

DETRIMENTAL CAUSES AND
CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL
INJUSTICE IN THE WORKPLACE:
EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC SECTOR
ORGANIZATIONS

Ahmad Raza Bilal¹, Noreen Rafi² and Sumaira Khalid³

Abstract

This study investigated the causes of organizational injustice and how this influences employees' job outcomes in public sector organizations in Pakistan. Two models were constructed and analyzed to fulfill the research goals. Data were obtained using a simple random sampling technique. Of the sample, 254 employees of public sector organizations filled out self-administered questionnaires. Multiple regression was applied to test direct proposed hypotheses. To evaluate the organizational injustice's indirect effect on organizational performance due to employees' job dissatisfaction, the mediation test of Preacher and Hayes (2004) was applied. The results showed that organizational injustice negatively impacts affective commitment and perceived organizational performance. Moreover, job dissatisfaction impacts the relationship in organizational injustice, perceived organizational performance and affective commitment.

Keywords: Organizational injustice, Job dissatisfaction, Affective commitment, Perceived organizational performance

JEL Classification: K310

1&3- Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan

2- Virtual University of Pakistan

Introduction

In uncertain, increasingly competitive global business environments, an organization's primary focus is recruiting, managing, retaining and training intellectual professionals who contribute to enhance the organizational performance (Muqadas, Rehman, Aslam, Rahman, 2017). The economic recession, decrease in foreign investment, war and terrorism, political influence in organizations, target killing, and increase in unemployment rate in Pakistan are major reasons of injustice and loss of intellectual and technical personnel (Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017; Aslam, Ilyas, Imran, & Rahman, 2016).

Parker and Kohlmeyer (2005) investigated the negative impact of perceived discrimination on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. There is a link within reward and performance in public sector organizations, so public sector employees tend to identify injustice in their jobs based on their perception of unfair treatment (Aslam, Arfeen, Mohti, & Rahman, 2015; Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002). Employees who perceive unfair treatment may start complaining about or protesting against the perceived injustice. In addition, unfair treatment has a negative impact on employees' work performance. These employees may become dissatisfied with their jobs, call in sick, show lower levels of commitment, and ultimately, they may seek to leave the organization (Aslam et al., 2016; Aslam, Mohti, Imran, & Arfeen, 2015). The management of public sector organization may be unable to provide employees with the resources they need to perform their jobs effectively. In addition public sector organizations are disrespectful to their employees and assign them additional responsibilities without a reward, leading to job dissatisfaction, which has a negative effect on affective commitment and perceived organizational performance (Aslam et al., 2015; Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017).

As compare with, when employees experience of better remuneration, promotional and medical benefits, they are more committed and satisfied with their jobs. Palaiologos, Papazekos, and Panayotopoulou (2011) also have explored that the standards of performance appraisal systems and its implementation should be lined up with employee's competencies, skills, attitudes, and goals to enhance their job satisfaction. Public sector organizations also rarely link rewards and performance due to political pressure, the personal feelings of authority figures, and the previous practices. Furthermore, employees having adequate ability forcefully moved more quickly to those departments that are overloaded with work, which ultimately causes to job dissatisfaction and decreased employees' commitment. According to Greenberg and Alge (1998), due to human resource as hot issue, organizational justice has gained prime importance to investigate the reasons of negativity in the workplace.

Many studies carefully weighed organizational injustice to be a stressor and found that it negatively impacts on the capability of employees to satisfy with work required (Cope et al., 2010; Vermunt & Steensma, 2001; Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017; Maslach & Leiter, 2008). Employees who are treated in an unfair way may have higher level of job dissatisfaction and turnover intention, which lead to higher replacement cost as the selecting, hiring, directing, and training cost of new employees (Aslam, Rehman, & Imran 2016; Sulu, Ceylan & Kaynak, 2010; Hinkin & Tracey, 2000).

Erudite, dedicated and enthusiastic employees must possess transactional motives, such as timely promotions, pay and annual appraisals. However, dedicated and erudite employees in public sector organizations of Pakistan are rewarded at the same level as average employees, on the basis of seniority, which results in organizational injustice. In addition, audit inquiries for procedural irregularities, especially when employees are overloaded; few opportunities for promotion; and no annual increases or awards due to procedural

mistakes may result in organizational injustice, which may accelerate the occurrence of adverse job outcomes (Shan *et al.*, 2015).

