THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Saud- Ur- Rehman Khan, Dr. Shehzad Ahmed, Dr. Muhammad Tahir Khan Farooqi

1 Phd Scholor (Education), Department of Educational Research & Assessment, University of Okara, Renala Campus,Okara, Pakistan

2 Assistant Professor of Education, Department of Educational Research & Assessment, University of Okara, Renala Campus,Okara, Pakistan

3 Associate Professor of Education, Department of Educational Research & Assessment, University of Okara, Renala Campus,Okara, Pakistan

Email: saud.urk@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study is designed to know the relationship between organizational justice and teachers' performance in special education institutions. Survey questionnaire was adopted to conduct the research. All teachers from the special education institutions of three randomly selected divisions of Punjab province constituted the population of the study. Cluster sampling technique was used to determine these Divisions i.e Multan, Rawalpindi and D.G Khan. Data was collected using a survey questionnaire in which respondents were asked to respond at 5-point likert type questionnaire. Collected data were analyzed using statistics on S.P.S.S 20. Pearson moments correlation coefficient were used to analyze the data. Results of the study revealed that organizational justice has a positive relationship with teachers' performance. Conclusions were drawn on the basis of findings. At the end, recommendations were given for betterment of special education institutions.

KEYWORDS: Organizational Justice. Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Teachers' performance, Special Education

INTRODUCTION

Justice refers to a worldwide measure of an organization's fairness (Rupp, Shao, Jones & Liao, 2014). Equality in the organizations may involve fair pay, equitable employment opportunities and employee selection processes. This is a major area of concern for heads as well as organizations (Swalhi, Zgoulli & Hofiadhllaoui, 2017).

Organizational justice is the view of the employee on equal opportunities within an organization (Asadullah, Akram, Imran, Arain, 2017). The understanding of how an organization allocates its resources and handles its workers is concerned with fairness. The dimensions of justice apply to whether an organization adheres to the laws of justice or not (Goldman & Cropanzano, 2014). Organizational justice is known as one of the most imperative research topics in organizational behavior, work psychology and human resources (Cojuharenco & Patient, 2013). Employees have a strong relationship with the company. The workers' perceptions about the approaches used within the organization and the organization's conduct against workers influence organizational justice (Chou, Chou, Jiang & Klien, 2013). Employees give an importance to the justice in their organization and their views about organizational justice can disturb their loyalty, satisfactory level, behavior, entrepreneurship and trust (Zhang, Lepine, Buckman & Wei, 2014). Organizational justice is one of the supreme leading factors

which influence performance, reaction and activities (Scott, Garza, Conlon & Kim, 2015). Organizational justice is imperative due to impartial dealing in improved societal relations and comprehensive accomplishment of the organization (Heidari & Saeedi, 2012). It affects significantly to the work demonstrated by the workers and their behaviors. If they perceive that equal opportunities and benefits are being given to them, they ultimately contribute to good results or otherwise contrary organizational outcomes will be produced (Usmani & Jamal, 2013).

It is basically characterized as the perception of individuals about the fairness of the organizations they work for (Yesil & Dereli, 2013). Due to its theoretical and practical significance, scholars have long been researching the idea of organizational justice (Fadel & Durcikova, 2014). The perceptions of the employees about their organization, its' processes, interactions and outcomes are reflected as organizational justice (Balwin, 2006). Organizational justice expresses to workers the message of appreciation and integrity that makes them feel proud to be members of their organization (Epitropaki, 2013). In the development of organizational culture, role of organizational justice cannot be ignored. Research scholars in organizational researches have paid noteworthy recognition to it (Spell & Arnold, 2007). In the formation and maintenance of social relations, expectations of workers for reward, respect and appreciation play an important role. The fairness is assessed by individuals based on the knowledge and understanding they receive from social interactions (Okumuş & Öztürk, 2015). In particular, the good perception of justice to workers may encourage them to conduct advantageous and constructive actions, contrary to it they may respond negatively when experiencing injustice (Graso & Grover, 2017).

In fact, organizational justice is reflected as a psychological state resulting from an assessment of a person's complete work area. It influences the employee's overall feeling (Kosi, Sulemana, Boateng & Mensah, 2015). Employees are inspired to work more when their organization rewards them (Shah & Jumani, 2015). A variety of studies explored the questions of "how" and "why" in the process of assessing the employees' perceived fairness and their performance (Kerwin, Jordan & Turner, 2015). Studies have shown that positive perceptions of justice contribute to positive employee performance (Jakopec & Susanj, 2014). It was revealed that negative perceptions of justice are found to be detrimental and result in low employee performance (Priesemuth, Arnaud & Schminke, 2013).

