Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences Review (JERSSR)

The Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice as the Predictors of Faculty

Achievement at the Higher Education Level

- 1. Humaira Abbasi
- 2. Dr. Saira Nudrat

PhD Scholar, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad Assistant Professor, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad

Abstract

The present study was conducted to find out the role of procedural justice and distributive justice as a predictor of faculty achievement and to identify the most dominating factor for faculty achievement at the higher education level. The study was descriptive and the survey technique was used for the collection of required data. All the public sector university teachers of Islamabad were taken as the population of the study. 100 university teacher were taken as a sample of the study through a simple random sample technique. The organizational Justice Measurement Instrument developed by Moorman and Neiof (1993) and the faculty achievement measurement instrument developed by Boyer (1997) was used as the research instrument. The instrument comprised 31 items. Data were collected through personal visits to sampled universities. The data were analyzed through confirmatory factor analysis, correlation and multiple regression. The findings of the study revealed that there was a significant relationship between organizational justice and faculty achievement. Results showed that procedural justice is positively associated with faculty achievement and has a significant impact. Results also showed that distributive justice is confidently related to faculty achievement and it is highly significant. According to the study findings, distributive justice is the most dominating factor for faculty achievement so it is recommended that university administrations focus on distributive justice for enhancing faculty achievement.

Keywords: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Faculty Achievements, University Teachers **Introduction**

The workforce is considered a very valuable constituent of institutions in this new era. Outcomes are achieved through the intellectual and hard work of the team. Organizations have internal and external practices under these practices rules and policies are applied. Like internal practices of organizations, Justice is an essential part of an employee's social life in the organization. Justice provides a way to determine individual and collective tasks, duties and accountabilities and also determine the rewards and output as the result of giving input to society. Justice is the basic right on which societies grow and develop. In this developing era justice is considering a moral and ethical element for a human being in the universe. For the last centuries justice was the philosophical school of thought and without the existence of justice nations could not build. Organizations developed when the working community perceive fairness and justice. In the 1960s first time organizational justice was investigated and after 1990, again conducted research on organizational justice and divided it into further kinds of justice (Lapidot & et al, 2007). The term organizational justice means how employees perceive fairness in their head's decisions, procedures and distributions of outcomes among them. However, in this modern period, where people got aware and set their priorities in life, they are concerned with justice, whether they are treated fairly or not in the workplace situation (Lambert, 2003).

The organizations are a communal arrangement of social properties based on a secretarial and well-designed structure. Organizations need qualified, skilful and efficient groups of employees. Employees always work hard and contributed, and without containing their untiring struggles, high commitment, loyalty and hard work organizations cannot achieve the desired outcomes. As with the importance of employee loyalty and commitment to their jobs, they are conscious of their achievements related to their career. Achievements are the factor of employee satisfaction and doing work more with the concerning work organizations. In workplace



organizations, if employees get rewarded, respected and output as a result of giving input, they perceive fairness in the workplace otherwise they feel injustice and lose their achievements. Organizational justice refers to employees' feelings and beliefs about their jobs in their workplace (Aziri, 2011). Organizational justice is the fair action of mind and behaviour which is reflected in the sense of their achievements in the form of getting rewards, promotions, discoveries, and productivity. Karem, Jameel and Ahmad (2019) stated that the term justice or fairness is considered a dynamic component in improving and keeping a smooth, fair and conducive environment in which they can develop the sense that they are treated fairly or not.

According to Yean (2016), organizational justice simply understands to deals with employees' observations of justice like different chances, salaries, incentives, admiration and upgrades provided by the organization. As a result, it becomes even more necessary for organizations to pay enough attention to this concept of justice. For this purpose, organizations must be fair in process of the distributive and procedural justice system. For educational institutions, especially at their education level, teachers are the core value of university development and as well as its high ranking. However, faculty (teachers) achievements are important for an individual faculty member and the whole faculty of the University. These institutions publically intended to equip society by preparing the young generation in the best way. So it is possible only with a devoted and loyal faculty. Therefore, the organizations need to provide such an atmosphere, where teachers can feel free of injustice, perceive fairness perform well and make their achievements. According to Boyer's (1997), Model of scholarship discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning. Moreover, from time to time organizational justice is constructed, with two, three or even four-dimensional models (Cropanzano, 1997). In this study, we will adopt the two-factor model of justice constructed by (Colquitt, 2001) and try to apply it and validate it in the context of academic achievement.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to find the role of "Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice as the Predictors of Faculty Achievement at the Higher Education Level" in Pakistan.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were the following;

- 1. To find the role of procedural justice as a predictor of faculty achievement at the higher education level.
- 2. To find the role of distributive justice as a predictor of faculty achievement at the higher education level.
- 3. To identify the most dominating factor for faculty achievement at the higher education level.

