Navigating Through Ubiquitous Factors Of Organisational Justice At (HEI). An In-Depth Qualitative Case Analysis Of Peshawar, Pakistan

Mian Asim Iqbal [1], Muhammad Atiq [2] , Dr. Owais Mufti [3] and Muhammad Danial [4], Gohar Saleem Parvaiz[5]

Abstract

In recent times, research on organizational justice has gained momentum as there has been a noticeable increase in employee dissatisfaction and demotivation in organizations worldwide. For the purposes of this paper, we examined the phenomenon of organizational justice in the context of Higher Education Institutes (HEIs). The external environment of HEIs has undergone significant changes, which include but are not limited to marketisation, governance, globalisation and increasing mobility of faculty and students. We adopt a qualitative approach and draw on insights of our research participants to delineate the importance of organizational justice in our purposively chosen HEI. Adhering to the qualitative tradition, five faculty and five staff mem[1]bers were purposively selected as research sample. The research sample comprised faculty and staff members who had served on either statutory or non-statutory committees within the HEI. Data collected through semi-structured interviews was thematically analyzed through deductive and inductive coding, which lead to the development of themes for the discussion of findings. Based on our rich empirical data, we find that favoritism, strategic foresight, open communication and decision-making ability influence the organizational justice process more than others. Research fills a notable contribution in extant literature on the topic by highlighting correlation between lack of organizational justice and the occurrence of organizational silence as a consequence.

1.0 Introduction

Organizational justice is the perception and evaluation of fairness in an organization. This concept of fairness incorporates perceived fairness of procedures, interactions, decisions and outcomes. The existence of organizational justice in an organization is of paramount importance because it leads to improved employee satisfaction and motivation, enhanced performance and reduced conflicts. Hence, the phenomenon of organizational justice has garnered enormous attention in recent scholarly works of (Clercq & Azeem, 2021; Kanwal, 2021; Lambert et al., 2020; Jackson, 2019; Cropanzano et al., 2015; Khan et al., 2015;

[1]Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan
[2&5]Associate Professor Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan Corresponding Author
[3]Associate Professor Address: 1-A, sector E-5, Phase 7, Hayatabad, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan   Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan
[4]Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan

Marshall Schminke, 2015; Burns, 2013; Vatandoust et al., 2009). Scholars have scrutinized the relevance of organizational justice in diverse organizational settings and explored the outcomes linked to its existence or absence. The groundbreaking work of Adams (1965), specifically the equity theory, posits that individuals assess their inputs and outcomes by comparing them to those of others in terms of the inputs they Hence, he further argues that fairness is not to be seen in absolute terms; rather, it has to be seen from the perspective of the outcomes. Kouchaki et al. (2015) contended that the perception of fairness differs between individual and group levels. Individuals are more likely to view groups, particularly those making decisions, as unfair when they experience less favorable outcomes. Conversely, this perspective does not hold true when individuals receive favorable outcomes.

Extant research on the phenomenon of organizational justice concludes that the lack of organizational justice has a negative effect on the employees of an organization. And this not only increases risks of lower productivity of employees but also increases the risks of sickness (Ybema et al., 2016). Similarly, Guh et al. (2013) concluded that the absence of organizational justice negatively effects employees' institutional trust while its presence has a statistically significant positive effect on employees' institutional trust. The lack of organizational justice negatively effects employees' work outcome, especially when these employees' score lower on power distance index (Simon et al., 2002). Rahman et al. (2016) also find that a lack of organizational justice leads to lack of organizational commitment from employees. Guven and Guven (2020) assert that personal happiness, job satisfaction, motivation and performance are the likely consequences of organizational justice. Scholars also report job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior as the likely consequences originating from the presence of organizational justice. (Argon, 2010; Khan et al., 2015; Kouchaki et al., 2015; Vatandoust et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2009). Hence, the significance of organizational justice in maintaining a conducive working environment in any organization cannot be denied. Thus, it is evident from the literature that employees of an organization mostly suffer due to lack of organizational justice in organizations, as it affects their job performance, motivation, job commitment, and organizational commitment. Nevertheless, scholars have examined the phenomenon of organizational justice by employing a quantitative approach mostly, which is in a sense flawed. The quantitative approach is considered less comprehensive due to its limited depth and the exclusion of the views, perceptions, and experiences of research participants. Further, the research participants are confined to answer through limited options given on a predetermined numeric scale. Therefore, in this paper, we overcome this research gap by employing a qualitative approach, with the aim to understand the development, outcomes and importance of organizational justice in the context of Higher Education university's (HEIs).

The subsequent portions of the paper follow this organization: first, a review of pertinent literature is discussed, followed by an elucidation of the research methodology and its findings. At the end, we present our conclusion and future research agenda.

2.0 Literature Review

The concept of justice is a centuries-old phenomenon. One can say that Justice is served when people get what they deserve. Initially, the philosophers and social scientists had discussed this concept, later on management scientists also started to pick up the talk. The study of justice can be traced back to at least the era of Plato and Socrates, and their view about justice has shaped the perception about this world today (Fortin & Fellenz, 2008). Social commentators and many of the philosophers were talking about justice, long before the management scientists did (Cropanzana et al., 2007). In simple terms, we can say that the

term Justice implies moral correctness and ethical relevance. In particular, justice is present when people have what they deserve and people are being treated in a manner as they should (Cropanzano et al., 2015). For instance, Price (2010) explains, that there are situations in which people get the outcome that they do not deserve and also do not get the outcome that they deserve.

2.1 Organizational Justice

According to (Cropanzano et al., 2015) in order to act justly, an individual needs to be able to evaluate the outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal behaviours. He described accomplishments of Lawgiver Solon who reformed the Athenian Government (Cropanzana et al., 2007). These were part of the prescriptive approach since they tried to logically determine what actions are really just, while Organizational Justice is borrowed from these old traditions, but they are different from the ones that were considered by the ancient philosophers. In organizational justice perspective, the management scientists consider an act to be just if it is perceived like that. It means that they are pursuing more of descriptive approach agenda for organizational justice. The researchers of organizational justice often use the words justice and fairness as synonyms but the justice rules and explanations differentiate between the two, the latter, for example, can be referred to the adherence to law and the former as whether the adherence was fair or not (Russell, Cropanzano & Kirk, 2015). The difference between the terms justice and organizational justice is that the former is more of a descriptive phenomenon and is seen in absolute terms. While the organizational justice is prescriptive in nature that depends on the perception of individuals i.e. if people perceive that organizational justice exists then it does otherwise not.

Researchers have explained the concept of organizational justice through Adams equity theory in 1965 but the researchers soon came to the conclusion that the equity theory alone cannot explain the fairness standard of exchange and can be explained through social exchange theory (Ali et al., 2017). Social exchange theory suggests that the employees' behavior is a direct result of the exchange process, which aims at maximizing profit and minimizing costs. Concept of The Organizational Justice concept is mainly divided into three types; these are, Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice and Interactional Justice (Jackson, 2019).

Procedural Justice:

Procedural justice is the perception of fairness about the processes in an organization. When people consider the processes as fair, then it will ultimately create a perception of fairness about the allocation of resources because of these "fair" processes. A procedural approach to justice focuses on the processes through which the outcomes are determined (Greenberg, 1987). Such an approach concentrates on the fairness of the procedures through which organizational decisions are made, contrary to the concept of Distributive Justice which focuses on the outcomes within an organization. People compare their own input and results regarding processes with that of others (Argon, 2010). Since the comparison of results affects employee motivation and job performance it ultimately results in the perception of justice in an organization. According to (Colquitt, 2001; Loi & Ngo, 2010) procedural justice also encompasses the right to appeal against the decisions as a result of these processes.