However it is very significant to recruit and retain employees having emotional attachments to the organization and ready to perform beyond the organization's expectations. Still, in Pakistan's public sector organizations, during recruitment process, favoritism and nepotism are prevailed which results in procedural injustice (Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017; Aslam *et al.*, 2016; Aslam *et al.*, 2015). Further, due to the personal feelings of authority figures, dedicated and knowledgeable employees may not be rewarded for internal positions or transfers, which may have negative influence on their job outcomes. Due to lack of balance and harmony, it is very tough to get effective information about career development and short term benefits for employees in public sector organizations. Moreover, subordinates e.g., grade-IV employees, are perceived as functional head's personal secretaries, which leads to feelings of disgrace in subordinates. Greenberg (2006) stated that mistreatment from authority figures leads to psychological distress and adversely affects self-esteem and status.

Most previous studies found that organizational justice or fairness had important impact on employees' job satisfaction, performance, attitudes, and intention to stay with the organization (Fields, Pang, & Chiu, 2000; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Shan *et al.*, 2015). Although there is rare recent literature available that investigates how organizational injustice impacts job outcomes and job dissatisfaction. This study is conducted to reveal the impact of organizational injustice on perceived organizational performance and affective commitment.

Literature Review

Researchers argued that in developing countries employees confront serious economic as well as sociopolitical challenges that have adverse impact on job outcomes (Muqadas et al., 2017; Muqadas, Ilyas, & Aslam, 2016; Shan et al., 2015). Pakistan's Public sector organizations face several challenges, including reorganization, deregulation, technological change, downsizing, and privatization, that scholars can use to evaluate the perception of injustice between employers and employees. Due to the prevalence of privatization and downsizing, most organizations recruit the temporary workforce, which may decrease the employees' commitment and they may perceive the injustice (Sims, 1994; Rousseau, 1995). Public sector organization employees expect fair appraisals, consistent increases in their incentives (i.e., financial or non-financial), employees' participation in the process of decision making, fair treatment, trust in employees and reward distribution, and effective information sharing about career. Conversely, employers seek to reduce costs may delay in increasing the financial and non-financial incentives. These employers may also expect more patience for ambiguity and value rigid direction and control of the management.

Organizational justice is mostly researched in organizational behavior, management and applied psychology (Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017; Parker & Kohlmeyer, 2005). Greenberg (1987) had introduced the organizational justice term for performance evaluation, that managers should be aware of injustice while completing performance evaluations. Justice is the foundation for retaining loyal employees and ensures a healthy work environment for organizational members (Aslam et al., 2016; Aslam et al., 2015). Justice benefits individuals, organizations, and society. The current study defines organizational injustice as the employees' belief or perception about the manager or employers' unfairness (Ambrose et al., 2002). Past studies have explored the three types of organizational injustice i.e.,

procedural injustice, distributive injustice, and interactional injustice (Robbins, Ford & Tetrick, 2012; Cropanzano & Wright, 2010). Distributive injustice refers to a process where unfair means are used to allocate the results across workers/employees and they don't receive their expected outcomes, especially when they compared their outcomes to the other employees with same job description (Ford and Huang, 2014). Interactional injustice occurs when employees receive inadequate information and interpersonal mistreatment from management.

It is evidenced that improvements in rewards system and increases in respect can have a positive impact on perception of fairness of employees (Shan et al., 2015). Scholars have identified the significance of organizational justice, which increases organizational commitment and trust, improves citizenship behavior and performance, increases customer satisfaction, and minimizes organizational conflicts (Cropanzana, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). As few studies explained that if in an organization, interaction justice is relatively high, the detrimental effect of distributive and procedural justice can be lessened (Goldman, 2003; Cropanzano et al., 2007). Unjust promotion, recognition practices, selection of unproductive personnel, limited opportunities for career development, and weak interpersonal relationships are negatively influenced on organizational performance and employee commitment.

Previous research has explored significance of employer-employee relationships by relating the organizational justice to employee's satisfaction, job outcomes, employees' attitudes commitment, and intention to stay (Fields et al., 2000, Cropanzano, 2007; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Alsam, Rehman, & Imran 2016). Procedural justice is considered an important organizational commitment predictor (Hassan and Hashim, 2011) while distributive justice is a significant predictor of pay and job satisfaction outcomes (Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017). Greenberg (2009) has explored in a study that procedural and interactional justice positively influence

on the job outcomes. Cropanzana et al, (2007) have explored two organizational justice's dimensions i.e., procedural justice and distributive justice and influence on job outcomes. Another study has also investigated a significant connection in procedural justice and organizational commitment (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992).