The definition of organizational justice originally stems from the aspect of "distributive justice," referring to an equal distribution of production (Colquitt, Scott, Rodell, Long, Zapata, Conlon & Wesson, 2013). Then the dimension of "procedural justice" was discovered which is complementary to that dimension and covers the decisions taken and the procedures applied (Esterhuzien, 2008).

Distributive and procedural justices were taken as two main aspects of organizational justice by some research scholars (Roch & Shanock, 2006). Some other scholars considered interactional justice as a sub-dimensional component of distributive justice (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). Another group of scholars see organizational justice as four factors model, they divided interactional justice into interpersonal and analytical justice sub-dimensions (Crawshaw, Cropanzano, Bell & Nadisic, 2013). Several researchers have looked at all facets of organizational justice (Cojuharenco & Patient, 2013). Factors like distributive, procedural, and interactional justice are three separate objects (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Others have

argued that a stronger theoretical approach is to separate procedural and interactional justice (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice represents the observed justice of the results found by a worker (Moorman, 1991). These results may include salary, advancement, rank, performance assessments and job tenure effects that have a strong impact on workers satisfactory level towards their job, job quality and achievement of the organization (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987). Distributive justice deals with workers point of view about justice linked with decision outcomes and distribution of tangible and intangible resources such as salary and praise (Usmani & Siraj, 2013).

The understanding of distributive justice is linked to the resources distribution. Feeling equal is based in such a way that workers think that resources were distributed equally (Campbell, Perry, Maertz, Allen & Griffeth, 2013).

Employees compare their efforts to their colleagues' efforts (Elamin, 2012). When they feel they are behaved unfairly, their level of satisfaction reduced. If they observe the performance of a decision to be unreasonable, they can engage in counterproductive work behavior. On the other hand, if employees observe the distribution process is a quite fair, rate of satisfaction and engagement increases (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001).

Procedural Justice

It stresses on the fairness of the procedures that lead to results and is validated when they believe that the processes followed in resource allocation are reliable, effective and impartial (Usmani & Siraj, 2013). This is also stated as the fairness of the decision-making processes that lead to outcomes and includes whether the decision-making procedures, process management and conflict resolution mechanisms are fair, transparent, reliable, rational or not, and whether or not workers have any means of engaging in the decision-making process (Yesil & Dereli, 2013).

Procedural justice can make it easier for employees to accept changes in organizational values and to adapt external change pressures in the organization (Lee, Sharif & Scandura, 2017). Employees' view of procedural justice is linked to the hierarchical level at which organizational outcomes are transmitted by managers or representatives of managers in compliance with structured organizational processes (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013).

Perception of procedural justice not only influences the employee attitudes and actions with respect to decisions taken by managers but it also carries a symbolic role, such as reinforcing the bond between workers and managers. Procedural justice may achieve the positive organizational outcomes by growing employee trust with the manager, colleagues and the organization (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). Procedural justice is known as the origin of social interaction in an organization (Swalhi, Zgoulli & Hofaidhllaoui, 2017). Procedural justice positively affects job engagement, information sharing and creative work actions of the workers (Kim & Park, 2017). Procedural justice makes it easier for workers to consider changes in the principles and priorities, and to respond to external change pressures. In addition to it, some results indicated that the method of allocating rewards is more important than the outcome (Lee, Sharif & Scandura, 2017).

Performance

The term performance comes from the word "to perform," which means to display and execute. It means "performing act;" or "performing an action". Hence the performance's

definition can be described as a performance that means acts that display an action or execute an operation. Therefore, performance is often interpreted as appearance in work or work behavior (Kamal, Azwan, Romle, & Yusof, 2015). According to some experts, performance is described as the product of work or job execution (Husain, 2013). It is an individual's job cycle to attain those outcomes (Markos, 2010). Performance can be defined as assigned duties to an employee and the results generated during a specified time period on a job function or operation. It can be referred to an action of performing a given task. Job performance refers to an act of performing or carrying out a particular task (Griffin, 2012).

