

Validity and Reliability Testing of Organizational Justice Scale in Educational Organizations

¹Tri Na'imah, ²Heru Kurnianto Tjahjono, ³Abd. Madjid

¹Post-Graduate Programs, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia; Lecturer in Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Indonesia; trinaimah@ump.ac.id*

²³Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Organizational justice is a concept that expresses employees' perceptions of the extent to which they are treated fairly, fairly, and equally. Previous research found differences in the dimensions of organizational justice. Organizational conditions must be considered when developing research instruments. Researchers conducted a psychometric analysis to determine the validity and reliability of the organizational justice scale construct in an educational organization setting and reveal the dimensions that can form organizational justice variables. Organizational justice is measured by procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, and informational justice. The participants were one hundred and sixty-two teachers in Banyumas Regency, Indonesia. The data analysis of this research is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) SmartPLS 3.2.8. The analysis results prove that the dimensions and indicators that make up the construct of organizational justice are valid and reliable. Thus, this measurement scale can be implied in research conducted in educational organizations in Indonesia.

Keywords: Validity, Reliability, Organizational Justice, Educational Organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Some research on organizational justice is based on Adams Equity Theory, which assumes that feelings of unfair treatment will arise if the ratio between the person's results and the inputs they provide for exchange is considered unbalanced compared to others (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978). The essence of this theory of justice is that if employees perceive that the rewards are inadequate, two possibilities can occur: the individual will try to get a greater reward or reduce the intensity of the effort made. This theory explains that a person's satisfaction depends on whether he feels there is justice or injustice in a given situation.

Organizational justice is an individual's perception of fairness in the decision-making process and the distribution of outcomes that

individuals have received in the workplace (Greenberg, 1987). Employees will continuously measure and compare inputs and work results. Therefore, organizational justice will affect the behavior of individuals within the organization.

Several researchers carried out several studies on organizational justice in various organizational settings, including police departments (Tjahjono et al., 2016), construction companies (Kogilavani, Yusliza, and Fatimah, 2013), army officers (Olsen et al., 2012), hotel industry (Nazarian et al., 2021; Li et al., 2020). Organizational justice is proven to affect teacher job satisfaction (Nojani et al., 2012; Elma, 2013), organizational citizenship behavior (Barusman & Mihdar, 2014), psychological well-being (Ajala & Bolarinwa, 2015). Furthermore, perceived injustice can

increase turnover (Addai et al., 2018), stimulate destructive behavior (VanYperen et al., 2000). Therefore, an appropriate organizational justice research instrument is needed to support the accuracy of the research design.

Research on organizational justice has been widely carried out in various settings, but little research has been conducted in educational organizations. The research results by Shamma (2015) recommend studying organizational justice with people from different cultural backgrounds because culture contributes to the formation of individual psychological dynamics. Educational organizations have a unique organizational culture, so it is essential to research organizational justice in educational institutions. Principals must create a fair organizational climate, at least in professional interactions (Hoy & Tarter, 2004), because workplace injustice can hurt teacher well-being. Even if teachers believe they are being mistreated, they will slow down their work and stay away from the principal (Aydin & Karaman-Kepeneci, 2008).

This study examines organizational justice from a psychometric point of view in the cultural environment of schools. Research on organizational justice in educational organizations is rarely done. Because there is no research instrument specifically used to measure organizational justice in Indonesia, this research examines the construction of an organizational justice scale applied to educational organizations psychometrically. Several research instruments are designed to measure organizational justice. However, there are differences of opinion about the dimensions that constitute the construct of organizational justice.

Addai et al., (2018) and Ali Khalil & Sharaf (2014) examined the organizational justice of teachers in Ghana and Egypt using the Organizational Justice Index instrument based on the dimensions of measuring distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Research on employees in the public sector in Pakistan and hotel employees in Spain also utilized organizational justice instruments developed by

Niehoff & Moorman (Moliner et al., 2008; Zafar Iqbal et al., 2017). Meanwhile, research on manufacturing employees uses Colquitt's tool (Colquitt, 2012), including procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice (Kogilavani et al., 2013).

Siswanti et al., (2020) recommend measuring the dimensions of measuring instruments for individuals in units with relatively similar perception, cognition, attitude, interest, and behavior. Therefore, organizational justice is socially constructed for organizational justice research, and one must understand the organizational context in which the individual is located (Erkutlu, 2011).