Significance of Research

This study has insight into the educational institutions, employees, and managerial staff of research scholars. On the bases of research findings, organizations can improve the procedures for decisions making and distributing resources equally. It will help to improve the organizational procedures to enhance faculty achievements. The research findings of the study can increase knowledge in the existing literature. Organizational management will facilitate employees and heads of the organization to improve their procedures. Research scholars will be facilitated for exploring new aspects in future. It will be part of the literature.

Literature Review

Organizations are communal units where individuals are considered the main power. Organizations need competent and active managerial staff for accomplishing goals and objectives. Justice is the basic need of employees which can affect their work performance (Randeree, 2008). Organizational justice is defined as the fair perception of individuals about their workplace (Greenberg 1987). Employees feel injustice in the distribution of outcomes and procedures used for making decisions about promotions, selections, rewards and other incentives (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008). Organizational justice is interlinked with faculty achievement, and job satisfaction (Le Nguyen, 2018). In any organization, human resource is the core resource for accomplishing goals and playing a role in organizational development. Employee achievement is deliberated as the self-motivated element and is the sign of achievements or loss of the organization as well as higher education (Khan, Idris & Amin, 2021). Structural honesty is determining the worker's feelings around equality in institutions. The equity theory of Adams (1965), deliberates on the origin of organizational justice and

described the concept of input and output, and the way of thinking about cost and reward. This theory emphasizes equity or inequity which is affected by motivation and achievement in their work.

Similarly, the satisfaction and success of employees are based on equality in workplace situations (Ghran et al., 2019; Jameel et al., 2020). On another side, injustice and inequality factors create tension, reduced motivation levels, employees thinking to leave the job, and losing trust in the organization. Inequity creates hurdles and stress levels which people want to eliminate. Organizational justice determines the perception of justice and fairness and their reactions (Karem et al., 2019).

It is considered the core value in educational organizations (Taşdan, 2008). However, individual welfare is comprised of positively participating in activities, making good relations with other colloquies, positive behaviours, and achievements (Seligman, 2011). So it is found that teachers of schools and universities feel stress about their jobs (Andrade & Cardoso, 2012). So it is based on the conditions and nature of individuals perceiving justice.

In the existing literature organizational justice is first-time distributed as a distributive and procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990).

Distributive Justice (DJ)

According to institutional policy, the fair distribution of assets, rewards, incentives, pay and promotions is called distributive justice (Greenberg, 1990). Institutions should focus on fair distribution because of it workers are satisfied with their jobs and try to do well. Distributive justice is based on the equal distribution of outcomes, according to equity theory distributive justice emphasizes equity, which means the equality of giving and taking (Adams, 1965).

Moorman (1991), defined it as employees' fairness of results which they achieved from organizations. Distributive deals with equity, equity means evaluation based on employees' input, and comparison with other employees earned under the same conditions (Lambert, 2019). Equity is the basic element which enhances the motivation factor in employees. The distribution of resources among individuals in the workplace situation is known as distributive justice (Suifan et al., 2017). This type of justice reduces negativity in the employees toward their heads and manager. Wang et al., (2010), stated that allocating rewards and benefits, salary, promotions, and awards among the employees that they expect from institutions are distributive. Faculty achievements are affected without the existence of distributive justice (Karem, Jameel and Ahmad, 2019). From the previous research findings, it is found that fair distribution of resources and output positively influences teachers' achievement, especially in teaching and research (Fitzgerald, S.M., Mahony, D., Crawford, F. 2014). It is further found from the research study of Fields et al. (2000), that distributive justice increased the motivation level of faculty members.