When the outcomes are not favourable, then procedural justice is more strongly felt. Procedural justice also includes the intervention of affirmative actions. Elaborating on the concept of procedural justice (Meshelski, 2020) states about the affirmative action's i.e. positive discrimination is compatible with procedural justice and will also be the case in an

ideal world. Peoples' reaction to distributive justice is very much influenced by procedural justice (Cremer, 2005). At the times when the outcomes are not favorable at these moments the impact of the procedural justice is more strongly sensed. Reporting the procedural justice phenomenon with regards to the police force's positive engagement with the citizens, (Sumpter, 2016) pointed out that when police forces are perceived to be carrying out their duties lawfully then people will be more receptive to interacting with them and will also cooperate.

The assumption that procedural justice precedes distributive justice is not always true. There can and are instances where employees of the organization consider processes within the organization as just but at the same time the allocation of the resources are not considered to be fair and just. It is because the justice in distribution is not always the as result of a process.

Distributive Justice:
Distributive justice refers to perception of justice in the distribution or allocation of resources. The term distributive justice has been studied from the equity and equality perspective by different authors. Groups are perceived as less fair than individuals when the distributions of resources are unfavorable. Much of the researcher's knowledge is based on the work of Adam in 1965 who used Social Exchange Theory in order to determine fairness. According to Adam, people were not concerned with fairness in absolute terms, instead, they are concerned about fairness in the outcome no matter those outcomes were fair or not (Vatandoust et al., 2009). While Adam supported the equity rule to determine the fairness in the outcome other authors have identified other allocation rules such as equality and need (Leventhal, 1976). Through the longitudinal data analysis in a post-merger scenario (Monin et al., 2013) have identified a less emphasis on distributive justice and a shift from equality to equity. Nonetheless, all the allocation standards have their ultimate goal of achieving fairness in distribution i.e. Distributive Justice. The choice of distribution of rewards may help in the prevention of conflicts and employees' dissatisfaction. On having received an unfavorable decision on an outcome, people perceive groups to be less fair as compared to individuals, but it is not the case when the decision is neutral or favorable (Kouchaki et al., 2015). Distributive justice requires that people perceive; benefits, responsibilities, and rights are allocated on merit (Yilmaz & Altinkurt, 2012).

One of the other key aspects of Distributive justice which has been missed out by the researchers is the timing of the distribution of resources or allocation of resources. Many of us may have witnessed that an employee might have got what he or she has deserved but still they perceive the outcome to be unjust. It is primarily because there is a delay in desirable outcomes. For example, an employee who desires to be promoted gets the promotion but not on time but with some delay, though he or she got the desired promotion but still they will feel deprived because of the timing of the promotion and hence will perceive the allocation of the resource as unjust. As there is a famous saying that 'justice delayed is justice denied'.

Interactional Justice:
Interactional justice refers to the perception of justice in the interaction between the supervisors and employees. The perception of fairness is not only dependent on the processes or distribution of resources, but also on the interactions between supervisors and employees. (Laschinger, 2004). During the 1980's, an analysis of procedural justice led to the development of another type of justice called Interactional Justice, that focuses on the perception of fairness in the interaction between the receiver and provider, as the outcomes are allocated (Shrivastava et al., 2016). While reporting negative news to the managers

having low empathy, the enhancement of self-awareness of such employees will increase their interactional justice (Whiteside & Barclay, 2016).

Interactional justice is further categorized into informational justice and interpersonal justice. According to Husted & Folger (2004) the perception of fairness does not solely depend upon the procedures but also depends on the way employees interact with each other. There are mainly four communication criteria that develop this fairness perception; these are i) respect; the subordinate must be treated with respect, ii) justification; whatever decisions are taken the managers should have a valid explanations for that and that they should provide the same to the subordinates, iii) truthfulness; that is the explanation they provide should be true, honest and candid, and iv) the correctness of questions; which means that the managers should refrain from biased and improper statements or questions. Similarly, while describing interactional justice Bies and Moag (1986) have identified four rules that will explain the interpersonal treatment on part of the managers; these are respect, propriety, justification and truthfulness. Current taxonomies of organizational justice place respect and propriety under interpersonal justice while justification and truthfulness are placed under informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Researches have revealed that the informational justice and interpersonal justice components of interactional justice are strong predictors of employees' attitude and behaviors (Scott et al., 2007). Components of interactional justice can be explained by distinguishing between "exchange" and "encounter". According to Bies (2005) procedural justice and distributive justice are bounded by exchange of resources and are less frequent. Whereas, the interactional justice (interpersonal and informational justice) can effectively be judged in almost any encounter between manager and subordinates (Scott et al., 2007).

The interaction between the supervisor and subordinates is an ongoing phenomenon and is not limited to the time of allocation of the outcomes or resources. So, describing the interactional justice as a phenomenon between the supervisor and subordinate at the time of allocation of resources is not right. Secondly, the interactional justice is not limited to the interactions between the supervisor (the resource allocator) and subordinate (the resource receiver); it can be among the other employees as well. So, in a conducive work environment the fairness perception in interactions among the employees can also be termed as interactional justice. As Husted and Floger (2004) rightly pointed out that the interactional justice can be determined by the way the employees interact with each other.

2.2 The Development of Organizational Justice:

From literature, we come to know that several factors play a role in developing the perception of justice in an organization i.e., organizational justice. These include power distance, ethical leadership, communication psychological contract, personality characteristics, etc. Empirical evidence shows employee empowerment, psychological contract, and communication as possible antecedents of organizational justice. Employee empowerment has a significant impact on distributive justice, and psychological contract has an impact on procedural and distributive justice. Similarly, communication has an impact on procedural and interactional justice (Haiyan Zhang, B.eng., 2006). Based on SET i.e; (Social Exchange Theory), ethical leadership results in interactional justice among the employees. However, this may vary on the basis of a collectivistic approach of the employees (Wang et al., 2017). Personality characteristics are important elements that develop employees' fairness perception with regards to managers' behaviours (Whiteside & Barclay, 2016). A collective fair perception of organizational values will create a collective perception of organizational justice (Marshall Schminke, 2015). Investigating the antecedents of organizational justice in the higher

education universities of Pakistan, (Kanwal, 2021) has found that structure of the organization, power distance, communication within the organization, and reward allocation are the key factors that influence organizational justice.

2.3 Organizational Justice in Educational universities:

In our opinion, among all the sectors and industries, the most important and crucial are the educational institutions. All other sectors and industries are directly dependent on the performance of the educational institutions. A good educational university will provide good and able graduates to the society and organizations, which will further enhance the overall performance of these organizations. It is, therefore, very essential that the educational institutions perform well because a good performing educational university would mean that able and talented graduates enter the organization and will enhance the performance of those organizations. It is also very necessary that the phenomena like organizational justice be properly taken care of in the educational institutions, as we have seen through the findings of numerous studies that organizational justice has influence in almost every aspect of an organizational development.

Studies conducted in medical universities in China by Chen et al., (2015) have found that the organizational justice significantly affects nurses' organizational trust and organizational identification and these in turn positively affect their commitment to the organization. The factor of employees' quick reaction to the unexpected problems in procedures while doing their job enhances the influence of procedural justice on job satisfaction (Clercq & Azeem, 2021). The effect of procedural justice and distributive justice and training has a positive impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Lambert et al., 2020). While the work overload has no significant effect on these two i.e. job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The perception of the employees about justice greatly influences the employees' thinking about how much the organization value those (Jacobs et al., 2014). The teachers' fairness perception with regards to their interaction with their administration, the process of decision making, and subsequent allocation of awards can greatly help in the effectiveness of high schools, as organizational justice in high schools positively affects organizational citizenship behaviour (Burns, 2013). On the other hand (Robert Jones & Gramberg, 2013) have found a positive effect of organizational justice on trust in administrators and college instructors, in the college of education students in Turkey. In one of the studies conducted in two state owned universities of Turkey, (Guven and Guven, 2020) reported that the female lecturer see personal happiness, job satisfaction, motivation and performance as likely consequences of organizational justice.

