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Abstract
The objective of this study was to know about the nexus among organizational justice (Org. Justice), organizational commitment (Org. Com), psychological capital (PsyCap) and job performance (JP). This study also aimed to test the mediatory effect of PsyCap and Org. Com in the nexus between Org. Justice and JP. Data were gathered from 554 Public Sector Universities’ Teachers, Pakistan (PSUTP). Eighty two percent (82%) of participants were male, while 18% were female. Twenty two percent (22%) respondents were Lecturers, forty eight percent (48%), Assistant Professors, nineteen percent (19%), Associate Professors and eleven percent (11%) Professors. The results revealed that Org. Justice has a positive nexus with PsyCap, JP and Org. Com. Psycap and Org. Com also showed a significant nexus with JP. Structure equation modelling confirmed that PsyCap and Org. Com partially mediated the nexus between Org. Justice and JP.
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Introduction
The concept of organizational justice pertains to the perceived equity inside an organization about the methods and procedures used for decision-making as well as the results of such methods and procedures. It includes several dimensions (Colquitt, 2001; Gilliland, 2008; Yadav & Yadav, 2016). Distributive justice (DJ) refers to how fairly decisions are made or allocations made inside the company. Based on their contributions, efforts, and performance, employees evaluate whether perks, compensation, promotions, and recognition are distributed equitably. Procedural Justice (PJ) is concerned with how equitable the methods and procedures that are used in decision-making are. It encompasses elements like impartiality, consistency, openness, and the degree of employee participation in decision-making. Interactional Justice (IJ) refers to how fairly people are treated and communicated with one another inside an organization. It entails treating staff members with decency and consideration, giving reasons for choices made, and acting with empathy and dignity while interacting with others.
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How well a person carries out the duties and obligations related to their position within an organization is referred to as their JP. It may include a range of topics, including meeting deadlines, producing high-quality work, being productive and efficient, working together with coworkers, adhering to business standards, and accomplishing objectives. Diverse definitions of JP have been offered by academics, each representing a unique set of circumstances and viewpoints. Campbell et al. (1990) define JP as "the set of employee behaviors that contribute, either positively or negatively, to organizational goal accomplishment." Borman and Motowidlo (1997) define JP as "the effectiveness with which incumbents perform activities that contribute to organizational goals." McCormick, Jeanneret, and Mecham (1972) define JP as "the ability of an employee to perform the duties of his or her job." Schmidt, Hunter, Outerbridge, and Goff (1988) define JP as "the behaviors necessary for successful job performance."

Psychological capital, sometimes known as PsyCap, is a term used in positive psychology to describe the positive psychological resources people have and make use of in order to perform well, overcome obstacles, and prosper in a variety of spheres of life, including the workplace. After a thorough investigation, academics have produced important definitions and contributions to PsyCap. The notion of PsyCap was first suggested by Luthans and Youssef (2004) in their article titled "Human, Social, and Now Positive Psychological Capital Management: Investing in People for Competitive Advantage." They define PsyCap as "an individual's positive psychological state of development characterized by high self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience." Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) in their book titled "Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge," explained four dimensions of PsyCap. Self-efficacy is the conviction that one can carry out activities and reach objectives effectively. Optimism is the ability to look forward to things positively, especially in the face of difficulty or failure. Hope is the willful pursuit of objectives via the creation of plans for achieving them and the upkeep of desire to do so. Resilience is the capacity to overcome obstacles, failures, and setbacks. PsyCap is positively associated with Org. Com (Nguyen & Ngo, 2020; Saadat et al., 2023; Safari et al., 2020), organizational citizenship behavior (Bibi, Ahmad, Sohail, & Ali, 2023; Qian, Zhang, & Jiang, 2020) and JP (Amini, Shehni Yailagh, & Hajiyakhchali, 2020; Zhang, Raza, Khalid, Parveen, & Ramírez-Ásis, 2023).

