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), and totally agree (5).
2. **Hersey and Goldsmith job performance questionnaire:** This questionnaire was designed by Hersey and Goldsmith (1981), based on the ACHIEVE Model. This questionnaire was adapted in this study comprises of 7 components and (42) questions. The questions were ranked similar to the rank given to questionnaire of Niehoff and Moorman's. The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was 0.930% using Cronbach's alpha. **Table 4** shows the dimensions of the questionnaires, the number of questions and their reliability.

Table 4. Number of questions and Cronbach's alpha of the variables

Main variables	Sub-variables (components)	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficients	Total Cronbach's alpha coefficients
Organizational justices	Distributive justice	5	0.825	0.937
	Procedural justice	6	0.911	
	Interactional justice	9	0.904	
Job performance	Ability	4	0.760	0.958
	Clarity	7	0.760	
	Help	5	0.773	
	Incentive	6	0.700	
	Evaluation	9	0.851	
	Validity	6	0.728	
	Environment	5	0.645	

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Analyses and decomposition of inferential data

The data were analyzed at an inferential level. The hypotheses of the research were tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient. To understand the relationship between variables and test hypotheses, Pearson's correlation coefficient was used in this study. The outcomes are summarized in Table 5. Main-hypothesis: Organizational justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

Table 5. Pearson correlation test results between organizational justice and job performance

Variables	Average	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient	Significance
Organizational Justice	53.28	13.22	0.785**	0.0001
Job Performance	133.01	21.36		

** The Correlation is Significant at the (0.01) Level (Two Ways)

Based on **Table 5**, it can be stated that the mean and variability of the dependent variable is 53.28 and 13.22 respectively, and the mean and variability of the independent variable was 133.01 and 21.36. The results also revealed that there is a strong relationship (0.785) between organizational justice and job performance at the 0.0001 significant level. Therefore, considering that the significance level ($\text{sig}=0.0001$) is smaller than the error level (0.05); ($\text{P-Value/Sig} < \alpha=0.05$) is a significant level and since the correlation coefficient ($R=0.785$) has been calculated. The relationship is positive and strong and therefore null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis (organizational justice has a positive and significant effect on job performance) accepted at a confidence level of 95%. It can be concluded that organizational justice has a strong and significant effect on job performance and is a suitable predictor for the job performance of faculty members of Kabul University.

Sub-hypothesis (1): Procedural justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

Table 6. Pearson correlation test results between distributive justice and job performance

Variables	Average	Standard deviation	Pearson coefficient	Significance
Distributive Justice	12.08	3.54	0.757**	0.0001
Job performance	133.01	21.36		

** The correlation is significant at the (0.01) level (two ways)

From **Table 6**, it can be observed that the average and variability of the distributive justice component are 12.08 and 3.54, respectively. The average of the independent variable (job performance) is 133.01 and its standard deviation is 21.36. It can be acknowledged that there is a meaningful relationship (0.757) between distributive justice and job performance with a significant level of 0.0001. Based on the outcomes, it can be said that there is a positive and strong relationship between distributive justice and the job performance of the academic staff members of Kabul University at 95% confidence interval. In other words, distributive justice has a significant and positive effect on job performance. It means that an increase in distributive justice leads to the improvement of the job performance of faculty members in Kabul University.

Sub-hypothesis (2): Procedural justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

Table 7. Pearson correlation test results between procedural justice and job performance

Variables	Average	standard deviation	Pearson coefficient	Significance
Procedural Justice	14.38	4.60	0.722**	0.0001
Job performance	133.01	21.36		

** The correlation is significant at the (0.01) level (two ways)

The results obtained using Pearson coefficient test between the procedural justice component and job performance are arranged in Table 7. From the table, it can be seen that the mean and variation of the procedural justice component are 14.38 and 4.60 respectively. The mean and dispersion of the job performance calculated 133.01 and 21.36 respectively. There is a relationship of (0.722) between procedural justice and the job performance of academic staff members of Kabul University, which is significant at the 0.0001 level. Therefore, considering that the significance level ($\text{Sig}=0.0001$) is smaller than the error level (0.05); ($\text{P-Value/Sig} < \alpha=0.05$) is a significant level and because the correlation coefficient ($R=0.722$) has been calculated, the relationship is positive and high, so with a hypothetical confidence level of 95% (procedural justice has a positive effect and has a significance in job performance) is confirmed and the null hypothesis is rejected. It can be concluded that procedural justice has a positive and significant impact on job performance and is a suitable predictor for improving the job performance of faculty members of Kabul University.

Sub-hypothesis 3: Relational justice has a positive and significant influence on job performance.