Procedural Justice (PJ)

This type of justice is defined as the procedures and decisions which are taken by the heads. It deals with fair procedures of implementing rules and making unbiased decisions in allocating resources. and in the up-gradation process (Greenberg, 1990). Fair distribution of resources among the employees develops loyalty and devotion towards institutions. Mainly higher educational institutions emphasized a transparent system of procedures and methods related to faculty members' achieved targets. Institutions must provide an environment free of politics and injustice as well. Earlier, Kim and Mauborgne (1998), found from their studies when decision-making processes were perceived by employees on fair bases, they performed better and do voluntarily. Results also showed that when employees feel unfair procedures in the system they resist and refused to cooperate with the organization. A research study done by Taylor (2003), used distributive justice in law and order management institutions for determining values and importance. Taylor (2003), suggested that fairness is a response to the national concern for fairness in exercising legal authority. Wang et al. (2010), said that procedures used for deciding outcomes should be fair. A research study conducted by Haider, Nazir & Arshad (2020), investigated the role of organizational justice in the lives of university teachers. The finding of the study revealed that there was a significant relationship found between the dimensions of organizational justice among university teachers. According to the findings of the study, it is recommended that supervisors, as well as higher authorities in organizations, may focus on all the dimensions of organizational justice equally.

Faculty Achievements

Faculty means a group of university teachers from different fields of knowledge. Faculty members are considered strong human resources at the higher education level. They play a vital role in research areas, the teaching and learning process and the personality development of students as well. Faculty members not only achieved their own goals and targets but they achieved the institutional targets. In the world, all higher educational institutes especially universities prepare the young generation with advanced knowledge and skills in every field of knowledge. Faculty engagement in producing intellectual and philosophical knowledge and achieving goals in relevant areas (Elliot and Hulleman, 2017).

Faculty achievement at university is important in high-quality teaching and research and has a positive impact on social and moral development, and the application and integration of knowledge and skills (Daumiller et al., 2019 b). The current study is intended to measure faculty achievement according to Boyer's Model of Faculty Scholarship (1990), which measured four domains of faculty achievement at the university level, which are discovery, interaction, application and teaching and learning. Faculty achievement depends on the indicators used to measure it.

Scholarship of Discovery

Scholarship of discovery is concerned with producing new knowledge and increasing knowledge through research and observation in the existing literature. Scholarship of discovery is known as an innovative study that increases or tests existing literature (Hofmeyer, Newton & Scott, 2007).

Boyer (1990) defined faculty for instance not only inculcating knowledge for new generations they also contributing to social development. So it is the production of new knowledge through hypotheses and research questions. Boyer (1997) further described it as the process of getting answers to questions through investigation, observation, and experimentation in the lab, laboratory and field called discovery which is done by the faculty in their subject. Different theoretical knowledge is the long-term struggle of observing and analyzing the theories and views (Johnston 1998). The recommendations and suggestions of research are new ideas for further exploring new areas of knowledge. In higher educational institutions the teaching and learning process is based on producing knowledge through research to develop the component of intellectual thoughts and wisdom (Paulsen and Feldmafor 1995).

The Scholarship of Integration

This type of scholarship deals with special arguments and relations crosswise disciplines (Boyer 1990). Integration and discovery are very much the same by nature but it has different meaning and arises different queries regarding their impact. This type of scholarship understands the sense of remote evidence and truths and constructs new patterns of knowledge that cannot make appropriate answers without this connection (Hofmeyer, Newton & Scott, 2007). Faculty of higher education institutions engaged in process of rethinking and integrating concepts and ideas from different fields and creating new theories and modules (Marks ES, 2000). However, it is a way of reshaping concepts and ideas. According to Boyer (1997), through integration scholars raise questions based on critical analysis and interpret explanations regarding research results and conclusions. According to existing literature, integration is considered significant for responding to existing difficulties in society (Boyer 1997). Previous research results indicated the work done by the faculty is a big source of producing new knowledge (Hofmeyer, Newton & Scott, 2007). Furthermore, finance agents helped in producing new advancements in the field of understanding and skills.

Scholarship of Application

It provides a link to other types of scholarship with practices (Boyers, 1990). Scholars develop links and relationships among one discipline to other disciplines, policymakers, different stakeholders and specialists to apply theory and practice for solving problems (Hall EO, 2001 & Glassick CE, 2000). Scholarship of the application covers the boundaries for problem-solving at the national and international levels (Bull, 1998). Scholars do work on applying knowledge for understanding how can solve problems at the micro and macro level (Glassick CE, 2000).

