
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND WORKPLACE HARMONY

Victor Barinua (Ph.D)

*Department of management, Faculty of Management Science
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt Rivers State, Nigeria*

Ogbeide Aghedo Godwin

*Department of management, Faculty of Management Science
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt Rivers State, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT

Organizational justice has been a major factor for improving organizational performance. Hence, the present study examined how organizational justice enhances workplace harmony. The study adopted three dimensions of organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactional justice) and discussed them on how they enhance workplace harmony. The study also adopted equity theory that promotes fairness in the workplace. Based on the review of related literature, the study found that the three dimensions of organizational justice improve workplace harmony when management displays fairness in the workplace. Thus, the study recommended that management should ensure that there is fairness in work procedures to improve workplace harmony. They should provide fair compensation system to improve workplace harmony. Management should ensure that interactional justice is practiced by frequent communication with employees and strive to ensure that information flows vertically and horizontally to improve employees' performance in the workplace.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, procedural justice, Distributive justice, Interactional justice, Workplace harmony

Introduction

Every organization requires workplace harmony, which is defined as mutual synergy and a good connection between employers and their subordinates. A good working environment is critical to a company's success. According to Elangovan and Xie (2000), a blissful workplace allows employees and employers to improve productivity and promote development. Leaders establish the environment for a healthy relationship in the workplace, and this creates the organization's culture over time. As a result, problems impacting workplace harmony are of concern to the leaders.

The frequency of management-workforce disputes is rapidly increasing in many areas of the global economy, which seems to be affecting workplace harmony. For decades, the workplace has been roiled by demands for higher wages and earnings as a form of incentivization, as well as bonuses, awards, and health benefits (Thurston & McNall, 2010). Despite these safeguards, there is still widespread dissatisfaction between employers and workers on one hand, and managers and employees on the other. Leadership styles, organizational structure, pay, organizational tactics, and organizational justice have all been studied by researchers over the years as elements that influence workplace harmony and other characteristics (Thurston & McNall, 2010; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2008; Milkovich & Newman, 2008).

Cropanzano et al. (2007) believe that organizational justice is a powerful variable that influences organizational performance and is a critical element in any organization's success. Organizational justice fosters fairness, honesty, respect, and trust, which is why it is so important. Individuals' views of fairness in resource allocation between people are important to distributive justice (Greenberg & Baron 2003). It also relates to the perceived fairness of the pay packages received by employees (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Participant perceptions of the fairness of the rules and procedures that govern a process are referred to as procedural justice, whereas interactional justice is referred to as the fairness of the rules and procedures that govern a process.

A good and peaceful workplace is one in which all employees are treated with dignity and respect, and no employee is harassed because of their religious or political beliefs (Elangovan & Xie. 2000). The same ideas will apply when it comes to promoting a positive and harmonious work environment regardless of color, gender, handicap, sexual orientation, or age. Workers' dissatisfaction stemmed from the organization's executives' unfairness. Employees and their job performance suffer because of inequity in work sharing, compensation, and communication (Greenberg & Baron 2003).

A healthy work culture that tolerates variety and enhances employees' ability in job delivery signifies a significant step toward achieving organizational objectives. Most managers are caught between a rock and a hard place when it comes to controlling power or using leadership techniques in the workplace (Elangovan & Xie. 2000). Workers may respond adversely in the form of strikes, complaints, and disputes when the incorrect management or leadership style is used, and a hostile work environment is produced. As a result, management must provide distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice to keep workers happy, engaged, and loyal to the company (Elangovan & Xie. 2000). Employees are more likely to exhibit good attitudes and behaviors such as loyalty and productivity when they believe are treated fairly by the company in all aspects. In terms of justice, issues such as distributing financial resources, employing workers in organizations, policymaking, and policy implications that impact decision-makers and those who are

affected by such choices need particular consideration (Colquit et al., 2005). However, based on the existing literature, it seems that research studies on organizational justice and workplace harmony are lacking. This necessitates the present study to examine how organizational justice enhances workplace harmony.

Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine how organizational justice enhances workplace harmony. The objectives of the study will include the following:

1. To examine how procedural justice enhances workplace harmony.
2. To examine how distributive justice enhances workplace harmony.
3. To examine how interactional justice enhances workplace harmony.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Review

The main areas of review will include the concept of organizational justice with its dimensions (procedural, distributions and interactional justice), the concept of workplace harmony with its measures (organizational commitment, teamwork, and task accomplishments). This will enable a better understanding of how organizational justice enhances workplace harmony in literature.