In organizational behavior and human resource management, the idea of Org. Com has been thoroughly examined. Academics from many fields such as psychology, sociology, and management have made valuable contributions to our comprehension of Org. Com. Meyer and Allen (1991) define Org. Com as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" and offered the Three-Component Model, which includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) define Org. Com as "the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization." Allen and Meyer (1990) define affective commitment as "the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization." Continuance commitment refers to "the perceived cost of leaving the
organization," and normative commitment explains "the perceived obligation to continue employment." Org. Com results in increased JP (Almasradi, Ali, & Ullah, 2022; Cobbinah, Ntarmah, Obeng, & Quansah, 2020; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellaty, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989), decreased turnover intention (ALI & AHMAD, 2021; Guzeller & Celiker, 2020; Pratama, Suwarni, & Handayani, 2022; Yücel, 2012), and organizational citizenship behavior (Mohamed & Anisa, 2012; Ridwan, Mulyani, & Ali, 2020; UTAMI, Sapta, VERAWATI, & Astakoni, 2021). We develop the following hypotheses after the above literature review:

H1: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to JP in Public Sector Universities’ Teachers, Pakistan (PSUTP).
H2: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to ORG. COM in PSUTP.
H3: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to PSYCAP in PSUTP.
H4: ORG. COM is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H5: PSYCAP is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H6: ORG. COM and PSYCAP mediate the nexus between ORG. JUSTICE and JP in PSUTP.

Research Methods

Data collection procedure
Data were collected from five hundred and fifty four teachers of public universities of Panjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and Balochistan regions of Pakistan during a two-month period (December 2023 and January, 2024). Seven hundred (N = 700) questionnaires were administered, and 556 were sent back. Only two questionnaires (N = 2) were eliminated owing to incomplete data, resulting in 554 complete questionnaires with 79% response rate. Eighty two percent (82%) of participants were male, while 18% were female. Twenty two percent (22%) respondents were Lecturers, forty eight percent (48%), Assistant Professors, nineteen percent (19%), Associate Professors and eleven percent (11%) Professors.

Measures

Measurement of ORG. COM
The ORG. COM scale was employed to gauge ORG. COM (Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990). This questionnaire has three dimensions: NC, AC and CC. Each aspect of ORG. COM has 6 questions. ORG. COM’ examples are “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.” and “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own” (AC), “It would be very hard for me to leave my job at this organization right now even if I wanted to” and “I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization” (CC) and “Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave” and “I would feel guilty if I left this organization now” (NC). A 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) was used for data collection. Table 1 shows the Cronbach’s alfa of AC, NC and CC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’ Alfa</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of PSYCAP
The PSYCAP scale is employed to gauge PSYCAP (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006). PSYCAP has 4 dimensions: “Hope, Resiliency, Optimism, and Efficacy”. Each dimension has 6 items. PSYCAP’s examples are "Right now I see myself as being quite successful at work," and "If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of several
methods to get out of it" (Hope), "If something can go wrong at work, it will," and "I always see the bright side of things about my employment" (Optimism), "I typically take tough things at work in stride" and "When I experience a setback at work, I have trouble rebounding from it, moving on" (Resiliency) and "I feel confident representing my work area in meetings with management," and "I feel confident helping to create targets/goals in my work area" (Self-efficacy). A 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) was used for data collection. Table 2 displays the Cronbach’s alfa of PSYCAP.

Table 2: Reliability of PSYCAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Resiliency</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’ Alfa</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Org. Justice

Org. Justice was gauged through Org. Justice scale (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). This questionnaire has 3 dimensions: IJ, DJ and PJ. Examples of DJ include “My work schedule is fair.”, and “I think that my level of pay is fair”. Examples of PJ include “Job decisions are made by the general manager (GM) in an unbiased manner”, and “To make job decisions, my GM collects accurate and complete Information”. Examples of IJ include “When decisions are made about my job, the GM treats me with kindness and consideration” and “When decisions are made about my job, the GM treats me with respect and dignity”. A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) used for data collection. Table 3 displays the Cronbach’s alfa of ORG.JUSTICE.