Hayes Tang (2014), found from his research scholarship of application is affected on the academic side with broad canes and practices. Boyer (1997) explained further the scholarship of application is like a bridge among disciplines of sciences, arts, technology etc, which create new aspects and wisdom of knowledge and skills to fulfil the requirements of society and institutions. Scholars always try to expand their research to fill the gaps in literature, theory and practice and get achievements for promotions and upgradation (Boyer's, 1997). Scholars engage in creating new

knowledge and prepare students for overcoming new challenges and inspire them on how they could contribute to social well-being (May Lee & Yuan, 2018). Scholarship of application based on innovative approaches to developing a new sense of knowledge in the existing realm through various disciplines like business, industry, public and private organizational systems, curriculum, and approaches used in the new design of the subject (Foster & Yaoyu, 2016; Loudon, 2019). The pragmatic environment of application contributes to the knowledge in reshaping the phenomena (Mulcahy, 2016). Sometimes faculty engage in solving organizational problems and prepare a document on the new policy, Implanting these practices and making new policies which empower students and the university as a whole through discovery, teaching and learning across the integration of disciplines (Scott & Unsworth, 2018).

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

This is comprised of transmitting and gaining knowledge and skills (Boyer, 1990), and further extended by Boyer (1997), the scholarship of teaching involves existing dynamic knowledge, serious intellectual and a strong commitment to lifelong learning. Recently according to Loudon (2019), this form of scholarship develops relationships among other scholarships of discovery, application and integration. It is the representation of teaching and learning as well. However, the evaluation of students reflects the quality of teaching in the sense of grades are the scholar's satisfaction and achievements. Introducing knowledge and skills through practice and research brings collaboration and communication among communities (Ashwin, 2020). Teaching and learning is the only way of giving power to university students to be a professional, specialists, producers and consumers as well (Nixon, Scullion, & Hearn, 2018).

Conceptual Framework

In the connection with the literature, a conceptual framework has been established that highlights indicators of organizational justice:



Figure 1 Conceptual Model of Distributive justice and Procedural justice as indicators of Faculty Achievement.

Employees are the central part of any organization who are contributed to organizational progress and development. Employees perceive justice or injustice in the workplace organization. Organizational justice is very much important for organizational growth and development. These perspectives are related to many of the organization's key results. In their study, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2011), found procedural justice and distributive justice are important determinants of departure intentions, while interactive justice is relatively weak. The study further revealed that distribution and procedural justice are important predictors. Colkitt (2001) also found that workplace justice is an important factor in determining job performance. It has also been found that procedural justice and distributional justice affect employee commitment levels. Therefore, it can be said that justice is the key determinant of the survival and growth of any organization.

In this study procedural justice and distributive justice were used as a predictor of faculty achievement. Procedural justice deals with employees' perceptions of fair procedures and processes used in decisions making process. Distributive justice deals with employees' perception of fair distribution of outcomes, rewards, salaries and incentives. Faculty achievement is concerned with faculty intentions and hard work to get something new in their field. Boyer's model of faculty achievement is adopted based on four parts, discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning. It is intended to find the role of procedural and distributive justice as a predictor of faculty achievement at the higher education level.

Research Methodology

It is intended to get desirable findings quantitative approach was used in this study.

Participant

For choosing the group of samples in this study, first, it is necessary to find samples as the number of public sector universities in Islamabad. Secondly, selected the faculty of social sciences of public sector universities. Faculty members' male and female both were taken through a random sampling technique. Thirdly, using the random sampling technique, it was determined that 100 faculty members of the social sciences departments based on gender, and work experience would be the participant in this study. In terms of gender 46% (n=46) were male faculty members and 54% (n=54) were female faculty members. In terms of working experience of male and female faculty members, 3% were less than one year, 13% were 2-3 years, 20% were 3-5 years, 24% were 5-10 years and 40% were more than 10 years.

Data Collection Tool

The required data was collected with the help of a detailed questionnaire. The questionnaire based on the first demographic part, and the second part based on distributive justice and procedural justice (independent variables) were used as an indicator measured by adapting instruments developed by Moorman and Niehoff (1993). The third section of the questionnaire comprised faculty achievement (dependent variable) divided into four parts such as discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning measured by adapting instruments developed by Boyer (1997).