Concept of Organizational Justice

The function of fairness in organizations is referred to as organizational justice, and it is closely related to workers' views of fair treatment (Cohen-charash & Spector, 2001). Because it has a direct effect on employee performance, organizational justice is a phrase used to describe the function of fairness in the workplace. Organizational Justice is concerned with the scenario in which workers develop views about their treatment at work and how this impacts their job performance (Moorman, 1991). Organizational justice may be used to describe employee retribution in response to inequitable outcomes or inappropriate procedures and interactions (Alslem & Achaini, 2007).

Researchers have identified three main models in developing the theory of organizational justice: (a) a two-factor model, consisting of distributive and procedural justice; (b) a three-factor model, consisting of distributive, procedural, and interaction justice; (c) a four-factor model, consisting of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. Regardless of the fact that several previous studies of organizational justice used a three- or four-factor model (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Tessema et al., 2014; Akram et al., 2016), there is less agreement on the distinction between interactional and informational justice due to the high inter-correlation (Colquitt et al., 2001).

As a consequence, it's unclear whether organizational justice should be defined using the three or four criteria. Nonetheless, scholars have reached an understanding of the distinction between procedural and distributive justice (Tessema et al., 2014). The two-factor model is the most widely used in organizational justice research (Alexander & Uderman, 1987; Moorman, 1991; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Karriker & Williams, 2009; Strom et al., 2014; Ghosh et al., 2017), and it also serves as the foundation for the three- and four-factor models that follow. Informational justice and interpersonal justice were split into two sub dimensions of interactional justice (Colquitt, 2001). The next sections go through each of the components of justice in more depth.

Procedural justice

According to procedural justice, “the individual's perception of the fairness of procedural aspects within a social system impacts resource allocation” (Leventhal, 1980). Procedural justice refers to participants' perceptions of the fairness of the rules and procedures that guide a process. If participants believe that organizational procedures are fair, they will be happier, more willing to accept the outcome of a procedure, and more likely to generate positive feelings about the company (Akbolat et al., 2015).

It's in line with the end outcomes, which cover methods, procedures, and processes equitably (Swalhi et al., 2017). It is considered to exist when processes include certain types of normatively accepted norms. The fairness of the procedures should meet the following criteria: they should suppress bias, yield good allocations, rely on accurate information, be correctable, represent all receivers' interests, and be based on contemporary moral and ethical standards (Leventhal, 1980).

In companies, procedural fairness is regarded as the bedrock of social interaction (Swalhi et al., 2017). It has a significant impact on employees' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral reactions to the business (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to Cropanzano et al. (2002), procedural fairness is more likely associated with organizational commitment and trust in top management. Procedural fairness, according to Kim and Park (2017), has a positive effect on employee engagement, information exchange, and innovative work behavior. Procedural fairness may aid employees in accepting changes in the organization's values and objectives, as well as adjusting to external pressures. Furthermore, many findings suggested that the manner of awarding rewards is more important than the outcome (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Distributive Justice

The perceived fairness of the results that a person receives from an organization is referred to as distributive justice. Individuals assess the fairness of distribution by comparing themselves to others. Outcomes may be allocated based on equality, need, or contribution (Alselem & Achaiani, 2007). The perceived fairness of an employee's results is referred to as distributive justice (Moorman, 1991). Pay, promotion, prestige, performance reviews, and job tenure, according to Lawler, have a significant impact on job satisfaction, quality of work life, and organizational success (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987).

Cropanzano et al. (2007) identify three allocation principles that, when implemented correctly, may lead to distributive justice: equality (to everyone the same), equity (to each in proportion to contributions), and necessity (to each in accordance with the most urgency). The concept of distributive justice is concerned with the fact that not all employees are treated equally; in the workplace, the distribution of outcomes is varied (Cropanzano et al. 2007).

Although procedural and interactional justice are different conceptions, Cropanzano et al. (2002) claimed that they are closely linked. Procedural justice is essential in creating interpersonal settings, as Tyler and Bies (1990) point out, and therefore impacts perceptions of interaction justice. Cropanzano et al. (2007) stated that fair procedures lead to intellectual and emotional recognition, which leads to the trust and commitment necessary for strategy implementation. As a result, from a procedural justice standpoint, the fairness of the assessment methods used to calculate ratings is emphasized (Greenberg 1986). According to Folger and Konovsky (1989), the ability of workers to communicate their emotions while

being assessed predicted a measure of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance assessment. Employees are more loyal and ready to act in the best interests of the company if the procedure is seen to be fair (Cropanzano et al., 2007). As a result, the distributive justice viewpoint emphasizes the fairness of the assessments given in relation to the labor done (Greenberg 1986). As a result, distributive fairness is guaranteed to improve workplace harmony.

