

Examining the Role of Organizational Justice in Predicting Teachers' Performance in Public and Private Schools

Athar Hussain*
Syed Zubair Haider**

Abstract

Organizational Justice (OJ) is a crucial component of organizational success. For employees' better performance, organizations need to be fair in their system regarding Distributive Justice (DJ), Procedural Justice (PJ), and Interactional Justice (IJ). The present research, therefore, is an attempt to analyze the role of OJ in predicting teachers' performance (TP) in public and private schools in Punjab. This study based on the gathered data from public (620) and private (400) schools' teachers working in 9 districts of Punjab. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) was utilized in this study to collect data from teachers. The descriptive and inferential statistics were applied on the collected data. The study findings revealed that among the three aspects of OJ, the perception of PJ and IJ in public teachers, and perception of PJ singly in private teachers had substantial positive influence on TP. Thus, PJ had been the best predictor of TP. However, it was noticed that DJ has no substantial effect on TP from both sectors.

Keywords: Organizational justice, teacher performance, private schools, public schools, school education

Introduction

In current era, injustice is the main problem of many organizations. To solve the issue of injustice in organizations, many educationists and social scientist identified and described the importance of OJ as a significant instrument for the effective functioning of organizations. Justice system also determined the fitness and efficiency of the social institutions (Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009). From last 30 years, the concept of OJ has received tremendous attention from researchers and it has become extensively studied area specifically in the field of organizational behaviour, management and organizational psychology (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). It is a key factor associated with the success of every organization (Ayobami & Eugene, 2013). Greenberg (1986) was the first person who introduced this term for the proper

* Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, R.Y.Khan Campus, Pakistan

**Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan, E-mail: zubairiub@hotmail.com

and morally correct dealing of employees. It is also regarded as an individual's feeling regarding fair dealing at workplace (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006). When the employees are rewarded same for their true contribution, struggles and work performed for organization, they displayed satisfaction, sense of belonging and commitment towards organization.

Moorman (1991) believed that OJ is employees' feeling concerning right treatment and fair dealing in their job tasks and the willingness that influence the various job-related issues within organizations. Kim (2009) argued that when employees perceived that they were treated fairly by their organization, they likely to build and sustain mutual associations with the organization. Fairness in the organizational policies, distribution, procedures, and interaction motivates employees and they reciprocate better response to the organization (in the form of positive attitude and increased productivity (Ayobami & Eugene, 2013). Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland (2007), found that OJ has the impending to generate benefits and important resources for organizations and increasing justice in organizations resulted improved outcomes from employees.

In general, OJ is divided into three main facets of DJ, PJ and IJ. Alsalem and Alhaiani (2007) define DJ as the employees' feeling of fair distribution of rewards within an organization. This dissemination of rewards can be based on parity, performance and necessity of employees, whereas in many cases, people decide the impartiality by comparing outcome with other people at workplace. Greenberg (1990) stated that employees' perception of justice in resources sharing developed on the basis of employees' generated output matched with anticipated involvement. Actually, the equity theory presented by Adams (1963) lays foundation for these descriptions. He argued that within an organization the perception of equivalence was developed by comparing the contributions and outcomes of all other people. Moreover, if the feeling of fairness found, the workforce feels committed and satisfied. According to equity theory, if people notice that their performance and involvement ratio are lesser than the outcomes they obtained from the organization, they embarrassed and tried to work hard. While those who highly contribute but rewarded less become demotivated.

Various studies identified that the mechanism of reward distribution used by different organizations is more important as compared to the outcomes itself and display a steady deviation of significance from distributive to PJ. The idea of PJ was evolved from the theory of Thibaut and Walker (1975) which is considered indispensable for employees' exploration and preparation. The PJ is regarded a fairness situation of organizational procedures. Posthuma et al. (2007) define PJ as people perceived fairness concerning procedures, processes, dealings and rules that help to control organizational matters. It is believed that commitment and satisfaction is a function of procedures not only rewards. Bayles (2012) described that giving

importance to employees' voice, objectivity in actions and fair decision making are regarded as the true notion of PJ. Similarly, impartiality in decision-making process, honesty of administration, and justice with workforce are also considered necessary for organizations to increase PJ.

