



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND LECTURERS' JOB PERFORMANCE IN STATE-OWNED UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CENTRAL STATES, NIGERIA.

Kever, Esther Nguper¹, Dauda, Saleh Agwom².

¹University of Maiduguri,

²Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between Procedural Justice and job performance among lecturers of State-owned universities in North-central Nigeria. The objective was to determine the relationship between Procedural justice and lecturers' job performance within the university system. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. The target population comprised 4,278 academic staff across selected state-owned universities in North central Nigeria. From this population, a sample size of 2,141 respondents was drawn, representing 50% of the total population, to ensure sufficient representation and generalisability of findings. The study utilised a stratified sampling technique to capture academic perspectives across institutions. Data were collected using a structured and validated questionnaire designed to measure both independent and dependent variables. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis to determine the strength and direction of relationships between procedural justice and job performance. The finding indicated that procedural justice significantly influenced job performance. The result suggests that transparent decision-making procedures are central to enhancing staff performance. The study concludes that institutionalising equitable relational processes across all administrative procedures can improve employee morale, trust, and



performance outcomes. It recommends that university managements should adopt justice-based policies that ensure transparent governance practices to boost productivity and institutional effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Procedural Justice, Job Performance, Lecturers.

Introduction

In Nigeria, where formal organizational life is still in its infancy or youth, there is a lot of interest in finding ways to inspire and keep employee loyalty. As a result, both employees who work in organizations and those who research them have a keen interest in the ideas of organizational justice and job performance. This is part of what has piqued the interest of the researcher to extensively look into the issue of procedural justice as it affects lecturers' job performance in the State owned universities in north central Nigeria.

In legal terminology, procedural justice pertains to the degree of fairness in the process of reaching a decision. It is the perception of the equity of the processes that determine the results one experiences. According to Onyishi (2015), unjust methods and procedures inherently fail to produce equitable outcomes. Procedural justice pertains to the perception of fairness in the procedures employed to make judgements based on predetermined outcomes (Inyang 2014). Procedural justice, as described by Osuocha (2015), refers to the fairness of the procedures, instruments, and processes used to determine results. Jimogu (2015) refers to it as the perception of lecturers of the appropriateness of the technique or procedures employed in making judgements for themselves or third parties. Thus, lecturers regard administrators and management conduct as the determinants of fairness in the university. The educational implication of this justice is that when management regularly and equitably adheres to processes, lecturers will sense a high level of procedural justice



(PJ). The criteria encompassed in this framework are: voice in decision-making, uniformity in rule application, precision in information utilisation, opportunity for expression, and prevention of bias (Aniedi, 2015).

In view of this trend, the university setting cannot be left out since the need for high performance among academic staff of the university cannot be overemphasized. Lecturers take into account what they receive in exchange for their efforts when evaluating whether management has treated them properly, and the results of their subjective evaluations seem to have a direct relationship with their performance at their jobs.

In the university system, it seems lecturers' performance at their jobs is greatly influenced by their own evaluation or perception of how much justice they get vis-à-vis the input they make in the organisation.

By way of summary, the term "procedural justice" describes how satisfied lecturers are with how resources are allocated inside the university. It is the perception of the equity of the processes that determine the results one experiences. Inequitable processes result in the complete rejection of the system by the employees who should be beneficiaries of such procedures. This aspect of organisational justice involves the equitable management of the procedures and judgments about the allocation of incentives. Procedural justice pertains to the perception of fairness in the procedures employed to make judgments based on predetermined outcomes. It seems the perception of lecturers of the appropriateness of the technique or procedures employed in making judgments for themselves or third parties is of paramount importance. The researcher perceives that the educational implication of this justice is that when management regularly and equitably adheres to processes, lecturers will sense a high level of procedural justice, and consequently put more effort into their jobs.