Interactional Justice

The provision of information to workers involves interpersonal justice, and there is a significant need for a focus on the actual presentation of required information. Managers required to grasp the intentions, beliefs, and attitudes of their employees, communicate effectively, respect their desires, and project politeness and friendliness (Colquitt, 2001). Interactions between supervisors and subordinates are an important component of organizational social interaction. Because workers' interpretations of these encounters are subjective, it's difficult for supervisors to figure out the ideal way to engage with them (Rousseau, 1995, 2001). Because the supervisor is an agent of the organization, when workers feel that their supervisors regard them positively, they interpret this as a sign of the organization's support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Employees are also aware that supervisors often transmit employee assessments to top management, which reinforces the link between supervisory and organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The principles of reciprocity, according to Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), are the foundation on which organizational interactional justice is built. Employees expect fair, honest, courteous, and helpful behavior from their employers, according to Blau (1964). Employees who perceive fair treatment by authorities are more likely to show good behaviors such as greater levels of dedication to the organization's goals, according to Cohen and Spector (2001). It refers to the degree of impartiality with which people are treated throughout decision-making processes (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Greenberg (1990, 1993) separated interpersonal and informational aspects in interactional justice. Interpersonal justice refers to whether a person in a position of power treats others with dignity and respect when carrying out organizational processes and procedures, while informational justice refers to whether appropriate reasoning and honesty are used when providing explanations (Colquitt, 2001; Greenberg, 1993). Individual views of the strength of reasoning provided by the organizational representative are bolstered by informational justice. These findings suggest that just keeping workers aware fosters a sense of fairness (Bies, 2001). Greenberg (1993) argued that interpersonal justice might be considered a social component of distributive justice since it is not always a part of the allocation process.

High-quality employee-supervisor contact provides both social and emotional support to workers in the form of desired work schedules, guidance on how to cope with difficult work problems, or giving encouraging words in conflict or stress circumstances (VanDyne et al., 2002). Employees confused or ambiguous emotions are alleviated by the enhanced degree of support given by high-quality interactions with supervisors (Harris et al., 2006). High-quality employee-supervisor interactions may be considered to offer important intangible resources to workers, such as enhanced value and self-worth (Sluss et al., 2008). A stronger psychological contract with the company is another result of high-quality employee-supervisor contact.

Employees' psychological contracts with their supervisors manifest themselves in the feelings that their supervisors are supportive, that their jobs are secure, that they have faith in their

supervisor and organizational decisions, that they are more committed to their supervisor and organization, and that they have a more positive attitude toward their supervisor and, by extension, the organization (Zagenczyk et al., 2011). According to research, positive treatment at work (fairness, excellent working circumstances, and high-quality employee-supervisor contact) leads to a sense of organizational support, which affects workers' attitudes (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Riggle, et al., 2009).

Supervisors, by default, play a critical role in assisting workers in dealing with different kinds of workplace stress by providing emotional support (Rego et al., 2007). Supportive supervision is linked with not just a caring work atmosphere, but also one that is secure and positive (Shore & Shore, 1995). Employees' socio-emotional needs, such as caring for people, esteem development, and workplace acceptance, are met in large part by perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Low-quality interactions may lead to or reinforce a violation of the employee's psychological contract with his or her boss, and, by extension, with the company.

Concept of Workplace Harmony

Industrial harmony means a pleasant and cooperative working relationship between employers and workers for mutual benefit (Otobo, 2005). Harmony in the workplace has really been defined as a condition of relative peace and stability in an organization characterized by group trust, employee-management understanding, and a lack of displays of dissatisfaction among employees (Bassey et al., 2012; Yesufu, 1984). Employee-management understanding and agreement on terms of working conditions, pay, advancement, job security, and safety, as well as ethical and professional behavior, is regarded the result of excellent interpersonal interactions at work.

Workplace harmony, according to Akume and Abdullahi (2013), is defined as a process of interest accommodation by the parties involved in such a way that allows for understanding and compromise in the setting of working conditions, rules, and power sharing. According to the authors, processes may be used to define a variety of actions that contribute to the structure and character of the interaction between management and their subordinates, whether officially or informally.

According to Ngethe et al. (2012), leaders use their power to motivate people to achieve their goals and objectives. Leaders that engage with their workers in a positive manner encourage loyalty and commitment. Thus, according to Gill et al. (2006), leadership continues to motivate, encourage, and recognize their followers in order to accomplish key performance objectives. On the other side, poor leadership demotivates workers, leading to grievances, strikes, and other forms of labor unrest. Authoritarian leadership has been shown to promote conflict, which destroys workplace peace.