Furthermore, the third important component of OJ is known as IJ. Initially, the idea was first introduced by Bies and Moag (1986) for the inter-personal behaviour and the conduct that employees received when different procedures of organizations implemented. It is based on various standards expressing the collective feelings of employees and indulgent, particularly, when the workforce within the organization was treated with respect, pride and care by their management. Moreover, the in-depth studies in the area of IJ identified two more parts, named as informational justice and interactional justice (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The first one deals with level of treatment such as courtesy, respect and care that an employee received from management whereas, the second one emphasized on the level of communication within organization or the information communicated to the workforce that what was the reason of adopting this specific procedure and why this mechanism of reward distribution was implemented.

Many researchers indicated that the prevalence of fairness within organization helps to increase employees' commitment and performance. Performance is regarded as collective behaviour related to particular assignment of an individual which he/she performs. It is the outcome of work, and has a direct positive relationship with employees' satisfaction, organizational goals, commitment and economic growth. As'ad (1995) described that task performance is a state of success and attainment achieved by people at workplace. Furthermore, psychologists describe performance as an explicit factor linked with a single individual, and considered it anything associated with a person or the thing a single person performs. It is also regarded as a state in which work related quality is achieved by an individual. The effectiveness of education sector relies largely upon how workforce is encouraged, developed and endowed with favourable atmosphere to accomplish their tasks.

Many studies have identified the linkages between perceived OJ and employees' performance. Yasar et al. (2014) believed that fairness perception within the organization enhances organizational profitability and employees' performance. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) depicted that OJ influences employees' performance and when employees perceived justice in an organization, they get motivated to do something better for the organization. Buluc and Gunes (2014) expressed that the employees' perceived OJ play a significant role in fulfilling the aims, organizational performance and quality. When the performance and efficiency of educational institutions are taken into consideration, it is known that OJ is very important idea. Efang et al. (2015) identified a substantial positive relationship among

OJ and work performance of college lecturers. Bauer and Liang (2003) argued that when individuals perceive that fair procedures and rules are followed in judging their performance, they likely to demonstrate in a better way. It is highly recommended that the idea of OJ and TP must be examined within diverse situations and cultural and influence of OJ on job performance should be explored. However, the studies were usually conducted in developed countries. Nevertheless, in Punjab, very few studies were performed to identify this important issue. Therefore, the current research is an attempt to provide information base by filling this knowledge-gap by examining role of OJ in predicting TP in Punjab.

Materials and Methods

This study examines the role of OJ in predicting TP. As, the study is quantitative in nature. So, quantitative research paradigm following descriptive design, and survey method was used which is the most frequently used technique for data collection (Haider & Qureshi, 2016). Descriptive research is also considered suitable for studying the current situation.

Participants

The sampling process of the study was based on four phases. Firstly, 9 districts (Bahawalpur, Rawalpindi, Dera Ghazi Khan, Kasur, Vehari, Gujrat, Okara, Mianwali and Jhang) of Punjab province were selected randomly out of total 36 districts. Secondly, 12 public and 12 private secondary schools (6 boys and 6 girls each) were conveniently selected from each district. Total 108 public secondary schools (54 male and 54 female) and 108 private secondary schools (54 male and 54 female) were selected. Thirdly, 07 SSTs from public and 05 SSTs from private secondary schools were purposively selected. Total 756 SSTs from public and 540 SSTs from private high schools were finally selected. Fourthly, the 9th class students' results (2017), who taught by already selected SSTs, were taken from their respective boards as a measure of TP. Total 756 public and 540 private SSTs were contacted to complete the questionnaire. Resultantly, 625 public and 406 private SSTs returned the completed questionnaires. After a thorough review, we rejected uncompleted questionnaires. Finally, a total of 620 public and 400 private SSTs' responses were found suitable representing a response rate of 82.01% and 74.04% respectively.