According to researchers e.g., Sulu, Ceylan, and Kaynak (2010) justice predicts the multiple job outcomes i.e., turnover intentions, job stress, workplace sabotage, trust and organizational commitment. In contrast, Sulu et al. (2010) have investigated a negative link in procedural and distributive injustice with organizational commitment. Moreover, it is also explored that distributive injustice increases the employee's turnover intention (Hassan & Hashim, 2011) However, researchers have not explored a connection in organizational commitment and interactional justice. Conversely, Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007) have investigated that procedural and distributive justices have significant influence on job stress and organizational commitment. Crow, Lee, and Joo (2012) have also explored a significant and meaningful relationship within organizational commitment and organizational justice. They have also investigated that job satisfaction and distributive justice have partial mediating impact on the indirect link of commitment and organizational justice. While Elanain (2009) has suggested in his study that management can bring improvement in job satisfaction and organizational commitment through improved distributive and procedural justice. Based on the extensive literature given above, following hypotheses are stated.

- **H1^A: Distributive injustice is negatively linked to affective commitment.**
- **H2^A: Procedural injustice is inversely linked to affective commitment.**
- **H3^A: Interactional injustice is negatively related to affective commitment.**

Shan et al. (2015) have explored that all dimensions of organizational justices are significantly related with organizational

performance. However, the researchers have investigated the strong relationship with in interactional justice and performance. Furthermore, another study has also highlighted the different dimensions of organizational justices, in which interactional justice is considered the performance's best predictor (Cropanzana et al., 2007). A recently study conducted by Cheng (2014) has highlighted that the organizational justice's perception has strongly association with performance appraisals. on the other hand, Greenberg (2010) has found that employees who were subjected to injustices suffered physical and mental illnesses more. They were also dissatisfied to the ultimate extent of reducing their organizational performance.

Kankaanranta et al. (2007) studied that job dissatisfaction was one of the major reasons to raise turnover intention of employees in organization. Additionally, they also found the main reasons of job dissatisfaction i.e., poor employees-employers relationship, inflexible time schedule, tense atmosphere and work overload etc. Turnley and Feldman (2000) examined the partial mediation impact of job dissatisfaction in employee behavior and psychological contract violation. Limited studies have been conducted to investigate the mediation effect of job dissatisfaction on organizational behavior. Moreover researchers have not found any study in which job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship of organizational injustice and job outcomes. The following hypotheses are proposed on the bases of above given literature review.

- *H4^a: Distributive injustice is negatively related to perceived organizational performance.*
- *H5^a: Procedural injustice is inversely related to Perceived organizational performance.*
- *H6^a: Interactional injustice is negatively related to perceived organizational performance.*
- *H1^b: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between distrubutive injsutice and affective commitment.*
- *H2^b: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between procedural injsutice and affective commitment.*
- *H3^b: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between interactional injustice and affective commitment.*

Palaiologos et al. (2011) explored that interactional justice and procedural justice as dimensions of organizational justice have considerable impact on job satisfaction and all of its types. In contrast, Ambrose et al. (2002) explored organizational injustice as the base of job dissatisfaction. Furthermore, Gim and Desa (2013) argued that ineffective and unfair distribution of rewards can have negative impact on job satisfaction, affective commitment and employees turnover intention. Another study investigated that ineffective and unfair appraisal systems are the major causes of injustice that lead to job dissatisfaction of employees (Daileyl & Kirk, 1992). Past research also explored that ill-treatment of supervisor increases the aggression in workplace and job dissatisfaction (Baron, Neuman, and Geddes, 1999). Beugré (2005) reasoned that organizational injustice perception is considered as a key predictor to job dissatisfaction and aggressive behavior of employees against management.