Teachers' Performance

Teaching is commonly known in contemporary society as one of the most significant and demanding profession (Vesely, Saklofske & Leschied, 2013). Considering the high stresses and aspirations regarding the progress of students and the work success of teachers, it is of major area of concern for a number of stakeholders, including administrators, parents, policy-makers and society at large (Hwang, Bartlett, Greben & Hand, 2017). Organizational trust has been conceptualized in the study as the expectations of teachers about the trustworthiness of school leaders (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2012).

The performance of teachers can be described as the actions they take in schools to attain educational goals (Hwang et al., 2017). The teacher's position is highly emotional and largely dependent on interactions with other members of the school community, and highlights the importance of the character of teachers in achieving good teaching performance (Alrajhi, Aldhafri, Alkharusi, Albusaidi, Alkharusi & Ambusaidi, 2017).

Studies on Organizational Justice and Performance

Organizational justice researchers determined the associations between perceptions of organizational justice and the consequences of employees (Ambrose, Schminke & Mayer, 2013). The research having samples of 300 teachers and heads of 60 secondary schools in Punjab revealed that two dimensions of OCB, i.e. altruism and universal compliance were significantly associated with procedural and interactional justice (Tatlah, Saeed & Iqbal, 2011). In a more comprehensive study from Gim and Desa (2014), it was revealed that successful employee engagement was linked to distributive and procedural justice in a substantial and positive manner; workers felt that they were dealt equally and compensation was also fair, they remained more dedicated to their company and they retained their jobs. Furthermore, this study showed that it is crucial for both public and private organizations to work equally with their workers to make them more active, and so far they might be more likely to remain on the organizations. Research on the relationship between the confidence relationships of teachers and their satisfaction at work is minimal in the educational literature. A significant study was performed using multilevel analyzes; related confidence, at the level of the individual instructor as well as the collective staff, to the satisfaction of teachers ' work. The findings indicated a positive effect of individual confidence attitudes on job satisfaction of teachers and found only 2.72 percent of the gap in job satisfaction level of teachers was at school level (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2012).

Positive relationships based on the school are seen as a significant source of job satisfaction for teachers. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2011) found that, through the feeling of belonging, the positive relationships between teachers, principals and peers were predictive of job satisfaction. In view of the above, it is fair to assume that teachers in schools with higher levels of organizational confidence will experience higher rates of job satisfaction. Policymakers,

educators and parents agree good teachers are the key to improving public education (Hamid, Hassan & Ismail, 2012).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between organizational justice and teachers' performance in special education institutions. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions.

1. What is the perception level of the teachers with regard to organizational justice in special education institutions?
2. What is the perception level of the teachers with regard to teachers' performance in special education institutions?
3. What type of relationship is there between the teachers' perception of organizational justice and teachers' performance in special education institutions?

METHODOLOGY

Sample and Population

Data were collected through questionnaire. Questionnaire was distributed to the teachers working in special education institutions of Punjab. Cluster sampling technique was used to select three divisions of Punjab i.e. Dera Ghazi Khan division, Rawalpindi division and Multan division to collect the data from participants. All the teachers from these three divisions were the sample of the study. Sample of five hundred seventy eight respondents were selected. Five hundred five respondents responded the questionnaire which is 87.7 percent of selected sample.

Data Collection Tool

The adopted questionnaire was used which encompassed of three parts: The first part of the questionnaire was delineating the background information of respondents' i.e, gender, academic qualification, field of specialization and experience. The second part was comprised of closed ended items about organizational justice which was adopted from the instrument "Distributive and Procedural Justice" of (Joy & Witt, 1992) and the third part consists of teachers' performance which was adopted from the instrument" Teacher Performance Evaluation Scale. The closed ended items were developed using Likert type questionnaire having value between one and five from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Before the administration of questionnaire, it was pilot tested to check the reliability of the instrument applying Cronbach alpha through S.P.S.S 20. Chronbach alpha is an appropriate measure for assessing the reliability of the questionnaire. Lombard (2010), declared the value of reliability outstanding if it is 90 or above, suitable if it is 80 or above and appropriate if it is 70 or above. A group of 40 teachers from Lahore Division were selected conveniently for pilot testing. Chronbach alpha is an appropriate measure for assessing the reliability of the questionnaire. Consequently, keeping in view values mentioned above, only those items were selected which were reliable and having reliability of 0.7 or above.

RESULTS

Table 1 defines the characteristics of the demographic variable "gender". 339 respondents out of 505 respondents are female, which are 67.1 percent of the entire sample size, and 166 respondents are male, which are 32.9 percent of the overall sample size.