Measures

Niehoff and Moorman (1993) OJS was used to gauged the SSTs' reflections regarding fairness in their institutions. After getting authors' permission, the scale was modified to make it suitable for the study. The scale measured three components of OJ. The DJ was measured by 04 items (public $\alpha = 0.79$, private $\alpha = 0.84$), PJ was measured by 05 items (public $\alpha = 0.86$, private $\alpha = 0.81$), and IJ was measured by 06 items (public $\alpha = 0.90$, private $\alpha = 0.88$) respectively. The questionnaire was based on four-point

Likert scale for measuring responses and administrated in Urdu, with questions first translated into Urdu and then back translated to English to minimize the possibility of meaning being lost. Data related to students' marks were collected through students' data noting sheet (SDNS) specifically designed to record the students' marks by obtaining their enrollments' data from their respective schools and BISEs.

Table 1
Description of the Respondents

Characteristics of respondents	Category	Public		Private	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All		620		400	
Average Age		40 Years		27.1 Years	
Average Experience		15.5 Years		4 Years	
Gender	Men	307	49.4	190	47.4
	Women	313	50.6	210	52.6
Location	Urban	314	50.7	210	52.6
	Rural	306	49.3	190	47.4
Job Status	Permanent	519	83.7	123	30.9
	Contractual	101	16.3	277	69.1
Acad. Qual.	B.A./B.Sc.	80	12.9	120	29.9
	M.A./M.Sc.	451	72.8	240	60.1
	M.Phil.	59	9.4	20	4.9
	Ph.D.	2	0.3	0	0.0
	MCS/BS (IT)	28	4.5	20	5.0
Prof. Qual.	No	7	1.1	154	38.4
	B.Ed.	264	42.7	202	50.4
	M.Ed.	344	55.4	40	10.2
	M.A.	4	0.6	4	1.0
	Education.				
	MS.Ed	1	0.2	0	0.0

In the current study, the data comprised of 620 public and 400 private SSTs' responses (see Table 1). For teachers the average age was 40 years and 27.1 years respectively. The average experience of public teachers was 15.5 years and experience of private teachers was 4 years. There were 307 men (49.4%) and 313 women (50.6%) public teachers and 190 men (47.4%) and 210 women (52.6%) private teachers. Majority of public 314 (50.7%) and private 211 (52.6%) teachers reported their school location as urban schools. The majority of the public teachers 519 (83.7%) were permanent and 101 (16.3%) were contractual, whereas in private, majority of teachers 277 (69.1%) were contractual and 123 (30.1%) were permanent. From the perspective

of academic qualification, both public and private teachers cover whole range. Majority of public teachers reported their professional qualification as M.Ed 344 (55.4%) and B.Ed 264 (42.7%). Whilst in private teachers, the share of teachers who had B.Ed degree 202 (50.4%) and no professional degree 154 (38.4%) was relatively high.

Results

In this study, we mainly focus on OJ and its effect on teachers' job performance. Initially, we calculate the basic descriptive statistics of measures. Next, we examined how the OJ explains the level of teachers' job performance with a hierarchical regression analysis.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice

Items	Public		Private	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Distributive Justice</i>				
1. My working hours are rational	3.02	.76	2.87	.87
2. I received market-based pay	2.61	.90	1.96	.96
3. I received moderately reasonable rewards	2.77	.98	2.65	.89
4. My work responsibilities are justified	3.20	.70	3.07	.82
Mean Score	2.89	.44	2.63	.68
<i>Procedural Justice</i>				
1. Principal allocates work duties equitably	3.02	.84	2.58	.89
2. In taking decisions, Principal keeps in mind employee's concerns	3.03	.8	2.38	1.11
3. Principal clarifies decisions for employee's satisfaction	3.14	.74	2.9	.84
4. Work decisions are equally implemented to all workforce	2.97	.81	2.8	.83
5. If an Employee is not satisfied, he / she may launch an appeal against decisions	3.09	.84	2.38	1.16
Mean Score	3.04	.49	2.60	.71
<i>Interactional Justice</i>				
When decisions are taken about my job....				
1. Principal fairly and sympathetically treats me	3.26	.75	3.03	.8
2. Principal gives me reverence	3.2	.78	2.96	.85
3. Principal worries for my personal requirements	2.76	.89	2.41	.84
4. Principal truthfully treats me	3.26	.69	3	.79
5. Principal converses with me the consequences of decisions	2.83	.83	2.8	.85
6. Principal justly expresses the decisions	2.98	.86	2.7	.84
Mean Score	3.04	.51	2.81	.60

