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Abstract

Justice plays an essential role in all social relationships, as it underpins ongoing commitment and mutual cooperation, even in situations of uncertainty, and creates an environment in which people feel valued, respected, and motivated to continue making a positive contribution to their environment. Organizational justice is related to employees' subjective assessment of the equity in the treatment received and its influence on engagement and behavior in the work context. This study aimed at carrying out a literature review of the dimensions of organizational justice and its relationship with the most diverse constructs related to the theory of social exchange, such as trust, commitment, and cooperation, whether from employees, customers, or other agents. To this end, a systematic review was carried out using PRISMA-
based strategies on the Scopus and Web of Science databases between 2015 and 2020. The results of the quantitative analysis indicate that this is a relevant topic in the academic literature published in a wide variety of journals in different categories. Furthermore, the qualitative analysis indicates that the effects of the perception of justice can be predicted in a unique way when it comes to people's behavior in social interactions since the effects of the dimensions of justice are not standardized for the different constructs in different environments and groups. This leads to the conclusion that the relationship between the different dimensions of organizational justice is quite specific, depending on the variable being analyzed and the group under study.
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Resumo
A justiça desempenha um papel essencial em todas as interações sociais, pois sustenta o compromisso contínuo e a cooperação mútua, mesmo quando há situações de incerteza e cria um ambiente em que as pessoas se sentem valorizadas, respeitadas e motivadas a continuar contribuindo de forma positiva para o meio em que vive. A justiça organizacional está relacionada à avaliação subjetiva dos funcionários sobre a equidade no tratamento recebido e sua influência no engajamento e comportamento no contexto laboral. O objetivo deste estudo foi realizar uma revisão da literatura associada às dimensões de justiça organizacional e sua relação com os mais diversos construtos relacionados à teoria da troca social, tais como confiança, compromisso e cooperação, seja de empregados, clientes ou demais agentes. Para tanto, foi elaborada uma revisão sistemática utilizando as estratégias baseadas no PRISMA, nas bases Scopus e Web of Science, entre os anos de 2015 e 2020. Os resultados da análise quantitativa indicam que este é um tema relevante na literatura acadêmica publicado nas mais diversas revistas de diferentes categorias. Além disso, a análise qualitativa indica que os efeitos da percepção de justiça podem ser previstos de maneira única quando se trata do comportamento das pessoas em interações sociais, uma vez que os efeitos das dimensões da justiça não são padronizados para os diferentes construtos em ambientes e grupos distintos. Isso permite concluir que a relação entre as diferentes dimensões da justiça organizacional é bastante específica, dependendo da variável que está sendo analisada e do grupo em questão.

Introduction

In a highly competitive business environment, renowned and successful organizations have turned their attention to integrating various organizational justice processes. The purpose of these processes is to strengthen, both directly and indirectly, employee trust and improve performance, with the aim of gaining a competitive advantage over competitors (Fiaz, Rasool, Ikram & Rehman, 2021). In this way, organizational justice presents itself as a unifying value that promotes fairness and stability in business organizations (Bitner, Booms & Tetreault, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Folger & Cropanzano, 2001).

Composed of several dimensions that are related to a wide range of attitudes and behaviors (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Colquitt, Scott, Rodell, Long, Zapata, Conlon & Wess, 2013), organizational justice has its origins in Adams' equity theory (1965), which highlighted the importance of the perception of equity in the results by an organization's employees. Justice plays a fundamental role in all social interactions since perceptions of equity underpin a continued commitment to exchange, even in situations of uncertainty (Adams, 1965).

The equity theory was founded by examining the nature of inputs and outcomes; the nature of the social comparison process; the conditions that lead to equity or inequality and the possible effects of inequality; as well as the possible responses that someone can make to reduce a condition of inequality (Pritchard, 1969). As conceptualized, inputs refer to any internal/endogenous factor (such as appearance, age, etc.) of the social agent that affects how they perceive the personal return they receive. Outcomes, in turn, refer to the results or rewards valued by the social agent (salary increase, bonus, better working hours, etc.). Together, inputs and outcomes form a relationship of perceived value (inputs/outcomes), which allows direct comparison of the relative importance of outcomes in relation to inputs.

