

An Analysis of the Relationship between Organizational Justice Dimensions with Employee Performance Dimensions: A Case Study of Universities in Kurdistan Region

Hezha Botan Ismail¹ & Karwan H. Sherwani²

¹ Independent Researcher, Erbil, Iraq

² Business and Management Department, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq

Correspondence: Karwan H. Sherwani, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq.

Email: Karwan.sherwani@ishik.edu.iq

Received: January 9, 2018

Accepted: February 22, 2018

Online Published: March 1, 2018

doi: 10.23918/ijsses.v4i4p161

Abstract: The purpose of this research is to analyze the relationship of three dimensions of organizational justice, namely, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice with dimensions of employee performance, namely, task performance and contextual performance in three private universities in Kurdistan Region (KR). The study was conducted based on data gathered from 87 members from all academic and administrative staff. The current study used the primary data for allocating questionnaire and the secondary data which is required for conducting research study work was gathered through journal articles and books related to organizational justice dimensions and dimensions of employee performance. The research strategy is quantitative by using survey questionnaire in three private universities in Kurdistan. The findings of the study show that three dimensions of organizational justice, namely, distributive, procedural and interactional justice have positive correlations with task performance and contextual performance.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Employee Performance, Task Performance, Contextual Performance, Universities, Kurdistan

1. Introduction

There is a social system called the organization, where the human resources are the most significant reasons for efficiency and effectiveness. If we want to embark on the quest of how an organization achieves justice and fairness, first we need to talk a little about managers and how their personal struggle dedication contributes to the success of the organization (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). According to Colquitt (2001), organizational justice (the study of fairness observations in the work environment) is generally categorized in distributive justice (equality of decision results and outcomes), procedure justice (fairness of basic leadership procedures), and interactional justice (treat people with regard and sensitivity and clarify the rationale for result thoroughly). On the other hand, there is also the employees' performance, which is considered the key variable that has an impact on the organizational performance. The Educational private sector must try its best to find out the factors that affect the performance of the employees. According to findings, injustice and unfairness in the workplace can cause a reduction in the level of the organizational performance. The main question is how unfairness is related with the level of employee performance. For instance, the workers who saw unfairness practices in the workplace may show a different kind of negative behaviour. The difference between task and contextual performance

has gotten wide acceptance in literature researching conduct at work (Conway, 1999; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Term 'task performance' alludes to the essential technical behaviors and exercises involved in the employment. 'Contextual performance' refers to conducts that encourage the environment in which the technical core operates. In the present day, associations in various areas have concentrated on assignment execution and logical execution through the specialist feeling about the organizational justice, for example, the wages and salaries justice, rewards justice, justice in undertakings and obligations distribution, and numerous different things inside the associations (Nasurdin, 2007).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is concerned with the fair treatment of employees (Randeree, 2008). Organizational justice is grown around attempts to describe and explain the role of fairness as a consideration workplace (Greenberg, 1990). Specifically, organizational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those determinations influence other work-related variables (Moorman, 1991 as cited in Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Organizational justice, which is people's impression of fairness in an organization, is a central worry. Workers are concerned about being dealt with fairly, administrators are worried about equally treating subordinates whom they are responsible for and researchers are concerned with the effect and consequences of not treating individuals fairly (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005). Organizational justice directly affects the employees' state of mind toward the work (Ali & Saifullah, 2014).

2.1.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice is the fairness of the outcome distribution (Colquitt et al., 2001). Distributive justice refers to the apparent equality of the outcomes that an individual gets from the organization. Results might be disseminated on the premise of equality and balance, need or commitment and people decide the fairness of conveyance through comparison with others (Alsalem & Alhaiani, 2007 as cited in Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Likewise, distributive justice has more influence on workers' than procedural justice (Tremblay et al., 2000).

2.1.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to members' perceptions about the equality of the principles and methods that direct a procedure (Nabatchi et al., 2007). According to Shan, Ishaq and Shaheen (2015) procedural justice is concerned with justice of the procedure involved in the allocation of results. Two criteria for procedural justice have been advanced: decision control (e.g., the ability to influence the actual result itself) and process control (e.g., the capacity to raise one's perspective and arguments for the period of a process) (Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

2.1.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice refers to the quality of the interpersonal treatment received during the execution of a procedure (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional equity is the third dimension of organizational justice and

it pertains to the human side of organization practices, that is, to the administration (or those controlling awards and resources). Justice is related with an individual's view of equality in regards to the relations with a decision-maker who is in charge of the procedure (Bies & Moag, 1986). Additionally, it is separated into two elements: informational and interpersonal justice. Interactional justice is the belief in one's job or giving the worker's a chance to make a choice (Colquitt, 2001).