The results express mean and SD of every question on DJ, PJ and IJ (See Table 2). Average value ($M = 2.89$, $SD = .44$) of public SSTs in comparison with private SSTs

($M = 2.63$, $SD = .68$) clearly demonstrate that teachers of public schools are more agreed and satisfied concerning DJ. Similarly, the SSTs of private schools are also somewhat satisfied and agreed with benefits and compensations that they received in institutions. Moreover, regarding PJ, the average value ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .49$) of public SSTs was again higher than private ($M = 2.60$, $SD = .71$) demonstrating higher level of satisfaction of public teachers with organizational procedures. Similarly, the high average value ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .51$) of public SSTs as compared to private teachers ($M = 2.81$, $SD = .60$) evidently showed that the teachers of public schools are highly satisfied and agreed regarding IJ.

Table 3
Pearson Correlations for Dimensions of Organizational Justice and Teachers' Performance

	M	SD	1	2	3	4
<i>Public</i>						
1. DJ	2.90	.45	–			
2. PJ	3.05	.50	.34**	–		
3. IJ	3.05	.52	.28**	.58**	–	
4. Teachers' Performance	51.85	10.16	.12*	.16*	.19**	–
<i>Private</i>						
1. DJ	2.64	.69	–			
2. PJ	2.61	.72	.77**	–		
3. IJ	2.82	.61	.79**	.81**	–	
4. Teachers' Performance	45.28	8.87	.32**	.28**	.45**	–

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 3, reveals the Mean score, SD and relationship (correlation) between the variables of the study. In dataset of public SSTs, association among DJ and PJ, $r = .34$, $p < .01$, and DJ and IJ is positive and significant, $r = .28$, $p < .01$. The correlation is also positive and significant between PJ and IJ, $r = .58$, $p < .01$. Moreover, teachers' performance also has positive and significant correlation with DJ, $r = .12$, $p < .05$, PJ, $r = .16$, $p < .05$, and IJ, $r = .19$, $p < .01$. Likewise, in dataset of private SSTs, the relationship between DJ and PJ, $r = .77$, $p < .01$, and DJ and IJ is positive and significant, $r = .79$, $p < .01$. The correlation is also positive and significant between PJ and IJ, $r = .81$, $p < .01$. Furthermore, teachers' performance also has positive and substantial association with DJ, $r = .32$, $p < .01$, PJ, $r = .28$, $p < .01$, and IJ, $r = .45$, $p < .01$.

Table 4

Teachers' Perceived Organizational Justice – Background Variables Comparison

Variable	Organizational Justice (Public)		Organizational Justice (Private)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Gender				
Male	3.00	0.39	2.53	0.65
Female	3.02	0.40	2.82	0.53
t	t (618) = -.601, Sig = .548		t (398) = -4.78, Sig = .000	
Location				
Urban	3.03	0.36	2.79	0.57
Rural	2.99	0.42	2.57	0.63
t	t (618) = 1.399, Sig = .162		t (398) = 3.604, Sig = .000	
Job Status				
Permanent	3.01	0.40	2.78	0.60
Contractual	2.98	0.38	2.67	0.62
t	t (618) = .808, Sig = .419		t (398) = 1.993, Sig = .047	
Acad. Qual.				
B.A./B.Sc.	3.09	0.38	2.66	0.55
M.A./M.Sc.	3.01	0.38	2.74	0.65
M.Phil.	2.94	0.44	2.39	0.77
Ph.D.	2.67	0.47	2.80	0.53
F	F (4, 615) = 1.736, Sig = .124		F (4, 395) = 2.242, Sig = .044	
Prof. Qual.				
NO	3.13	0.41	2.66	0.62
B.Ed.	3.04	0.41	2.77	0.63
M.Ed.	2.99	0.38	2.47	0.57
M.A. Education	2.77	0.50	3.05	0.10
F	F (4, 615) = 1.273, Sig = .279		F (4, 395) = 3.286, Sig = .021	