- 1. Distributive justice and procedural justice scale was adapted by Moorman and Niehoff (1993). The total items were 15, which were answered on five points Likert-type scale such as (strongly agree "5" and strongly disagree "1"). Distributive justice was comprised of 6 items and procedural justice included 7 items.
- 2. The faculty achievement scale was adapted which was developed by Boyer (1997) and included four sections, such as discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning. The total items were 18 which were measured with the help of five points Likert-type scale (always "5" often "4" sometimes "3" rarely "2" never "1").

For the validity of the scale, questionnaires were distributed among 5 experts, according to their suggestions some items were deleted and some were improved. In the second stage, a scale was used for the pilot study with a sample of 30 faculty members of public sector universities in Islamabad. Responses were collected through personal visits for measuring the reliability of the scale. The reliability was checked through Cronbach's alpha for checking the accuracy and consistency of the instrument.

Reliability Analysis

"Consistency refers to how well the things used to measure an idea fit together as a group." According to Sekaran, (2003) "Cronbach's alpha is a reliability coefficient that reflects how well the elements in a set are positively connected". Reliability numbers between 0.7 and 0.8 are considered adequate, whereas reliability values above 0.8 are considered good (Sekaran, 2003).

Table 2

Reliability Analysis of Data

Variable/Dimension	No of items	Reliability
Distributive Justice	5	.906
Procedural Justice	5	.842
Faculty Achievement - Discovery	4	.765
Faculty Achievement – Application	11	.861
Faculty Achievement – Integration	4	.806
Faculty Achievement – Teaching & Learning	4	.846

As revealed in the above table, the reliability statistics of distributive justice (0.906), procedural justice (0.842), faculty achievement – discovery (0.765), application (.861), integration (0.806) and teaching & learning (0.846). All values are above the acceptable range of 0.70. **Data Collection Procedure**

Data collection is also an important part of the research. It is the process of getting accurate and sufficient data from the respondents. For this purpose, teachers personally visited and filled out questionnaires from the teachers (male and female both) of predetermined departments of social sciences of public sector universities in Islamabad.

Data Analysis

For getting the desired answers frequency, percentage, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation and multiple regression had been used through SPSS for analyses of data.

Findings of the Research Study

The findings of the study are given below.

Demographic Analysis

Table 1

Demographic Analysis of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	46	46.0
Female	54	54.0
%		
Social Sciences	100	100
Service		
< 1 year	3	3.0
2-3 years	13	13.0
3-5 years	20	20.0
5-10 years	24	24.0
> 10 years	40	40.0

Table 1 shows that female contributors have a significantly higher response rate than male contributors. Out of a total of 100 respondents, 46 male respondents (46%) contributed to the study, which is lower than the contribution of 54 female respondents (54%). The contributions of respondents of social sciences are 100%. There are five service categories among the respondents. Respondents in the service groups < 1 year gave a response of 3%, 2-3 years 13%, 3-5 years 20%, 5-10 years 24% and >10 years 40%.

Descriptive Analysis

Sekaran (2003) declares Descriptive Analysis tests and Normality Analysis tests to be the most rigorous data analysis techniques for research purposes. Skewness and kurtosis tests were employed to check for normalcy in the data and to determine whether the results of the data fell within the -2 to 2 range or not (Trochim and Donnelly, 2006; Field, 2000 and 2009; Gravetter and Wallnau, 2014). The skewness and kurtosis test findings are well within range, thus the above-tabulated data can be determined to be normal and appropriate for further research based on the results.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The AMOS is used to check the model fitness and to perform the Confirmatory variable's analysis. The variable items' loading values need to be checked to perform the analysis. A confirmatory factor analysis of the sample data (n=100) using AMOS 27.0 (Arbuckle, 1994) was conducted by researchers. This was to assess the latent structure which consists of all constructs in the proposed conceptual model with the method of maximum likely hood estimation. All variables' average variance extracted is above the threshold of 0.50 and reliabilities are above the threshold of 0.70, so all latent constructs guarantee good reliability properties as seen in Table 3. Researchers believe that the scales of all first-order factors have satisfactory reliability properties (Bagozzi and Yi 1988; Hair et al. 2010). The reliability for all scales of first-order factors have necommended that factor loading above the cutoff value of 0.50 is ideal, and in addition, the standardized factor loadings of greater than 0.40 are also acceptable. The below figure shows the loading of each item.