Research shows that employees of universities can be an ideal group for cross-cultural studies as the universities across the globe tend to have similar organizational culture (Jiang et al., 2017). In a cross-cultural study conducted in universities (HEIs) of China, South Korea and Australia (Jiang et al., 2017) have found a positive significant effect of organizational justice on organizational trust and organizational commitment with a varying degrees among distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Their study focused on social exchange relationship (social exchange theory) between employees and their organizations (i.e., Higher Education universities) in order to test the justice effects. They argued that all three main components of organizational justice, that is procedural, distributive and interactional justice, have the ability to initiate social exchange at the workplace.

2.4 Organizational Justice in Pakistani Context

Numerous studies on organizational justice have been conducted in western countries, few of which are mentioned in the previous sections. Most of the studies on organizational justice

conducted in western countries have adopted a quantitative approach while very few studies have analyzed organizational justice in a qualitative manner. In Pakistan also many studies have been conducted on organizational justice and almost all of them are quantitative in nature.

Analyzing the effect of organizational justice by taking two of its dimensions that is Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice on organizational commitment in three higher education university of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Rahman et al., 2016) have found positive and significant effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment of employees. They adopted quantitative methodology for their study and used structured questionnaires for data collection purposes. Similarly, investigating the role of gender in organizational justice using a quantitative approach in University of Punjab, Ansari et al., (2016) have found that organizational justice perception of females are higher than that of males.

The procedural justice dimension of organizational justice has positive and strong influence on organizational citizenship behaviour and distributive justice has a positive but weak influence on organizational citizenship behaviour (Iqbal et al., 2012). Iqbal, had conducted this study in selected universities of Punjab using a survey method i.e. using a quantitative approach. In another quantitative study by Imran et al., (2018) have found a significant and positive relationship of organizational justice, job security and job satisfaction on organizational productivity and suggested to improve the three independent variables in order to improve organizational productivity.

In a study conducted in the banking sector of Pakistan by (Jehanzeb and Mohanty 2020) found that the organizational justice have no effect on organizational citizenship behaviour while there was a positive and significant relationship of organizational justice on organizational commitment. They used quantitative approach in order to reach to the findings. In another research by (Iqbal & Ahmad, 2016) has shown that there is a strong effect of Organizational justice on organizational commitment and similarly employees' trust has influence on the organizational commitment. They conducted their research in the commercial banks of Attock city in Pakistan and used quantitative methodology to reach to their findings.

Similarly in the research by (Saifi and Shahzad 2017) they studied a mediating role of job satisfaction in a relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour, and found that the job satisfaction does mediate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The methodology they adopted for their study was quantitative by employing cross-sectional survey method for data collection. This study was conducted in different public and private organizations located mainly in Lahore, Pakistan.

In another survey by (Mehmood & Ahmad, 2016) have shown that procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice all three are strongly and positively related to employee performance. Where, procedural justice being the strongest predicator of employee performance. They conducted their study in eight (08) universities located in twin cities of Pakistan (i.e.; Islamabad and Rawalpindi). They adopted quantitative methodology for their study thereby using structured questionnaire for data collection and using descriptive, correlational and regression analysis for data analysis.

Bakri and Ali (2015) conducted their study in thirty (30) private banks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan. They adopted quantitative methodology for their study using structured questionnaire for data collection and have shown that organizational commitment significantly and positively mediates the effect of organizational justice and turnover intentions.

Investigating the effect of organizational justice on employee's job dissatisfaction by employing psychological empowerment as a moderator (Muqadas et al., 2017) have found a significant and negative effect of organizational justice on employee job dissatisfaction, whereby the psychological empowerment has a weak relationship between the two.

Conducting a study to find out moderating effect of Job embeddedness between organizational justice and turnover intensions, Arif (2018) have found out that Job embeddedness does not moderate the relationship between organizational justice and turnover intentions. Arif conducted the study in banking sector of Pakistan. For this study, quantitative approach was adopted. Whereas, for the purpose of data collection two large size, three medium sized and two small sized banks were selected and data was gathered from 660 employees of these banks through a structured questionnaire.

Study by (Tahseen & Akhtar, 2016) has shown that organizational justice strongly and positively effects faculty trust that in turn positively effect organizational citizenship behaviour. For the purpose of data collection, they selected 12 public and private universities from Punjab, Pakistan. They as usual adopted quantitative approach for methodology thereby collecting data through structured questionnaire and analyzing the data through regression analysis. In yet another quantitative study by Saboor et al. (2018) have tried to find the effect of organizational justice on employees' contextual performance with the moderating effect of organizational respect. Saboor has taken three categories of performance that are task performance, counterproductive behaviours and contextual performance where they found a significant and positive effect of organizational justice on contextual performance of employees.

The studies mentioned above clearly displays the approach of researchers towards organizational justice. All of them have employed a quantitative approach towards organizational justice and none have studied this important phenomenon in a qualitative manner, in a sense, that they have not sorted views, opinions and experiences of participants for their respective study. The participants (respondents) were bounded to answer the questions through structured questionnaires in order to find the effect of organizational justice on predetermined and pre-selected variables.

The studies in question exhibit a notable lack of depth, particularly in addressing the intricacies of organizational justice. There is a discernible shallowness that fails to meet the requisite level of thoroughness essential for a comprehensive exploration of this subject. Though in western countries some of the studies have been conducted in a qualitative manner, thereby incorporating views, opinions and experiences of their participants in their studies on organizational justice; however, it is limited in the context of Pakistan. As agreed by all the justice researchers and experts that organizational justice is a perception-based phenomenon. That is organizational justice is in the minds of people (employees) and cannot be determined in absolute manner, therefore, it becomes imperative to take in-depth views and opinions of participants of a study, thereby incorporating the same into a study. Moreover, these studies lack a holistic view of organizational justice. Most of these studies

are causal in nature and have not addressed the "how" question, i.e.; how organizational justice is developed? and how it influences other matters? like organizational performance, employee performance, turn over intensions, job dissatisfaction.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on Equity theory and Social Exchange Theory (SET). These two theories help explain the concept of organizational justice and many other concepts that are related to it and compensate for each other's deficiencies. According to Adams (1965), "Inequity is present for Person whenever he perceives/feels that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of Other's outcomes to Other's inputs are unequal". That is people tend to compare the input they give (in terms of hard work, skills, experience) and in return the outcome they receive (compensation, promotions and rewards) with the input that others give and the outcome they receive. So, if employees see a balance in this comparative analysis, then they will perceive fairness within the organization and on the other hand if they observe imbalance in this comparison then they will perceive it as unfair. As a result, they will adopt behaviorus that will harm organizations like absenteeism, turn over intentions, lying etc.

Later on, researchers discovered that the equity theory alone cannot explain the standard of fairness in exchange (Husted, 1998). The Social Exchange Theory (SET) along with the equity theory can explain the standard of perception. "Social exchange theory predicts that, in reaction to positive initiating actions, targets will tend to reply in kind by engaging in more positive reciprocating responses and/or fewer negative reciprocating responses"(Cropanzano et al., 2017). Social Exchange Theory proposes that social behaviour is the outcome of the social exchange process that aims at maximizing the benefits and minimizing the costs (Szali, et al., 2017). This means that people try to terminate the relationship when the benefits are more than the costs.

Perception of fairness is not limited to the allocation of resources but also is involved in the perception of fairness (in processes and even in interactions). A procedural approach to justice focuses on the processes through which the outcomes are determined (Greenberg, 1987). Such an approach concentrates on the fairness of the procedures through which organizational decisions are made, contrary to the concept of Distributive Justice which focuses on the outcomes within an organization.