Inferential statistics (t-test and ANOVA) were used to find out effects of background characteristics as independent variables and teachers' perceived OJ as dependent variable (See table 4). The results indicate no substantial variance among male and female public SSTs concerning OJ, $t(618) = -.601$, $p = .548$. Whereas, difference is high among private male ($M = 2.53$, $SD = .65$) and female ($M = 2.82$, $SD = .53$) SSTs $t(398) = -4.781$, $p = .000$. The residence wise analysis again describe no major difference between public SSTs of urban area and rural area concerning OJ, $t(618) = 1.399$, $p = .162$. Whereas, major variance was found concerning OJ in private SSTs among urban ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .57$) and rural ($M = 2.57$, $SD = .63$), $t(398) = 3.604$, $p = .000$. Similarly, again no significant difference was found among permanent and

contractual public SSTs concerning OJ, $t(618) = .808, p = .419$. However, in case of permanent ($M = 2.78, SD = .60$) and contractual ($M = 2.65, SD = .62$) private SSTs, the difference is again significant regarding OJ, $t(398) = 1.993, p = .047$. Moreover, academic, $F(4,616) = 1.736, p = .124$, and professional qualification of public teachers regarding OJ, $F(4,615) = 1.273, p = .279$ have no significant difference. Whereas, in private SSTs, the difference for academic, $F(4,395) = 2.242, p = .044$ and professional qualification $F(4,395) = 3.286, p = .021$ was found significant for OJ.

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Performance of Public-School Teachers' as Dependent Variable

Predictors	Step 1 β (t)	Step 2 β (t)	Step 3 β (t)
Distributive Justice	-.012 (-.298)	.013 (.304)	.009 (.200)
Procedural Justice		.074* (1.724)	.100*** (1.967)
Interactional Justice			.048** (1.859)
Model R ²	0.030	0.129	0.146
ΔR^2	=	0.09	0.05
Model F	0.089	1.530*	1.326***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Considering the public-school teachers' performance as a dependent variable, the impact of OJ dimensions as predictors were investigated (See Table 5). The first model involves the single variable that is, DJ, as predictor of teachers' performance. The DJ did not significantly associate to SSTs' performance in public schools. However, after the inclusion of PJ at second step, the amount of explained variance in teachers' performance increases by .9% to an overall level of 12.9%. Therefore, it showed that PJ explained considerable variance in dependent variable. Moreover, inclusion of IJ as a predictor variable in third step yielded a little change in the amount of variance explained in teachers' performance. Step 3 shows that a unit increase in PJ ($\beta = .100, p < .001$) will bring 10% increase in TP while value of R^2 (.146) indicate a small-size influence of all justice components on the performance of public SSTs. The results revealed the major contribution of PJ and IJ in describing variances in TP $F(3, 617) = 1.326, p < .001$).

Table 6
Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Performance of Private School Teachers' as Dependent Variable

Predictors	Step 1 β (t)	Step 2 β (t)	Step 3 β (t)
Distributive Justice	.053* (1.207)	.141 (1.788)	.116 (1.316)
Procedural Justice		.169* (2.135)	.201** (2.162)
Interactional Justice			0.064 (.664)
Model R ²	0.040	0.119	0.152
Δ R ²	=	0.07	0.03
Model F	1.043*	2.302*	1.679**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Considering the private school teachers' performance as a dependent variable, the impact of OJ dimensions as predictors were investigated (See Table 6). The first model examined, involves the single variable only, that is, DJ, as predictors of teachers' performance. The DJ found to be significantly related to teachers' performance. After inclusion of PJ at second step, the amount of explained variance in teachers' performance increases by 7% to an overall level of 11.9%. Therefore, it showed that PJ explained small variance in dependent variable. The inclusion of IJ as a predictor variable in the third step yielded a negligible change in the amount of variance explained in teachers' performance. Step 3 in Table 6 shows that a unit increase in the PJ ($\beta = .201$, $p < .01$) will bring 20.1% increase in TP. However, value of R² (.152) shows small-size influence of all justice facets on performance of private SSTs. The results reveal that t-value is only significant for PJ (2.162) in step 3. It demonstrates major contribution of PJ in explaining variance in teachers' performance, $F(3, 397) = 1.679$, $p < .01$.