This study aims to analyze the structure of factors and determine the validity and reliability of the Indonesian version of the organizational justice scale. In contrast to previous research, this study used a psychometric analysis with teacher respondents who worked in educational organizations. Researchers modified the organizational justice scale with procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015; Olsen et al., 2012; Omar et al., 2018). So, the purposes of this study are 1) to test the construct validity and reliability of organizational justice 2) to analyze the dimensions and indicators that can shape organizational justice. The researchers hope that these psychometric analysis results can be used to conduct research in educational institutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Some research-based equity theory is declining because of several new approaches to studying organizational justice. Furthermore, the element of equity theory assumed that: 1) people try to create and maintain a just community, 2) if there is a condition of injustice, it will motivate individuals to reduce and eliminate it, 3) the more significant the perception of injustice, the greater motivation to act and to reduce the condition of the tension, 4) people will notice the unpleasant

injustice more quickly than the pleasant one (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978).

Moreover, in 1987, the concept of organizational justice emerged using a taxonomic pattern. There are four theories of justice: content-reactive theory, content-proactive theory, reactive-process theory, and proactive-process theory. The difference in these dimensions is found in eliminating injustice and pursuing justice (Greenberg, 1987).

The content-reactive theory is a conceptual approach to fairness that examines individual responses to ill-treatment and how they react to the unfair distribution of various rewards and resources. Most people will respond negatively to injustice. The proactive content theory studies individuals' efforts to achieve a fair distribution of results. The process-reactive theory examines personal reactions to decision-making procedures. The Proactive-process approach analyzes individual efforts to determine the strategies used to achieve justice (Greenberg, 1987).

Procedural justice is the basis for the legitimacy of an institution. The fair procedure can reduce the "ill effect" of inappropriate results. When employees believe that their leader has used the planning process fairly, they will provide more support, commit more to the organization, and foster trust and commitment, encouraging cooperation (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).

There are two theories in the study of procedural justice, namely the self-interest model and the group-value model. Thibaut and Walker proposed the self-interest model in 1975, which explains how procedural fairness can be achieved when every individual involved in a process or procedure benefits even if it is not entirely in line with the common interests (Cole & Flint, 2004). In this model, decision control refers to the degree of employees' ability to control the decisions made by the organization because they want to get satisfactory results for their personal needs.

Furthermore, Lind & Tyler (In Siswanti et al., 2020) believes that procedures

based on personal interest will be difficult to achieve justice because employees need to be noticed as members of the organization. According to the group-value model, procedural fairness can be felt if the existence of employees is respected and appreciated. Leaders who prioritize togetherness and consider employees to have a voice in decision-making will encourage employees to innovate. Therefore, leaders must be able to empower employees so that employees find meaning in their work (Cobanoglu, 2021).

Distributive justice is an employee's assessment of the organization's results and rewards (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015). These rewards can be in the form of financial and promotional opportunities (Colquitt, 2012). The basic principle of distributive justice is based on comparing the results obtained by one person to those of other employees. Distributive justice refers to the basic concept of equality or equity. This concept is based on the translation of justice as equal pay (such as salary and other incentives) for work done. Employees perceive fairness when the ratio between input (effort) and results (reward) is proportional to the percentage of other employees (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

The existence of social sensitivity indicates interactional justice in organizations, for example, when a leader treats his subordinates with respect and dignity. Interactional justice describes subordinates' perceptions of fairness in social interaction (Robbins and Judge, 2007). In interactional justice, it is assumed that humans, as organizational members, can pay attention to symbols that reflect their position within the organization. Therefore, humans try to understand, seek, and maintain social relationships in organizations.

Interactional justice is divided into two types, namely interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice refers to how subordinates are treated by their superiors at work. Interpersonal justice is strengthened when managers respect subordinates, treat subordinates with dignity and sincerity and portray leaders as not making

untrue statements or offending subordinates (Colquitt, 2001).

Greenberg argues that interpersonal justice is related to the communication process between superiors and subordinates. Therefore, politeness and respect are essential components in determining whether or not an interaction is fair. For example, when the leader does not approve or reject the results of the work of his subordinates but shows concern, the attendants perceive it to be more justified. Informational justice is a social aspect of procedural justice that focuses on information obtained by individuals regarding the certainty of procedures and providing accurate information about these processes and procedures. Informational justice is the right to information and a proper explanation of the procedures to be followed when decisions are made (Deepak, 2021).

