

ADMINISTRATIVE FAIRNESS AS GOOD GOVERNANCE. THEORY OF JUSTICE IN GREEK HEALTH SYSTEM

Emmanouil Bempekidis¹, Department of Public Administration, Sofia University

Abstract

The present paper aims to present the concept of justice focusing on the theory of John Rawls to cover health and social determinants of health in Greece. The administrative Justice is also analyzed with an emphasis on employees' perceptions of Organizational Justice, employee performance and organizational justice and finally in the relationship between organizational justice and citizen satisfaction.

Key word: *employee performance; organizational justice; citizen satisfaction; Greece*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of justice from ancient times to the present day is a concept that is not easy to define. The concept of justice has preoccupied human beings and this has to do both with their need to feel that they are not wronged, and with their need to feel that they are not unfair to others. In this context, of course, the criteria for each are different and most often relate to the selfishness that characterizes each individual. Absolute justice is utopian and impossible to exist (Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Since man is the measure of all things in everyday life and in organizations, then justice is his own justice, that is, a specific idea humans have of the concept of justice and expresses it in their own laws. In organizations, justice is characterized by how people in key administrative positions understand justice and, on the other, how their subordinates want to identify with the specific justice that is imposed on them (Erkutlu, 2011).

Based on the above, one can understand the concern of people to recognize justice, as well as the organizations that operated based on the meaning of justice, of course what they consider to be justice. Organizations today recognize the important role that organizational justice plays in the perception of justice within them. Recent studies on the importance of organizational justice are currently studying this theory (Ambrose & Schminle, 2003)

The field of organizational justice continues to be influenced by additional factors that are not always measurable, such as the size of an organization, distribution channels, collaborations, interpersonal relationships within an organization, level of satisfaction, organizational commitment, the process of evaluating power, organizational politicization, internal behaviors, performance, etc. (Colquitt et al., 2001).

¹ Emmanouil Bempekidis is a PhD student, Department of Public Administration, Sofia University 'St. Kl. Ohridski' Education: University of Nicosia, Master in Business Administration, 2014 – 2015; London South Bank University, Business Administration, 2009 – 2012; University of Portsmouth, Accounting with finance, 2008 – 2009.

JOHN RAWLS'S THEORY OF JUSTICE

John Rawls in his book "A Theory of Justice" advocates a free, fair and politically viable society. He deals with the way in which a society of inequalities could take fairer forms while maintaining its freedom. He argues that it is up to the individual will to create such a society, provided that the physical and social predispositions that intrinsically affect each individual are exceeded. According to the principles of liberalism, the individual has the "right" and also the means for the ideal "new state" (Wolthuis, 2017).

Focusing on this direction, he conducts an experiment to lead the reader to a just society. He calls this experiment "original position". It is about a state of affairs where its members are equally represented as ethical persons, without being affected by random circumstances and factors. He challenges everyone to imagine a society exactly the way they want it, but without knowing what position one will assume in it. Justice for him is exactly what we choose when negotiating behind the veil of ignorance. The participant in the experiment is asked to decide on the future of the whole society based on the following risks (Miele, 2017):

If he creates a world of total inequality and injustice, where some are at a disadvantage over others, this entails the risk of finding himself in the lower strata, experiencing the injustice he "built".

If he creates a world that is completely just, where everyone enjoys equal rights, for example, he will be in the same social position as the rest, having lost whatever privileges he enjoyed so far.

The substantive dilemma is whether the "ignorance" of the outcome of the decision and the fear that accompanies it determines the final decision. Also, everyone's present position (the privileges one enjoys today) in the social community will determine the final decision. This view can also be extended to international relations, as a series of events such as decisions of international bodies on military interventions, their causes, the rationale that justifies their necessity, and others, form an unprecedented humanity framework of rules, often testing the strengths of the international community in matters of justice and ethics.

In the theory of justice, Rawls deals with the idea of justice as fairness in a liberal society. The principles of justice are seen as the subject of prime agreement in an initial situation. To this end he constructs a thought experiment. He selects a portion of rational individuals who are interconnected in different ways and each driven by their own ends and seeks the principles of justice in them. The behaviors of these people are determined by their choices and interests. The outcome that will occur effortlessly between them will lead to a state of equilibrium, an original position, where any agreement that will be "concluded" will be characterized as fair (Soh, 2017).

