



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS RESEARCH: G  
INTERDISCIPLINARY

Volume 15 Issue 3 Version 1.0 Year 2015

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

## Organizational justice: a vision by higher education academic staff

By Tirso Javier Hernández Gracia, Edgar Martínez Torres, Ma. Del Rosario García Velázquez, Enrique Martínez Muñoz & Guillermo González Naranjo

*Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, Mexico*

**Abstract-** Organizational justice is a common concept and of great interest among high education professionals, because it represents equal opportunities and outcomes for all people. The objective of this paper is to determine the significant effect among the qualifying academic variables and the variables in organizational justice. The sample population was made up of 334 teachers and we used Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice Instrument. The main results show that the teachers within a range of 40 to 49 years old perceive a better distribution in the work-load. This could be explained because they have greater seniority in the institution.

**Keywords:** *organizational, distributive, procedural and interactional justice.*

**GJMBR - G Classification :** JEL Code : D23



ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE A VISION BY HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMIC STAFF

*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



RESEARCH | DIVERSITY | ETHICS

# Organizational Justice: a Vision by Higher Education Academic Staff

Tirso Javier Hernández Gracia <sup>α</sup>, Edgar Martínez Torres <sup>σ</sup>, Ma. Del Rosario García Velázquez <sup>ρ</sup>,  
Enrique Martínez Muñoz <sup>ω</sup> & Guillermo González Naranjo<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract-** Organizational justice is a common concept and of great interest among high education professionals, because it represents equal opportunities and outcomes for all people. The objective of this paper is to determine the significant effect among the qualifying academic variables and the variables in organizational justice. The sample population was made up of 334 teachers and we used Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice Instrument. The main results show that the teachers within a range of 40 to 49 years old perceive a better distribution in the work-load. This could be explained because they have greater seniority in the institution.

**Keywords:** *organizational, distributive, procedural and interactional justice.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture is defined by Omar (2006), cited by Patlan et al.(2014) as the perception employees have about what is fair and what is unfair inside the organization where they work. In essence, the assumption researchers that support the value of organizational justice have is, that if employees believe they are being treated fairly, this will bring about positive attitudes toward their work, their bosses and supervisors, and the organization itself; on the other hand, if they feel the treatment they receive is unfair, such perception will end up creating tension, feelings of dissatisfaction and demotivation (De Boer, et. al, 2002), which will result in lack of productivity, decreased work quality, and absenteeism (Wayne, et. al, 2002). Greenberg (1993) cited by Martinez (2014) proposed a two-dimensional taxonomy, in which the first dimension defines the categories of distributive and procedural justice and the second dimension by social components associated with distributions and procedures.

As stated by Buluc (2015) in modern organizations, it is common to hear the concepts of fairness, justice and righteousness.

According to Colquit, Noah and Jackson (2006) cited by Tziner et al.(2015) organizational justice generally relates to three specific components, distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Greenberg (1993) cited by Martinez (2014) proposed a two-dimensional taxonomy. In the first dimension, he defines the categories of distributive and procedural justice, while the second dimension deals with the social components associated with distributions and procedures. This way, interactional justice was divided into interpersonal justice (that is the treatment among those making distributive decisions and those affected by them) and informational justice (based on the extent to which people perceive that they are receiving the adequate and necessary information for the efficient performance of their tasks).

According to Moorman (1991) organizational justice is the perception workers have about what is fair or what is not in the organization, which includes three aspects: distributive, procedural and interactional.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### a) *Distributive justice*

In accordance with Tziner (2015) the concept of distributive justice traditionally is based on Adams' general theory of equality; Greenberg (1993) defines distributive justice as the perception of justice on resources received by the organizations and individual workers, since they may experience a sense of injustice when they feel they are not treated equally.

According to Leventhal (1980), cited by Enoksen (2015), distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness by employees of an organization. For Moorman (1991) cited by Patlan et al.(2013) distributive justice is perceived regarding different aspects of work: wage levels, working hours, workload and allocation of responsibilities.

Messick and Cook (1983) cited by Arboleda (2009) state that distributive justice is related to the perception of a fair result taking into account the initial investment.