Table 2Convergent Validity: Factor Loadings, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Construct Reliability

Name of Variable/Construct	Items	Factor Loading	AVE Score	CR Values
Distributive Justice			.67	.91
	OJD1	0.816		
	OJD2	0.863		
	OJD3	0.847		
	OJD4	0.824		
	OJD5	0.724		
Procedural Justice			.53	.84
	OJPJ6	0.561		
	OJPJ7	0.750		
	OJPJ8	0.915		
	OJPJ9	0.756		
	OJPJ10	0.592		
Faculty Achievement - Application			.51	.85
	AP1A	0.517		
	AP1B	0.624		
	AP1C	0.674		
	AP2A	0.647		
	AP2B	0.570		
	AP3A	0.440		
	AP3B	0.400		
	AP4A	0.741		
	AP4B	0.780		
	AP5	0.554		
	AP6	0.493		
Faculty Achievement – Discovery			.50	.77
	FAD1	0.569		
	FAD2	0.889		
	FAD3	0.598		
	FAD4	0.632		
Faculty Achievement - Integration			.51	.78
-	INT1	0.427		

The Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice as theAbbasi & Nudrat

	INTI2	0.572		
	INTI3	0.870		
	INTI4	0.820		
Faculty Achievement – Teaching & Learning			.58	.85
	TAL1	0.758		
	TAL2	0.801		
	TAL3	0.752		
	TAL4	0.736		

Table 2 shows the factor loading (estimated value) of each variable which was extracted from AMOS output. If any item has factor loading ≥ 0.50 (Cua et al., 2001), it will be included for further analysis. No item has a factor loading of less than 0.50 so for further analysis we will not exclude any item. The loading value of each item, decision, AVE and CR values are given in the below table. Convergent validity is measured by using the AVE formula, the value of AVE greater than 0.50 is accepted on the scale. Generally, the AVE acceptance value is >0.50 but according to, Fornell and Larcker (1981). Generally, a composite reliability value >0.70 is accepted for good reliability of the scale. Suppose other benchmarks (Loading, AVE, CR) are within an acceptable range then a reliability value between 0.60-0.70 is acceptable. The results show that all values are in the acceptable range.

Correlation Analysis

A correlation is a statistical measure of the relationship between two variables. The measure is best used in variables that demonstrate a linear relationship between each other. Correlation is also known as the establishment of relationships among the variables in the study. The correlation coefficient is measured on a scale that varies from + 1 through 0 to - 1. The complete correlation between two variables is expressed by either + 1 or -1. When one variable increases as the other increases the correlation is positive; when one decreases as the other increases it is negative. The complete absence of correlation is represented by 0. The following table shows the correlation values of all variables among themselves.

Table 3

Correlation Analysis

Variables	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Faculty Achievement
Distributive Justice	1		
Procedural Justice	.497**	1	
Faculty Achievement	.522**	.469**	1

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

Table 3 shows that all variables positively and significantly correlate with each other. Distributive justice and procedural justice have a positive and significant relationship (r=0.497, p<0.01). Distributive justice also has a positive and significant relationship with faculty achievement (r=0.522, p<0.01). The results also show that procedural justice also has a positive and significant relationship with faculty achievement (r=0.469, p<0.01).

Table 4

Multiple Regression

IV to DV	Beta	t-value	\mathbf{R}^2	$\Delta \mathbf{R}^2$
Distributive Justice > Faculty	.279***	4.009	.331	.317
Achievement				
Procedural Justice > Faculty	.220***	2.903		
Achievement				

N=100 *p<0.05; **p<0.01: ***p<0.001.

Table 4, results showed that distributive justice is positively associated with faculty achievement and has a significant impact as beta value= 0.279^{***} p<.001. A positive beta value shows that distributive justice is positively associated with faculty achievement and a p value<0.001 shows that it is highly significant. Results also showed that procedural justice is positively associated with faculty achievement and has a significant impact as a beta value= 0.220^{***} p<.001.

Conclusion and Discussion

The main objective of the present study was to find the role of procedural justice and distributive justice as a predictor of faculty achievement at the higher education level. A comprehensive analysis

of the data revealed that the sample respondents perceive that all variables such as procedural and distributive justice positively and significantly correlate with faculty achievements.