That is why the principles that govern each agreement must be fair. Rawls made a hypothesis that the people involved in the endeavor would be behind the veil of ignorance. They could not know, when legislating, whether they were the rulers or the ruled. Also, they would not know how their judgments and choices could affect them individually, but would evaluate them by general criteria, that is, they would attempt to make an assessment of whether these solutions would benefit the whole. None of the participants could be aware of the position they would take in the society themselves, nor the socio-political and economic conditions that would prevail, and nothing else that might affect them, such as gender, color, religion, ethnicity (Gališanka, 2019).

The principles that they end up with should be able to be integrated into society and applied by citizens by sharing their sense of justice and maintaining a symmetrical relationship between the parties. The veil of ignorance aims, given the ignorance of the particular characteristics of each, to make citizens treat each other with respect and selflessness and to ensure neutrality in some way. By not knowing their interests, it is impossible for the actors to adapt the principles of justice to their own measures. It is equality and impartiality that will ensure justice. Justice is a virtue, a moral duty of the individuals in a society. For Rawls all social goods, such as freedom, opportunities,

wealth, must be distributed fairly and equitably, unless an unequal distribution is to the benefit of the weak (Wolthuis, 2017).

On a philosophical-political level, the concept of justice is related to the concept of impartiality. Significant at this point is the contribution of John Rawls and his theory of justice (Rawls 1971). Rawls attempts to answer the question “What rules of justice, defining their rights and obligations, would individuals choose for the functioning of social institutions if their views were not affected by the position in which these individuals are?”. He adopts the concept of the “original position”, where the original members of society do not know the position they will have and are covered by a “veil of ignorance”. In this original position people will set rules for the distribution of “primary goods”, that is, the necessary - in addition to physical - goods - Marshall (1965) calls them social, political and civil rights - for the attainment of their goals (Daryaei & Haghghat, 2017).

Therefore, the basic rule of justice for the distribution of primary goods is that they should be distributed equally unless the unequal distribution of a good benefits all people. This rule entails two principles: (a) equal rights for the most extensive fundamental freedoms for all and (b) potential inequalities should be based either on the benefit of those who are in a more difficult position (maximin) or they should be derived from the positions for which everyone has equal opportunity to take (Akrami et al., 2017).

The question posed by the World Health Organization is: Assuming that the citizens of a country were in the original position where they were covered by the ignorance veil, what rule would they choose as law to finance health services? The answer it adopts is that citizens would all choose to pay the same percentage of their income. On this basis, equitable distribution is linked to the ability of households to pay, that is to say, the real disposable income. The real disposable income is the income that households have at their disposal for consumption, after deducting expenditure on essentials such as food, clothing and housing, and taking into account assets and future income. The distribution of financial burden is considered fair when the ratio of households' total financial contribution for the financing of health services to the total household expenditure, excluding basic living expenses, assumes the same value for all households, regardless of household health level or the use of health services (Akrami et al., 2017).

From the outset, however, one must point out the intrinsically intersubjective nature of the primary goods. That is, their offer raises questions of reciprocity, depending on the circumstances of justice: the objectively limited resources and the subjective (legitimate) conflict of perceptions and interests. Reciprocity means, however, that, as evil must have a general (independent of specific principal names) and abstract form, for example, it should be punishable by a fine or deprivation of freedom, likewise the contribution of each to the public burdens should only be monetary (tax) and not, for example, provision of personal labor (as in the case of pre-modernism community morals); so, in principle, primary goods must also be general and abstract. Before their beneficiary converts them into special and specific skills, they should only exist as exceptions in kind, such as for example the benefits of a national health system, to tackle problems of economies of scale. In any case, our claims based on social rights, or better yet on the principle of equality, against the state, usually require, for their satisfaction, the participation of all of us in a narrow conceptual framework of cooperation, such as, for example, compulsory social security. Otherwise, a national health system, without the financial contributions of all of us as quasi-taxes, would be impossible. However, the very principle of the difference itself presupposes a narrow conceptual framework of cooperation, which is not, however, effortlessly justified by the principles of non-distributive justice that have the regulatory primacy (Daryaei & Haghghat, 2017).

ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE

The concepts of leadership and of the leader in Administrative Science have been portrayed as the person on top of the administrative pyramid of a business or organization,

which is certainly not true. And herein lies the difficulty of defining its place in relation to organizational justice, which by its very nature in people who lack the relevant education, has been incorrectly identified. For these people, the leader of an organization is the one who defines the organizational justice according to his or her own standards and they are bound to follow it, but this is not the case since they themselves can adjust justice to their own circumstances (Bourandas, 2008).

One guiding definition in this regard is as follows: “leadership in organizational justice is the process of influencing a group of people by a person based on specific rules and in such a way that they volunteer and are willing with appropriate cooperation to do their best to achieve effective goals arising from the mission of the group and its ambition for progress or for a better future” (Bourandas, 2008; Cheung, 2013; Mahajan & Benson, 2013).

Leadership involves organizational justice, while the latter defines the former, in part, but its foundations are largely based on emotional intelligence. The notion of justice “awakens” emotions at times good and at times bad for employees, affecting and determining them (Skarlicki, 2001).

The true leader creates and continuously develops an effective, value-creating, fair-functioning organization that meets the needs of all stakeholder groups, such as customers, employees, shareholders, society, etc. (Carton, 2008)

The leader achieves short-term results, that is, “wins the day” and at the same time develops the organization, “builds the future”. Lastly, the leader makes his/her colleagues follow him/her voluntarily and willingly, that is, the leader ensures organizational justice through appropriate attitudes and behaviors, commitment, and predisposition to the highest possible performance (Bourandas, 2008)

What links leadership with organizational justice is profoundly essential. In most regions of the developing world, best business practices have not yet taken their definitive form. An organization based on principles of togetherness and genuine leadership would hire people with the skills needed to practice genuine leadership. Continuous learning of these abilities would be part of the daily operation and the whole organization would evolve into a place of human progress and well-being (Skarlicki et al., 1999; Cropanzano et al., 2001).

As more and more women enter the business world dynamically, concerns about a balanced attitude to both professional and personal obligations are heightened. But as social values change, concern about achieving professional and social balance is also expressed by men. However, this is a difficult case as organizations nowadays face strong competition worldwide, employees are increasingly pressured to increase their efficiency and consequently the hours required to spend in the workplace are increasing. Thus organizations try as much as possible to increase their profitability by increasing the expectations of their employees regarding their time, energy and commitment to their work (Erkutlu, 2011).

The phrase “family-friendly” describes the various policies that companies follow to support the striving for professional and personal balance. An effort that yields satisfactory results sometimes and other times results less satisfactory results depending on the culture of each organization. Burke (2000) describes a study that refers to the relationship between the values that exist in an organization to enhance the balance between work and personal life, the experience and commitment in the workplace, and the existence of physical and mental well-being. The research was conducted on men who held a managerial position and found a desire for values that support this balance more, for less hours of work, less stress, more fun, more career prospects, fewer chances of resignation, more opportunities for community participation and having fun with friends and higher levels of peace of mind.

Various researchers describe and evaluate more intensively projects from companies that are interested in contributing to the best possible Quality and work-personal life relationship. These companies have realized that the personal needs of the employees and the

goals of the organization need to be taken into account in order to properly adapt the strategy of the company and ultimately benefit both the company and its workforce.

When employees perceive that leaders are fair and when leaders' behaviors are attributed to their good intentions, employees tend to conclude that leaders are committed to them and that high quality exchanges occur. Leaders can try to shape the work environment so that they provide more opportunities for efficient work behavior. Indeed, it would be difficult for an employee to self-sacrifice if he/she had little contact with colleagues (and therefore there were no opportunities to meet his/her needs for help) or if the rules of work were so rigid that the employee could not help colleagues (Fujimoto et al., 2013). Similarly, employees would find it difficult to participate responsibly in the administration of the organization or to make constructive suggestions if there were no staff meetings or other meetings for that purpose. Leaders can enhance workplace behavior by changing the structure of tasks employees perform, the conditions under which they perform their work and/or the human resources management practices that govern their behavior. Thus, leaders need to understand which characteristics of their behavior tend to be more related to work behavior in different contexts (Hegtvedt & Clay-Warner, 2004).