- *H⁴: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between distributive injustice and organizational performance.*
- *H⁵: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between procedural injustice and organizational performance.*
- *H⁶: Job dissatisfaction mediates the relationship between interactional injustice and organizational performance.*

Research Methodology

Sample: The reason to select the public sector organizations' employees is continuously changing environment, increasing uncertainty and technological breakthrough due to privatization. The population of the present study was the employees that are working on different positions (i.e., managerial and non-managerial) in State life Insurance Corporation of Pakistan and public sector banks from two districts of Southern Punjab i.e. Rahim Yar Khan and District Bahawalpur. Public sector banks contain The bank of Punjab, National bank of Pakistan, Sindh bank, The bank of Khyber, and The Punjab Provincial Cooperative bank. 840 employees were taken from public

sector banks and 310 from State life Insurance Corporation of Pakistan. Total population frame consists of 1150 employees of both districts of Rahim Yar Khan District and Bahawalpur.

Sample size is considered significant that lies in 200 to 400 respondents' range which also decreases the biasness present in the statistical results (J.F. Hair, 2010). 370 employees had taken as sample size from the 1150 employees of population frame. Further, simple random sampling as probability sampling technique is employed because population frame is apprehended.

Measures

Organizational injustice perception questionnaire developed by Colquitt (2001) was used widely to measure injustice perception prevailed in the organization. This scale was changed into reverse statements. The job dissatisfaction scale developed by (Seashore *et al.*, 1982) was used from past study. While the affective commitment scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and the scale of perceived organizational performance (Delaney & Huselid, 1996) was used.

Structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. Questionnaires were administered in employees of State Life Insurance Corporation and Public sector banks of two districts. About 370 questionnaires were sent through e-mail or mail. Total of 283 questionnaires were received in which 29 questionnaires were incomplete with 10 percent missing values, thus these questionnaires were disposed off (Hair, 2010). Thus, from 254 questionnaires, data was analyzed for this present study. Eventually 69 percent response rate was calculated.

85 percent of respondents were male and 15 percent female. In addition, 132 responses were represented those in 20 - 30 years, and 76 respondents were in 31 - 40 years age bracket. In term of educational breakdown, about 179 respondents were with the master's

degrees, and 69 respondents with bachelor degrees. As to the designation in organization about 135 respondents of this study were with managerial position and 119 respondents with non-managerial positions. With respect to experience of the respondents, 145 respondents represented 6 - 10 years experience bracket and remaining respondents represented below 5 years experience.

Results and Analysis

Reliability test was implemented to check consistency that pertains “the extent to which the instrument yields the same results on repeated trials” (Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). According to a study, the excellent and acceptable reliability range is 0.06 – 0.09 or more (George and Mallery, 2003) and in this study, alpha values were come in 0.822 – 0.839 ranges that were also considered acceptable. In Table: 2, all the results of descriptive statistics i.e. mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficients were stated. Mean values of organizational injustice components indicate different injustices. The test of Pearson’s correlation was applied to take out correlation results from the proposed hypotheses of this study.

Table 1:
Reliability and descriptive results

<u>Constructs</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. D</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	
	<u>Alpha</u>							
Distributive Injustice	0.822	3.51	1.19					
Procedural Injustice	0.828	3.43	1.05	.369**				
Interactional Injustice	0.836	3.45	1.09	.199**	.285**			
Job Dissatisfaction	0.825	3.57	1.26	.188**	.259**	.213**		
Affective	0.835	2.62	1.06	-.261**	-.283**	-.422**	-.246**	
Commitment								
P. Org. Performance	0.839	2.68	1.03	-.277**	-.340**	-.233**	-.299**	.293**

Note: *P < .05 and **P < .01 for two-tailed test. Cohen (2013) has presented the weak relationship range exist in .10-.29, medium range lies in .30-.49 & strong rang lies in .50 to 1.

Table 3:
Multiple Regression Results

<u>Statistics</u>	<u>Model 1: DI, PI, II & AF</u>			<u>Model 2: DI, PI, II & OP</u>		
R²	22.5			15.8		
Adjusted R²	21.5			14.8		
Model Significance	.000			.000		
F-value	24.14			15.62		
	DI & AF	PI & AF	II & AF	DI & OP	PI & OP	II & OP
Standardized Beta	-14.2	-12.9	-35.7	-16.1	-24.3	-13.2
Un-standardized Beta	-12.7	-12.9	-34.5	-14.1	-23.9	-12.5
Significance-Value	0.19	0.38	.000	0.01	.000	0.03

Note: Independent variables are DI=Distributive Injustice, II=Interactive Injustice, PI=Procedural Injustice. Dependent variables are POP=Organizational Performance, AF=Affective Commitment. *P <.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001

Model 1:

In model, R² value indicated the 22.5 percent change in independent variable of affective commitment. Whereas, F and P values of linear hypotheses were investigated satisfactory and significant. Results in *Model 1* were also showed a significant but negative relationship in distributive, procedural and interactive injustice with affective commitment. Result also explored that Interactive injustice calculated standardized regression value more significant than others.