Organizational Trust

Trust is defined as a readiness to become vulnerable in the presence of another person. Colquitt and colleagues (2001) found that trust is predicted by all three aspects of justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional). Employees who believe their workplace is fair are more likely to respond favorably. Employees would be more loyal and ready to operate in the organization's best interests (Cropanzano et al., 2007). In the perspective of the workers, this builds trust. Scholars anticipate (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) that there is a greater connection between trust and procedural justice than trust and

distributive justice, based on prior research. However, since trust is usually linked with specific individual, interpersonal and informational forms of justice are even better predictors of trust than procedural justice, according to the agent-system model. Employees develop confidence in companies when results are perceived as fair, according to Pillai et al (2001). Employees who believed their supervisor had presided over a fair evaluation procedure were more likely to rate their trust favorably, according to Folger and Konovsky (1989). Brockner and Siegel (1996) conducted research that found a link between procedural fairness and greater levels of trust. Employees will accept unfavorable choices provided they are given a real and fair explanation (Daly and Geyer, 1994); here is where interactional justice comes into play. Effective communication (an essential expression of interactional justice practice), according to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), would play a key role in maintaining trust and may neutralize any skepticism in the context of organizational transformation. Mayer et al. (1995) further argue that treating subordinates kindly would aid in the development of trust.

The trust between an organization and its members is referred to as organizational trust. This kind of trust emerges because of interactions between coworkers, managers, and organizational leaders. Organizational trust, according to Shockley-Zalabak & et al, (2010), organizational trust is established based on roles, connections, experiences, and organizational affiliations and is defined as favorable personal judgments that individuals have about the content and conduct of the organization's members.

Organizational trust is a place where individuals feel safe, warm, and accepted. Interpersonal trust is a kind of trust that manifests itself in face-to-face interactions. This kind of trust includes interactions between friends and coworkers, as well as trust between a boss and an employee, a supervisor and a subordinate, an employer and an employee, a teacher and a student, a doctor and a patient, and a driver and a passenger. Interpersonal trust, according to Shockley-Zalabak (2000) is made up of three elements: precarious position, communication, and dependence on information. Interpersonal trust, they think, is defined as an individual's reliance on information obtained from a third party (the other person). This knowledge pertains to uncertain environmental circumstances as well as the practical implications of the hazardous situation in which both parties are engaged. Thus, in interpersonal trust: a person's dependence on another person in order to accomplish desired goals in a perilous situation.

Organizational Commitment

The majority of organizational commitment assessments focused on emotional commitment, or how much workers connect with the business and make its objectives their own (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Tyler has argued in the past (Tyler, 1990) that procedural justice has a greater connection with institutional support than distributive justice. This is also validated by many research and is compatible with the two-factor hypothesis (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). However, it's worth noting that many research have backed the distributive dominance paradigm instead. For example, Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) discovered a greater link between distributive justice and organizational commitment than Greenberg did for procedural justice. Other findings back up the agent-system paradigm, indicating that procedural justice predicts organizational commitment better than interactional justice (Masterson et al., 2000). According to Lambert, Hogan, and Griffin (2007), procedural and distributive fairness have an effect on an employee's organizational commitment level.

Because emotional commitment develops as a result of organizational procedures and systems, it is associated with procedural justice rather than distributive justice (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Cohen-Charash et al. (2001) agree with this result that emotional

commitment is associated with procedural fairness in a major and meaningful way. The commitment to perseverance was shown to be unrelated to justice (Konovsky & Cropanzano 1991). However, Cohen-Charash et al. (2001) discovered a negative connection between continuous commitment and procedural and interactional fairness. Regardless of the situation, organizational commitment can only be accomplished when there is organizational fairness.

Theoretical Review

Equity theory gave birth to the concept of organizational justice (Adams, 1963, 1965). Adams' study on equality (Adams, 1963; 1965) was one of the earliest psychological investigations on people's views of how results are distributed (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Individuals evaluate the fairness of their own or others' rewards exclusively on the basis of merit, according to the idea. Individuals in organizations are said to compare the ratios of their own results, which are usually tangible incentives, to inputs, such as donations, to the ratios of other organizational referents, according to the theory. Work habits will be adjusted as a result of the comparisons. People will be driven to alter the situation by adjusting their inputs and results, changing their referent other; misrepresenting their perspective, or quitting the company if the comparisons produce large disparities (Mitchell et al., 2001). Four interconnected assertions form the basis of this theory:

- i. When people believe justice is fair, they will strive to optimize their results.
- ii. Groups develop equitable criteria and impose sanctions on members based on those standards.
- iii. Inequity causes psychological discomfort in proportion to its magnitude; and
- iv. When people are in distress, they want to get out of it by restoring fairness.
- v. Rather than altering the environment, individuals may persuade themselves that distributive justice exists by distorting perceptions (Leventhal, 1976).