One explanation for employees involved in workplace behavior is related to cognitive assessments of employees' fair treatment by an organization. This view is theoretically rooted in the fundamental theory of Adams (1965), which states that employees evaluate their work situations by cognitively comparing their inputs to the organization with the results they receive in return. If employees perceive their organization to be fair, then they are likely to perform better. It appears, however, that some forms of justice provide for better work behavior. For example, Moorman (1991) found that the best predictor of work behavior is interactive justice. On the contrary, other studies have found that procedural justice is a better predictor of work behavior (Yadav & Gupta, 2017). When employees believe that they are being unfairly treated by the organization or supervisor, they are likely to believe that social exchange has been violated. If these employees realize that the cost of staying in the relationship outweighs the benefits, they are likely to withdraw from the relationship. This withdrawal may be in the form of lower performance (Cowherd and Levine, 1992), increased absenteeism and turnover (Hulin, 1991), divergent behaviors (Skarlicki et al., 1999), decreased emotional commitment (Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018) and reduced citizen satisfaction (Yadav & Gupta, 2017; Moorman, 1991). When employees perceive a fair work environment, they are likely to respond to social exchange and perform more.

Greenberg (1987 as cited in Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013) considers organizational justice as the way in which an employee evaluates both the organization and his/her behavior towards the organization (for example, if a company dismisses half of its employees, employees feel mistreated) (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008).

A person's perceptions of these decisions as right or wrong can influence his or her subsequent behavior. Justice is often of central interest to organizations because the consequences of perceptions of injustice can affect work behaviors. Justice in organizations can include issues related to perceptions of fair remuneration, equal opportunities for promotion and staff selection procedures (Korsgaard et al., 2015).

Organizational justice is seen as a multidimensional construct. Its four proposed components are distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice. Distributive justice is regarded as the justice associated with the outcomes of decisions and the allocation of resources. The results or resources distributed may be tangible (e.g. payment) or intangible (e.g. praise). Perceptions of distributive justice can be reinforced when the results are considered to be equally applicable (Olafsen et al., 2015). Procedural justice relates to the processes that lead to results. When individuals feel they have a voice in the process then procedural justice is high (Rupp et al., 2017). Interpersonal justice is about how fair

employees are treated. Finally, informational justice relates to the information provided to employees (Blader & Tyler, 2013).

Research also indicates the importance of influence and emotion in assessing the fairness of a situation, as well as the reactions of one's behavior to the situation (Barsky, Kaplan, & Beal, 2011).

One concept related to organizational justice is corporate social responsibility (CSR). Organizational justice generally refers to perceptions of equality within the organization, while corporate social responsibility focuses on justice in dealing with individuals outside the organization (Rupp et al., 2015).

Corporate social responsibility refers to a mechanism by which companies monitor and regulate their performance in accordance with ethical and social standards, so that they have a positive impact on all stakeholders. Thus, corporate social responsibility includes organizations that behave in ways that benefit members of society at large. It has been suggested that an employee's perceptions of the level of corporate social responsibility of the organization in which he or she is working can influence one's attitudes and perceptions about justice even if he or she is not mistreated (Rupp et al., 2015).

The idea of organizational justice comes from the equity theory (Adams, 1965), which assumes that judgments of equality and inequality come from comparisons between self and others based on inputs and outputs. Inputs refer to what a person perceives (e.g. knowledge and effort), while the results are what an individual perceives to come out of an exchange relationship (e.g., pay and recognition). The benchmarks on which these inputs and outputs are evaluated may be internal (older selves) or external (other people) (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013).

EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Higher levels of justice are perceived when employees feel they have an input into the process rather than when employees do not perceive that they have the opportunity to participate (Cropanzano et al., 2015; Bies, 2015; Xu et al., 2016).

The perception of organizational justice is also dependent on communication, which affects interpersonal and informative perceptions of justice (Xu et al., 2016). Effective communication improves perceptions of justice by improving employees' perceptions of the manager's reliability and by reducing feelings of uncertainty (Al-Zu'bi, 2010; Cropanzano et al., 2015).

Employees' perceptions of injustice within the organization affect organizational justice as a whole. Commonly reported outcomes include counterproductive behaviors, absences, turnover, and emotional exhaustion (Ibrahim & Perez, 2014).

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

The impact of organizational justice perceptions on employee performance is as follows (Cohen, 2015): improving perceptions of justice improves productivity and performance and vice versa (Karriker & Williams, 2009).

Greater perceived injustice leads to lower levels of job satisfaction while greater perception of justice leads to higher levels of job satisfaction (Al-Zu'bi, 2010; DeConick, 2010; Cohen, 2015).