Table1

Gender wise distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percent

Female	339	67.1
Male	166	32.9
Total	505	100.0

Table 4.1 defines the characteristics of the demographic variable "gender". 339 respondents out of 505 respondents are female, which are 67.1 percent of the entire sample size, and 166 respondents are male, which are 32.9 percent of the overall sample size.

Table 2

Mean and standard deviation of "organizational justice"

Factor	Mean	S.D
Organizational Justice	3.52	1.230

Table specifies that the mean score of the variable "organizational justice" is 3.52 and standard deviation is 1.230. The result of analysis of organizational justice suggest that teachers' responses to the statements relating to organizational justice were "agree" (M=3.52, sd= 1.230).

Table 3

Mean and standard deviation of "teachers 'performance"

Factor	Mean	S.D
Teachers' Performance	3.39	1.386

The results of the analysis of teachers 'performance suggest that (Table 3) teachers' responses to the statements relating to teachers 'performance were "agree" (M=3.39, sd= 1.386). According to the study's findings, it's crucial to note that the teachers are constant and dedicated to their jobs. The relationship between organizational justice and teachers 'performance was analyzed using Pearson correlation and the results are displayed in Table 4

Table 4.

Relationship between organizational justice and teachers' performance in special education institutions

	N	Mean	Pearson r	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organizational justice	505	3.52	.04*	.005*
Teachers' performance		3.39		

Table indicates that the relationship of two variables, "organizational justice" and "teachers' performance" and 0.04 is the value of the correlation coefficient. The presence of a positive indicator indicates that there is a relationship between organizational justice and teachers' performance. This implies that high organizational justice yields high teachers' performance.

CONCLUSION

Organizational justice and teachers 'performance are two very important concepts in considering the effectiveness of an educational organizations. The organizational justice of head will relate to the teachers 'performance of their institutions. Organizational justice and teachers 'performance are found to be positively correlated in this study. Therefore, principals are

supposed to act fairly and avoid behaviors that may weaken the teachers' trust in justice to evolve teachers 'performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Organizational justice and teacher performance are key topics for educational institutions, according to researches. Teachers' perceptions of their institutes and administrators in terms of fairness have a favorable influence on their performance. Teachers' performance to their institutions will increase when principals treat them equitably in this regard.

REFERENCES

Alexander, S. & Ruderman M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. Social Justice Research. *1,* 177–198.

Alrajhi M., Aldhafri S., Alkharusi H., Albusaidi S., Alkharusi B., Ambusaidi A., et al. (2017). The predictive effects of math teachers' emotional intelligence on their perceived self-efficacy beliefs. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 67 378–388. 10.1016/j.tate.2017.07.003

Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M. & Mayer, D. M. (2013). Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(4)*, 678-689.

Asadullah M. A., Akram A., Imran H., Arain G. A. (2017). When and which employees feel obliged: a personality perspective of how organizational identification develops. Rev. Psicol. del Trabajo y de las Organ. 33, 125–135. 10.1016/j.rpto.2017.02.002

Balwin, S. (2006), Organizational justice. Retrieved from http://www.employement studies.co.uk/pdflibrary/mp73.pdf/ (12 April 2012).

Campbell, N. S., Perry S. J., Maertz, C. P., Jr., Allen, D. G. & Griffeth R. W. (2013). All you need is… resources: the effects of justice and support on burnout and turnover. Human Relation, *66*, 759–782.

Chou, T. Y., Chou, S. T., Jiang, J. J., & Klein, G. (2013). The organizational citizenship behavior of IS personnel: Does organizational justice matter? Information & Management, *50*, 105–111.

Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. (2001). The role of justice in organization: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behaviors and Human Decision Process, *86*: 278-321.

Cojuharenco, I. & Patient, D. (2013). Workplace fairness versus unfairness: Examining the differential salience of facets of organizational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 86*, 371–393.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E. & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(2)*, 199-236.

Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational justice: New insights from behavioural ethics. Human Relations, *66(7)*, 885-904.

D.S.A. Hedari, N.Saeedi (2012). Studying the role of organizational justice on job satisfaction(Case study : An Iranian company). *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2* (7), pp. 6459-6465

Elamin, A.M. (2012). Perceived organizational justice and work-related attitudes: A study of Saudi employees. J. Entrepreneurship Manage. Sustainable Develop., 8: 71-88. DOI: 10.1108/20425961211221633

Esterhuzien, W. (2008). Organizational Justice and Employee Responses to Employement Equity. Master Thesis, University of South Africa, South Africa.