In Nigeria, where organize justice within the academia still struggling, there is a lot of interest in finding ways to inspire and keep lecturers' loyalty. As a result, both lecturers who work in the university and those who research them have a keen interest in the ideas of procedural justice



and job performance. This is part of what has piqued the interest of the researcher to extensively look into the issue of procedural justice as it affects lecturers' job performance in the State owned universities in North Central Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

In the state-owned universities in the north central geopolitical states in Nigeria, the researcher perceives that the performance of lecturers has been trending downward recently. The level of performance of lecturers at work seems to have shown very little improvement, despite government efforts to encourage effective learning through the provision of resources and an improved work environment. There seems to have been accusations made against lecturers that they don't take their responsibilities seriously, such as timely delivery of lectures and compiling of student results.

Whatever the situation, it's crucial to remember that how well academics do on the job and how the university administration treats them are related. Any university's administration can only expect the best performance from its lecturers if it treats them justly and fairly. To this end, it is expected of the university administration to make sure that lecturers who uphold their commitment to their work and perform at a high standard are appropriately recognised, given promotions, and assigned to positions of authority and responsibility. However, in the North Central geopolitical zone, this doesn't seem to be the case as many State-owned universities seem to be in danger of collapsing because nepotism, tribalism, and sectionalism have flourished within the administration instead of treating its lecturers with justice, fairness, and equity. The researcher has observed that brain drain seems to be on the increase within the system as a result of the alleged inequity in our state-owned universities located in the north central geopolitical zone. Lecturers leave academia to pursue careers in politics, business, farming, and other fields. Because there seems to be the impression that they have been treated unfairly, those who dare to stay are so demotivated that their performance at work is practically at an all-time low. Poor welfare packages, inadequate incentives, low standards of work



in some State-owned colleges, and a cavalier attitude towards academic achievement from the State governments in charge of these institutions are a few instances of the perceived injustice. It appears that most State-owned universities are vulnerable to strikes actions because of this quality of service. Academic narrow-mindedness appears to be on the increase, encouraged by the nepotism and favouritism that sometimes seem to be directed at non-indigenes of the state in certain universities. Moreover the available literature seems to be tailored more towards other fields aside education, like business, politics, etc. Education being the mother of all, the researcher hopes by the results of this study, to unravel the need for a high justice system within the education sector, and possibly stimulate the relevant stakeholders to activate a more operational justice system within the sector.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study was to determine the Relationship between Procedural Justice and Lecturers' Job Performance in State Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria.

Research Question

The research question answered in this study was:

to what extent does Procedural Justice Relate to Lectures' Job Performance in State Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria

Hypothesis

The following null hypothesis was tested in this study at 0.05 level of significance:

H₀₁: There is no significant Relationship between Procedural Justice and Lecturers' Job Performance in State Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria.



Research Methodology

A cross-sectional quantitative survey strategy was adopted for this investigation. This is because in a cross-sectional study, data is gathered from homogeneous participants at several locations (Anikweze, 2013). Hence this study was interested to find out the relationship of procedural justice and lecturers' job performance in State owned universities in North Central geopolitical states, Nigeria.

Within this context, the researcher analyzed the number of lecturers employed in all the state-owned universities of the north central states, the faculties in the said universities and lecturers, that is, the target population. Furthermore, the researcher clearly explained the sample and sampling methods used to determine the overall sample size of the study.

The target population consisted of lecturers from the six State-owned universities located in North Central Nigeria. The most recent census or head count data of lecturers employed in these universities was acquired from the registries of the respective institutions. Such action was taken in order to guarantee the genuineness of the data.

Table 1: Distribution of the Study Population by State-Owned Universities, Number of Faculties and Number of Lecturers in North Central States, Nigeria.

S/N	Name of State-owned University	No. of Faculties	No. of Lecturers	No. of sample per University.
1	Nasarawa State University, Keffi	10	756	378
2	Benue State University, Makurdi	13	976	488
3	Abubakar Audu University, Ayingba	07	883	442



4	Kwara State University, Maletе- Ilorin	11	729	365
5	Plateau State University, Bokokos	09	715	358
6	Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai	08	219	110
	TOTAL	58	4,278	2141

Source: MIS and Personnel Registries of the various universities.(2025)

The study sampled 2141 lecturers out of 4278 population of lecturers in State-owned universities in north central Nigeria. This sample represent 50% of the entire population of lecturers working with state-owned universities in north central Nigeria. Sample selection was conducted using the multistage random sampling technique. The first stage involved purposive sampling to choose the six state owned universities. This was followed by the utilization of simple random sampling technique in selecting faculties from the six purposively selected universities in north central Nigeria. 50% of the faculties were selected from each of the universities and the selection was based on proportion to size of the faculties, bringing the total to 29 faculties as presented in Table 2. Out of the chosen faculties, lecturers were chosen to constitute the 50% necessary for the respondents.