Furthermore, equity theory indicated that individuals compare their own perceived work results to their own perceived labor inputs with their peers' equivalent ratios. As a result, their involvement in organizations may be altered (Colquitt et al., 2001). Promotions, money, recognition, equipment, or any other job-related resources are regarded inputs, while time and effort are considered outputs. If the percentages are equal, people in organizational contexts should feel equally happy. If the ratios are unbalanced, employees may perceive injustice and try to correct the situation. They may decide to reduce the number of input-output comparisons, for example (Shkoler & Tziner, 2017).

Furthermore, organizational justice is founded on the social exchange theory, which sees social activity as a series of sequential transactions involving two or more individuals (Blau, 1964). A reciprocity mechanism is used to transfer resources in these transactions. As a consequence, one side has a tendency to reciprocate the other's positive (or sometimes negative) behaviors (Cropanzano et al., 2017). A transaction may be compared to a professional relationship. Someone, for instance, exchanges work for cash (Cropanzano et al., 2002). The fairness of an employee's trading relationship with a business determines the quality of such relationship (Swalhi et al., 2017). Employees may feel obliged to repay the favor if they believe the business and its leaders are treating them fairly (Ghosh et al., 2013).

The equity theory guides the outcome-oriented viewpoint. According to Adams' concept of distributive justice, people are more concerned about whether the results are fair than the absolute quantity of the consequences (Tessema et al., 2014). When a person believes a result is unfair, it may affect his or her emotions (anger, joy, pride, or guilt), cognitions (cognitively distort one's own or others' inputs and results), and behavior (performance and withdrawal

(Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In a nutshell, Adams' (1965) equity theory is concerned with how individuals react to unfair outcomes. When an outcome is seen to be wrong in contrast to some standard, the individual is likely to face distributive injustice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Distributive Justice and Workplace Harmony

Distributive justice is more strongly linked with responses to specific outcomes than with reactions to the organization or one's supervisor, according to Cropanzano et al. (2002). Distributive fairness, as Ghosh et al. (2017) noted is a better predictor of the sacrifice that everyone in the company must make. The feeling of distributive justice is related to resource distribution (Campbell et al., 2012). To put it another way, how resources are distributed fairly and adequately supplies affects employees' sense of fairness. According to Dailey and Kirk (1992), employees may explain their desire to quit by locating "evidence" that demonstrates how incentives are distributed unfairly. Furthermore, when it comes to evaluating their company, distributive justice seems to be a significant influence (Loi et al. 2006). Employees will be more loyal to their employer if they can't get similar benefits elsewhere (Lee et.al. 2007). As a consequence, it goes without saying that distributive justice promotes workplace harmony.

Procedural Justice and Workplace Harmony

Procedural fairness has different impacts on organizational outcomes, according to various studies. For example, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) investigated the predictive capabilities of procedural justice using a main effect approach, showing that distributive justice influenced personal outcomes. Thus, according to Fields et al. (2000), procedural fairness has a greater impact on how employees perceive their bosses. In the past, procedural fairness was shown to be more predictive of a variety of work attitudes, notably organizational commitment (Warner et.al. 2005). The fairness of the decision-making process appears to be more important than the amount of compensation received by individuals (Teprstra & Honoree, 2003).

Interactional Justice and Workplace Harmony

Bies (2001) found that there are actions and behaviors that create a sense of unfairness when it comes to interactional injustice in a recent fascinating study. Examples include derogatory judgments, deception, and invasion of privacy, as well as careless or abusive conduct, public censure, and coercion. According to Bies (2001), apathy about these and other comparable actions may lead to a decrease in perceptions of fair treatment. In establishing the concept of interactional justice, Bies and Moag (1986) proposed four characteristics that define fair interpersonal treatment of subordinates by CEOs: (a) Respect: interacting with subordinates should be done with honesty and dignity; (b) Propriety: unwise and detrimental remarks should be avoided; (c) Justification: all judgments should be explained in detail; and (d) Truthfulness: these explanations should be open, candid, and honest.