Increased procedural injustice crises can lead to low productivity (Cohen, 2015), because the relationship between perceived procedural injustice and counterproductive work behaviors can be mediated by perceived regulatory conflict in which employees perceive conflict between the rules of their work group and the rules of the organization. Thus, more perceptions of procedural injustice lead employees to perceived regulatory conflict, which is

likely to lead to counterproductive work behaviors (Gruys and Sackett, 2003; Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara & Verano-Tacoronte, 2007).

Burnout is related to general perceptions of organizational justice (Liljegren & Ekberg, 2009; Schunck et al., 2015). Perceptions of injustice are important predictors and determinants of turnover intention (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). In other words, turnover intention is an important result of the employee's perceptions of justice. Interpersonal and distributive justices are more predictive of turnover intention than procedural justice (Thomas & Nagalingappa, 2013).

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN SATISFACTION

While many researchers have attempted to identify design and performance aspects that significantly affect end-user satisfaction, it can be argued that the management process involved in introducing such changes (e.g. a new facility or workspace) may be just as important if not more important for satisfaction. Finch (2004) suggested that customer satisfaction from facilities is determined not only by technical performance but also by a "complex set of exchange processes" such as effective communication and expectations management.

However, in every organization there are uncontrollable variables and unforeseen changes that result in changes in deadlines and scarce resources. How can organization managers meet customer needs when both those needs and the environment in which they operate change so often? Uncertainties arise in (1) matching unforeseen space requirements with supply, (2) managing obsolete facilities renovation, (3) contradictory approaches of internal and contracted service providers, (4) addressing competing space and service requirements, 5) combining long-term strategy (e.g. neighborhood needs) with immediate requirements (e.g. arrival of new employees).

As the size of an organization increases, so does the complexity of the facility's strategy. Explaining to department managers that their needs have been incorporated into the strategic plan and will be fulfilled over the next four years has little impact when faced with the impending arrival of staff. So how can teams relax their clients in the mean time? Customer satisfaction can be achieved by adopting a service rather than a technical approach to facility management, focusing on organizational justice and maintaining customer perceptions of justice. In particular, emphasis should be placed on procedural justice, as it is considered the most important form of justice in the provision of services.

Distributive justice refers to the allocation of resources (Homans, 1961) or to the perceived impartiality of the results an individual receives from organizations (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The results can be distributed on the basis of equality, need, or contribution (Leventhal, 1976), and individuals determine the fairness of the distribution by comparison with others.

However, with the finding that the procedures used to determine the results may have more influence than the outcome itself, the emphasis has gradually shifted from distributive to procedural justice. Procedural justice can be defined as the fair method, the mechanism and the processes used to determine outcomes (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), or the perceived justice of the processes used in decision making (Su et al., 2019).

Lind and Tyler (1988) investigated relational approaches to justice and argued that rules developed through group identification lead individuals to develop a commitment to social processes and power relations. These in turn are used to make decisions about the fair process. Fair procedures must be consistent, free, precise, have error correction mechanisms, take into account the concerns of all parties and be ethically acceptable (Leventhal, 1980).

Support for the beneficial effects of procedural justice and its primacy on distributive justice in the impact of behavior has emerged in a wide variety of settings. Thibaut and

Walker (1975) examined the concept in a legal context and found that dissenters were willing to accept a decision that they disagreed with if they could see that the process by which it was decided was fair.

Similarly, Tyler and Folger (1980) found in police-citizen encounters that individuals who felt that they had been treated fairly had more positive evaluations of their relationships with the police and police in general, whether or not the police solved the problem for which it was called.

It was reported by Greenberg (1987) that where outcomes or rewards were perceived as unfair, simple procedures lead to an increase in the means of assessing the impartiality of those outcomes. That is, perceptions of procedural justice can change and affect perceptions of distributive justice. It has also been shown that fair procedures were considered fair regardless of the outcome of those procedures. This is in line with Leventhal's (1980) hypothesis that "if the procedures are considered fair, then the final distribution is likely to be accepted as fair, while it may be disadvantageous" (p. 36).

Studying this hypothesis within a multinational organization, Kim and Maugeorgne (1996) examined the effects of perceived procedural justice on the manager's commitment to implement decisions. They found that as perceptions of procedural justice in the decision-making process increased, their commitment to implement the decisions (i.e. the outcome of this process) is also increased.