Table 2: Distribution of Sample by Sampled Faculties and Lecturers in State-Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria.

S/N	Name of State-owned University	Faculties Sampled (50% of Sample population)	of Lecturers
1	Nasarawa State university, Keffi	05	378
2	Benue State University, Makurdi	07	488
3	Abubakar Audu University, Ayingba	04	442



4	KwaraState University, Maletе-Ilorin	06	365
5	Plateau State University, Bokkos	05	358
6	Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai	04	110
	TOTAL	31	2141



The data collection instrument for this study consisted of a questionnaire that has been specifically designed by the researcher. The researcher made use of this instrument due to its capacity to efficiently collect data from a substantial number of respondents in a significantly limited timeframe. The questionnaire was sent to experts for face and content validity. This study assessed the consistency of the reliability estimate by employing the Cronbach alpha method and an alpha value of 0.655 was obtained. The instrument was personally administered to the respondents by the researcher, with the assistance of two highly trained research assistants.

Descriptive statistics of frequency count, percentages and mean were used for analysis of the research question. The hypothesis was tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) method and multiple regression analysis at a significance level of 0.05. The analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Data Analysis and Results

Table 3: Response Rate of Questionnaire

Response Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Questionnaires Distributed	2141	100.0
Returned	2061	96.3
Not Returned	80	3.7
Invalid	42	2.0
Valid	2099	98.0



Source: Field Survey (2025)

Out of the 2,141 questionnaires distributed to the respondents, 2,062 were returned, representing a response rate of 96.3%. Among the returned questionnaires, 43 were deemed invalid, constituting 2% of the total. The valid questionnaires amounted to 1,958, accounting for 91.5%. This high response rate indicates a good level of cooperation from the respondents and ensures the representativeness of the data. Table 4.1 shows the detailed breakdown of the response rate

Research Question

To what extent does Procedural Justice Relate to Lecturers' Job Performance in State Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria?

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution for Procedural Justice

Items	SA		A		D		SD	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
I am not sure what determines how I can get a promotion in the University	833	38.9	779	36.4	324	15.1	205	9.6



I am told promptly when there is a change in policy, rules, or regulations that affects me.	911	42.6	812	37.9	252	11.8	166	7.8
It's really not possible to change things around here.	839	39.2	675	31.5	365	17.0	262	12.2
There are adequate procedures to get my performance rating reconsidered if necessary.	923	43.1	683	31.9	317	14.8	218	10.2
When changes are made in this University, the lecturers usually lose out in the end. If I were to be subjected to any disciplinary action, I believe my department would adequately inform me of my faults and appeal rights.	893	41.7	635	29.7	423	19.8	190	8.9
I am aware of the specific actions/inactions that can warrant a disciplinary action against me.	762	35.6	823	38.4	292	13.6	264	12.3
The procedures used to evaluate my performance have been fair and objective.	838	39.1	802	37.5	346	16.2	155	7.2
Job decisions are made by the superiors in an unbiased manner	788	36.8	839	39.2	286	13.4	228	10.6
My superior makes sure that all employees concerned are heard before job decisions are made	821	38.3	680	31.8	337	15.7	303	14.2
To make decisions, my superior collects accurate and complete information.	791	36.9	714	33.3	431	20.1	205	9.6
	950	44.4	700	32.7	282	13.2	209	9.8

E
d
u
c
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
F
o
r
u
m

*Journal of Educational
Studies*



*Vol 14 No. 1
Faculty of Education*

March, 2026

U
n
i
v
e
r
s
i

E
d
u
c
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
F
o
r
u
m

*Journal of Educational
Studies*



*Vol 14 No. 1
Faculty of Education*

March, 2026

U
n
i
v
e
r
s
i

*E
d
u
c
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
F
o
r
u
m*

*Journal of Educational
Studies*



*Vol 14 No. 1
Faculty of Education*

March, 2026

*U
n
i
v
e
r
s
i*

subordinates.