The concept emerged in the mid-fifties when employees expressed their concern about the distribution of wages and it is defined as the cost and effort it takes to solve a problem or as the calculation of benefits received given the cost of the service/product,

*Author α: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.  
e-mail: theman@uaeh.edu.mx*

*Author σ: Profesor investigador de la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo. e-mail: edgaral10@hotmail.com*

*Author ρ: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.  
e-mail: rosy\_gave@hotmail.com*

*Author ω: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.  
e-mail: enriquemarvar@yahoo.com.mx*

*Author ‡: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.  
e-mail: guillermo\_ggn@hotmail.com*

or as equal treatment to all customers (Maxham and Netemeyer 2002, Mc Collough 2000).

#### b) *Procedural justice*

Greenberg (1993) defines procedural justice as the impartiality of the means by which a resource allocation decision is made. According to Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) procedures are likely to be considered fair if they meet six elements: they must be consistent, unbiased, accurate and correctable, should represent all problems and should prevail on the basis of ethical standards.

For Moorman (1991) procedural justice is defined as the degree in which decisions are made on the job and include mechanisms to ensure the proper collection of information, the possibility of expression by the workers and the existence of feedback processes.

Leventhal et al. (1980) states that for the procedures to be seen as fair, the following criteria must be taken into account:

- They must apply in the same conditions to all people at any given moment;
- They must not be biased;
- The information used to make decisions must be valid and reliable
- There must be procedures to detect and correct biased actions;
- Must conform to the company's ethical and moral standards ;
- Must take into consideration the opinions of the groups that may be affected by those decisions.

According to Arboleda (2009) the perception of justice that individuals have about the policies and procedures that employees follow is known as procedural justice. Thus processes are just when they are defined in a fair and consistent manner, letting people know that the organization has standardized processes to allocate resources and salaries to employees. So it is a complementary concept to distributive justice.

#### c) *Interactional justice*

Interactional justice has been found to be an important variable in understanding a variety of workers attitudes and their behavior in response to layoffs, budgetary decisions, purchasing decisions, negotiating tactics, corporate hiring practices (Bies and Moag 1986), customer service practices, and operational market practices. Moreover, interactional justice has been an important variable in understanding organizational behavior (Moorman, 1991), confidence in management and organizational commitment and consumer behavior.

Bies y Moag (1986) call it interactional justice when the procedures are implemented and carried out with different levels of quality, which reflects in the way customers receive friendly, dignified and respectful treatment from the directors of the organization.

Moorman (1991) defines interactional justice as the degree to which employees feel their needs are taken into account and that there are appropriate explanations to the making of decisions.

The perception of being treated fairly by the management in an organization produces in the employees behavior patterns that favor or limit their interest to give greater or lesser effort, to feel satisfied or dissatisfied, to value the directors positively or negatively, to achieve greater or lesser organizational commitment or be more or less vulnerable to stress according to Greenberg (1993) cited by Xiaoyu (2012).

In the opinion of Arboleda (2009) interactional justice was initially the part of procedural justice to assess whether people offered customers a friendly treatment, but in the eighties the concept received more attention to measure the quality of interpersonal relationships and he defines it as the intention to help communicate what is appropriate and strive to solve problems.

#### d) *Organizational justice in the academic world*

Moorman (1991) suggests that the study of organizational justice in an educational institution begins when the perceptions of academics are known from the following approaches:

- Distributive justice. It is defined as the fairness with which an organization, through management, distributes benefits such as, incentives, work positions, and promotions.
- Procedural justice. It is defined as the fairness in the procedures with which an organization makes the decisions to distribute the benefits.

Moorman (1991) proves the importance of the perception of organizational justice on the part of the employees of an educational institution as a modifier of the work attitudes and behaviors which give us the following:

- The relationship between participation and job satisfaction is influenced significantly by the perception that people have of receiving a fair treatment in the process of decision making. This is defined as distributive justice, resulting in the fact that the participatory systems make the perception of distributive justice more critical.
- The perception of distributive justice affects satisfaction and the idea that workers have of the incentives being related to work effort.

This perception of organizational justice has effects that go beyond the attitudes and behaviors of workers such as organizational commitment and effort, because, through them, influence can be applied on the clients of the educational services such as students, who respond to the assessment they make of the fairness with which they are treated with positive (or negative) emotional responses with respect to both, the teachers and the educational organization as Moorman

(1991) noted in a study done on a sample of students and university professors seen as clients.