According to (Husted & Folger, 2004) the perception of fairness does not only depend on the fairness in processes but also depends on the way employees interact with each other. They have identified mainly four communication criteria that help develop this fairness perception, these are; respect, justification, truthfulness and the correctness of questions (Husted & Folger, 2004).

Table-1 Development of Organisational Justice 1, Table- 2 Outcomes of Organisational Justice and Figure 1 organizational justice (in appendex-1) shows the summary of the Literature Review; names of the authors and what variable/constructs they have used in their respective studies in order to explain the phenomenon of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour and its influences.

3.0 Research Methodology

For the purposes of this paper, we adopted a qualitative research approach to comprehend the development and importance of organizational justice in the context of HEI. Employing a qualitative research approach is instrumental in understanding and interpreting the views of

research participants as they engage in explaining their own social reality and its formation. Thus, this approach is characterized by the exploration of a phenomenon of interest in a specific socio-cultural context through a small sample size (Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2014) but aids in co-creating knowledge with the research participants by gaining deep insights from them about the phenomenon of interest in its embedded context (Anderson & Warren, 2011). We have chosen the context of HEI here because the external environment of higher education has undergone significant changes that include but are not limited to marketisation, governance, globalisation and increasing mobility of faculty and students (Howells et al., 2014). Thus, these factors together, pose challenges for the management of HEI, as well as their employees. Hence, to explore the phenomenon of organizational justice we have chosen one of the leading business school of the country (ie.; ranked number one in the province by Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan). This business school is located in Peshawar (capital city of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan) and offers different undergraduate, graduate and post graduate programs in the fields of management, computer science, social science, economics, psychology and English literature.

Primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2012) with the active participation of faculty and staff members of the Institute. Adhering to research ethics articulated by (Lune & Berg, 2017; Husband, 2020), the privacy of all research participants has been ensured and all names and designations of the research participants have been anonymized. In total, ten interviews were conducted; five of them were faculty members and five were staff members. Following the qualitative tradition, purposive sampling (Creswell, 2009; Ravitch & Carl, 2020) was adopted to interview those employees who had served more than five years at the university and had been part of different statutory and non-statutory committees. This ensured that the participants had comprehensive knowledge of and were familiar with the processes of the institute. Thematic analysis technique used by (Boyatzis, 1998) earlier was employed here in the research to analyze the extensive data collected through semi-structured interviews.

4.0 Research Findings

4.1 Organizational Justice:

As explained in the literature review section, procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice are the components of organizational justice; therefore, the ensuing subsections detail our findings in relation to these components.

Procedural Justice:

In many of the processes at the Institute, there is procedural justice especially for the processes that are in place for grants of scholarships, student admissions, hostel room allocations, and procurement etc. The reason for the existence of procedural justice is that, in these areas, rules are well-defined and are implemented in letter and spirit. Faculty member, F1, shared his experience in the following words:

"When I look at the scholarship awarding process, I think we are exemplary in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province. As I am part of the committee that awards different types of scholarships to students, I can confidently say that it is very transparent. So, I think the scholarship side is our strength".

Similarly, S1 who is a staff member, explained the existence of procedural justice at the Institute in the following words:

"At least in procurement processes and in hostel matters, I believe there is procedural justice at the Institute. The reason is that rules are very clear and the defined processes are followed according to Institute's own and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Public Procurement Regulatory Authority (KPPRA) rules. Let me give an example of how tenders are assigned at the university. For procurement, we go through a process and after completion; even those vendors were satisfied with our process who did not win the tender for procurement, and no complaints are received afterwards".

Nevertheless, the processes related to HR remain our weak point. All the respondents when they talked about the absence of procedural justice, they gave examples of HR related processes. For example, Faculty member, F1, argues that:

"Then there are other things, like the hiring process, that we are not good at. This is a significant weakness right from the beginning that prevails at the university. We used to follow an informal process of engaging faculty members on a visiting basis first. Then, we test them and assess them over a period of two years and after that we issue a contract of one year. So, it was the informal system that was followed and because of that there were a lot of procedural problems that unfolded after a decade, and which is demotivating for many."

Staff member, S2, also agrees to the issue of procedural injustice vis-a-vis HR process and asserts that:
"I would give my own example about HR related issue (appointments and promotions). There is no justice at all, as at the time of new appointment it should have been endorsed through the selection board (statutory body) of the institute but the correct process was not followed. As a candidate it wasn't my headache; I was happy that I got the job. But there was a flaw in the hiring process and this affected my promotion as when the time came and everything was ready for the promotion, but since my initial appointment process was not correct, I was not promoted to the next rank."

The absence of procedural justice in HR processes leads to resentment and demotivation among employees, thus, negatively affecting their performance.

Distributive Justice:
Since most of the resource allocations are just, therefore the responses were somewhat similar to the one that we receive for procedural justice. Faculty members were satisfied with the provision of the resources such as office allocation, office furniture, and IT equipment. But they were dissatisfied with the perceived injustices in budget and HR related allocations such as appointments and promotions.
Staff member S2 describes the state of distribution justice in the following words:
"If I look at the resources such as office equipment, facilities etc. so there is no problem. Whenever, I want anything for official purposes, I get facilitated. I have no complaints regarding resource allocation…but on the other side if I look at my pending salary increases and promotion, definitely due to procedural issues, I faced financial loss as I was not promoted on time and did not get the related pay raise benefit."
Faculty member F2 illuminates the above mentioned issue in the following words:
"Talking about salary increases, for example, I understand the problem when staff of the Institute asks management to increase their salary, and management tells them that we are short of funds. In my opinion, it isn't the responsibility of office staff or accounts department or any other to bring funds for the university, that's the responsibility of its leadership."

The above-mentioned responses indicate that when it comes to HR related matters like pay raise and promotion, the faculty and staff members do not perceive the distribution of resources as just. However, vis-a-vis the issue of promotion, staff member S3 who is also part of the management maintains that:

"There are so many people who come to me for promotion but there are reasons for not getting promoted. We had a heated argument with our administrative staff who asked to present their cases of promotion to selection board, and I was of the opinion that their cases cannot be sent to selection board. This is because they were initially appointed without advertising their post; hence their initial appointment was faulty".

From the above-mentioned quote, it is evident that management perceives that they are doing justice with their colleagues but faculty and staff members are unanimous on perceived injustices in the allocation of resources. Nevertheless, appointments without advertising the post indicate that the recruitment and selection process is flawed and needs significant improvement. Therefore, faculty and staff members perceive that both procedural and distributive justices are non-existent at the university.

Interactional Justice:
Generally, employees at the university interact with each other in a cordial and respectful manner. However, when it comes to the information sharing aspect of interactional justice, there are weaknesses in it. Faculty member F3 maintains that:

"I think that the faculty and staff have good relations with each other at a personal level but when it comes to sharing of knowledge and other important things that is missing here. Important things are kept in few hands and all stakeholders are not taken on board. Several faculty members faced a challenging situation when their contracts were not renewed on time. Subsequently, they had to resort to the Right to Information (RTI) process. However, even through RTI, they receive the necessary information on the last day of the valid time period, indicating a deliberate delay."

Similarly, staff member S4 gave his answer in the following words:

"Justice in the interaction (Interactional justice) at the Institute is ensured. Interactions between managers and subordinates and among the employees take place in a cordial, respectful, and friendly way. At the Institute there is open communication and an open door policy. However, information sharing at the university is very weak. The management will meet anyone with respect and in a cordial way but will not give any information without following formal and lengthy procedure. I may share one of my experiences in this regard; HR Rules 2019 were prepared and got approved from the Board of Governors (BoG) but the key stakeholders, that is employees of the Institute, were kept in the dark during this process of preparation and subsequent approval of the document. In my opinion this should not have been done the way it was done. At least the management should have informed section heads, if not all employees, about such a document during the preparation stage."