Model II

In Table 3, R² value discovered the 15.8 percent variation in perceived organizational performance as independent variables. Moreover, P value and F value in *Model 2* were also found significant. Distributive

and interactional injustice described considerably weak negative connection with perceived organizational performance. While procedural injustice reported the somewhat strong relationship with perceived organizational performance.

Table 4:

Mediation Test (Distributive Injustice, Affective Commitment, Job Dissatisfaction,)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A¹-Path</u>	<u>B¹-Path</u>	<u>C¹-Path</u>	<u>C¹-Path</u>
	<u>X-M</u>	<u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>X-Y</u>	<u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.2002	-0.1712	-0.233	-0.1987
P-value	0.0026	0.0009	.000	0.0003
T-value	3.0411	-3.3626	-4.293	-3.669
R ²		0.1083		
Adjusted R ²		0.1012		
Significance value		.000		
F-value		15.2453		

Note: X=Distributive injustice; M=Job dissatisfaction; Y=Affective commitment, *P < .05, **P< .01, ***P < .001, 5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% confidence level.

To check the indirect effect Mediation regression test developed by Preacher and Hayes (2004) was used. Through this test distributive injustice indirect effect on affective commitment by job satisfaction was measured. The *A¹-Path* results revealed the positive connection in distributive injustice and job dissatisfaction while the results of *B¹-Path* explored the negative relationship in affective commitment and job dissatisfaction. And the results of *C¹-Path* results indicated that distributive injustice had negative effect on affective commitment. The evaluated *C¹*(*C¹-Path*) results revealed that job dissatisfaction decreased the distributive injustice's negative effect on affective commitment. The *C¹*(*C¹-Path*) results vividly evidenced the presence of partial mediation effect. Furthermore, the significance value of hypotheses, F value, and R² value confirmed the acceptance and validity of proposed hypothesis of this study.

Table 5:
Mediation Test (Job Dissatisfaction, Procedural Injustice, Affective Commitment)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A²-Path</u>	<u>B²-Path</u>	<u>C²-Path</u>	<u>C²-Path</u>
	<u>X-M</u>	<u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>X-Y</u>	<u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.3098	-0.1553	-0.2848	-0.2367
P-value	.000	0.0029	.000	0.0002
T-value	4.2488	-3.0065	-4.6886	-3.8235
R ²		0.1122		
Adjusted R ²		0.1051		
Model Significance value		.000		
F-value		15.8614		

Note: X=Procedural injustice; M=Job dissatisfaction; Y=Affective commitment; *P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001.

Mediation test of researchers i.e., Preacher and Hayes (2004) was used to evaluate the indirect impact of procedural injustice and affective commitment with mediating impact of job dissatisfaction. At First, *A²-Path* is evaluated that indicate significant positive relation in procedural justice with job dissatisfaction. While, *B²-Path* revealed that there is negative association between job dissatisfaction and affective commitment. In table 5, *C²-Path* explored that procedural injustice has significant negative impact on affective commitment. For mediator effect, *C²(C²-Path)* is evaluated. The results discovered that job dissatisfaction decreases the negative impact of procedural injustice on the variable of affective commitment. This *C²(C²-Path)* comparison also described that the partial mediation effect was found significantly. Thus values i.e., P-value, R² value, and F-values are significant enough to accept the proposed hypothesis.

Table 6:
Mediation Test (Job Dissatisfaction, Interactional Injustice, Affective Commitment)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A³-Path</u> <u>X-M</u>	<u>B³-Path</u> <u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>C³-Path</u> <u>X-Y</u>	<u>C⁴-Path</u> <u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.2443	-0.1372	-0.4075	-0.374
P-value	0.0007	0.0049	.000	.000
T-value	3.4526	-2.8381	-7.3999	-6.7282
R ²		0.204		
Adjusted R ²		0.1977		
Model Significance value		.000		
F-value		32.1728		

Note: X=Interactional injustice; M=Job dissatisfaction; Y=Affective commitment; P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001.