The results also concluded that distributive justice is positively associated with faculty achievement and had a highly significant impact on faculty achievements like discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning. This indicates that the faculty is more self-confident about fairness regarding the distribution of workload, duties, facilities, salary, and overall job responsibilities. These all factors relating to distributive justice had a highly significant effect on faculty achievements. It was concluded that university teachers are satisfied with distributive justice. Nazir Nadia & Mahek (2020) concluded from their study that a strong relationship was found between distributive justice and university teachers. Therefore activities regarding distributive justice should be improved. The study by Ayman, Judit, József & Samir (2020) found that there was a strong positive relationship between distributive justice and the trust climate. Kovačević, Zunić and Mihailović (2013) conducted a study on the school achievement of students they found from the study that positive correlation between all dimensions of justice with school achievement, and it was highly significantly correlated only for the distributive aspect of organizational/school justice among other types of organizational justice. Awamle & Fernandes (2006) determined a high correlation between distributive justice and faculty satisfaction with their job. Distributive justice always matches the fairness of specific outcomes related to that amount of achievements by others however, it is directly interlinked with the achievement of faculty members in educational institutions (Farndale, Hope-Hailey and Kelliher, 2011; Karem, Jameel and Ahmad, 2019).

Fitzgerald, S.M., Mahony, D., Crawford, and F. (2014) found after collecting information from the administrators about allocating resources among the faculty members based on their quality of teaching and research. Research productivity and its impact on students were very significant in allocating resources. No more differences were found because of another factor of allocating resources among the departments. Only differences were found in the distribution of resources because of research-based production and quality of teaching.

It is also found from the current study that the most dominating dimension of justice is distributive justice which needs to increase because if we increase the level of distributive justice then the level of faculty achievements increased at the higher education level. So it can be suggested that processes of equal distribution of rewards and outcomes should be expended and assured to make it possible for faculty to perform well in achieving targets and goals.

Recommendations

- On the bases of the findings of this study, it is recommended that universities may make improvements in distributive and procedural justice for increasing faculty achievements. Because justice is the basic need of faculty to do well.
- Distributions of outcomes, rewards, salary and other incentives related to the faculty of universities may equal and transparent.
- To enhance faculty achievement (discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning) universities may provide equal opportunities for performing better and achieving their goals and objectives. Fair distribution boosts the faculty members for their achievements.
- University administration may ensure a fair system of distribution among faculty members so that deserving faculty members could be encouraged and appreciated.
- For efficient and competent faculty higher educational organizations should provide an environment in which faculty make their achievements in producing new knowledge, research publications, new teaching models, software and integration of disciplines.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz : (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). New York: Academic Press

- Arbuckle, J. L. (2010). *IBM SPSS Amos 19 User's Guide*. Crawfordville, FL: Amos Development Corporation.
- Andrade, P. S., & Cardoso, T. A. O. (2012). Prazer e dor na docência: Revisão bibliográfic asobre síndrome de Burnout. Saúde e Sociedade, 21(1), 129-140.
- Aziri. B. (2011). Job Satisfaction: A Literature Review. Management Research and Practice,3(4),77-86.