4.2 Organizational Justice Development
Favoritism, strategic foresight, decisions making ability of the management, rules and its implementation, open communication, procedural delays, information sharing, personality characteristics are the key elements that develop organizational justice. Among these elements, favoritism, open communication, decision making ability and strategic foresight were the common elements for the development of procedural, distributive and interactional justices. The element of favoritism was most talked about and all the respondents were unanimous in its key role in the development of organizational justice.

Following are the respondent's views about the development of organizational justice at the Institute in their own words. Staff member S5 describes the development of organizational justice at the university in the following words:

"We are faced here with the issue of favoritism. The faculty members always support each other and not the staff; for example, if a committee is constituted, they take lenient action against their fellow faculty members. Further, if their promotion cases are forwarded it will be given top priority. Similarly, if they have some issue related to their educational degree, it will be quickly handled without a delay, and it is all done, because they have a stronghold. For example, one of the faculty internal reviews for research was not done and was awarded a degree and many other such cases have occurred."

Staff member S1 illustrates the presence of favoritism in the following words:

"All employees are not equally treated. The influential and powerful employees get their work done, while those who do not speak are not entertained, they lack behind. Most of the faculty members get their promotions on time, for example, we have seen that some of the Assistant Professors on TTS were promoted to Tenured Associate Professor despite the fact there were no vacant slots available in the budget for them. On the other hand, most of the staff members were not promoted despite spending more than ten years on the same posts, as is the case with Special Pay Scale SPS-09 employees of the Institute. These SPS-09 employees have submitted many applications for their promotions but there is no action till date. Similarly, the faculty gets extra payments for the summer semester besides their salaries while the staff members who perform duties with them for the same semester do not get the extra payments".

Faculty member F5 highlights different factors for the development of organizational justice. He contends that:

"Whether it is procedural, distributive, or interactional justice, all are positive when there is no breach of the psychological contract between the management and employees. Since the Institute's management did not foresee many things coming, this leads to many problems that we face today, specifically, related to promotions and regularization of employees. In short, it is the lack of leadership's foresightedness, lack of decision of making, lack of resources, and claim of ownership of the Institute by few leads to impression that there is no fairness."

Similarly, faculty member F2 points towards favoritism and lack of strategic foresight, as the key reasons for the development of organizational justice at the university:

"My point is that the problem comes from strategic HR, and perhaps we are not ready for that. For example, we do not know what will be the HR section requirements in the coming five to ten years. We also don't have next five years' motivational and sustainability plan? And no need assessment plan. So, see the problem is that there is capacity, capability issues at a strategic level. Whether it is procedural, distributive or interactional injustices, they all are generated due to lack of foresightedness on the part of management."

Hence, from the above mentioned quote, we can conclude that the major elements that lead to the absence or presence of organizational justice are favoritism, strategic foresight of the management, decision making ability and open communication.

4.3 Organizational Justice Outcomes:

Demotivation, stress and anxiety, employee behaviour, employee facilitation, conflicts, organizational performance, turnover ratio and organizational silence are the main outcomes of organizational justice on the employees. The outcomes of organizational justice as stated by the research participants in their own words are mentioned below. Faculty member F2 contends that:

"For me indications are there; the first is stress and stress translated into different forms (for example, that include people who don't speak, they get demotivated). People going outside

organizations for mediation, and to the courts etc. are indications of perceived injustices. People have stopped taking interest in voluntary things, and they have stopped complaining. This is also an indication that they are under stress, and there is less job security, more turnovers, and no sense of ownership."

Faculty member F5 while discussing organizational silence gave reasons why employees at the Institute do not speak up. He argues that:

"People remain silent because they fear it might backfire or they won't be heard by top management. People are afraid to discuss issues and problems that are present in the processes or distribution of resources or any other matter. They are silent for two reasons; one is that some people say that even if we talk about the issues and problems, it falls on deaf ears and the management does not seem to act upon it. Secondly, when someone identifies a problem and demands its correction, the other person takes it personally, which further leads to resentment among the employees and management. I pointed out problems in the processes at many forums of the Institute but to no avail, instead, it led to resentment between me and a few of the officials."

Furthermore, staff member S3 is of the opinion that:

"Perception is that things are not right and it creates demotivation in employees and is in turn stressful. People look for other opportunities like; you will find people applying for different jobs. They don't want to continue because they are not happy as they have not been promoted on time, or they are not happy with their salaries and career progression. Top management should be concerned about this that the thinking and mindset of employees are changing in an undesirable way."

Faculty member F4 contends that the absence of organizational justice creates an environment of fear and argues that:

"The absence of organizational justice creates an environment of fear and people are unable to speak out their minds but it varies from person to person. If a person is struggling in his career, he won't speak because of fear factor. There are people who will speak in front of me openly but not in front of the management because they are on contract and they feel insecure. The point is that importance of our argument is not weighed by top management. Person who is speaking matters a lot rather than argument. We think only two or three people in the management know everything what they are doing? Management think they know everything and whatever they do, they do it in good faith but this mindset that we know everything and others don't is wrong and is totally unacceptable".

Hence, the outcomes of the absence of organisational justice are organisational silence, fear, job insecurity, demotivation and high turnover ratio, which ultimately negatively affect the organisational performance.

Discussion

Organisational justice is the perception of fairness held by an employee of an organisation (Greenberg, 1990). In this paper, we investigate the concept of organisational justice in the context of a university. The main emphasis is on whether it exists at the university or not, how this perception develops, and what are the consequences of the presence or absence of organisational justice. In the following subsections, we discuss our findings vis-a-vis the development and outcomes of organisational justice.

4.4 Development of Organisational Justice:

The research participants have identified different elements that lead to organisational justice. The most common are favoritism, strategic foresight, decision-making ability, and open communications.

Favoritism means the intentions and a tendency to deviate from a principled stance or justice for the benefit of a specific individual or specific group (Dağli & Akyol, 2019). Workplace favoritism significantly and positively affects psychological contract violations, thereby increasing the turnover intentions (Arasli et al., 2019). In this study, the presence of workplace favoritism has been affirmed by all the interviewees. The faculty members have confirmed the presence of person specific favoritism, while staff members referred to group specific favoritism. Even some of the staff, (interviewees) have categorically mentioned the 'faculty' of the Institute as the favored group.

Strategic foresight is the capability to create a high quality futuristic view and to use this ability for the benefit of an organisation (Slaughter, 2002). The research participants termed it very important and described the lack of it as a key factor that develops a negative thought about organizational justice. Strategic foresight also is a key factor to cope with environmental uncertainty and one of the key antecedents of an organization's dynamic capabilities (Haarhaus & Liening, 2020).

Closely associated with the strategic foresight element is the **Decision-making ability** of the leadership or top management. As mentioned above, strategic foresight demands timely and right decisions, so that it can be used for the benefit of the organisation. Lack of strategic foresight will most probably lead to wrong and ill-timed decisions that will ultimately lead to more problems for the organisation, and hence, will badly affect organizational justice.

We also find **Open communication** as an important factor, which helps develop organisational justice. Open communication means free flow of information in upward, downward, diagonal and horizontal directions within the organisation (Kanwal, 2021). If there is open communication that several positive effects can be seen on the other hand if there is lack of open communication then it will lead to an adverse effect on organisational justice. The research participants of our study perceive open communication as one of the key elements, which helps develop organisational justice. Though on the face of it, it seems that open communication is a term that can only be related to the interactional justice component of organisational justice. But, surprisingly the open communication element, besides interactional justice, has also been found to be a key developer of procedural and distributive justice as well.