The *A³-Path* results showed a fair positive relation in interactional injustice and job dissatisfaction. Moreover, *B³-Path* identified the negative association in job dissatisfaction and affective commitment. *C³-Path* showed that procedural injustice has moderate negative effect on affective commitment. After evaluating *C³* (*C³-Path*) results it is compared and determined that job dissatisfaction decreases the negative impact present in indirect association of procedural injustice and affective commitment. After comparing the results, it is discovered that partial mediation existed significantly. Thus overall F-value, P-value, and R² are enough to accept the proposed hypothesis.

Table 7:
Mediation Test (Job Dissatisfaction, Distributive Injustice, Org. Performance)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A⁴-Path</u> <u>X-M</u>	<u>B⁴-Path</u> <u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>C⁴-Path</u> <u>X-Y</u>	<u>C⁵-Path</u> <u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.2002	-0.2101	-0.2423	-0.2003
P-value	0.0026	.000	.000	0.0002
T-value	3.0411	-4.2855	-4.5748	-3.839
R ²		0.1396		
Adjusted R ²		0.1328		
Model Significance value		.000		
F-value		20.3681		

PAKISTAN BUSINESS REVIEW APRIL 2017 P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001

Results highlighted that the partial mediation in variables found significantly. Thus, F-value, R^2 and overall P-value, are important enough to accept proposed hypothesis

Table 8:

Mediation Test (Job Dissatisfaction, Procedural Injustice, P. Org. Performance)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A⁵-Path</u> <u>X-M</u>	<u>B⁵-Path</u> <u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>C⁵-Path</u> <u>X-Y</u>	<u>C⁵-Path</u> <u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.3098	-0.1857	-0.3349	-0.2774
P-value	.000	0.0002	.000	.000
T-value	4.2488	-3.7767	-5.7347	-4.7072
R ²		0.163		
Adjusted R ²		0.1563		
Model Significance value		.000		
F-value		24.441		

Note: X= Procedural injustice, M= Job dissatisfaction, Y= P. Org. Performance *P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001, 5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% confidence level.

It was explored that job dissatisfaction decrease the negative impact of procedural injustice on perceived organizational performance. It also proved that there is partial mediation present in $C^{55}(C^5-Path)$. Thus overall value of P, F and R2 are significant.

Table 9:

Mediation Test (Job Dissatisfaction, Interactional Injustice, P. Org. Performance)

<u>Statistical descriptions</u>	<u>A⁶-Path</u> <u>X-M</u>	<u>B⁶-Path</u> <u>M(X)-M</u>	<u>C⁶-Path</u> <u>X-Y</u>	<u>C⁶-Path</u> <u>X(M)-Y</u>
Un-standardized Beta	0.2443	-0.2145	-0.2206	-0.1682
P-value	0.0007	.000	0.0002	0.0037
T-value	3.4526	-4.3011	-3.8075	-2.9335
R ²		0.1193		
Adjusted R ²		0.1123		
Model Significance value		.000		
F-value		17.0017		

Note: X=Interactional injustice, M=Job dissatisfaction, Y=P. Org. Performance, *P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001.

The A⁶-Path results pointed up that there was fair positive link in interactional injustice and job dissatisfaction. It was explored that job dissatisfaction as mediator decrease the interactional injustice' negative impact on perceived organizational performance. Moreover, this comparison indicated the presence of significant partial mediation. Thus, the values of R², P, and F are enough significant to accept the stated hypothesis.

Discussion

Researcher developed two models i.e., linear model and mediation model to carry out this study. Questionnaires were distributed to 370 participants, of which 254 responded. Reliability analysis and Factor analysis were done to check construct validity and internal consistency of all variables structured questionnaire according to the set standard of Joseph F Hair (2009). By using a multiple regression technique, three hypotheses on the basis of significance value and un-standardized beta were accepted. Distributive injustice (*H1^A*) and procedural injustice (*H2^A*) had weak negative link with employee's affective commitment. Whereas, (*H3^A*) hypothesis proved that procedural injustice has strong negative influence on employees' affective commitment as compared to distributive injustice and procedural injustice. These hypotheses had similar and consistent results in comparison of past studies (Sulu et al., 2010; Lambert et al., 2007). Furthermore, three other hypotheses (*H4^A*, *H5^A*, and *H6^A*) of linear model were also proved valid based on significance value and unstandardized beta. Distributive injustice (*H4^A*) and interactional injustices (*H6^A*) were inversely related with perceived organizational performance. (*H5^A*) hypothesis had also strong negative association with perceived organizational performance. Thus the results of hypotheses *H1^A*, *H2^A*, and *H3^A* had consistency with previous studies (Fields et al., 2000; Al Rawashdeh, 2013).