METHOD

Research Design

The quantitative research approach was used, especially the psychometric analysis of the organizational justice scale. The research instrument used is the Indonesian version of the organizational justice scale, which was developed based on the dimensions of Colquitt (2001), namely procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. Response choices are graded on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, with the higher the score indicating the perceived level of organizational justice.

Sample and Data Collection

This study involved 162 teachers from educational institutions in the Banyumas region, Indonesia. 88.3% of respondents are over 30 years old, while 11.7% are under 30. When viewed from the service period, 11.7% of respondents have worked less than five years, 37.1% have 6-15 years of service, 41.3% have 16-25 years of service, 9.9% have less than five years of service.

Analyzing of Data

The psychometric analysis was performed to calculate convergent validity, discriminant validity, construct reliability, and composite reliability (Ramayah et al., 2018). Convergent validity aims to determine the validity of each correlation between indicators and their latent constructs or variables. The outer loading or loading factor value and the Average Variant Extracted (AVE) value were used to test the convergent validity. An indicator is declared to meet the excellent category's convergent validity if all have outer loading values is greater than 0.5 (Abdillah & Jogiyanto, 2015). Thus, the higher the loading factor value, the more critical the loading role in interpreting the factor matrix is. The indicator is valuable if AVE value for each variable is more significant than 0.5 (Hair Jr et al., 2010).

Discriminant validity is the degree of mismatch between the attributes that the measuring instrument should not measure and the theoretical concepts about the variable. Discriminant Validity can be calculated using the cross-loading value of the manifest variable against each latent variable. For example, the latent variable's correlation and its indicators (the manifest variable) are more significant than those with other latent variables. It is assumed that the latent variable predicts its indicator better than other latent variables (Abdillah & Jogiyanto, 2015).

The construct reliability was also tested using composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha from the indicators measuring the constructs. Composite reliability was used to test the reliability value of indicators on a variable. A variable can be declared to meet the composite reliability if its value is more significant than 0.7. The reliability test with the composite reliability was strengthened using the Cronbach alpha value. A variable can be stated reliable if it has a Cronbach alpha value of > 0.6 (Abdillah & Jogiyanto, 2015).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the convergent validity analysis can be seen in table 1:

Table 1. *Variable-Dimension Factor Loading Value*

Dimensions	Loading Factor	Description
Procedural Justice	0,583	Valid
Distributive Justice	0,924	Valid
Informational Justice	0,562	Valid
Interpersonal Justice	0,842	Valid

The evaluation results of the outer model also found that the loading factor value from the dimension to the indicator has a value of > 0.5 , as shown in table 2:

Table 2. *Dimension-Indicator Loading Factor Values*

Indicator	Loading Factor	Description
PJ1	0,755	Valid
PJ2	0,818	Valid
PJ3	0,540	Valid
DJ1	0,780	Valid
DJ2	0,626	Valid
DJ3	0,722	Valid
IFJ1	0,717	Valid
IFJ2	0,654	Valid
IFJ3	0,735	Valid
IFJ4	0,591	Valid
INJ1	0,608	Valid
INJ2	0,836	Valid
INJ3	0,808	Valid

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value of organizational justice is 0.554. The loading factors and AVE results indicate that each dimension has good convergent validity so that the indicators are declared valid to be used as research instruments. Furthermore, the discriminant validity test is carried out to prove whether the construct's indicator will have the most significant loading factor formed by combining the loading factor with other constructs. The discriminant validity test uses the cross-loading value. When an indicator is declared to meet the discriminant validity, the needle's cross-loading value on that variable is the largest when compared to other variables. The results are shown in table 3:

Table 3. *Cross Loading*

	PJ	DJ	IFJ	INJ
PJ	0,666	0,442	0,456	0,532
DJ	0,256	0,677	0,553	0,421
IFJ	0,522	0,678	0,707	0,681
INJ	0,418	0,298	0,765	0,872

The construct reliability analysis results measured by composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha can be seen in table 4.