Table 8. Pearson correlation test results between transactional justice and job performance

Variables	Average	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient	Significance
Transactional Justice	26.79	7.20	0.786**	0.0001
Job Performance	133.01	21.36		

** The correlation is significant at the (0.01) level (two ways)

From **Table 8**, it can be stated that the average and dispersion of the relational justice component are 26.79 and 7.20 respectively, and the average of the dependent variable of job performance is 133.01 and its standard deviation is 21.36. It can be acknowledged that there is correlation (0.786) between relational justice and job performance at 0.001 significance level. Considering this significance level, it is smaller than the error level (0.05); (P-Value/Sig≤ 0.05) is a significant level and because the correlation coefficient (R=0.786) has been calculated, the relationship is positive and at a high level, so with a confidence level of 95% of the hypothesis (relational justice has a positive effect and has significance in job performance) has been confirmed. The results of this hypothesis showed that transactional justice has a positive and significant impact on job performance. It means that the increase of relational justice leads to the development of job performance. Results of organizational justice and the job performance using of the Pearson correlation test showed that the components of transactional justice and procedural justice has a higher relationship with the variable of job performance with correlation coefficients (0.786 and 0.722), than the component of distributive justice and job performance which was poor (R=0.393). It should be noted that the relationship between the relational justice component alone and the job performance variable is slightly higher than the overall organizational justice relationship with the dependent variable (job performance) (0.785-0.786).

Table 9. Summary of the results of organizational justice and its dimensions with job performance using Pearson coefficient

Variable	Distributive Justice	Procedural justice	Transactional justice	Organizational justice	Job Performance
Distributive justice	1	0,433**	0,424**	0,650**	0,393**
Procedural justice	0,433**	1	0,806**	0,903**	0,722**
transactional justice	0,424**	0,806**	1	0,939**	0,786**
Organizational Justice	0,650**	0,903**	0,939**	1	0,785**
Job Performance	0,393**	0,722**	0,786**	0,785**	1

4. CONCLUSION

Justice is one of the basic human needs provides a suitable platform for the development of human societies. Man have always dealt with numerous organizations and their relationship can be either direct or indirect. The findings of this study revealed that both distributive justice and procedural justice have a positive and substantial impact on the academic performance of Kabul University faculty members. Also, the findings showed that organizational justice with its dimensions have a positive and significant influence on job performance. This study shows that observing the dimensions of organizational justice has led to the development of job performance at a high and acceptable level and is a suitable predictor for improving the job performance of academic staff members of Kabul University. Therefore, in order to improve job performance and its effective development, paying attention to organizational justice is considered a constructive and very vital action. This research also shows that organizational justice causes job satisfaction, motivation, retention, interest, efficiency and effectiveness, job commitment and the productivity of the organization at all.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS

The authors discussed the results and contributed to from the start to final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that he has no competing interests.

REFERENCES

- Bakhshi E, Kalantari R, Salimi N. (2016). Assessment of Job Performance and its Determinants in Healthcare Workers in Islamabad-e Gharb City based on ACHIVE Model In 2016. *J Arak Uni Med Sci* 2017; 20 (2):1-9. <http://jams.arakmu.ac.ir/article-1-4933-fa.html>
- Campbell, L., & Finch, E. (2004). Customer satisfaction and organizational justice. *Facilities*, 22(7/8), 178-189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632770410547543>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 425.
- Deepak, St. and Khalid P. (2018). "Measurement of Organization Justice Scale and its Dimensions on White Collared Professionals – An Empirical Analysis". *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp, 543-557. ISSN: 2320-2882.
- Edgar Martinez T, et al. (2015). Organizational Justice: A Vision by Higher Education Academic Staff. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 15(G3), 9–17.
- Ghalem, Â. & et al. (2016). Performance: A concept to define. doi = 10.13140/RG.2.2.24800.28165.
- Gracia, J, H. et al. (2015). "Organizational Justice: A Vision by Higher Education Academic Staff." *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 15.
- Hersey, P. & Goldsmith, M. (1981) A situational approach to performance planning. *Training & Development Journal*, 34(11), 38–44.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H. and Johnson, D.E. (2001) *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources*. 8th Edition, PrenticeHall, Inc., Upper Saddle River.
- Iaturochmah, Siti J; Achmad Su, and Ade Irma A. (2019) "The Role of Organizational Commitment in Influence of Justice toward Employee Performance." *International Conference on Rural Development and Entrepreneurship 2019 : Enhancing Small Business and Rural Development Toward Industrial Revolution 4.0*. Vol. 5 No. 1, pp: 383-394, ISBN: 978-623-7144-28-1.
- Indahyati, N., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2019). The relationship between organizational justice with job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, vol., 6 issue (2), pp: 63-71. doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n2.611.
- Iqbal MZ, Rehan M, Fatima A, Nawab S. (2017). "The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance in Public Sector Organization of Pakistan". *Int J Econ Manag Sci* 6: 431. doi: 10.4172/2162-6359.1000431.
- IQBAL, K. (2013). "Determinants of Organizational Justice and its impact on Job Satisfaction. A Pakistan Base Survey". *International Review of Management and Business Research*, Vol. 2 Issue.1, pp.48-56. ISSN: 2306-9007.
- Kalay, Faruk. (2016). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance: A Survey in Turkey and Turkish Context. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*. 6. 10.5296/ijhrs.v6i1.8854.
- Kazemi, H. (2003). *Salary and salary systems*. Tehran: Danesh Publications. Manly, Nourai Ashtiani. (2016). *Organizational justice and employee performance*. Growth Yearbook, p. 100-107.
- Kılıç, T, Sedat, B. & Witold G.(2015). "A New Approach to The Organizational Justice Concept: The Collective Level of Justice Perceptions" *International Journal of Health Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 157-175. DOI: 10.15640/v3n1a9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/v3n1a9>.
- Kiragu, Pl; John Mu and Paul O, G. (2020), Influence of innovation in strategy implementation on organizational performance: A Case of Unga Holdings Limited, Kenya, *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 9, (5), 48-57.
- Lee, Ch. (2021). "Informational Justice, Cognitive Trust, and Satisfaction: Purchasers' Perspective of Healthcare Distribution Market." *Journal of Distribution Science*, vol. 19 issue 2, pp: 5-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15722/jds.19.2.202102>.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980). "What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships", in Gergen, K., Greenberg, M. and Willis, R. (Eds), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*. Plenum, New York, NY, pp. 27-55.