E
d
u
c
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
F
o
r
u
m

*Journal of Educational
Studies*



*Vol 14 No. 1
Faculty of Education*

March, 2026

U
n
i
v
e
r
s
i

E
d
u
c
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
F
o
r
u
m

*Journal of Educational
Studies*



*Vol 14 No. 1
Faculty of Education*

March, 2026

U
n
i
v
e
r
s
i



At my university, lecturers are allowed to challenge
or appeal job decisions made by their superiors.



740 34.6 785 36.7 350
266 12.4 Source: Field Survey (2025)

Table 4 presented a detailed analysis of the questionnaire items under Procedural Justice. Each item was evaluated using a four-point Likert scale, and the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' choices are shown for Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The responses reflect varying levels of agreement, which give insight into the participants' perceptions of procedural justice in their work environment. From the table above, the item numbered 1 shows the highest SA response with 833 respondents (38.9%), while item number 2 recorded 812 Agree (A) responses accounting for 37.9%. Some items like numbers 3 and 4 show relatively lower agreement rates and higher disagreement, indicating divergent views among respondents. This suggests that while the overall perception of procedural justice is favourable, there are variations across specific sub-elements. This outcome is mirrored by several reviewed literatures as will be seen in the discussion of findings.

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution for Job Performance

Item	SA		A		D		SD	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
I consistently prepare thoroughly for my lectures.	830	38.8	739	34.5	260	12.1	312	14.6
I effectively communicate course content to my students.	814	38.0	722	33.7	300	14.0	305	14.2
I meet my teaching deadlines and submit required reports on time.	875	40.9	756	35.3	277	12.9	233	10.9
I receive positive feedback from students regarding my teaching.	976	45.6	788	36.8	252	11.8	125	5.8
I regularly engage in academic research activities.	868	40.5	776	36.2	309	14.4	188	8.8



I publish scholarly articles in reputable academic journals.	855	39.9	778	36.3	317	14.8	191	8.9
I participate actively in departmental and faculty meetings.	844	39.4	756	35.3	423	19.8	118	5.5
I collaborate well with my colleagues on academic and non-academic matters.	950	44.4	700	32.7	302	14.1	189	8.8
I attend classes regularly and punctually.	834	39.0	721	33.7	358	16.7	228	10.6
I respond to students' academic needs and concerns promptly.	991	46.3	800	37.4	234	10.9	116	5.4
I contribute meaningfully to curriculum development and review.	810	37.8	688	32.1	372	17.4	271	12.7
I seek opportunities for professional development and training.	790	36.9	658	30.7	409	19.1	284	13.3
I perform administrative duties assigned to me effectively.	944	44.1	779	36.4	307	14.3	111	5.2
I contribute to the achievement of my department's academic goals.	893	41.7	714	33.3	293	13.7	241	11.3

Source: Field Survey (2025)

Table 5 presented a detailed analysis of the questionnaire items under Job Performance. Each item was evaluated using a four-point Likert scale, and the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' choices are shown for Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The responses reflect varying levels of agreement, which give insight into the participants' perceptions of job performance in their work environment. From the table above, the

item numbered 1 shows the highest SA response with 830 respondents (38.8%), while item number 2 recorded 722 Agree (A) responses accounting for 33.7%. Some items like numbers 3 and 4 show



relatively lower agreement rates and higher disagreement, indicating divergent views among respondents. This suggests that while the overall perception of job performance is favourable, there are variations across specific sub-elements. This agrees with the findings of many reviewed works as will be seen in the discussion of findings.

Hypothesis

The following null hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance:

H₀₁: There is no significant Relationship between Procedural Justice and Lecturers' Job Performance in State Owned Universities in North Central States, Nigeria.

Table 9: Coefficient Table of the Study Variables

Variable	B	Std. Error	T	Sig.
Intercept	-0.055	0.116	-0.47	0.639
Procedural Justice	0.243	0.013	19.15	0.000

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Based on the regression output in Table 9, the p-value for Procedural Justice is 0.000. Since this value is less than the 0.05 threshold, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that Procedural Justice (B = 0.243) has a statistically significant effect on Job Performance.