Regression mediation test of Preacher and Hayes (2004) was employed to check indirect impact of three dimensions of

organizational injustice (i.e., distributive, procedural and interactional injustice) through job dissatisfaction on job outcomes. The effects of partial mediation of hypotheses ($H1^B$ $H2^B$ and $H3^B$) were assessed and proved the indirect association in affective commitment, organizational injustice by job dissatisfaction. Hypotheses ($H4^B$ $H5^B$ and $H6^B$) found that job dissatisfaction is partially mediate on organizational injustice and organizational performance which had negative relationship. This study examined the mediating impact of job dissatisfaction that was rarely examined even in Western culture. This is an entirely new construct involved in the relationship of affective commitment, organizational injustice, and perceived organizational performance.

Conclusion

Organizational employees are confronting the injustice greatly in public sector organizations on the basis of gender, nepotism, race, favoritism, excessive influenced from government and union, which causes stress, anxiety, uncertainty and disgrace feelings. All these ultimately affect employees as well as organizational performance. Injustice in organizations is one of greatest hurdle that decline the performance of employees in different ways. Thus organizational injustice is considered the basic building block of job dissatisfaction. In current study, employees of are the main victim of injustice prevailed in public sector organizations of Pakistan on the basis of gender, race, favoritism, political influence and nepotism. Therefore employees of public sector organizations have great feelings of uncertainty, disgrace, stress and anxiety that lead to great decline in organizational performance. In this study, a conceptual insight has developed though practical orientation and an extensive literature.

Implications

The extant of literature on organizational injustices are linked to the workplace sabotage, occupational health risk and disparities, work alienation, abusive supervision, psychosomatic well being and job satisfaction (Schmitt & Dörfel, 1999; Muqadas, Rehman, & Aslam, 2017; Greenberg, 2010; Muqadas et al., 2017; Ambrose et al., 2002). Previous literature in perspective of injustices have not been investigated the effect of organizational injustice on job outcomes, i.e., affective commitment, job dissatisfaction, and organizational performance of public sector organizations in Pakistan as a developing country. Management should have to take immediate actions to eliminate the injustices practiced in the respective organizations so that affective commitment and performance level of organization can be increased.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations of present research should be noted in optimistic discussion. First, data is gathered from two districts of Punjab province therefore results may not be generalized to all provinces and all public sector organizations. Therefore it is recommended to collect data from one country or more so that generalizability can be achieved. Second, results are interpreted in limited way and issue of causality is raised because it is cross sectional study in which data is collected one time. Consequently, future research can be conducted by using longitudinal design. Furthermore, present research proved that organizational injustice impacts on affective commitment with $R^2=22.5\%$ and on organizational performance with $R^2=15.8\%$.

References

- Abu Elanain, H. M. (2009). Job characteristics, work attitudes and behaviors in a non-western context: Distributive justice as a mediator. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(5), 457-477.
- Al Rawashdeh, E. T. (2013). Organizational justice and its impact upon job performance in the Jordanian customs department. *International Management Review*, 9(2), 29-35.
- 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.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 947-965.
- Aslam, U., Ilyas, M., Imran, M. K., & Rahman, U. U. (2016). Detrimental effects of cynicism on organizational change: an interactive model of organizational cynicism (a study of employees in public sector organizations). *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 29(4), 580-598.
- Aslam, U., Arfeen, M., Mohti, W., & Rahman, U. U. (2015). Organizational cynicism and its impact on privatization (evidence from federal government agency of Pakistan). *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 9(4), 401-425.
- Alsam, U., Rehman, C. A., & Imran, M. K. (2016). Intelligence and Managerial Performance: An Interactive Role of Knowledge Sharing Culture. *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(3), 598-617.
- Aslam, U., Mohti, W., Imran, M. K., & Arfeen, M. I. (2015). Impact of personality and organizational context on employees' job outcomes. *Pakistan Business Review*, 17(3), 603-623.
- Baron, R. A., Neuman, J. H., & Geddes, D. (1999). Social and personal determinants of workplace aggression: Evidence for the impact of perceived injustice and the Type A behavior pattern. *Aggressive behavior*, 25(4), 281-296.