4.5 Outcomes of Organisational Justice:
Through rigorous data collection, we have identified some important outcomes of the absence of organisational justice at the Institute. They are explained as follows;
Demotivation of employees is observed in case of absence of organisational justice in an organisation. But surprisingly there was a difference of opinion on whether this demotivation element further results in poor job performance or not. Some of the interviewees were of the opinion that though they felt demotivated by the lack of organisational justice, but it has not affected their job performance. They claimed that due to the organisational culture of the Institute they and other staff members are giving their hundred percent and this demotivation (feeling) is not effecting students also. Nevertheless, few of the respondents were of the opinion that the demotivation caused due to lack of organisational justice was definitely adversely affecting employees' job performance and students.

"Stress is defined as a relationship or transaction in terms of adaptation and interaction between a person and the setting or environment that can place a burden on individual well-

being and lead to psychological disorders, unhealthy conducts, and, ultimately, disease" (García-Campayo et al., 2016). The perceived injustices resulting in stress is a complex matter (Greenberg, 2004). Given the adverse effects of stress, it presses the management of an organisation to be aware of the fact that how perceived injustices may trigger a stress reaction. Greenberg further advocated that stress at the workplace can best be managed by promoting organisational justice. We also find that lack of organisational justice leads to stress and anxiety, thereby implying that stress & anxiety at the workplace can be eliminated by promoting organisational justice at the Institute.

Turnover intention is an employee's intention to leave the job from an organisation (Lee, Huang, & Zhao, 2012). In this an employee actively considers quitting the job and begins searching for other job options (Rai, 2013). Distributive justice component of organisational justice impacts turnover intentions while there is no impact of procedural justice on turnover intentions (Rai, 2013). While (Colquitt et. al., 2001) find the impact of both distributive and procedural justices on turnover intentions.

However, we find that all the components of organisational justice to a lesser or greater degree influences the turnover intentions of employees. The turnover intention element is associated with the influence of organisational justice on the organisation itself. As more and more employees intend to leave the organisation it will have a negative effect on the organisation. Similarly, organisational Silence refers to a phenomenon in which powerful forces withhold information about potential problems and issues of employees (Milliken, 2000). These forces create an environment so that the employees perceive that speaking about the problems and issues are unwise. The managers create an environment of silence because they fear negative feedback from their subordinates. Fear of employees is one of the factors that cause organisational silence (Zekeriya, 2021). Organisational silence being an outcome of the lack of organisational justice is one of the interesting outcomes of this study, in a sense that the organisational silence has not been investigated as an outcome of organisational justice in the context of developing countries like Pakistan.

The research participants of the study were of the view that the management has created an environment where employees do not speak about the problems prevailing at the Institute. They opted to remain silent on different issues for two reasons; one is that they perceive, speaking about the issues will not bear fruits as their suggestions about the problems will not be entertained and secondly, they consider it to be unwise to speak out as it may backfire and may create more problems for them.

4.6 Conclusion

At the Institute, generally there is organisational justice when it comes to grant of scholarships, procurements, admissions, hostel matters etc. but on the other hand, when it comes to the HR related matters the faculty and staff members perceive it to be unjust for different reasons. Employees of the Institute interact with each other in a cordial and respectful manner; however, there is room for improvement in the information sharing aspect. In this research presence of favoritism stands out among other elements that develop organisational justice, followed by strategic foresight, decision making ability of the management, and open communication. Besides these, there are other elements that helps develop organisational justice, these are; well defined rules and set criteria, procedural delays, knowledge about rules and regulations, rules implementation, indifference, information sharing and personality characteristics.

Additionally, presence or absence of organisational justice significantly influences demotivation, job performance, stress and anxiety, employee behaviour, employee facilitation, conflicts, organisational performance, turnover ratio and organisational silence are some of the aspects that results due to the presence or absence of organisational justice. Among all these organizational justice elements the most striking and novel outcome of the absence of organisational justice has been the organisational silence, which refers to the employee's tendency of keeping silent on issues or problems related to themselves and the others.

Appendix

Table-1 Development of Organisational Justice

S.No	Elements that develop Organisational Justice	Author's Name
1	Employee Empowerment	(Haiyan & B.eng., 2006)
2	Psychological Contract	(Haiyan & B.eng., 2006)
3	Communication	(Haiyan & B.eng., 2006), (Kanwal, 2021)
4	Ethical Leadership	(Wang et al., 2017)
5	Personality Characteristics	(Whiteside & Barclay, 2016), (Aggarwal et al., 2021)
6	Organisational Structure	(Kanwal, 2021)
7	Power Distance	(Kanwal, 2021)
8	Reward Allocation	(Kanwal, 2021)
9	Gender	(Ansari et al., 2016)

Table- 2 Outcomes of Organisational Justice

S.No	Influences of Organisational Justice	Author's Name
1.	Organizational citizenship behaviour	(Burns, 2013), (Cropanzana et al., 2007), (Iqbal et al., 2012), (Saifi & Shehzad, 2017), (Tahseen & Akhtar, 2016)
2.	Job satisfaction	(Cropanzana et al., 2007). (Vatandoust et al., 2009), (Khan et al., 2015), (Lambert et al., 2020)
3.	Job performance	(Cropanzana et al., 2007), (Clercq & Azeem, 2021), (Mehmood & Ahmad, 2016)
4.	Organisational Commitment	(Vatandoust et al., 2009), (Lambert et al., 2020), (Rahman et al.,2016), (Iqbal & Ahmad, 2016)
5.	Employee Behaviour and Attitude	(Zhang et al., 2009), (Argon, 2010)
6.	Turnover intentions	(Bakri & Ali, 2015), (Arif, 2018)
7.	Trust and mistrust feelings of employees	(Saunders & Thornhill, 2004)
8.	Job Tension	(Andrews et al., 2015)
9.	Job Security	(Leung, 2014)
10.	Organisational effectiveness	(Burns, 2013)
11.	Employee Motivation	(Argon, 2010)
12.	Personal happiness	(Guven & Guven, 2020)

S.No	Influences of Organisational Justice	Author's Name
13.	Organisational Productivity	(Imran et al., 2015)
14.	Job Dissatisfaction	(Muqadas et al., 2017)
15.	Contextual Performance	(Saboor et., al, 2018)
16.	Employees' Attitude and Behaviour	(Chen et al., 2015)

Figure 1 Organizational Justice

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.

Aggarwal, A., Nobi, K., Mittal, A., & Rastogi, S. (2021). Does personality affect the individual's perceptions of organizational justice? The mediating role of organizational politics. Benchmarking. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-08-2020-0414

Ali, S. Z., Manzoor, H., Rashid, M., & Ahmad, W. (2017). Impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical evidence from Pakistan. City University Research Journal, 7(1), 134–150.

Alvesson, M., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2012). Interviews. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (eds.) Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges, 239-258. Sage: London.

Anderson, A. R., & Warren, L. (2011). The entrepreneur as hero and jester: Enacting the entrepreneurial discourse. International Small Business Journal, 29(6), 589-609.

Andrews, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., & Kacmar, C. (2015). The Interactive Effects of Behavioral Integrity and Procedural Justice on Employee Job Tension. Journal of Business Ethics, 126(3), 371–379. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1951-4

Ansari, N., Moazzam, A., Jabeen, N., & Salman, Y. (2016). GENDER AND PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE: A STUDY OF UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB. Pakistan Journal of Women's Studies, 23(1).