The perception of organizational justice also has a major impact on teacher behavior by preventing the manifestation of symptoms of stress and pathologies with negative effects that affect academic organizational efficiency.

#### e) Problem statement

In order to perform an analysis of organizational justice in a sample of professors from a public higher education institution, the next objective was set: "To determine the significant effect between the qualifying variables of the professors and the variables of organizational justice." The research hypotheses are as follows

*H10* There is no statistically significant relationship perceived by the professors between the organizational justice variables and the qualifying variables at a university.

*H1A* There is a statistically significant relationship perceived by the professors between the organizational justice variables and the qualifying variables at a university.

### III. METHOD

To reply to the statement of the problem we carried out the collection and analysis of data using descriptive statistics and inferences which corresponds to a quantitative, non-experimental, cross design approach.

The research was conducted on a sample of 334 teachers to whom we applied Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice instrument, which consists of three dimensions and includes 20 items on a five-point Likert scale

We carried out the validity of the instrument and the results obtained in the dimension analysis performed with the Quartimax main components and rotation method gave confirmation of the construct in which three dimensions were obtained: Dimension 1, Distributive justice composed of 5 items, Dimension 2, Procedural justice made up of 6 items, and Dimension 3, Interactional justice which has 9 items, thus confirming the validity of the construct as it can be seen in Table 1.

*Table1* : Construct validity on the scale of organizational justice

Items on the scale	Dimensions			Commonality
	F1. Distributive Justice	F2. Procedural Justice	F3. Interactional Justice	
1	.846			.798
2	.643			.627
3	.578			.678
4	.680			.720
5	.506			.484
6		.702		.505
7		.904		.819
8		.839		.718
9		.917		.845
10		.764		.615
11		.796		.647
12			.848	.719
13			.882	.787
14			.833	.701
15			.879	.772
16			.901	.829
17			.835	.709
18			.849	.732
19			.924	.856
20			.839	.732
% explained variance.	58.29	7.74	5.43	
% of accumulated explained variance.	58.9	66.03	71.47	

*Note: Extraction method: Analysis of principal components with Quartimax rotation. Source: Authors' calculations based on a statistical run.*

In the reliability results of Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice Scale, the score for the three dimensions was as follows: for Dimension 1 distributive

justice was 0.730, for Dimension 2, Procedural Justice, 0.921 and for Dimension 3, interactional Justice, 0.961, as it can be seen in table two.

*Table 2 :* Reliability of Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice Scale

Dimensions	Cronbach's alpha
F1. Distributive Justice	.730
F2. Procedural Justice	.921
F3. Interactional Justice	.961

*Source: Authors' calculations based on a statistical run.*

#### IV. RESULTS

The hypotheses raised in this investigation were tested by the Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA). We found a statistically important relationship between the organizational justice variable perceived by the professors and the qualifying variables. These results proved hypothesis **H1<sub>A</sub>** which states that the organizational justice variables perceived by the academics have a statistically significant relationship with the qualifying variables.

Based on the results of the Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA), the distributive justice dimension perceived by the sample of professors has a statistically significant relationship with the qualifying variables: age, schooling of teachers, and the educational programs where they teach.

- As shown in Table 3 the highest mean score of the distributive justice dimension and the age variable is

found in teachers with an age range of 40 to 49 years (mean=3.29) and the lowest in the age range of 30 to 39 years (mean=2.96)

- In regard to the schooling variable, the highest mean of the distributive justice dimension is found in professors that have an specialty (mean=3.45) and the lowest in educators with a doctorate degree (mean=2.81)
- According to the educational programs where they teach, the highest mean of the distributive justice dimension is found on professors that work in undergraduate programs (mean=3.17) and the lowest for those who teach a postgraduate level (mean=2.79).

No significant differences between the variables: marital status, gender, category, school where they teach, hours they work or seniority were identified among the professors.

*Table 3 :* Mean scores of distributive justice in accordance with the qualifying dimension variables.