The concept of organizational justice was introduced by Greenberg (1987), who described it as employees' perceptions of equity within organizations. It refers to how employees perceive whether they are being treated fairly in their work environment activities and how these perceptions influence their behavior and the actions resulting from this perception. In this context, organizational justice is related to employees' subjective assessment of the equity of the treatment they receive and its influence on their engagement and behavior in the workplace. The aspect of organizational justice that focuses on the justice of outcomes, such as payment and promotion decisions, came to be known as distributive justice as it related to the fair distribution of outcomes within the workplace (Luo, 2007).
Distributive justice is related to the justice perceived by individuals about the results they receive (Akram, Lei, Haider & Hussain, 2020).

According to Del Río-Lanza, Vazquez-Casielles and Diaz-Martin (2009), the justice perceived by individuals in relation to the results they receive is directly related to the anticipation of these results based on the efforts they put into their work and their contributions to the organization. When assessing distributive justice, Whitman, Caleo, Carpenter, Horner and Bernerth (2012) point out that comparisons between employees' contributions, such as the effort expended, and the results provided by the organization, such as salary, appreciation, and performance evaluation, are used as fundamental criteria for this assessment.

The essential values of distributive justice are those that foster effective cooperation to promote the well-being of each member in the economic, social, psychological, and physiological areas. Three basic principles of distributive justice, or distributive rules, are equity, equality, and necessity (Deutsch, 1985; Tyler, 1994).

Distributive justice refers to equity in the distribution of results, considering individual contributions. According to Adams' theory, justice is linked to the proportion of contributions. As mentioned by Carnovale (2019), and Luo (2007), distributive justice is considered the oldest type of justice and is based on the principle that the parties involved in a transaction should be affected by the equitable distribution of results in relation to the resources invested by these parties.

However, Deutsch (1985), and Leventhal (1976, 1980) propose that in addition to contribution, equality and need should also be considered in the distribution of results. In short, distributive justice is a judgment on the justice of the way in which results are distributed, regardless of the criteria used to evaluate this justice, whether based on need, equality, contributions, or a combination of these factors (Leventhal, 1976, 1980).

In different situations, the preference for a specific distribution standard can vary according to organizational contexts, objectives, and personal motivations (Deutsch, 1985). However, Thibaut (1975) points out that the procedures adopted to determine outcomes can have a greater impact on the perception of justice than the outcome itself. They introduce the concept of procedural justice, which is based on research in the judicial sphere and equates this form of justice with control of the process. According to this perspective, individuals tend to consider procedures fairer when they have a sense of control over them. This second type of justice refers to the impartiality of the procedures adopted rather than the fair distribution of rewards (Dong, Zou, Sun & Zhang, 2019).
In the organizational context, Leventhal (1980) introduced the concept of procedural justice, which refers to employees' perception of the procedural component of the system that regulates decision-making processes. He identified six criteria for assessing procedural justice: consistency, impartiality, accuracy, correctness, representativeness, and ethics. When the procedures adopted by the organization reflect these characteristics, employees perceive them as fair. This results in greater employee satisfaction, a greater willingness to accept the results of these procedures, and a greater likelihood of developing positive attitudes toward the organization (Tyler & Lind, 1992).

Therefore, procedural justice concerns employees' perception of the methods and procedures used in the organizational decision-making process, which must be consistent, impartial, and morally acceptable (Croppanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Equity in processes is a crucial determinant of people's reaction to a decision (Liu, Chow & Huang, 2020).

In an alliance context, procedural justice is defined as the perception of justice in the strategic decision-making processes of the alliance and in the procedures that affect the gains and interests of each party involved, according to the representatives of each party (Luo, 2007). While distributive justice focuses on the results, procedural justice is mainly focused on the equity of the procedures (Carnovale, 2019).