Discussion and Conclusion

The educational situation of Pakistan clearly demonstrates that teachers, the main elements of change, faced many problems during the deliverance of their responsibilities. A number of studies reported that various factors affect TP in schools and OJ is also among these variables that influence TP in public and private institutions. Present research is an effort to examine the role of OJ in predicting TP. According to the results of the study, thee SSTs of public schools are more satisfied regarding DJ at

their workplace. They expressed that benefits which they received from their schools are justified and reasonable however the SSTs of private schools are less agreed and satisfied with the compensation offered to them by their schools. Likewise, public school teachers are temperately satisfied with procedures used to deal the employees in schools. Furthermore, they argued that the procedures used by school management are generally fair and transparent but SSTs of private schools are again not much agreed with PJ regarding his issue. They expressed that their management do not involve them in decision making process. Furthermore, SSTs of public schools are moderately and SSTs of private schools are slightly agreed with IJ at workplace. In general, we may argue that both public and private teachers perceived moderate and little fairness in schools.

The results of gender-wise analysis also indicated that teachers of public schools did not vary expressively concerning OJ. This finding is similar to Al-Zu'bi (2010) who reported no major differentiation among perceptions of male and female respondents' regarding OJ. Similarly, findings of Ghodsian and Mehdizadeh (2015) also explored no substantial variation among administrations' insight regarding OJ and TP in terms of sex separation. The findings of Heidari et al. (2012) also in line with findings of this research and indicated no significant difference between dimensions of justice based on gender, academic level, work experience and education. Ahmadzadeh et al. (2012) reported no substantial association among respondents' gender, education level and perception of OJ. However, a sizeable difference was noticed in private male and female SSTs concerning OJ. High average score of female SSTs identified that females have positive perception about OJ and, they are looking more satisfied and agreed regarding prevalence of OJ in their institutions as compared to males. Moreover, Kniveton (2004) argued that males give more importance to money and monetary benefits while females give importance to relish the work. In the same way, Brockner and Adsit (1986) noticed that males always showed very high concern in matters of DJ as compared to women.

Correspondingly, location-wise analysis revealed that public SSTs from urban areas and rural areas schools do not vary meaningfully in terms of OJ. On other hand, private SSTs from urban and rural schools vary substantially concerning OJ. In both public and private sector schools, a high average value of urban SSTs indicated high satisfaction level with regards to OJ than rural teachers. Moreover, in permanent and contractual public-school teachers, the observation regarding OJ also does not vary in substantial terms. However, it varies substantially in Private SSTs. Overall, high average value of permanent teachers revealed the high satisfaction level of permanent teachers regarding OJ in their institutions as compared to private SSTs. For teachers of public schools, the study results also expressed an insignificant difference among teachers' academic level and perceived OJ. These findings of this study are also in line

with the results of Al-Zu'bi (2010) who reported no major association among individuals' perception of OJ and academic qualification. Whereas, in our study, the findings are significant for private SSTs. Moreover, for public SSTs, the influence of teachers' professional qualification was also not substantial regarding OJ. This situation further explored that SSTs having M.A Education, M.Ed, B.Ed or no professional qualification did not put any meaningful effect on OJ. But in our study, the effect of professional qualification regarding OJ was found in private SSTs.

This study results, primarily confirm the findings of various previous researches that studied the OJ in connection with many other vital factors and TP (Allen & Meyer, 1990). According to the results of the hierarchical regression, the role of PJ in both public and private datasets was more vibrant in explaining teachers' performance. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) indicated that among the three dimensions of OJ, PJ is the key determinant of employees' performance. The findings of Ahmed (2010) also described the significant impact of DJ and PJ on TP. Likewise, results of Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) are also very similar with the results of our study. In the current study, PJ and IJ in public teachers and PJ in private teachers emerged as the main contributing factors. Wang et al. (2010) identified that among the three facets of OJ, IJ is the most important predictor of employee performance.