Throughout the years, scholars have structured organizational justice such that respect and propriety standards fall under interpersonal justice and justification, and honesty explains informational justice (Bies, 2005; Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt & Shaw, 2005; Greenberg, 1993). The significance of interpersonal and informational fairness is explained by Bies' (2005) difference between exchanges" and encounters. According to Bies (2005), procedural and distributive justice are mostly related to resource exchange issues, which are uncommon in organizations. Interpersonal and informational justice are apparent in almost all encounters

between managers and subordinates, regardless of whether resource allocation decisions are being adjudicated or not. This supports the argument by Folger (2001) that managers in interactional justice settings have a lot of flexibility when it comes to following (or violating) justice standards. As a consequence, interactional justice has a value that can be seen in everyday life that other elements of justice lack. The primary goal of interactional justice research is to identify key touchstones for fair interactions or treatment in a variety of organizational settings. According to current study, managerial conduct that shows interpersonal sensitivity in interactions with employees improves employees' perceptions of the decision-making process (Brockner, 1994; Tyler & Bies, 1990). Based on this in-depth examination, the study argues that interactional justice promotes workplace harmony.

Organizational Justice and Workplace Harmony

Employee attitudes (job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational commitment) and behaviors are influenced by organizational justice, according to many studies (creative work behavior, organizational citizenship activity, and work performance). For example, Usmani and Jamal (2013) investigated the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction and found that distributive justice, interactional justice, and personal time are all related to job satisfaction. Employees are more likely to undertake more work and perform better when they believe they are treated fairly. Organizational justice has a substantial and positive impact on employees' innovative work behavior, according to Akram et al. (2016). Organizational justice has an impact on employee behavior and performance in some small and medium-sized companies, according to Swalhi et al. (2017). Organizational citizenship engagement has also been related to fairness perceptions in research (Karriker & Williams, 2009; Tziner & Sharoni, 2014).

When employees have high perceptions of organizational justice, their positive feelings toward their employers may be improved. Nonetheless, a lack of organizational justice will lead to employee dissatisfaction and negative emotions, both of which will have serious consequences. According to Pekurinen et al. (2017), low organizational justice may have a detrimental effect on nurses' behavior toward coworkers (collaboration), as well as poor employee-patient interactions and changes in nurses' behavior toward patients. According to Shkoler and Tziner (2017), a feeling of injustice may jeopardize employees' resources and make them feel as if they don't have enough. It irritates and exhausts them, resulting to burnout and potentially hazardous organizational behaviors including theft, sabotage, withdrawal, and harassment.

As a consequence, employees have a sense of belonging as a result of fairness and justice, which is an essential component of organizational commitment. However, some research has shown a connection between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Lambert et al. (2007) found that procedural and distributive fairness had a significant impact on employees' loyalty to the company. Furthermore, in their study of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment and turnover intentions, Nazim and Shahid (2012) discovered that both distributive and procedural justice perceptions had a significant relationship with organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Fariha et al. (2013) discovered that distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice all have a significant relationship with organizational commitment. Organizational justice seems to enhance workplace peace, according to a review of prior studies.

Conclusion

The study examines the how organizational justice improves workplace harmony. After a careful study of past related literature, the present study found that of organizational justice enhances workplace harmony. This implies that lack of organizational justice causes disharmony in the workplace, this is evidence in lack of organizational trust and organizational commitment. Thus, the study concludes that organizational justice is a strong instrument for achieving workplace harmony which needs proper attention by management to ensure that they display fairness in all aspect of the organizational operations to improve workplace harmony.

Recommendations

From literature reviewed on organizational justice and workplace harmony, work procedures to improve workplace harmony. They should provide fair compensation system to improve workplace harmony. Management should ensure interactional justice by frequent communication with members of the organization and strive to ensure that information flows vertically and horizontally in order improve employees' performance in the workplace. Practically, these will lead to organizational trust, organizational commitment and thereby improve workplace harmony.