Arasli, H., Arici, H. E., & Çakmakoğlu Arici, N. (2019). Workplace favouritism, psychological contract violation and turnover intention: Moderating roles of authentic leadership and job insecurity climate. German Journal of Human Resource Management, 33(3), 197–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002219839896

Argon, T. (2010). A Qualitative Study of Academicians' Views on Performance Evaluation, Motivation and Organizational Justice. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2(1), 133–180. www.iojes.net

Arif, S. (2018). Impact of organizational justice on turnover intentions: moderating role of job embeddedness. SEISENSE Journal of Management, 1(2), 34-52.

Bakri, N., & Ali, N. (2015). The impact of organizational justice on turnover intention of Bankers of KPK, Pakistan: The mediator role of organizational commitment. Asian Social Science, 11(21), 143–147. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n21p143

Bauer, W. Ma., & Gaskell, G. (2007). Qualitative Researching With Text,Image and Sound (W. Ma. Bauer & G. Gaskell (eds.); 5th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

Bies, R. J. (2005). Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct? In J.

Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), Handbook of organizational justice (pp. 85-112). Mahwah,

NJ: Erlbaum.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Z. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiations in organizations (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. Sage: London.

Burns, W. R. T. (2013). A Study of Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Student Achievement in High Schools Author. American Secondary Education, 42(1), 4–24.

Chen, S. Y., Wu, W. C., Chang, C. S., Lin, C. T., Kung, J. Y., Weng, H. C., Lin, Y. T., & Lee, S. I. (2015). Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. BMC Health Services Research, 15(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1016-8

Chiaburu, D. S., Lim, A. S., Chiaburu, D. S., & Audrey, S. (2016). Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : Manager Trustworthiness or Interactional Justice ? Predicting Organizational. Journal of Business Ethics, 83(3), 453–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/sl0551-007-9631-x

Clercq, D. De, & Azeem, M. U. (2021). Unpacking the relationship between procedural justice and job performance. 59(9), 2183–2199. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2019-1211

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a

measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386

Cremer, D. (2005). Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510571603

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Cropanzana, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. Perspectives, 21(4), 34–48. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27747410?seq=1&cid=pdf-

Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 479–516. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099

Cropanzano, R. S., Ambrose, M. L., Cropanzano, R. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2015). Organizational Justice. In The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199981410.013.1

Dağli, A., & Akyol, Z. (2019). The Relationship between Favouritism Behaviours of Secondary School Administrators and Organizational Commitment of the Teachers. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 7(7), 35. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v7i7.4191

Flick, U. (2007). Designing Qualitative Research (U. Flick (ed.); First). SAGE Publications Inc.

Fortin, M., & Fellenz, M. R. (2008). Hypocrisies of fairness: Towards a more reflexive ethical base in organizational justice research and practice. Journal of Business Ethics, 78(3), 415–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9330-z

García-Campayo, J., Puebla-Guedea, M., Herrera-Mercadal, P., & Daudén, E. (2016). Burnout syndrome and demotivation among health care personnel. Managing stressful situations: The importance of teamwork. Actas Dermo-Sifiliograficas, 107(5), 400–406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adengl.2016.03.003

Gluschkoff, K., Elovainio, M., Hintsa, T., Pentti, J., Salo, P., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2017). Organisational justice protects against the negative effect of workplace violence on teachers' sleep: A longitudinal cohort study. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 74(7), 511–516. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2016-104027

Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. Source: The Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9–22. https://about.jstor.org/terms

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16(2), 399–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208

Greenberg, J. (2004). Stress fairness to fare no stress: Managing workplace stress by promoting organizational justice. Organizational Dynamics, 33(4 SPEC.ISS.), 352–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.003

Guba, E. G., Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and Methodological Bases of Naturalistic Inquiry. 30(4), 233–252.

Guh, W. Y., Lin, S. P., Fan, C. J., & Yang, C. F. (2013). Effects of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors: Mediating effects of institutional trust and affective commitment. Psychological Reports, 112(3), 818–834. https://doi.org/10.2466/01.21.PR0.112.3.818-834

Güven, S., & Güven, B. (2020). Organizational Justice and Being a Woman; What Female Lecturers Say. International Journal of Progressive Education, 16(4), 302–311. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.268.19

Haarhaus, T., & Liening, A. (2020). Building dynamic capabilities to cope with environmental uncertainty: The role of strategic foresight. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 155(September 2019), 120033. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120033

Haiyan Zhang, B.eng., M. A. (2006). ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE [McMaster University]. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50008-9_166

Howells, J. R. L., Karatas-Ozkan, M., Yavuz, C., & Atiq, M. (2014). University management and organizational change: a dynamic institutional perspective. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 7, 251-270.

Husband, G. (2020). Ethical data collection and recognizing the impact of semi-structured interviews on research respondents. Education Sciences, 10, 206.

Husted, B. W., & Folger, R. (2004). Fairness and transaction costs: The contribution of organizational justice theory to an integrative model of economic organization. Organization Science, 15(6), 719–729. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0088

Imran, M. K., Iqbal, S. M. J., Aslam, U., & Muqqadas, F. (2018). Organizational politics and performance outcomes: Investigating the buffering effect of organizational justice. Pakistan Business Review, 20(1), 47-58.

Iqbal, H. K., Aziz, U., & Tasawar, A. (2012). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. World Applied Sciences Journal, 19(9), 1348–1354. https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.09.750

Iqbal, Q., & Ahmad, B. (2016). Organizational Justice, Trust and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Pakistan. Journal of Applied Economics and Business, 4(01), 26–43.

Jackson, N. (2019). Organizational justice in mergers and acquisitions: Antecedents and outcomes. In Organizational Justice in Mergers and Acquisitions: Antecedents and Outcomes. Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92636-0

Jacobs, G., Belschak, F. D., Hartog, D. N. Den, Journal, S., April, N., Jacobs, G., Belschak, F. D., & Hartog, D. N. Den. (2014). (Un) Ethical Behavior and Performance Appraisal : The Role of Affect , Support , and Organizational Justice. Journal of Business Ethics, 121(1), 63–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/s

Jehanzeb, K., & Mohanty, J. (2020). The mediating role of organizational commitment between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Power distance as moderator. Personnel Review, 49(2), 445–468. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2018-0327

Jiang, Z., Gollan, P. J., & Brooks, G. (2017). Relationships between organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational commitment: a cross-cultural study of China, South Korea and Australia. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28(7), 973–1004. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1128457

Kanwal, N. (2021). An investigation of Organizational Justice in Pakistan ' s higher educational institutes Kanwal , N WestminsterResearch An investigation of Organizational Justice in Pakistan ' s higher educational institutes Kanwal , N . This is an electronic version of (Issue June 2020) [University of Westminster]. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30027.31523

Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2015). Organizational Justice and Job Outcomes: Moderating Role of Islamic Work Ethic. Journal of Business Ethics, 126(2), 235–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1937-2

Kim, H. S. (2005). ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AS ANTECEDENTS OF EMPLOYEE-ORGANIZATION RELATIONSHIPS IN THE CONTEXT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE: A MULTILEVEL ANALYSIS. Graduate School of the University of Maryland.

Kouchaki, M., Smith, I. H., & Netchaeva, E. (2015). Not all fairness is created equal: Fairness perceptions of group vs. individual decision makers. Organization Science, 26(5), 1301–1315. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0992

Lambert, E. G., Keena, L. D., Leone, M., May, D., & Haynes, S. H. (2020). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment ofcorrectional staff. Social Science Journal, 57(4), 405–416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2019.02.002

Lee, C. C., Huang, S. H., & Zhao, C. Y. (2012). A study on factors affecting turnover intention of hotel empoylees. Asian Economic and Financial Review, 2(7), 866.

LEUNG, X. L. and K. (2014). What signals does procedural justice climate convey ? The roles of group status , and organizational benevolence and integrity. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35(4), 464–488. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26610910

Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The Distribution of Rewards and Resources in Groups and Organizations. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 9I, 91–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60059-3

Loi, R., & Ngo, H. Y. (2010). Mobility norms, risk aversion, and career satisfaction of Chinese employees. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 27(2), 237–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-008-9119-y

Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (9th ed.). Pearson: Harlow.