Findings

The current study confirms that procedural justice positively and significantly impacts job performance. This result has been seen to enhance employees' trust, motivation, and willingness to contribute positively to organizational goals.



Discussion

The current study confirms that procedural justice; the perceived fairness of decision-making processes within an organization; positively and significantly impacts job performance. This result aligns with the theoretical argument that fair procedures enhance employees' trust, motivation, and willingness to contribute positively to organizational goals. Across varied contexts and sectors, procedural justice has consistently emerged as a key driver of employee performance.

This finding is supported by Karanja (2016), whose investigation in Kenya across public secondary schools and commercial banks demonstrated that procedural justice significantly predicted organizational performance, particularly among teachers. Even in the banking sector, where different operational cultures exist, procedural justice remained the only justice component significantly influencing performance. These findings reinforce the idea that procedural justice transcends industry boundaries and plays a universal role in enhancing employee outcomes.

Likewise, Ismael and Faeq (2022), in a study of private enterprises in Kurdistan, Iraq, observed a strong and statistically significant correlation between procedural justice and job performance. Among the various forms of justice analyzed, procedural justice had the strongest influence, confirming the current study's result that transparent and consistent procedures foster employee trust and improved work outcomes.

Similarly, Hyder et al. (2022), working with a population of medical professionals in Pakistan, found that procedural justice boosts in-role performance. Using partial least squares analysis, their results underscore the broader organizational benefits of procedural justice in performance-critical settings such as healthcare. This aligns with the current study's context, emphasizing that when employees view decision-making processes as just, they tend to reciprocate with higher productivity and engagement.

Further support comes from Krishnan, Loon, Ahmad, & Yunus (2018) who, studying employees of a private Malaysian manufacturing firm, found that procedural justice significantly influences employees' job performance. These findings highlight the relevance of procedural justice across



Sapkota (2021) in Nepalese Quality Assurance Accredited Colleges similarly found a positive and significant link between perceived procedural justice and job performance among teaching faculty. His study, like the current one, places emphasis on educational settings and confirms that fair procedural structures positively influence instructors' performance and commitment to their duties.

In a related study, Tyokosu, Emakwu, and Ejoha (2020) examined public primary school teachers in Benue State, Nigeria, and found that procedural justice had a notably strong predictive effect on teachers' performance, even more so than other justice dimensions. This direct corroboration in both geographic and professional context strengthens the present study's validity and relevance.

Khtatbeh et al. (2020) further elaborate on this dynamic in their Jordanian study by establishing that procedural justice not only directly correlates with job performance, but also acts as a mediator between job analysis and performance. Their use of structural equation modeling confirmed that employees' performance is enhanced when fair procedures are used to assign and evaluate roles.

In Uganda, Luswata (2021) revealed that procedural justice has a strong positive association with both affective commitment and job performance. This implies that fair treatment in processes enhances employees' emotional attachment to the organization, which then translates to better job performance; supporting the current study's implication that procedural fairness indirectly contributes to organizational loyalty and efficiency.

Mohamed (2014), studying healthcare workers in Egypt, similarly found that higher levels of procedural justice were linked with enhanced quality performance, underscoring the relevance of fairness in procedures to employees' service delivery and accountability.

Yean and Yusof (2016) argued that procedural justice has the power to influence not only job performance but also employees' economic well-being and career behavior. They emphasize that when procedures are perceived as fair, professionals tend to pursue excellence and development, directly supporting the current study's conclusion that fair processes build performance.

In Surabaya, Indonesia, Mentari and Ratmawati (2018) found that procedural justice boosts

employee engagement through psychological contract fulfillment, suggesting that fair processes



create mutual expectations between employees and employers, fostering commitment and better performance.