A further form of organizational justice that managers of organizations can use to influence customer satisfaction levels is transnational justice. Justice is defined as the quality of the agency (Bies & Moag, 1986). This method is used to investigate a person's behavior. Simply put, it's the way information is communicated. In the context of managing organizations, this involves addressing customer concerns, listening to their needs, and encouraging and understanding.

Bies and Moag (1986) reported that the treatment of those affected by a decision in a polite and political manner helped to maintain perceptions of justice. There are two different components of interactive justice, namely interpersonal sensitivity and social accounts (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Interpersonal sensitivity refers to maintaining a polite and attentive approach to others, while social accounts include the provision of adequate explanations for adverse effects. There has been much debate as to whether this represents an independent construct or is a sub-form of procedural justice, but regardless of such a discussion, the results of the research to date suggest that courtesy of individuals contributes to a positive perception of organizational justice.

Concerning the dimensions of procedural justice in service provision, the findings underscore that employees understand that while managers often cannot control the effects, they can influence processes. Organizational managers do not have the resources to meet the needs of all clients (i.e. the ability to maintain perceptions of distributive justice), but have the ability to influence the way resources and services are distributed among the organization's clients.

As defined by Osburn et al. (1990), forms of procedural justice can be classified according to the level of employee engagement or, in this case, customer engagement. Customer engagement in an organization's activities can range from simple communication to decision-making to ongoing customer focus groups that are appropriate actions and engage in problem solving activities. Indeed, input levels can be further increased to give focus groups the power to make decisions about which managers have a veto right.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J.S. (1965), “*Inequity in social exchange*”, in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 267-99
- Akrami, F., Abbasi, M., Karimi, A., Shahrivari, A., Majdzadeh, R., & Zali, A. (2017). Analyzing the politico-moral foundations of the Iran’s health system based on theories of justice. *Journal of medical ethics and history of medicine*, 10.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
- Ambrose, L.M., & Schminle, M. (2003). Organization Structure as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Perceived Organizational Support, and Supervisory Trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology* Copyright 2003 by the American Psychological Association, Inc, 88 (2), 295–305.
- Barling, J. and Phillips, M. (1993), “*Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: an exploratory study*”, *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 127, pp. 649-56.
- Barsky, A., Kaplan, S. A., & Beal, D.J. (2011). Just feelings? The role of affect in the formation of organizational fairness judgments. *Journal of Management*, 37, 248-279.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (2003), *Leaders: strategies for taking charge*. Harper Business Essentials.
- Bies, R. J. & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria for Fairness. In B. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Vol. 1, 43 – 55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J. (2015). Interactional justice: Looking backward and looking forward. *Oxford handbook of justice in work organizations*, 89-107.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). How Can Theories of Organizational justice Explain the Effects of Fairness?. *Handbook of organizational justice*, 329.
- Carton, A.M. (2008). *Enhancing Leadership Theories with Goal Structure*. Duke University, Fuqua School of Business.
- Cheung, M. F. (2013). The mediating role of perceived organizational support in the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 34(6), 551-572.
- Cohen, A. (2015). Organizational Justice. In *Fairness in the Workplace* (pp. 23-30). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Cowherd, D.M. and Levine, D.I. (1992), “*Product quality and pay equity between lower-level employees and top management: an investigation of distributive justice theory*”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 37, pp. 302-20.

- Cropanzano, R., Fortin, M., & Kirk, J. F. (2015). How do we know when we are treated fairly? Justice rules and fairness judgments. In *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 279-350). Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three roads to organizational justice. In *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 1-113). Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Daryaei, A. A., & Haghghat, H. (2017). Financial Freedom and Socially Responsible Market Economy: An Analysis from Rawls's Theory of Justice. *Journal of Money and Economy*, 12(3), 251-275
- 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.
- 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.
- Finch, E. (2004) *Facilities Management*. In D. Clements-Croome (Ed.). *Intelligent Buildings: Design Management and Operation*. UK: Thomas Telford. (In Press).
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. CA: Sage.
- Fujimoto, Y., Härtel, C. E., & Azmat, F. (2013). Towards a diversity justice management model: integrating organizational justice and diversity management. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 9(1), 148-166.
- Gališanka, A. (2019). *John Rawls: The Path to a Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to Procedural Injustice in Payment Distributions: Do the Means Justify the Ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 55 – 61.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of organizational justice*. Psychology Press.
- Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42.
- Hegtvedt, K. A., & Clay-Warner, J. (2004). Linking legitimacy and procedural justice: Expanding on justice processes in organizations. In *Legitimacy Processes in Organizations* (pp. 213-237). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. NY: Harcourt
- Hulin, C. (1991), "Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations", in Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, M.L. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 102-8.
- Ibrahim, M. E., & Perez, A. O. (2014). Effects of organizational justice, employee satisfaction, and gender on employees' commitment: evidence from the UAE. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(2), 45.
- Karriker, J. H.; Williams M. L. (2009). Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Mediated Multifoci Model. *Journal of Management*, 35, 112.
- Kim, W. C. & Maugborgne, R. A. (1996). *Procedural Justice and Managers In-role and Extrarole Behavior: The Case of a Multi-National*. *Management Science*, 42 (4), 499

- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Call, M. L. (2015). The Role of Concern for Others in Reactions to Justice: Integrating the Theory of Other Orientation with Organizational Justice. *The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, 387.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). *Fairness in Social Relationships*. In J. W. Thibaut, J. T. Spence & R. C. Carson (Eds.), *Contemporary Topics in Social Psychology*, 211 – 239. NJ: General Learning Press.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). *What Should be done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships*. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*, 27 – 55. NY: Plenum.
- Liljgren, M. & Ekberg, K. (2009). The associations between perceived distributive, procedural, and interactional organizational justice, self-rated health and burnout. *Work*, 33, 43-51.
- Lind, E. A. & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. NY: Plenum
- Mahajan, A., & Benson, P. (2013). Organisational justice climate, social capital and firm performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(7), 721-736.
- Miele, A. (2017). An Explanation of John Rawls's Theory of Justice with a Defense of the Veil of Ignorance.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991), "Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 845-55
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International journal of hospitality management*, 29(1), 33-41.
- Olafsen, A. H., Halvari, H., Forest, J., & Deci, E. L. (2015). Show them the money? The role of pay, managerial need support, and justice in a self-determination theory model of intrinsic work motivation. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 56(4), 447-457.
- Osburn, J., Moran, L., Musselwhite, E. & Zenger, J. (1990). *Self-Directed Work Teams*. Illinois: Business One Irwin
- Ozel, A., & Bayraktar, C. A. (2018). Effect of organizational justice on job satisfaction. In *Industrial Engineering in the Industry 4.0 Era* (pp. 205-218). Springer, Cham.
- Rupp, D. E., Wright, P. M., Aryee, S., & Luo, Y. (2015). Organizational justice, behavioral ethics, and corporate social responsibility: Finally the three shall merge. *Management and Organization Review*, 11(1), 15-24.
- Schunck, R., Sauer, C., & Valet, P. (2015). Unfair pay and health: The effects of perceived injustice of earnings on physical health. *European Sociological Review*, 31(6), 655-666.
- Skarlicki, D. P. (2001). Cross-cultural perspectives of organizational justice. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12(4), 292-294.
- Soh, M. L. (2017). Health care and Rawls's theory of justice Singapore: a case study.
- Su, L., Huang, S. S., & Nejati, M. (2019). Perceived justice, community support, community identity and residents' quality of life: Testing an integrative model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 41, 1-11.

- Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: Preference fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science, 19*, 339-347
- Thibaut, J. W. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. NJ: Erlbaum
- Thomas, P., & Nagalingappa, D. G. (2013). Consequences of perceived organizational justice: An empirical study of white-collar employees.
- Tyler, T. R. & Folger, R. (1980). Distribution and Procedural Aspects of Satisfaction With CitizenPolice Encounters. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1* (4), 281 – 292
- Wolthuis, B. (2017). Principles of economic union: An extension of John Rawls's theory of justice. *European Law Journal, 23*(6), 454-466.
- Xu, X., Payne, S. C., Horner, M. T., & Alexander, A. L. (2016). Individual difference predictors of perceived organizational change fairness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(2), 420-433.
- Yadav, L. K., & Gupta, P. (2017). Procedural Justice, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Mediating Role of Organizational Trust—Indian Tourism Industry Study. *Management and Labour Studies, 42*(3), 275-292.
- Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. & Verano-Tacoronte, D. (2007). Investigating the effects of procedural justice on workplace deviance: Do employee's perceptions of conflicting guidance call the tune? *International Journal of Manpower, 28*(8), 715-729.