- Mirela-Oana Pinteana and Lect. Monica-Violeta Achim, (2010), Performance - An Evolving Concept, Annals of University of Craiova - Economic Sciences Series, 2, (38), 12.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). "Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 76 No. 6, pp. 845-855.
- Niehoff, B.P. and Moorman, R.H. (1993), "Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 527-556.
- Noor-ul-Ain. (2020). "Exploring the Role of Organizational Justice in Predicting Job Performance". Indus Journal of Management Sciences. Vol. 01, Issue 01, pp, 1-30,
- Rajaei, Z., & Arghavani, A. (2016). Investigating the Impact of Organizational Culture on Employees' productivity. Iioab Journal, 7, 242-249, ISSN: 0976-3104.
- Rezaian, A. (2009) Expectation of Justice and Justice in the Organization (Advanced Organizational Behavior Management), 3rd edition, Tehran, Samt Publications.
- Sarwary, Kh & Adel, An. (2022). The Effect of Organizational Justice on Employees' Job Satisfaction. The Seybold Report Journal. 17 (10), 308–325. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7180946>.
- Scott, B. A., Garza, A. S., Conlon, D. E., & Kim, Y. J. (2015). Why do managers act fairly in the first place? A daily investigation of "hot" and "cold" motives and discretion. Academy of Management Journal, 1015(1), 37–57.
- Soltani Arabshahi K, sorabi Z, Keshavarzi M H, Ramezani G. (2019). Investigation of the Relationship between Self-determined Motivation and Work Engagement of Faculty Members of Iran University of Medical Sciences. J Med Educ Dev. 2019; 12 (33):26-41
- Sulaiman Al-A, Saleh, Ib. (2018). "The Impact of Organizational Justice on the Counterproductive Work Behavior: A Field Study Conducted in the Jordan Customs Department". International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 9 • N 1, pp,27-38. ISSN 2219-1933 (Print), 2219-6021(Online).
- Sulistiowati, Sulistiowati & Komari, Nurul. (2020). ACHIEVE Model on Research and Publication Performance. GATR Global Journal of Business Social Sciences Review. 8. 22-29. DOI: 10.35609/gjbssr.2020.8.1(3).
- Terzi, A.R., et al. (2017). An Analysis of Organizational Justice and Organizational Identification Relation Based on Teachers' Perceptions. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5, 488-495.
- Unaam, Ak, O. & Benjamin, Ok (2021). Organizational Justice and Employee Commitment in the Port Harcourt Area Command of the Nigeria Police Force. Saudi J Bus Manag Stud, 6(9): 366-375. DOI: 10.36348/sjbms.2021.v06i09.002.
- Wang, X., Liao J., Xia D., & Chang T. (2010). The impact of organizational justice on work performance - mediating effects of organizational commitment and leader-member exchange. International Journal of Manpower, 31(6), 660-677.
- Yadav, L, K. and Ngendra, Y. (2017). "Organizational Justice: An Analysis of Approaches, Dimensions and Outcomes". Nmims Journal Of Economics And Public Policy. Vol. 2. Issue 1. pp, 44-63.
- Yaghoubi, M., Rakhsh, F., Javadi, M., & Bahadori, M. (2013). A study of determining factors affecting the performance of nurses based on the achieve model in selected hospital of Isfahan (Iran). Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 2(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9531.119033>.
- Zainalipour, H et al, (2010). "A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among teachers in Bandar Abbas middle school." Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences. vol. 5. pp: 1986–1990, doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.401.