Table 3: Reliability of ORG. JUSTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>IJ</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>DJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’ Alfa</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Performance

JP scale was employed to gauge JP (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Examples include "I help my teammates with their tasks when they are absent", "I help other employees with their job when they are not present" and "I come up with original ideas to boost the department's standards overall" (ERP), "I achieve the objectives of my job" and "I satisfy all job criteria" and "I am proficient in all areas of my job, manage duties with expertise" (IRP). A 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree” was used for data collection. Table 4 displays the Cronbach’s alfa of IRP and ERP.

Table 4: Reliability of JP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>IRP</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’ Alfa</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Correlation among Org. Justice, PsyCap, JP and Org. Com

|--------------|--------|----------|----|
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>Org. Com</th>
<th>JP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Com</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 5 shows correlation among ORG. JUSTICE, PSYCAP, ORG. COM and JP. ORG. JUSTICE reveals a positive nexus with PSYCAP (r = .291), JP (r = .269) and ORG. COM (r = .352). PSYCAP and ORG. COM also show a significant nexus with JP. Therefore, we accept:

H1: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H2: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to ORG. COM in PSUTP.
H3: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to PSYCAP in PSUTP.
H4: ORG. COM is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H5: PSYCAP is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.

Research Model: Effect of ORG. JUSTICE on JP through PSYCAP and ORG. COM

The 4-factor model of ORG. JUSTICE, ORG. COM, PSYCAP and JP was calculated through the use of Structural Equation Modelling. The following fit indices demonstrate how well the model matched the data: GFI = .962, CMIN/DF = 2.559, DF = 49, LO 90 = .042, HI 90 = .064.
RMR = .073, RMSEA = .053, Chi Square = 125.378, CFI = .972, AGFI = .940 and p-value = .000. A regression score of 0.20 indicates that ORG. JUSTICE has a statistically significant impact on JP. PSYCAP (Regression Value = 0.80) and ORG. COM (Regression Value = 0.83) were significantly impacted by ORG. JUSTICE. Additionally, the results showed that PSYCAP and ORG. COM had a significant impact on JP, with beta value of 0.34 and 0.29 respectively. The factor loadings for ORG. JUSTICE, PSYCAP, JP, and ORG. COM are all within allowable bounds. After including ORG. COM and PSYCAP as mediators, the regression coefficient of ORG. JUSTICE's effect on JP dropped from 0.36 to 0.20. As a result, we accept each of the following hypotheses:

H1: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H2: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to ORG. COM in PSUTP.
H3: ORG. JUSTICE is statistically related to PSYCAP in PSUTP.
H4: ORG. COM is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H5: PSYCAP is statistically related to JP in PSUTP.
H6: ORG. COM and PSYCAP mediate the nexus between ORG. JUSTICE and JP in PSUTP.

Table 6: Values of GFI, CFI, RMSEA, RMR, LO 90, HI90, DF, CMIN and CMIN/DF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Value</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>D F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>RM R</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>LO 90</th>
<th>HI 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125.378</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the values Chi-square/CMIN, DF, NFI, RMR, CFI, GFI, CMIN/DF, AGFI, and RMSEA. The values of different indices which include GFI = .962, CMIN/DF = 2.559, DF = 49, LO 90 = .042, HI 90 = .064, RMR = .073, RMSEA = .053, Chi Square = 125.378, CFI = .972, AGFI = .940, and p-value = .000. are all within allowable bounds. This research has established a 4-factor model comprising ORG. JUSTICE, PSYCAP, JP, and ORG. COM.

**Conclusion**

The objective of this study was to know about the nexus among Org. Justice, Org. Com, PsyCap and JP. This study also aimed to test the mediatary effect of PsyCap and Org. Com in the nexus between Org. Justice and JP. Data were gathered from 554 Public Sector Universities’ Teachers, Pakistan (PSUTP). Eighty two percent (82%) of participants were male, while 18% were female. Twenty two percent (22%) respondents were Lecturers, forty eight percent (48%), Assistant Professors, nineteen percent (19%), Associate Professors and eleven percent (11%) Professors. The results revealed that Org. Justice has a positive nexus with PsyCap, JP and Org. Com. PsyCap and Org. Com also showed a significant nexus with JP. Structure equation modelling confirmed that PsyCap and Org. Com partially mediated the nexus between Org. Justice and JP.
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