Variable	N	Mean	F	p
Marital Status:			.181	.671
Single	89	3.16		
Married	137	3.12		
Gender:				
Male	137	3.16		
Female	89	3.09		
Age:			3.727	.012
Up to 29 years	22	3.26		
From 30 to 39	103	2.96		
From 40 to 49	65	3.29		
50 or more years	36	3.26		
Schooling:			5.951	.001
Bachelor	70	3.28		
Specialty	24	3.45		
Master	92	3.08		
PhDs	40	2.81		
Category:			2.705	.101
Hourly paid	88	3.23		
professor				
Full-time professor	138	3.07		

School where they teach:			1.526	.183
Agricultural Cs.	31	3.17		
Administrative Cs.	54	3.09		
Basic Sciences and Engineering	39	3.30		
Arts	38	3.10		
Social Sciences	34	2.90		
Health Sciences	30	3.28		
Programs where they teach:			6.214	.013
Undergraduate	203	3.17		
Postgraduate	23	2.79		
Hours worked per day:			1.089	.338
Up to 5 hours	35	3.26		
From 6 to 8	184	3.10		
More than 8	7	3.37		
Seniority:			1.682	.126
Up to 5 years	85	3.09		
From 6 to 10	81	3.09		
From 11 to 15	20	3.20		
From 16 to 20	14	3.38		
From 21 to 25	11	3.47		
From 26 to 30	9	2.73		
More than 30 years	6	3.56		

Source: Authors' calculations based on a statistical run.

In regard to the procedural justice dimension of the variable organizational justice perceived by a sample of professors, there is a statistically important relationship with the variables: school where they teach and teacher's seniority.

As it can be seen in Table 4, the highest mean scores of the distributive justice dimension and the institute where they teach variable are found with the professors who teach at the Institute of Agricultural Sciences (ICAP) (mean=3.45), and the lowest with those who teach at the Institute of Economic-Administrative Sciences (ICEA) (mean=2.75).

In the matter of the seniority variable, the highest mean of the procedural justice dimension is found in those academics with a seniority greater than 30 years (mean=3.72) and the lowest with those with between 26 to 30 years on the job (mean=1.81).

No significant differences between the following variables were identified: marital status, gender, age, academic schooling, category, programs where teach, and the number of hours worked every day with the perceived procedural justice dimension.

Table 4 : Mean scores between the procedural justice dimensions according to the qualifying variables.

Variable	N	Mean	F	p
Marital Status:			3.010	.084
Single	89	3.23		
Married	137	3.00		
Gender:			.149	.700
Male	137	3.11		
Female	89	3.06		
Age:			.055	.983
Up to 29 years	22	3.13		
From 30 to 39	103	3.07		
From 40 to 49	65	3.12		
50 or more years	36	3.06		
Schooling:			.769	.512
Bachelor	70	3.19		
Specialty	24	3.21		
Master	92	2.97		
PhDs	40	3.12		
Category:			.006	.939
Hourly paid	88	3.10		
Professor	138	3.09		



Variable	N	Mean	F	p
Full time professor				
Institute where they teach:			3.396	.006
Agricultural Cs.	31	3.45		
Administrative Cs.	54	2.75		
Basic Cs. Eng.	39	3.35		
Arts	38	3.19		
Socials Cs.	34	2.81		
Health Cs.	30	3.19		
Programs where they teach:			.019	.891
Undergraduate	203	3.09		
Postgraduate	23	3.12		
Hours worked per day:			1.21	.300
Up to 5 hours	35	2.88		
from 6 to 8	184	3.12		
more than 8	7			
Seniority:			3.264	.004
Up to 5 years	85	3.19		
from 6 to 10	81	3.04		
from 11 to 15	20	3.14		
from 16 to 20	14	3.30		
from 21 to 25	11	3.06		
from 26 to 30	9	1.81		
more than 30 years	6	3.72		

Source: Authors' calculations based on a statistical run.

The interactional justice dimension of the justice variable perceived by teachers has a statistically significant association with the variables: marital status, the institute where they teach and their age.

Table 5 shows that the highest mean scores of the interactional justice dimension and the marital status variable are found among single teachers (mean=3.34) and the lowest among married teachers (mean=3.04).

Regarding the "institute where they teach" variable the highest mean of the interactional justice dimension is found with the teachers that work at the Agricultural Sciences Institute (ICAP) (mean=3.49) and

the lowest among those who teach at the Economic-Administrative Sciences Institute (ICEA mean=2.81).)