2.2 Employee Performance

Employee performance is viewed as a multi-faceted dimension (e.g., task performance, contextual performance, job deduction, etc.) (Somers & Birnbaum, 1998; Suliman, 2007 as cited in Kalay, 2016). Employee performance has two key factors; task performance (in-part conduct) and contextual performance. Task performance is usually defined as the ability of a worker to satisfy her/his undertakings and responsibilities as laid out in the role description (Griffin et al., 2007). Contextual performance is individual efforts that have no immediate relationship to fundamental job functions (Kalay, 2016). Employees' perception from fair conducts in work has led to three different factors of justice in the organization i.e. distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Mehrabi et al., 2012).

2.2.1 Task Performance

Task performance is defined as activities that transform raw materials into the goods and services that are produced by the organization (Aguinis, 2013). Task performance consists of job-specific behaviours including core job responsibilities (Conway, 1999). According to Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) task performance includes transformation of raw materials into the products (goods and services) that the organisation produces.

2.2.2 Contextual Performance

Contextual performance positively affects task performance (Sonnentag et al., 2008). Contextual performance is defined as those behaviors that contribute to the organizations effectiveness by providing a good environment in which task performance can occur (Aguinis, 2013). According to Conway (1999) contextual performance consists of non-occupation-specific behaviours such as, cooperating with co-workers and showing commitment.

3. Methodology

3.1 Data and Sample

The population of this research was academic and administrative staff in the private sector of Kurdistan Region (KR), which contains three private universities. The researchers have adopted quantitative approach by using survey questionnaire; the current study was directed using descriptive-correlation. The questionnaire is distributed to 87 members from all academic administrative but 9 of the respondents didn't fill the questionnaire completely. We have chosen 29 respondents as a sample from each university.

3.2 Measures

Distributive Justice (DJ): The distributive justice dimension was measured with five items scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .725. Their scale was measured using a 5-points Likert order scale from SD - strongly disagree to SA - strongly agree 1-5.

Procedural Justice (PJ): The procedural equity dimension was measured with six items scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in this study was .778. Their scale was measured using a 5-points Likert order scale from SD - strongly disagree to SA - strongly agree 1-5.

Interactional Justice: It was measured with 9 items scale developed by Niehoff & Moorman, 1993. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in this study was .892. Their scale was measured using a 5-points Likert order scale from SD - strongly disagree to SA - strongly agree 1-5.

Task Performance (TP): It was measured with 5 items scale developed by Koopmans et al. (2014). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in this study was .734. Their scale was measured using a 5-points Likert order scale from SD - strongly disagree to SA - strongly agree 1-5.

Contextual Performance (CP): This factor was measured with 8 items scale developed by Koopmans et al. (2014). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in this study was .810. Their scale was measured using a 5-points Likert order scale from SD - strongly disagree to SA - strongly agree 1-5.

4. Discussion and Results

4.1 The Level of Organizational Justice Dimensions in Three Private Universities

Table 1: Distributive Justice (Descriptive Statistics)
Distributive Justice (Descriptive Statistics)

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| Distributive Justice | 78 | 1.60 | 5.00 | 276.40 | 3.5436 | .69797 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 78 | | | | | |

Distributive justice is the first dimension of organizational justice, there were some items which had a high mean compared to other items in the same dimension as in item question one (Q1) with the mean 3.8077 and item question five (Q5) with the mean 3.7436. The means are ranged between maximum 3.8077 to minimum 3.1410 and the average mean of 5 items of distributive justice is 3.5436 which shows there is a good level of distributive justice.

Table 2: Procedural Justice (Descriptive Statistics)

| Procedural Justice (Descriptive Statistics) | | | | | | |
|---|----|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Procedural Justice | 78 | 1.33 | 5.00 | 277.00 | 3.5513 | .64147 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 78 | | | | | |

Procedural justice is the second dimension of organizational justice. There were some items which had a high mean compared to other items in the same dimension as in item question (Q10) with the mean 3.8590 and item question eight (Q8) with the mean 3.6026. The means are ranged between maximum 3.8590 to minimum 3.4231 and the average mean of 6 items of procedural justice is 3.5513 which shows there is a good level of procedural justice.

Table 3: Interactional Justice (Descriptive Statistics)
 Interactional Justice (Descriptive Statistics)

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| Interactional Justice | 78 | 1.22 | 5.00 | 301.33 | 3.8632 | .62750 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 78 | | | | | |

Interactional justice is the third dimension of organizational justice. There were some items which had a high mean compared to other items in the same dimension as in item question thirteen (Q13) with the mean 4.0385 and item question thirteen (Q17) with the mean 3.9615. The means are ranged between maximum 4.0385 to minimum 3.6026 and the average mean of 9 items of interactional justice is 3.8632 which shows there is a good and higher level of interactional justice.