- Beugré, C. D. (2005). Reacting aggressively to injustice at work: A cognitive stage model. *Journal of business and psychology, 20*(2), 291-301.
- Ceylan, A., & Sulu, S. (2011). Organizational injustice and work alienation. *E+ M Ekonomie a Management, 2*, 65-78.
- Cheng, S. Y. (2014). The mediating role of organizational justice on the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(8), 1131-1148.
- 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. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology, 86*(3), 386.
- Cropanzana, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 34*-48.
- Crow, M. S., Lee, C.-B., & Joo, J.-J. (2012). Organizational justice and organizational commitment among South Korean police officers: An investigation of job satisfaction as a mediator. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 35*(2), 402-423.
- Daileyl, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations, 45*(3), 305-317.
- Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management journal, 39*(4), 949-969.
- Fields, D., Pang, M., & Chiu, C. (2000). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of employee outcomes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(5), 547-562.
- Ford, M. T., & Huang, J. (2014). The health consequences of organizational injustice. *Contemporary Occupational Health Psychology: Global Perspectives on Research and Practice, Volume 3*, 35-50.

- Gim, G., & Desa, N. M. (2013). The Impact of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Affective Commitment on Turnover Intention among Public and Private Sector Employees in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4 (6), 487-492.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 91(1), 58.
- Greenberg, J. (2009). Everybody talks about organizational justice, but nobody does anything about it. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2(2), 181-195.
- Greenberg, J. (2010). Organizational injustice as an occupational health risk. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 205-243.
- Greenberg, J., & Alge, B. J. (1998). Aggressive reactions to workplace injustice.
- Hair, J. F. (2009). Multivariate data analysis.
- Hair, J. F. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*: Prentice Hall.
- Hassan, A., & Hashim, J. (2011). Role of organizational justice in determining work outcomes of national and expatriate academic staff in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21(1), 82-93.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover: Putting a price on the learning curve. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 14-14.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2013). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 256-269.
- Kankaanranta, T., Nummi, T., Vainiomäki, J., Halila, H., Hyppölä, H., Isokoski, M., . . . Virjo, I. (2007). The role of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction and demographic factors on physicians' intentions to switch work sector from public to private. *Health Policy*, 83(1), 50-64.

- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*(6), 644-656.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of applied psychology, 93*(3), 498.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management journal, 35*(3), 626-637.
- Muqadas, F., Rehman, M., Aslam, U., & Rahman, U. U. (2017). Exploring the Challenges, Trends, and Issues for Knowledge Sharing: A Study on Employees in Public Sector Universities. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 47*(1), 2-15.
- Muqadas, F., Ilyas, M., & Aslam, U. (2016). Antecedents of knowledge sharing and its impact on employees' creativity and work performance. *Pakistan Business Review, 18*(3), 655-674.
- 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.
- Okechukwu, C. A., Souza, K., Davis, K. D., & de Castro, A. B. (2014). Discrimination, harassment, abuse, and bullying in the workplace: Contribution of workplace injustice to occupational health disparities. *American journal of industrial medicine, 57*(5), 573-586.
- Palaiologos, A., Papazekos, P., & Panayotopoulou, L. (2011). Organizational justice and employee satisfaction in performance appraisal. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 35*(8), 826-840.
- Parker, R. J., & Kohlmeyer, J. M. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 30*(4), 357-369.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models.

- Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*: Sage.
- Schmitt, M., & Dörfel, M. (1999). Procedural injustice at work, justice sensitivity, job satisfaction and psychosomatic well being. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(4), 443-453.
- Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). *Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice*: New York: Wiley.
- Shan, S., Ishaq, H. M., Shaheen, M. A., & O'Connor, S. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Performance in Libraries: Mediating Role of Leader-Member Exchange Relationship. *Library Management*, 36(1/2).
- Sims, R. R. (1994). Human resource management's role in clarifying the new psychological contract. *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 373-382.
- Sulu, S., Ceylan, A., & Kaynak, R. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship between organizational injustice and organizational commitment: Implications for healthcare professionals. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(8), p27.
- Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (1999). Social constructionist methods. *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*, 147-172.
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25-42.
- Vermunt, R., & Steensma, H. (2001). Stress and justice in organizations: An exploration into justice processes with the aim to find mechanisms to reduce stress. *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice*, 2, 27-48.