References

- Akbolat, M., Yilmaz, A. & Akic, O. (2015). The Effect of Organizational Justice Perception on Job Satisfaction of Health Employees. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences*. 1, 2311-3197.
- Akram, T., Haider, M., & Feng, Y. (2016). The Effects of Organizational Justice on the Innovative Work Behavior of Employees: *An Empirical Study from China*. 114.
- Akume, A. & Abdullahi, Y. (2013). Challenges and Prospects of Effective Industrial Conflict Resolution in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 36, 199-208. 10.1080/09718923.2013.11893188.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of Procedural and Distributive justice in Organizational Behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1(2), 177-197
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Alsalem, M., & Alhaiani, A. (2007). *Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employees Performance*. Aledari 108, 97-110
- Bassey, A. O., Ojua, T. A., Archibong, E. P. & Bassey, U. A. (2012). "Impact of Inter-union Conflict on Industrial Harmony: A Study of Tertiary Health Institutions in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2, 5-8.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*, 89–118.
- Bies, R. J. (2005). Are procedural justice and interpersonal justice conceptually distinct? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice*, 85–112.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communications criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research in negotiation in organization*, 1, 43–55).
- Blau, P.M. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
- Brockner, J. (1994). Perceived fairness and survivors' reactions to layoffs, or how downsizing organizations can do well by doing good. *Soc Just Res* 7, 345–363 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02334861>
- Brockner, J., and Siegel, P.A. (1996), 'Understanding the Interaction between Procedural and Distributive Justice: The Role of Trust,' in *Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, eds. R.M. Kramer and T. Tyler, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 390–413.
- Campbell J. P. (2012). Behavior, performance, and effectiveness in the twenty-first century. See Kozlowski 2012, pp. 159–96
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321

- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The Handbook of Organizational Justice*, 113–152.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice*, 3–56
- Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31. 874-900. 10.1177/0149206305279602.
- Cropanzano, R. and Greenberg, J. (1997) Progress in Organizational Justice: Tunneling through the Maze. In: Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T., Eds., *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E., Daniels, S. & Hall, A. (2017). Social Exchange Theory: A Critical Review with Theoretical Remedies. *The Academy of Management Annals*. 11, 1-38. 10.5465/annals.2015.0099.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(3), 324-351.
- Daly, J. P., & Geyer, P. D. (1994). The role of fairness in implementing large-scale change: Employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(7), 623–638. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150706>
- Eisenberger, R. & Armeli, Stephen & Rexwinkel, B. & Lynch, P.D. & Rhoades, L.. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86. 42-51. 10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42.
- Eisenberger, R. & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*, 10.1037/12318-000.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500– 507
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Elangovan, A.R. & Xie, Jia. (2000). Effects of Perceived Power of Supervisor on Subordinate Work Attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 21. 319-328. 10.1108/01437730010343095.
- Fariba, R., Sardar, M. & Mozafar, Y. (2013). Relationship of organisational justice and organisational commitment of the staff in general directorate of youth and sports

- in Chahar Mahal Va Bakhtiari Province. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(3), 696 – 700
- Fields, Dail & Chan, Andrew & Akhtar, Syed. (2000). Organizational context and human resource management strategy: A structural equation analysis of Hong Kong firms. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11. 264-277. 10.1080/095851900339864.
- Folger, R. (2001). Fairness as deonance. In S. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice*, 3–33).
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781452225777>
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Ghosh, P., Satyawadi, R., Prasad Joshi, J. & Shadman, M. (2013). Who stays with you? Factors predicting employees' intention to stay. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 21(3), 288–312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-Sep-2011-0511>
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Differential Intolerance for Inequity from Organizational and Individual Agents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 16(3), 191-196.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). *Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: do the means justify the ends*. 72(1), 55-61
- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. (2003). *Behavior in Organization: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. 7th Edition, Prentice Hal
- Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. (2006). An examination of temporal variables and relationship quality on promotability ratings. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 677–699.
- Karriker, Joy & Williams, M. (2009). Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Mediated Multifoci Model. *Journal of Management*, 35. 112-135. 10.1177/0149206307309265.
- Kim, J. & Park, J. (2017), The role of total factor productivity growth in middle income. *Adb economics working paper series*, 3-7.
- Konovsky, M. & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived Fairness of Employee Drug Testing as a Predictor of Employee Attitudes and Job Performance. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 76. 698-707. 10.1037//0021-9010.76.5.698.
- Konovsky, M. A. & Pugh, S. (1994). Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange. *Academy of Management*, 37, 656-69. 10.2307/256704.