Marshall Schminke, A. A. and R. T. (2015). Ethics, Values, and Organizational Justice: Individuals, Organizations, and Beyond. Journal of Business Ethics, 130(3), 727–736. https://doi.org/10.1007/sl0551-014-2251-3

Mehmood, N., & Ahmad, U. N. B. U. (2016). Organizational Justice and Employee Performance: Evidence From Higher Education Sector in Pakistan. Jurnal Kemanusiaan, 25(2), 48–56. http://www.management.utm.my/jurnal-kemanusiaan/attachments/article/225/JK_25_02_04.pdf

Meshelski, K. (2020). Procedural Justice and Affirmative Action Author (s): Kristina Meshelski Source : Ethical Theory and Moral Practice , Vol . 19 , No . 2 (April 2016), pp . 425-443 Published by : Springer Stable URL : https://www.jstor.org/stable/24762636 Ethic Theory . 19(2), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/sl0677-015-9633-l

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). Sage: London.

Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational Silence : A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World Author (s): Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison and Frances J . Milliken Source : The Academy of Management Review , Vol . 25 , No . 4 (Oct ., 2000), pp . 706-725 Published by : Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 706–725.

Monin, P., Noorderhaven, N., Vaara, E., & Kroon, D. (2013). GIVING SENSE TO AND MAKING SENSE OF JUSTICE IN POSTMERGER INTEGRATION Author (s): PHILIPPE MONIN , NIELS NOORDERHAVEN , EERO VAARA and DAVID KROON Source : The Academy of Management Journal , Vol . 56 , No . 1 (February 2013), pp . 256-284 Published b. The Academy of Management Journal, 56(1), 256–284.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(6), 845–855. https://doi.org/10.1002/mrc.1260320406

Muqadas, F., Rehman, C. A., & Aslam, U. (2017). Organizational Justice and Employee'S Job Dissatisfaction: a Moderating Role of Psychological Empowerment. Pakistan Business Review, 18(4), 848–864. https://www.journals.iobmresearch.com/index.php/PBR/article/view/1114

Neuman, W. L. (2002). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. In J. Lasser (Ed.), Teaching Sociology (Second, Vol. 30, Issue 3). Pearson Education, Inc. https://doi.org/10.2307/3211488

Nicholls, D. (2009). Part one – Philosophies. International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation, 16(10), 526–533.

Ones, C. V. and D. S. (2002). Examining the Construct of Organizational Justice : A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Relations with Work Attitudes and Behaviors. Journal of Business Ethics, 38(3), 193–203. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25074792

Price, M. E. (2010). Free riders as a blind spot of equity theory: An evolutionary correction. In Managerial Ethics: Managing The Psychology of Morality (pp. 235–256). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203852460

Rabia Imran, Mehwish Majeed, and A. A. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice, Job Security and Job satisfaction on Organizational Productivity. Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 3(9), 840–845. https://doi.org/10.7763/joebm.2015.v3.295

Rahman, A., Shahzad, N., Mustafa, K., Khan, M. F., & Qurashi, F. (2016). Effects of organizational justice on organizational commitment. International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 6(3), 188–196.

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? International Journal of Human Sciences, 10(2), 260–284. http://library.gcu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9 h&AN=90596083&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2020). Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical and methodological (2nd ed.). Sage: London.

Robert Jones, C. S. and B. V. S. S., & Gramberg. (2013). Perceptions of college of education students in Turkey towards organizational justice, trust in administrators, and instructors. Higher

Education, 66(5), 521–533. https://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/s 10734-0 13-96 19-7

Russell Cropanzano, M. F. and, & Kirk, J. F. (2015). How do We Know When We are Treated Fairly? Justice Rules and Fairness Judgments. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 33, 279–350. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120150000033010

Saboor, A., Rehman, M., & Rehman, S. (2018). Organizational Justice and Employee Contextual Performance : the Moderating Effect of Organizational Respect. Pakistan Business Review, 19(4), 995–1011.

Saifi, I. A., & Shahzad, K. (2017). The mediating role of job satisfaction in relationship between organizational justice and employee performance. Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 11(1), 126–146.

SAUNDERS, M. N. K., LEWIS, P., & THORNHILL, A. (2019). Research Methods for Business Students. In Pearson Education Limited (Vol. 195, Issue 5). https://www.amazon.com/Research-Methods-for-Business-Students/dp/1292208783/ref=sr_1_2?dchild=1&qid=1614706531&refinements=p_27%3AAdrian+Thornhill+%2F+Philip+Lewis+%2F+Mark+N.+K.+Saunders&s=books&sr=1-2&text=Adrian+Thornhill+%2F+Philip+Lewis+%2F+Mark+N.+K

Saunders, M., & Thornhill, A. (2004). Trust and mistrust in organizations: An exploration using an organizational justice framework. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13(4), 493–515. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320444000182

Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Justice as a Dependent Variable: Subordinate Charisma as a Predictor of Interpersonal and Informational Justice Perceptions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(6), 1597–1609. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1597

Shrivastava, S., Jones, R., Selvarajah, C., & Van Gramberg, B. (2016). Organisational justice: A Senian perspective. Journal of Business Ethics, 135, 99-116.

Simon, S. K. L., John, S., & Samuel, A. (2002). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross-National Study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23(1), 1. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=792934951&Fmt=7&clientId=25620&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Slaughter, R. A. (2002). Developing and Applying Strategic Foresight.

Spence Laschinger, H. K. (2004). Hospital Nurses' Perceptions of Respect and Organizational Justice. Journal of Nursing Administration, 34(7), 354–364. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200407000-00009

Sumpter, C. (2016). S . Rajaratnam School of International Studies Report Part Title : Procedural Justice Report Title : COMMUNITY POLICING TO COUNTER VIOLENT EXTREMISM : Report Subtitle : EVIDENT POTENTIAL AND CHALLENGING REALITIES Report Author (s): Cameron Sumpter S . R. http://www.jstor.com/stable/resrep05925.6

Tahseen, N., & Akhtar, M. S. (2016). The impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior with the mediating role of trust. International Journal of Social Science Archives, 10(1), 104–121.

Vatandoust, K., Bakhshi, A. G., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment Related papers Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. International Journal of Business and Management, 4(9), 145–154.

Wang, H., Lu, G., & Liu, Y. (2017). Ethical Leadership and Loyalty to Supervisor in China: The Roles of Interactional Justice and Collectivistic Orientation. Journal of Business Ethics, 146(3), 529–543. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2916-6

Whiteside, D. B., & Barclay, L. J. (2016). The Face of Fairness: Self-Awareness as a Means to Promote Fairness among Managers with Low Empathy. Journal of Business Ethics, 137(4), 721–730. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2357-7

Ybema, J. F., van der Meer, L., & Leijten, F. R. M. (2016). Longitudinal Relationships Between Organizational Justice, Productivity Loss, and Sickness Absence Among Older Employees. International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 23(5), 645–654. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-016-9546-y

Yilmaz, K., & Altinkurt, Y. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice, organizational

trust and organizational citizenship behaviors in secondary schools in turkey. Advances in Educational Administration, 13, 223–248. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3660(2012)0000013014

Zekeriya, N. A. S. (2021). Factors Affecting the Organizational Silence of Academics Employed at the Universities in Pakistan. Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler …, 9(1), 9–27. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/anemon/issue/60335/674992

Zhang, L., Nie, T., & Luo, Y. (2009). Matching organizational justice with employment modes. Journal of Technology Management in China, 4(2), 180–187. https://doi.org/10.1108/17468770910965028