Table 4. *Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha*

	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Procedural Justice	0,626	0,752
Distributive Justice	0,717	0,754
Informational Justice	0,730	0,799
Interpersonal Justice	0,706	0,770

These results indicate that the organizational justice construct has a composite reliability value above 0.70 and Cronbach's alpha above 0.60, so it can be concluded that the construct is reliable. This analysis proves that the organizational justice scale with procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice and informational justice is appropriate for use. These findings are similar to those of Olsen in Norway (Olsen et al., 2012), Omar in Argentina (Omar et al., 2018), and Shibaoka et al. in Japan (Shibaoka et al., 2010).

The validity of organizational justice measures needs to be improved, and it is necessary to investigate the source of justice (Olsen et al., 2012). Therefore, different organizational settings require various measurement tools for organizational justice. The justice climate must always be maintained in school organizations because it affects the educational process.

This study's significant findings prove that the dimension of distributive justice is the most dominant in shaping the construct of organizational justice in educational institutions (loading factor value = 0.924). Furthermore, the dimension of interpersonal justice also has a high factor loading value, namely 0.842. Yilmaz & Taşdan (2009) also argue that

distributive justice plays an essential role in achieving individual satisfaction.

Distributive justice is assessed using three perspectives, namely equity, equality, and need. Equity means that employees are rewarded for their contributions to the company, whereas equality means that every employee has the same opportunity in results or compensation. Need means providing products or benefits based on employee personal needs (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983). In this study, "equity" is evaluated from teachers' respect for their contributions to the school. So if teachers work overtime and complete school assignments well, they deserve to be given more overtime pay than other teachers who don't work overtime. "Equality" is estimated based on the opportunity given to all teachers to get equal compensation. Principals should give male and female teachers equal opportunities to develop their careers. The principal must respect teachers' differences in the division of tasks, not discriminate against race, gender, religion. "Need" is evaluated by measuring rewards according to the teacher's personal needs, that is, providing benefits or based on the teacher's needs.

The findings of this study reinforce the importance of distributive justice in education organizations. Several previous studies have shown that procedural and distributive justice plays a significant role in determining organizations' negative behavior (Palupi & Tjahjono, 2016). The results of Ajala & Bolarinwa (2015) research show that distributive justice and interactional justice affect the psychosocial well-being of employees. On the contrary, procedural justice and distributive justice can affect teachers' intention to resign from the teaching profession (Addai et al., 2018). If the teacher does not believe he is being treated fairly, he will be dissatisfied with his job. For this reason, the implementation of distributive justice in education organizations is essential.

Measurement of interactional justice is also important because if the principal is treated politely and dignifiedly, it can boost self-confidence and improve mental health in the

workplace (Ajala & Bolarinwa, 2015). Ereş et al., (2014) found a correlation between distributive justice and interactive justice. The teacher views that giving all teachers the same assignment and responsibility is a positive relationship between the principal and the teacher. Interactional justice has also been shown to affect schools' organizational identification: a sense of belonging to the school's vision and mission and a sense of belonging. In this study, interactional justice was measured by three indicators, namely INJ1 (loading factor value = 0.608), INJ2 (loading factor value = 0.836 and INJ3 (loading factor value = 0.808). These findings suggest that interactional justice can be implied in schools through positive interactions between principals and teachers. Hamzah et al., (2021) recommend integrating elements of trust and respect into the relationship between leaders and subordinates to motivate subordinates to explore their roles in the organization.

Open leaders are approachable and communicate well, encouraging employees to express their expectations (Nguyen et al., 2019). When the principal communicates openly with teachers, it encourages them to express their aspirations. Udin et al., (2021) prove that leaders can provide inspirational motivation to encourage subordinates to achieve long-term organizational goals. Zubaidah et al., (2021) recommend that a school principal's leadership style balances school tasks and social relations. In educational organizations, principals must provide opportunities for teachers to participate in the change process, encourage teachers to build a tradition of mutual support during the change process, be open, and open up opportunities for positive feedback for all parties involved.

This description proves that the development of a scale of organizational justice in educational organizations can be used to make changes and improvements to school organizations. This study has limitations because it only involved female participants and was conducted in one type of school. Future researchers can validate this measuring instrument with a wider variety of participants.

