

Relationship between the Components of Organizational Justice and Instructional Performance of Teachers

HossainZainalipour, EghbalZarei, MarziehAsadinejad* and MohsenEbrahimi

University of Hormozgan, Bandar Abbas, Iran

ABSTRACT

Present study is a casual-comparative research that investigated hope and self-efficacy in high and low achievement students in high schools of Bandar Abbas. Using purposive sampling method and pair-wise matching, 60 high school students selected and were divided into two high achievement and low achievement groups. For measure the self-efficacy, the motivational strategies learning questionnaire (MSLQ) is used and hope is measured by Snyder hope scale. Results of study indicate in both variables (hope and self-efficacy), differences were in favor of High achievement group. In the end of article, findings are discussed and practical recommendations are presented.

Keywords: hope, self-efficacy, high and low achievement students

INTRODUCTION

Considering the history of social life and the way of formation of governments in the context of human societies, it seems that realization of justice, especially in an Islamic society, is the basis for justification of the existence of a government and the cornerstone for the legitimacy of the system and its stability in the political, economic and cultural context in a society [1]. In recent years, organizational justice has been so commonly used as a field of study that it has gone beyond its origins; that is, fundamental areas of sociology and social psychology and it has been incorporated in the applied areas of industrial and organizational psychology, human resource management, consumer behavior and case studies. Organizational justice refers to employees' feelings and perceptions of the rate of fairness and equality in behaviors and work relationships. In organizational justice, this issue is raised that how employees should be treated to feel they have been treated fairly [2]. In classifying the types of organizational justice, three concepts of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have been recommended [3]. Recently, Colquitt[4] has suggested another aspect to organizational justice through dividing interactional justice to interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice includes perception of the components of interpersonal decisions in relation to the assignment of organizational resources and outcomes, and informational justice refers to perception of the content of decisions relationships in relation to the assignment of organizational resources and outcomes. It's debated that informational justice deal with the accuracy of the information given to individuals about a decision [5]. This aspect of justice investigates how much information is given to individuals about why procedures have been used in a specific way or why outcomes have been distributed in a specific manner [4]. Distributive justice refers to employees' attitudes and thoughts concerning the suitability of their outputs and payments [6]. Historically, many researches concerning organizational justice concentrate on distribution of payments or work-related rewards. But distributive justice is not merely limited to fairness of payments. It includes a wide series of organizational outcomes (promotion, rewards, punishments, work programs, benefits and performance assessments); in other words, distributive justice refers to a wide range of attitudes and perceived fairness about distribution and assignment of organizational outcomes and outputs (praise) comparing with employees performance and inputs (contributions) [7]. After proving the inability of theory of equity and other models of distributive justice in explaining individuals' reactions to their perceptions in the field of injustice, procedural justice was proposed. This type of justice refers to the fairness perceived of the procedures and processes through which outcomes are assigned [6]. Accordingly, procedures are fairly perceived when they are applied constantly and without considering personal benefits and based on accurate information, interests of all organizational sections of participants are considered, and standards and ethical norms are adhered to. Interactional justice is defined based on the equity perceived of interpersonal relations associated with organizational procedures and the quality of interpersonal relationships. This type of organizational justice considers fairness of decision makers' behavior [8]. Interactional justice focuses on the behavior of supervisors and their contribution in observing organizational justice and it is conceptually similar to the informal quality of behavior, while procedural justice is conceptually similar to formal decision making. Studies indicate that in the organizations where employees believe decision making processes are unfair, organizational commitment has been gradually reduced, working less efficiently, displacement and withdrawal have been increased and finally

*Corresponding Author: AsadinejadMarzieh, University of Hormozgan, Bandar Abbas, Iran,
Email: m.asadinejad2010@gmail.com

organizational performance also has been reduced. But continuous changes and environmental dynamics and complexities of offering services in diverse and changeable environment have increased the necessity of the existence of satisfied, motivated and skilled employees for organizations [9]. In relation between justice and employees' attitudes, numerous studies have shown the significant impact of employees' attitudes towards equality and organizational justice on various aspects of organizational behavior. Studies that were done by theorists in the past show the importance of the attitudes on the base of equality in an organization. In addition to them, the modern researches and studies done within this scope indicate that employees who have feeling of more inequality have less job satisfaction in relation to other employees; such perception has had a reducing impact on employees' performance [9]. Folger and Konovsky [10] found that perception about distributive justice will be significantly connected with increase in satisfaction of payment and job satisfaction. Moreover, the increase in employees' positive perception of organizational justice has had an impact on various types of job behaviors such as the rate of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, the rate of malingering, the rate of their trust to managers, working relationships and interactions with colleagues, knowledge and performance sharing and organizational productivity. Additionally, feelings of deprivation and inequality will bring some psychological and behavioral effects on employees, e.g. dissatisfaction, job stress and absence. Bakshi et al [11] also emphasize that the feeling of justice in an organization will directly have an impact on the job satisfaction and organization commitment. What is more, this feeling has influenced job satisfaction, trust in managers, and the rate of organizational conflict, the rate of tension / stress, and assessments of supervisors. Given the sensitivity of the issue of organizational justice, it has been attempted to study the relationships of the organizational justice components with teachers' instructional performance in the present study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present research is a correlational study that regression analysis has been used to investigate the relationship between the components of organizational justice and teachers' instructional performance. To explain educational performance variable as the criterion variable, variables of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and informational justice have been evaluated as predictive variables. The statistical population of the current research was teachers who were employed in high schools of Bandar Abbas. The considered sample includes 300 people of teachers who were selected by multi-stage cluster sampling. For measuring the components of organizational justice, researcher prepared questionnaire was used. The reliability coefficient of questionnaire was 0.94. Content validity of the questionnaire was determined at an appropriate level too. For analysis of data, SPSS software, 18 versions is used.