In relation to the seniority variable, the highest mean of the interactional justice dimension is found in the professors who have a seniority of more than 30 years (mean=3.72) and the lowest among those that have been teaching between 26 to 30 years (mean=1.76).

No significant differences between the following variables were identified by the professors: gender, age, academic schooling, category, and the number of hours worked per day with the interactional justice dimension.

Table 5: Mean scores between interactional justice dimensions according to the classifying variables

Variable	N	Mean	F	p
Marital Status:			4.670	.032
Single	89	3.34		
Married	137	3.04		
Gender:			.024	.876
Male	137	3.15		
Female	89	3.17		
Age:			.460	.711
Up to 29 years	22	3.39		
From 30 to 39	103	3.10		
From 40 to 49	65	3.17		
50 or more years	36	3.14		
Schooling:			.623	.601
Bachelor	70	3.27		
Specialty	24	3.27		
Master	92	3.06		
PhDs	40	3.11		
Category:			.037	.848

Variable	N	Mean	F	p
Hourly paid	88	3.17		
Professor				
Full time	138	3.15		
professor				
Institute where they			2.987	.012
teach:	31	3.49		
Agricultural Cs.	54	2.81		
Administrative Cs.	39	3.42		
Basic Cs. Eng.	38	3.35		
Arts	34	2.93		
Socials Cs.	30	3.10		
Health Cs.				
Programs where			1.548	.215
they teach:	203	3.19		
Undergraduate	23	2.90		
Postgraduate				
Hours worked per			1.148	.319
day:	35	2.93		
Up to 5 hours	184	3.19		
from 6 to 8	7	3.41		
more than 8				
Seniority:			3.365	.003
Up to 5 years	85	3.26		
from 6 to 10	81	3.12		
from 11 to 15	20	3.16		
from 16 to 20	14	3.32		
from 21 to 25	11	3.27		
from 26 to 30	9	1.76		
more than 30 years	6	3.72		

Source: Authors' calculations based on a statistical run.

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In regard to distributive justice and according to the results obtained, scholars that range in age from 40 to 49 years perceive a better distribution of the workload and this could be explained because they are academics who have seniority in the institution.

In respect to the schooling variable, those who have a specialty recognize a more positive distributive justice; this could be explained because they feel that the wages earned, the workload, and the work schedule are distributed according to the level of preparation they have.

The teachers that detect a more equitable distributive justice are those who teach at the bachelor's degree level, which could be related to the structure of the curricula and study plans.

As far as procedural justice is concerned, the professors of the Agricultural Sciences Institute notice a more positive justice, and this could be due to the fact that the director makes sure that all the concerns of the academic personnel are heard before decisions are made, they receive additional information when it is required in order to object or appeal some decisions made by the director, who, during this process, treats the staff with kindness and consideration, and shows concern for the rights of the teachers.

The seniority variable in relation with procedural justice came out more positive with those academics that have been at the job for 26 to 30 years. This could be a result of the interest these teachers have to carry out each and every one of the procedures defined within the study plans and programs in order to fulfill the curricular objectives.

Finally, the result of the interactional justice dimension was more positive with those teachers who are single and this is due to the fact that they have less limitations in their relationship with their co-workers.

At the Agricultural Sciences Institute there is a more positive perception of a procedural justice, which means that the professors have improved the manner they interact and relate to the rest of the personnel.

Seniority is an important aspect for interactional justice and, according to the results, the scholars with more than 30 years working have a more positive perception, and this is due to the fact that they have more capacity to relate with their workfellows.

There have been studies on organizational justice with the objective of having the workers perceive what is just and unjust within the organization to which they belong. Based on their perception, the workers could sustain positive attitudes towards their jobs, the decision makers and the organization; that is why it is vital to continue with further studies to explain the



behavior of organizational justice to improve the perception of the distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. It is also essential to continue with its analysis regarding job satisfaction, organizational climate, as well as with the image of the company in order to create and propose strategies to improve the levels of perception.