4.2 The Levels of Task Performance and Contextual Performance in Three Private Universities

Table 4: Task Performance (Descriptive Statistics)
 Task performance (Descriptive Statistics)

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| Task Performance | 78 | 2.80 | 5.00 | 327.00 | 4.1923 | .55027 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 78 | | | | | |

Task performance is the first dimension of employee performance. There were some items which had a high mean compared to other items in the same dimension as in item question twenty-two (Q22) with the mean 4.3205 and item question twenty-one (Q21) with the mean 4.3077. The means are ranged between maximum 4.3205 to minimum 4.0000 and the average mean of 5 items of task performance is 4.1923 which shows there is a good and higher level of task performance justice.

Table 5: Contextual Performance (Descriptive Statistics)
Contextual performance (Descriptive Statistics)

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| Contextual Performance | 78 | 2.25 | 5.00 | 312.25 | 4.0032 | .57863 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 78 | | | | | |

Contextual performance is the second dimension of employee performance. There were some items which had a high mean compared to other items in the same dimension as in item question twenty-nine (Q29) with the mean 4.1795 and item question thirty (Q30) with the mean 4.0385. The means are ranged between maximum 4.1795 to minimum 3.8846 and the average mean of 8 items of contextual performance is 4.0032 which shows there is a good and higher level of contextual performance justice.

4.3 Correlations

Table 6: Correlations

| | | Correlations | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Distributive Justice | Task Performance | Contextual Performance |
| Distributive Justice | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .236* | .262* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .038 | .021 |
| | N | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| | | Procedural Justice | Task Performance | Contextual Performance |
| Procedural Justice | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .271* | .251* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .016 | .027 |
| | N | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| | | Interactional Justice | Task Performance | Contextual Performance |
| Interactional Justice | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .366** | .263* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .001 | .020 |
| | N | 78 | 78 | 78 |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

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

Table 6 shows that the relationship between distributive justice and task performance is a weak positive relationship in three private universities in Kurdistan because of $r = .236$ for task performance. Although, the second dimension is called procedural justice, the relationship between procedural justice and task performance is a weak positive relationship in three private universities in Kurdistan because of $r = .271$, for task performance. The third dimension is called interactional justice, the relationship between interactional justice and task performance is moderately positively correlated in three private universities in Kurdistan because of $r = .366$ for task performance. The results indicate that the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and task performance is positively correlated with each other but not strongly.

The first dimensions of organizational justice is called distributive justice and the relationship between distributive justice and contextual performance is a weak positive relationship in three private universities in Kurdistan, because of $r = .262$ for contextual performance. Although, the second dimension is called procedural justice, the relationship between procedural justice and contextual performance is a weak positive relationship in three private universities in Kurdistan because of $r = .251$

for contextual performance. Likewise, the relationship between interactional justice and contextual performance is a weak positively correlated in three private universities in Kurdistan because of $r = .263$ for contextual performance.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this research is to find the level of fairness and the level of task and contextual performance, the correlation between the dimensions of fairness and dimensions of performance in private universities. As result of frequency and descriptive analysis, the findings show that the levels of fairness vary from dimension to another dimension of fairness but interactional dimension had more acceptance according to respondents' perception. The results also indicate that the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and contextual performance is positively correlated with each other but not strongly.

References

- Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance Management* (Third Edition ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Ali, M., & Saifullah, Z. (2014). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A case study of banking sector of balochistan. *Journal of Information Engineering and Applications*, 4(11), 25-30.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A Study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1, 43-55.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- 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), 425-445.
- Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1, 3-13.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2005). *Handbook of Organizational Justice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates .
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327-347.
- Kalay, F. (2016). The impact of organizational justice on employee performance: A survey in Turkey and Turkish context. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 6(1), 1-20.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Vet, H. C., & Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. *Journal of Environmental Medicine*, 56(3), 331-337.
- Mehrabi, J., Javadi, M., Charmian, A., Zadeh, N., Tanhai, M. (2012). Studying relationship between organizational justice and employees' performance case study: Damloran pharmaceutical company in borjoerd, Iran. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 2(2), 271-279.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480.

- Nabatchi, T., Bingham, L., Good, D. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: A six-factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(2), 148-174.
- Nasuridin, A. M. (2007). Organizational justice as an antecedent of job performance. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 9(3), 235-343.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Rad, A. M., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19(2), 11-28.
- Randeree, K. (2008). Organisational justice: Migrant worker perceptions in organizations in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics*, 3(4), 59-69.
- Shan, S., Ishaq, H. M., & Shaheen, M. A. (2015). impact of organizational justice on job performance in libraries. *Emerald Insights*, 36(1/2), 70-85.
- Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Spychala, A. (2008). Job performance. *Micro approaches (Sage handbook of organization behavior)*, 1, 427-447.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tremblay, M., Sire, B., & Balkin, D. B. (2000). The role of organizational justice in pay and employee benefit satisfaction, and its effects on work attitudes. *Group and Organization Management*, 25(3), 268-289.
- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 525-531.