Gim, G.C.W., & Desa, N.M. (2014). The impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, and affective commitment on turnover Intentionamong public and private sector employees in Malaysia. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 4(6), 487.

Goldman, B. & Cropanzano, R. (2014). "Justice" and "fairness" are not the same thing. Journal of Organizational Behavior.

Graso M., Grover S. L. (2017). Organizational justice comes of age: review of the oxford handbook of justice in the workplace edited by Russell Cropanzano and Maureen Ambrose. Soc. Just. Res. 51, 1–10. 10.1007/s11211-017-0282-5

Griffin, R.W. (2012). Management. Mason, USA: South- Western College Pub.

Hamid. R. A., Hassan, S. S. S. & Ismail, N. A. H. (2012). Teaching Quality and Performance Among Experienced Teachers in Malaysia. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, *37(11)*, 5. Retrieved from https://www.learntechlib. org/p/113412

Hwang Y. S., Bartlett B., Greben M., Hand K. (2017). A systematic review of mindfulness interventions for in-service teachers: a tool to enhance teacher wellbeing and performance. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 64 26–42. 10.1016/j.tate.2017.01.015

Kerwin, S., Jordan, J., S., & Turner, B., A. (2015). Organizational justice and conflict: Do perceptions of fairness influence disagreement? *Journal of sport management review, 18*, 384-395.

Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2013). Bad behavior in groups: The impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behavior in work units. Group & Organization Management, 38(2), 230–257.

K.J. Fadel, A. Durcikova. (2014). If it's fair, I'll share: The effect of perceived knowledge validation justice on contributions to an organizational knowledge repository. *Journal of Information and management, 51.*

Kim, W., Park, J. (2017). Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organizational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior for sustainable organizations.

Lee K., Sharif M. & Scandura T. (2017). Procedural justice as a moderator of the relationship between organizational change intensity and commitment to organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management. 30,* 501–524.

Markos, S. 2010. Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(12), 89-96.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology. 76*:845.

O. Epitropaki**a,** (2013). A multi-level investigation of psychological contract breach and organizational identification through the lens of perceived organizational membership: Testing a moderated-mediated model. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34,pp. 65-86.

Okumuş, A. & Öztürk, E. (2015). Sosyal Mübadele Teorisi. İçinde M.İ. Yağcı & S. Çabuk (Eds.), Pazarlama Teorileri, (ss. 13-33), MediaCat Yayınları, 2. Baskı, Ekim, 2015, İstanbul.

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A metaanalytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *123(2)*, 159-185.

Scott, B. A., Garza, A. S., Conlon, D. E. & Kim, Y. J. (2015). Why do managers act Fairly. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies* ISSN 2162-3058 2016,*Vol. 6, No. 1* 19 in the first place?

Skaalvik E. M., Skaalvik S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 27 1029–1038.

Spell, C.S. & Arnold, T. (2007). An appraisal perspective of justice, structure, and job control as antecedents of psychological distress. Journal of organizational behavior, 28 (6), 729-51.

Suliman, A. & Kathairi, M. A. (2013). Organizational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE. Employee Relations, *35(1)*, 98-115.

Swalhi, A., Zgoulli, S. & Hofaidhllaoui, M. (2017). The influence of organizational justice on job performance: the mediating effect of affective commitment. *Journal of Management Development*. 36, 542–559.

Tatlah, I, A, Saeed, M. & Iqbal, M. Z. (2011). Organizational behavior and Procedural interactive justice in HRM: A secondary school level study. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences, 2(1),* 14-17.

Usmani S. & Jamal S. (2013). Impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice, spatial justice on job satisfaction of banking employees. Review of Integrative *Business* and Economics. *2*(1), 351.

Van Maele D., Van Houtte M. (2012). The role of teacher and faculty trust in forming teachers' job satisfaction: do years of experience make a difference? *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 28 879–889.

Vesely A. K., Saklofske D. H., Leschied A. D. W. (2013). Teachers-the vital resource: the contribution of emotional intelligence to teacher efficacy and well-being. *Can. J. School Psychol.* 28 71–89. 10.1177/0829573512468855

Yesil, S., & Dereli, S., F. (2013). An empirical investigation of the organizational justice, knowledge sharing and innovation capability. Procedia, social and behavioral sciences, 75, 199-208.

Zhang, Y., Lepine, J. A., Buckman, B. R. & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair . . . or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor–job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal. 57(3)*, 675–697.