### REFERENCE RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Al-Zu, H.A. (2010) "A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction", *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (12): 102-109.
2. Arboleda, Arango, A. M. (2009). La actitud del consumidor según la percepción de justicia organizacional. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 25 (113), 99-112.
3. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). "Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness". *Research on negotiations in organizations*, 1, 43-55.
4. Buluc, B. (2015) The relationship between academic staff's perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Studia Psychologica*, 57, 49-62.
5. Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J. & Roman, P. (2005) "Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: A Test of Three Competing Models", *Social Justice Research*, 18 (4): 391-409.
6. Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J. & Roman, P. (2005) "Organizational justice and job satisfaction: A test of three competing models", *Social Justice Research*, 18 (4): 391-409.
7. Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P.E. (2001) "The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 86 (2): 278-321.
8. Colquitt, J.A. & Jackson, C.L. (2006) "Justice in Teams: The Context Sensitivity of Justice Rules Across Individual and Team Contexts", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36 (4): 868-899.
9. Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C. & Ng, K.Y. (2001) "Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 425-445.
10. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E. & Gilliland, S.W. (2007) "The Management of Organizational Justice" *Academy of Management Perspectives*, November, p. 34-48.
11. De Boer, E., Bakker, A., Syroit, j. y Schaufeli, W. (2002). Unfairness at work a predictor of absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 181-197.
12. Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M. & Vahtera, J. (2002) "Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health" *American Journal of Public Health*, 92 (1): 105-108.
13. Enoksen, Elisabeth (2015) Examining the dimensionality of colquitt's organizational justice scale in a public health sector context. *Psychological Reports: Employment Psychology & Marketing*, 116,3, 723-737. DOI 10.2466/01.PR0.116k26w0
14. Erdogan, B., Liden, R.C. & Kraimer, M.L. (2006) "Justice and leader-member Exchange: the moderating role of organizational culture" *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (2): 395-406.
15. Fryxell, G. E. & Gordon, M.E. (1989) "Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of satisfaction with union and management", *Academy of Management Journal*, 32 (4): 851-866.
16. Greenberg, J. (1993). The social of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. En R. Cropanzano (Org.): *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*, 86 (3), 386-400.
17. Leventhal, GS. Karuza, J. Fry (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In Mikuta G. Ed, *Justice and social interaction*. 167-218. New York: Springer-Verlag.
18. Martínez, Edgar (2014) "Aplicación del Balanced Scorecard en una organización educativa: Efectos de la estrategia en los resultados de desempeño" Tesis para obtener el grado de doctor. Tlaxcala, México.
19. Maxham III, J. G., & Netemeyer, R. G. (2002). Modeling customer perceptions of complaint handling over time: The effects of perceived justice on satisfaction and intent. *Journal of Retailing*, 78, 239-252. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(02\)00100-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(02)00100-8)
20. Mc Collough, M., Berry, LL. Yadav MS. (2000). An empirical investigation of customer satisfaction after service failure and recovery. *Journal of service research*, 2000.
21. Moorman, R.H. (1991) "Relationship between Organizational and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perception Influence Employee Citizenship", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (6): 845-855.
22. Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993) "Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, 36 (3): 527-556.
23. Omar, Alicia. (2006). Justicia organizacional, individualismo, colectivismo y estrés laboral. *Psicología y Salud*, 16 (2), 181-199.
24. Patlán, P., Martínez, T., Hernández, H (2012) El clima y la justicia organizacional y su efecto en la satisfacción laboral. *Revista Internacional de Administración y Finanzas*, 5 (5), 1-19.
25. Patlán, P., Flores, H., Martínez, T., Hernández, H., (2014) Validez y confiabilidad de la escala de justicia organizacional de Niehoff y Moorman en

- población mexicana. *Revista de Contaduría y Administración* 59(2), 97-120.
26. Tziner, A., Felea. Mihai., Vasiliu, C. (2015) Relating ethical climate, organizational justice perceptions, and leader-member exchange (LMX) in Romanian organizations. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 31, 51-57.
  27. Wayne. S., Shore, L., Bommer, W. y Tetrick, L. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 590-598.
  28. Xiaoyu, Li., Yiyang, Qu., Hao, Ren (2012) Examining The Impact Of Organizational Justice And Servant Leadership On OCB. Proyect funds: The National Soft Science Program (2009GXS5D108).