- Lambert, E. & Hogan, N. & Griffin, M. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35. 644-656. 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.09.001.
- Lee, Kin & Lev, Baruch & Yeo, Gillian. (2007). Organizational Structure and Earnings Management. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing, & Finance*, 21. 10.1177/0148558X0702200213.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 91-131.
- Leventhal, H., Meyer, D. & Nerenz, D. (1980). The common sense representation of illness danger. *The Common Sense Representation of Illness Danger*. 17-30.
- Lowe, H. R., & Vodanovich, J. S. (1995). A field study of distributive and Procedural Justice as predictors of satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10(1), 99-114.
- Masterson, S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. & Susan, M.. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43. 738-748. 10.2307/1556364.
- McFarlin, D., & Sweeney, P. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4-12.
- Milkovich, G.T. & Newman, J. M. (2008), *Compensation* (9th ed), McGraw-Hill, Irwin.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855
- Nazim, A. & Shahid, J. (2012). Relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment and turnover intentions amongst medical representatives of pharmaceuticals companies of Pakistan. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(2), 201 -212
- Nelson, R., Howden, M & Smith, M. S. (2008: Using adaptive governance to rethink the way science supports Australian drought policy. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 11(7), 588-601
- Ng 'ethe, J. M., Namasonge, G.S. & Mike, A. I. (2012). *Influence of Leadership Styles on Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya*, 6-9.
- Nkiinebari, N. P. (2014). Workplace democracy and industrial harmony in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 3(1), 223- 245.
- Otobo, D. (2005). *Industrial Relations: Theory and Controversies*. Lagos: Malhhouse Press Ltd.
- Pekurinen, V. M., Valimaki, M., Virtanen, M., Salo, P., Kivimaki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2017). Organizational justice and collaboration among nurses as correlates of violent

- assaults by patients in psychiatric care. *Psychiatric Services*, 68(5), 490–496. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201600171>.
- Pillai, R. & Williams, E. & Tan, J. (2001). Are the scales tipped in favor of procedural or distributive justice? An Investigation of the US, India, Germany, and Hong Kong (China). *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 312-332. 10.1108/eb022861.
- Rego, A., Sousa, F., Cunha, M., Correia, A. & Saur-Amaral, I. (2007). Leader Self-Reported Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Employee Creativity: An Exploratory Study. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 16, 250-264.
- Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714 0021-9010/02/\$5.00 DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698
- Riggle, R., Edmondson, D. & Hansen, J. (2009). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Perceived Organizational Support and Job Outcomes: 20 Years of Research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 1027-1030. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.003.
- Rousseau, D. (1989). Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organisations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139. 10.1007/BF01384942.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 511-541.
- Schoorman, F., Mayer, R., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 344-354.
- Shkoler, O. & Tziner, A. (2017). The mediating and moderating role of burnout and emotional intelligence in the relationship between organizational justice and work misbehavior. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 33, 10.1016/j.rpto.2017.05.002.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., & Cesaria, R. (2000). Measuring organizational trust: A diagnostic survey and international indicator. San Francisco, CA: *International Association of Business Communicators*, 4-8.
- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. 1995. Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano & K. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support*: 149–164.
- Sluss, D. M., Klimchak, M., & Holmes, J. J. (2008). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between relational exchange and organizational identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 457-464
- Strøm, R., D’Espallier, B. & Mersland, R. (2014). Female leadership, performance, and governance in microfinance institutions. *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 42. 60–75. 10.1016/j.jbankfin.2014.01.014.

- SWALHI, Abdelaziz & ZGOULLI, Saloua & Hofaidhllaoui, Mahrane. (2017). The influence of organizational justice on job performance: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Journal of Management Development*. 36. 10.1108/JMD-11-2015-0162.
- Sweeney, P. D. & McFarlin, D. B. (1993) 'Worker's Evaluation of the "Ends" and "Means": An Examination of Four Models of Distributive and Procedural Justice', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55: 23–40.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2003). The relative importance of external, internal, individual, and procedural equity to pay satisfaction. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 35 (6): 67-74
- Tessema, M., Ready, K., & Astanie, M. (2014). Does Part-Time Job Affect College Students' Satisfaction and Academic Performance (GPA)? The Case of a Mid-sized Public University. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 5 (2), 1-10.
- Thurston, Paul & Mcnall, Laurel. (2010). Justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 25, 201-228. 10.1108/02683941011023712.
- Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In J. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings*, 77-98.
- Tziner, Aharon & Sharoni, Gil. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, job stress, and workfamily conflict: Examination of their interrelationships with respondents from a non-Western culture. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*. 30, 35–42. 10.5093/tr2014a5.
- 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 Research*, 2(1).
- Warner, M., Edwards, V., Polansky, G., Pucko, D. & Zhu, Y. (2005). *Management in Transitional Economies: From the Berlin Wall to the Great Wall of China*.
- Yesufu, T.M. (1984). *The Dynamics of Industrial Relations: The Nigerian Experience*.
- Zagenczyk, T., Gibney, R., Few, W. & Scott, K. (2011). Psychological Contracts and Organizational Identification: The Mediating Effect of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Labor Research*. 32. 254-281. 10.1007/s12122-011-9111-z.