The study findings are also similar with the results of Abasi et al. (2014) who expressed main positive effect of OJ on the employees' performance. In their meta-analysis, Colquitt et al. (2001) also revealed a little impact of OJ components on employees' performance. Similarly, Yasar et al. (2014) also explained that high level of OJ within an organization, also increase the probability of better employees' performance and ensure high organizational profitability. According to the results of the current study, it is believed that taking measures that will enhance teachers' performance, particularly emphasizing OJ in schools, will be helpful. Yavuz (2010) identified that if teachers' have positive perception of OJ in school, this will enhance their commitment to their organization and increase their performance. Thus, it may be valuable to improve practices of DJ, PJ and IJ in schools and, school administration should try to find various ways to promote justice that contributes overall employees' performance.

References

- Abasi, E., Mohammadipour, R., & Aidi, M. (2014). An Investigation of the Impact of Organizational Justice Dimensions on Job Satisfaction (Case Study: An Iranian Bank). *Universal Journal of Management*, 2(3), 132-137.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Wage inequities, productivity and work quality. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 3(1), 9-16.

- Ahmadzadeh Mashinchi, S., Yaghoubi, E., Ahmadi, E., Hadi, A., & Hamid, E. (2012). An analysis of correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(3), 995-1002.
- Ahmed, R. (2010). *Direct and interactive effects of organizational justice and perceptions of politics on personal and organizational outcomes*. International Islamic University, Islamabad.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Alsalem, M., & Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between organizational justice and employees performance. *Aledari*, 108, 97-110.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
- As'ad, M. (1995). Psikologi industri. *Yogyakarta: Liberty*.
- Ayobami, A. P., & Eugene, O. O. (2013). Impact of Perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment of a Food and Beverage Firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 3(14), 207-218.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), p145.
- Bauer, K. W., & Liang, Q. (2003). The effect of personality and precollege characteristics on first-year activities and academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 277-290.
- Bayles, M. (2012). *Procedural justice: Allocating to individuals* (Vol. 10): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.
- Brockner, J., & Adsit, L. (1986). The moderating impact of sex on the equity-satisfaction relationship: A field study. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(4), 585.

- Buluc, B., & Gunes, A. M. (2014). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment in primary schools. *Anthropologist, 18*(1), 145-152.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of applied psychology, 86*(3), 425.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 34*-48.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 12*, 317-372.
- Efanga, S. I., Aniedi, M. O., & Gomiluk, O. I. (2015). Organizational Justice and Job Performance of Lecturers in Federal Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *American International Journal of Social Science, 4*(1), 111-117.
- Fernandes, C., & Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management research news, 29*(11), 701-712.
- Folger, R. G., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management* (Vol. 7): sage publications.
- Ghodsian, F., & Mehdizadeh, A. H. (2015). The relationship between managers' organizational Justice and performance of first-grade high school Teachers in Tehran, Iran. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, 5*(3), 463-470.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of applied psychology, 71*(2), 340.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of applied psychology, 75*(5), 561.
- Haider, S. Z., & Qureshi, A. (2016). Are All Children Equal? Causative Factors of Child Labour in Selected Districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 5*(1), 3-10.
- Heidari, M., Rajaeepoor, S., Davoodi, S. M. R., & Bozorgzadeh, N. (2012). Investigating the Relationship Between Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Teachers of Abadeh. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 18*(1), 113-122.

- Kim, H. (2009). Integrating organizational justice into the relationship management theory. Retrieved from [Online] Available: <http://www.allacademic.com>.
- Kniveton, B. (2004). The influences and motivations on which students base their choice of career. *Research in Education*, 72(1), 47-59.
- 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.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Posthuma, R. A., Nabatchi, T., Blomgren Bingham, L., & Good, D. H. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: A six-factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(2), 148-174.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Wang, X., Liao, J., Xia, D., & Chang, T. (2010). The impact of organizational justice on work performance: Mediating effects of organizational commitment and leader-member exchange. *International Journal of manpower*, 31(6), 660-677.
- Yasar, M. F., Emhan, A., & Ebere, P. (2014). Analysis of Organizational Justice, Supervisor Support, and Organizational Commitment: A Case Study of Energy Sector in Nigeria *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly* 5(3), 37-46.
- Yavuz, M. (2010). The effects of teachers' perception of organizational justice and culture on organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management* 4(5), 695-701.