RESULTS

Descriptive indicators of mean and standard deviation of predictive and criterion variables have been presented in table 1. In addition to review the research hypotheses, the correlation matrix of predictive variables and the criterion has been computed. The correlation matrix between the variables under study has been presented in table 2.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Predictive and Criterion Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	N
Instructional performance	3.3543	1.27137	300
Distributive justice	3.9073	1.40504	300
Procedural justice	5.0639	1.83019	300
Interactional justice	5.5920	1.42756	300
Informational justice	5.3822	1.57455	300

Table 2. Correlation Matrix of Predictive and Criterion Variables

Variable	Instructional performance	Distributive justice	Procedural justice	Interactional justice
Distributive justice	0.269			
Procedural justice	0.368	0.449		
Interactional justice	0.373	0.343	0.857	
Informational justice	0.333	0.466	0.853	0.898

Based on this, interactional justice variable has the maximum amount of the correlation coefficient and distributive justice variable the minimum amount of the correlation coefficient with instructional performance variable (the criterion variable). Other variables have correlation coefficient between the two values with the criterion variable.

After performing regression analysis on research data, it was observed that the overall model under study explains about 56 percent of the variance of the criterion variable. To determine the significance of calculated R^2 , ANOVA test has been used. The amount of F was calculated 64.486 which is significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$, $F = 64.486$). The detailed results are given in table 3.

Table 3. Amount of R, R², B and β in Under Study Model

Variable	B	β	T value	Sig.	R	R ²	F	Sig.
Equation constant	1.54	-	4.55	0.05	0.75	0.56	64.486	0.05
Distributive justice	0.45	0.39	2.043	0.05				
Procedural justice	0.53	0.21	3.21	0.05				
Interactional justice	0.055	0.061	0.54	-				
Informational justice	0.052	0.062	0.73	-				

As it is seen in the above table, for the significant test of beta coefficients calculated for each predictive variable in the model, T test has been performed. The results of the analysis show that procedural justice with beta amount of 0.21 and distributive justice with beta of 0.39 explain instructional performance positively and significantly. It should be mentioned that the other variables in the model do not significantly explain the criterion variable.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to investigate the relationship between component of organizational justice and teachers' instructional performance. In general, the findings of the present study showed that the components of interactional justice and distributive justice are considered as the most important components affecting teachers' instructional performance. The results obtained from the present study are in line with the findings of the previous study [12, 13, 14 and 15]. The results of the present research can provide managers and education planners with necessary insight to promote teachers' instructional performance relying on the components of organizational justice. It is recommended to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and job variables such as job motivation and organizational commitment and also personal variables like work conscience and behavioral discipline in future studies.

REFERENCES

1. MoshrefJavadi, M., Dalvi, M. &Abdolbaqi A. 2006. Organizational justice in the shadow of Alavi justice. *Journal of Islamic Management*, 19, 1, 105.
2. Greenberg, J. & Lind, E.A. 2000. The pursuit of organizational justice: from conceptualization to implication to application. In Cooper, C.L. and Locke, E.W., *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Blackwell Press, Malden, MA.
3. Greenberge, J. 1990. Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 2, 399-432.
4. Colquitt, J. A. 2001. On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
5. Greenberg, J. 1987. Taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
6. 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.
7. Folger, R., &Cropanzano, R. 1998. *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
8. Bobocel, D. &Holmvall, C. 2001. Are interactional justice and procedural justice different? Framing the debate. In S. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (pp. 85-110). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
9. DeConick, J. B. 2010. The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 1349-1355.
10. Folger, R., &Konovsky, M. A. 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32,1,115- 130.
11. Bakshi, A., Kumar, K., &Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International Journal Business Management*, 4, 9, 145-154.
12. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35,3, 626-637.
13. Blakely, G., Andrews, M., & Moorman, R. 2005. The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 20, 2, 259-273.
14. Alexander, S. &Ruderman, M. 1987. The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 2, 177-198.
15. Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. 2000. Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 4, 738-748.