Conclusion

The results of the psychometric analysis showed that the organizational justice scale compiled in this study was both valid (convergent and discriminant validity) and reliable (Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha). As a result, the Indonesian version of the organizational justice scale derived from Colquitt's (2001) dimension can be used to measure the fairness of teacher organizations in educational organizations. The advantage of this measuring tool is its specific context in educational organizations. Due to its simplicity, the measurement tool can provide recommendations on what dimensions need to be concretely improved by parties involved in educational management.

This study has limitations because the research sample is teachers who are willing to be participants, so they are less representative in generalizations.

Principals are advised to pay attention to all dimensions of organizational justice in leading teachers because it is proven that all dimensions of organizational justice can be applied in educational organizations. Further researchers must expand the scope and variety of research subjects for future researchers. Other validity analyses need to be done, such as predictive validity, to add information to improve aspects related to education management

Reference

- [1] Abdillah, W., & Jogiyanto. (2015). Partial Least Square (PLS), Alternatif Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) dalam Penelitian Bisnis. Penerbit Andi.
- [2] Addai, P., Kyeremeh, E., Abdulai, W., & Sarfo, J. O. (2018). Organizational justice and job satisfaction as predictors of turnover intentions among teachers in the Offinso South District of Ghana. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 7(2), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2018.2.235>
- [3] Ajala, E., & Bolarinwa, K. (2015). Organisational Justice and Psychological Well-Being of Employees in the Local Government Service of Osun State, Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 9(4), 55. <https://doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v9i4.5>
- [4] Ali Khalil, E. A.-H., & Sharaf, I. M. (2014). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Teachers' Work Related Outcomes in Egypt with an Integer Programming Model. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 6(4), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajebasp.2014.148.158>
- [5] Aydin, I., & Karaman-Kepenekci, Y. (2008). Principals' opinions of organisational justice in elementary schools in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(4), 497–513. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810882027>
- [6] Barusman, A. R. P., & Mihdar, F. (2014). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior With Organization Commitment as the Moderator. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(9), 118–126.
- [7] Carrell, M. R., & Dittrich, J. E. (1978). Equity Theory: The Recent Literature, Methodological Considerations, and New Directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(2), 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1978.4294844>
- [8] Cobanoglu, N. (2021). The Relationship between Shared Leadership, Employee Empowerment and Innovativeness in Primary Schools: A Structural Equation Modeling. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(1), 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.12973/EU-JER.10.1.327>
- [9] Cole, N. D., & Flint, D. H. (2004). Perceptions of distributive and procedural justice in employee benefits: Flexible versus traditional benefit plans. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410520646>
- [10] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 386–399. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- [11] Colquitt, J. A. (2012). Organizational Justice. In S. W. . Kozlowski (Ed.), *The*

- Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology (Vol. 16, pp. 525–547). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199828340-0044>
- [12] Cook, K. S., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (1983). Distributive Justice, Equality and Equality. *Arm. Rev. Sociol.*, 9, 217–241. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.001245>
- [13] Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. (2015). Organizational Justice. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, October 2017, 379–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.22033-3>
- [14] Deepak, S. (2021). Perceptions of Organization Justice: An Empirical study of working women from Bangalore. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 22(6), 83–100.
- [15] Elma, C. (2013). The Predictive Value of Teachers' Perception of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 157–176.
- [16] Ereş, F., Gulcan, M. G., & Celik, S. (2014). Primary School Teachers' Perceptions of Justice and Trust in Principals in Ankara. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(2), 33–41. https://www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_2_February_2014/6.pdf
- [17] Erkutlu, H. (2011). The moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(6), 532–554. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111161058>
- [18] Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306437>
- [19] Hair Jr, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Vol. 7). Pearson Prentice Hall. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.03.133>
- [20] Hamzah, H., Nordin, N. S., Dwiyantri, R., Na'imah, T., & Mawi, N. (2021). The Role of Well-Being, Supervisor Support and Positive Feedback on Lecturers' Work Engagement. *The Journal of Behavioral Science (TJBS)*, 16(1), 73–84. <https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/IJBS/article/view/245504>
- [21] Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540410538831>
- [22] Kogilavani, M., Yusliza, M., & Fatimah, Z. S. (2013). An Empirical Investigation of the Influence of Organizational Justice on Safety Climate. *Journal of Academic Research International*, 4(6), 327–342. [http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.4\(6\)/2013\(4.6-35\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.4(6)/2013(4.6-35).pdf)
- [23] Li, C. jun, Chang, K. K., & Ou, S. M. (2020). The relationship between hotel staff's organizational justice perception, relationship quality and job performance. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2020.1739953>
- [24] Moliner, C., Martinez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiro, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 327–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320701743616>
- [25] Nazarian, A., Velayati, R., Foroudi, P., Edirisinghe, D., & Atkinson, P. (2021). Organizational justice in the hotel industry: revisiting GLOBE from a national culture perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(12), 4418–4438. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2021-0449>
- [26] Nguyen, P. V., Ngoc Le, H. T., Ahn Trinh, T. V., & Sa Do, H. T. (2019). The effects of inclusive leadership on job performance through mediators. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 63–94. <https://doi.org/10.21315/aamj2019.24.2.4>
- [27] Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice As a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

- Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 527–556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>
- [28] Nojani, M. I., Arjmandnia, A. A., Afrooz, G. A., & Rajabi, M. (2012). The Study on Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction in Teachers Working in General, Special and Gifted Education Systems. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2900–2905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.586>
- [29] Olsen, O. K., Myrseth, H., Eidhamar, A., & Hystad, S. W. (2012). Psychometric properties of a Four-Component Norwegian organizational justice scale. *Psychological Reports*, 110(2), 571–588. <https://doi.org/10.2466/01.08.14.PR0.110.2.571-588>
- [30] Omar, A., Salessi, S., Vaamonde, J. D., & Urteaga, F. (2018). Psychometric properties of Colquitt's Organizational Justice Scale in Argentine workers. *Liberabit. Revista Peruana de Psicología*, 24(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.24265/liberabit.2018.v24n1.05>
- [31] Palupi, M., & Tjahjono, H. K. (2016). A Model of Religiosity and Organizational Justice: The Impact on Commitment and Dysfunctional Behavior. *Proceedings of The 27th International Business Information Management Association Conference*, May, 1781.
- [32] Ramayah, T., Hwa, C. J., Chuah, F., Ting, H., & Memon, M. A. (2018). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 3.0. Pearson Malaysia SDn Bhd.
- [33] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson Education, Inc., publishing as Prentice Hall.
- [34] Shamma, F. (2015). Organizational justice among school principals within Israeli Arab Schools from the Teachers' Point of View. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 7(3), 129–132. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART2018468>
- [35] Shibaoka, M., Takada, M., Watanabe, M., Kojima, R., Kakinuma, M., Tanaka, K., & Kawakami, N. (2010). Development and validity of the Japanese version of the organizational justice scale. *Industrial Health*, 48(1), 66–73. <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.48.66>
- [36] Siswanti, Y., Tjahjono, H. K., Hartono, A., & Prajogo, W. (2020). Organizational justice climate: Construct measurement and validation. *Test Engineering and Management*, 82(March), 8574–8590.
- [37] Tjahjono, H. K., Palupi, M., & Dirgahayu, P. (2016). Career Perception at the Republic Indonesian Police Organization Impact of Distributive Fairness, Procedural Fairness and Career Satisfaction on Affective Commitment. *Bisnis & Birokrasi Journal*, 22(2), 130–135. <https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v22i2.5702>
- [38] Udin, U., Suud, F. M., & Firdausi, A. K. (2021). Transformational Leadership Training: A Key Driver to Improve the Effectiveness and Productivity of CV Ning Sri Stone Crusher. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Bussiness and Government*, 27(2), 5821–5829. <https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.02.585>
- [39] VanYperen, N. W., Hagedoorn, M., Zweers, M., & Postma, S. (2000). Injustice and Employees' Destructive Responses: The Mediating Role of State Negative Affect. *Social Justice Research*, 13(3), 291–312. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026411523466>
- [40] Yilmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2009). Organizational Citizenship and Organizational Justice in Turkish Primary Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 108–126. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230910928106>
- [41] Zafar Iqbal, M., Rehan, M., Fatima, A., & Nawab, S. (2017). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance in Public Sector Organization of Pakistan. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 06(03). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000431>
- [42] Zubaidah, R. A., Haryono, S., & Udin, U. (2021). The effects of principal leadership and teacher competence on teacher performance: The role of work motivation. *Quality - Access to Success*, 22(180), 91–96. https://www.srac.ro/calitatea/en/arhiva/2021/QAS_Vol.22_No.180_Feb.2021.pdf