- Alshaaban & Samir (2020), Impact of distributive justice on the trust climate among Middle Eastern employees Wpływ dystrybucyjnej sprawiedliwości na atmosferę zaufania wśród pracowników na Bliskim Wschodzi Języki publikacji 10.17512/pjms.
- Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y., Singh, S.: On the use of structural equation models in experimental designs: two extensions. Int. J. Res. Mark. 8, 125–140 (1991)
- Boyer (1997), EL: Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher
- Bull, N. H. (1998). *Defining Scholarship for the University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System.* University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System. Storrs, CT. 3 pp.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: 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, 386–400.
- Cropanzano, R. and Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in Organizational Justice: Tunneling Through the Maze, International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12, 317.
- Fitzgerald, H Mahony, Crawford, D & Bradley, H (2014), Distributive Justice in Higher Education: Perceptions of Administrators; *Innovative Higher Education* Strategic Management Journal Volume 19, Issue 4 p. 323-338
- Field, A. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS. London: SAGE.
- Field, A. (2000). *Discovering statistics using SPSS for windows*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: SAGE.
- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioural sciences* (δ^{th} *ed.*). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (2005). (Eds.), Handbook of organizational justice, 85–112. (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,).
- Greenberg, J., (1987), Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends?, Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(1), 55-61.
- Golnaz Tabibnia, Ajay B. Satpute, and Matthew D. The Sunny Side of Fairness Preference for Fairness Activates Reward Circuitry (and Disregarding Unfairness Activates Self-Control Circuitry) Lieberman University of California, Los Angeles
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ghran, L. A. Z., Jameel, A. S., & Ahmad, A. R. (2019). The effect of organizational justice on job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. International Review, 3(3–4), 82–90.
- Haider, Nazir & Arshad (2020), Analysis of Organizational Justice: A Cross-Sectional Study Of University Teachers; PJER, Vol 3, Issue 2
- Helberg, C. (1996). Pitfalls of data analysis. Practical assessment, research & evaluation, 5(5), 1-3.
- Hall EO: Scholars and scholarship. Scand J Caring Sci. 2001, 15: 273-274. 10.1046/j.1471-6712. 2001.00057.x.
- Hayes Tang, (2014), "The scholarship of application in the context of academic entrepreneurialism: A review of the discursive field", Asian Education and Development Studies, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 292-302.
- Ivana Kovačević1, Predrag Zunić2, Dobrivoje Mihailović (2011) Concept of Organizational Justice in the Context of Academic Achievement /management.fon.2013.0024
- Khan M. Idris & Amin (2021), Leadership Style And Performance In Higher Education: The Role Of Organizational Justice *International Journal of Leadership in Education* Theory and Practice
- Karem, M. A., Jameel, A. S., & Ahmad, A. R. (2019). The impact of organizational justice dimensions on organizational commitment among bank employees. International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 23(2), 502–513
- Kim, C. W., & Mauborgne., R., (Apr 1998), Procedural Justice, Strategic Decision Making, and the Knowledge Economy, Strategic Management Journal, 19 (4), 323-338.

- Karem S. Jameel. Ahmad (2019). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment On Nurses' Performance Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews 7(6):332-339 DOI:10.18510/ hssr. 2019.7658
- Lapidot, Y., Kark, R., Shamir, B. (2007). The impact of situational vulnerability on the. development and erosion of followers' trust in their leader. The Leadership Quarterly. VOI.18, pp, 16-2
- Loudon, G. (2019). Integrating ideas from design disciplines into STEM. curricula. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4(1), 284–286.
- Lambert, E. (2003). Justice in corrections: An exploratory study of the impact of organizational justice on correctional staff. Journal of Criminal Justice, 31, 155-168.
- Marks (2000) ES: Defining scholarship at the uniformed services university of the health sciences school of medicine: A study in cultures. Acad Med., 75: 935-939.
- Morrow, J. (2016). *PD presenter's week: Jennifer Ann Morrow on what to do with. "dirty" data Steps for getting evaluation data clean and useable.* American. Evaluation Association: http://aea365.org/blog/
- Mulcahy, C.M. (2016). *Pedagogy, praxis and purpose in education*. 3(1), 373–384. doi: https://doi. org/10.1080/23752696.2018.1510294
- 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, 527-556.
- Nixon, E., Scullion, R., & Hearn, R. (2018). student consumers' narcissistic (dis)satisfactions and the narcissistic (dis)satisfactions of the student-consumer. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(6), 927–943.
- Nguyen, P, Khuong, Hoang, Le Dong (2018), Ethical Leadership, Organizational Justice and Supporting Environment on Employee Engagement: Empirical Evidence for Public Policy Implications; 14th International Conference 133-135
- Randeree. K. (2008). Organizational justice: migrant worker perceptions in organizations in the United Arab Emirates. Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics 3(4), 57.
- Sekaran. U. 2003. Research Methods for Business, 4th ed. NY: John Wiley and Sons. Inc
- Scott, M., & Unsworth, J. (2018). Matching final assessment to employability: Developing a digital viva as an end-of-programme assessment. *Higher Education Pedagogies*,
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). Flourish A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2006). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog. Trochim, W. & Land, D. (1982). Designing designs for research. *The Researcher*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Taghrid S. Suifan, Hannah D, Ayman & Abdallah (2017), *Does organizational justice affect turnover intention in a developing country? The mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment:* Journal of Management Development, ISSN: 0262-1711
- Tyler, R., T., (2003) Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law, Crime and Justice, 30, 283-357.
- Taşdan, M., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales' adaptation to Turkish. TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 33(150), 87
- Yean, T. F. (2016). Organizational justice: A conceptual discussion. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 219, 798-803.