Conclusion

The findings of this study have established that procedural justice plays a pivotal role in determining job performance among employees. Procedural justice was found to exert significant positive influences on job performance, thereby underscoring the importance of fairness perceptions within the workplace. This conclusion validates the fundamental assumptions of the Equity Theory (Adams, 1965) which proposes that people act in the light of what they view as fair; that internal resources, such as employee satisfaction, motivation, and trust arising from fair treatment, are critical to achieving and sustaining superior organisational performance. The results of the study indicate that justice-oriented management practices can effectively foster enhanced output in university lecturers; boost morale, and positive organisational citizenship behaviour. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that perceptions of fairness are not merely abstract organisational ideals but are instrumental to real, measurable performance outcomes. In a competitive and resourceconstrained environment such as the Nigerian education sector, particularly in public institutions, integrating justice frameworks into human resource and managerial strategies could be a key lever for improving efficiency and productivity. Therefore, State-owned Universities in North Central Nigeria must prioritise fairness in processes, interpersonal dealings, communication, and outcomes to harness the full potential of their human capital and gain sustainable competitive advantage.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following actionable recommendations are proposed to enhance job performance through improved organisational justice practices:

1. Human Resource departments or similarly tagged offices of State-owned universities should

adopt formal policies that guarantee consistency, neutrality, and lecturer-voice in key administrative



decisions. This will foster Procedural Justice and encourage lecturers to trust the fairness of organisational processes;

2. To improve Procedural Justice, management of State-owned Universities in North Central Nigeria should implement mechanisms for timely and accurate dissemination of information. This includes regular briefings, open-door policies, and feedback platforms that ensure lecturers are informed about policies, decisions, and changes affecting them.



REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* Vol. 2, pp. 267–299. Academic Press.

Akpan, C. P. (2013). Job security and job satisfaction as determinants of organizational commitment among university teachers in Cross River State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 1(2), 82-93.

Anikweze, C.M (2013). *Simplified Approach to Educational Research* Makurdi: Gofat Ventures Limited.

Hyder,S; Malik,M.I; Hussain, S; Tasneem, M; Kaleem, M & Saqib, A. (2022) Organizational justice and employee in-role performance nexus: a dual theory perspective. *Cogent Business & Management*: 9(1) 1-13.

Ismael ZN, & Faeq DK, (2022). Analyzing the Relationships Between Organizational Justice and Job Performance. *International Journal of Engineering Business and Management* 6(5):14-25

Karanja, G.W. (2016).Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment in Public Secondary Schools and Commercial Banks in Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D thesis,Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya.

Khtatbeh, E.M, Mahomed, A.S.B, Rahman, S.A & Mohamed, R.(2020). The mediating role of procedural justice on the relationship between job analysis and employee performance in Jordan Industrial Estates. *ScienceDirect*, 6(10), 1-9.

Krishnan, R. Loon, K.W. Ahmad, N.A.F & Yunus, N.A.S. (2018). Examining the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Performance: *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*: 8(3), 485- 495.

Luswata, E. (2021) Procedural Justice, Affective Commitment and Job Performance among



Maicibi, N.A. (2017). *Organizational Behaviour: Pragmatics and prudenials: Ya-Byangs Publishers, Jos Plateau State.*

Mentari, R.R. & Ratmawati, D. (2018) Linking Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice to Employee Engagement through Psychological Contract Fulfillment: *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 117(3), 199- 203.

Mohamed, S.A. (2014) Relationship between Organizational Justice and Quality Performance among Healthcare Workers: A Pilot Study: *The Scientific World Journal* 18(1), 75-79.

Nwokolo, E. E., Ifeanchi, N. C., & Anazodo, N. N. (2016). Perceived organizational justice, and leadership styles as predictors of employee engagement in the organization. *Nile Journal of Business & Economics*, 4, 16-28.

Sapkota, S.P. (2020) Impact of organizational justice on Job performance in Nepalese Quality Assurance Accredited (QAA) College: *Nepalese Journal of Management Research* 1(1), 63- 69.

Tyokosu, M. A; Emakwu, J & Ejoha, R.S (2020) Organizational Justice and the Performance of Public Primary School Teachers in Benue State-Nigeria: *BSUJEM* 2 (1), 134- 146.

Yean, T. F., & Yusof, A. A. (2016). Organizational Justice: A Conceptual Discussion. *Procedia— Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 798-803.