By emphasizing the importance of the quality of interpersonal treatment in organizational procedures, Bies and Moag (1986) introduced the concept of interactional justice. This concept covers the communicative aspect of interpersonal relationships and refers to the perception of how an individual is treated, usually by a supervisor, within an organization (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004; Roch & Shanock, 2006). Interactional justice refers to the way in which information and decisions are communicated, as well as the way in which people affected by these decisions are treated, with respect and consideration (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Interactional justice has also been delineated into interpersonal justice (i.e., treatment reflecting respect and dignity (Bies & Moag, 1986) and informational justice i.e., providing an adequate explanation (Greenberg, 1993). Informational justice is related to the perception of justice in the communication of organizational procedures, while interpersonal justice concerns the perceived quality of treatment of people in the organization (Colquitt & Jackson, 2006).

A promising way to understand the relationship between these dimensions of justice and behavior involves considering non-traditional behaviors in the organizational environment. These behaviors are generally not covered by conventional job descriptions and
are more under the personal control of the individual (Organ, 1977). An example of non-traditional behavior is Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), defined as actions that support the psychological environment in which work takes place, noting that such actions are less mandatory job requirements and less likely to be explicitly rewarded (Organ, 1977).

When examining the relationship between payment beliefs and organizational citizenship, Organ and Konovsky (1989) speculated that justice promotes a feeling of trust among employees, reducing their anxiety about performing extra behaviors. Therefore, fair treatment would lead employees to redefine their working relationship as a social exchange, in which organizational citizenship would be seen as a resource that can be negotiated (Moorman, 1991). Social exchange theory can be seen as a multidisciplinary paradigm that describes how various types of resources can be exchanged, following certain rules, and how such exchanges can generate a high-quality relationship (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Based on this line of thought, Konovsky and Pugh (1994) proposed that justice in the workplace creates the kind of trust that makes social exchange relationships more viable, thus encouraging the emergence of organizational citizenship behaviors.

Li and Cropanzano (2009) have found that perceptions of justice (procedural and distributive) were significantly related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, trust and turnover intentions. Organizational commitment corresponds to the personal attachment and identification of an employee with the organization, which results in acceptance of its objectives and values (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993), i.e., it is defined as the desire on the part of an employee to remain a member of an organization (Meyer, Allen & Gellatly, 1990).

Lee, Carswell and Allen (2000) defined organizational commitment as a psychological link between a person and an organization. There are three dimensions to organizational commitment: affective, continuity, and normative. In general, affective commitment is more related to affection for the organization, continuity commitment is related to the fear of losing one's job, and normative commitment is based on the feeling of obligation to stay (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Trust has been defined as confident and positive expectations about an administrator's words, actions, and decisions (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; Mcallister, 1995), and as a willingness to be vulnerable to an administrator, regardless of the ability to monitor or control the administrator's actions (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995). Konovsky and Pugh (1994) showed that procedural justice was positively associated with trust in the supervisor, with trust going on to predict the OCB.
In line with the above development, the main objective of this study is to conduct a literature review associated with the dimensions of organizational justice and their relationship with the most diverse constructs related to social exchange theory, such as trust, commitment, and cooperation, whether of employees, customers, or other agents. The objective is focused on the following research question: "What is the state of the art of the interaction between organizational justice and certain attitudes, and behaviors derived from social exchange theory, and what are the consequences of the relationship between these dimensions on the constructs found?"

By exploring and organizing prior knowledge about the relationships found among the various constructs that make up organizational justice and the social exchange theory, the answers to these questions aim to provide a comprehensive and systematic view of these interactions. This approach will allow researchers in the field to gain an in-depth understanding of the factors and relationships relevant to individual and organizational outcomes. Thus, the study aims to facilitate the identification of gaps in existing knowledge and direct future research, helping researchers to make well-founded decisions and advance the field of study. In the next section, the methodology and results are presented, followed by a discussion, of theoretical and practical implications, as well as a conclusion, including the study's limitations and the direction of future research.

Methodological Procedures

A systematic literature review is a method that aims to identify, evaluate, and interpret all available relevant research related to a specific research issue, topic area, or phenomenon of interest. The individual studies that contribute to a systematic review are known as primary studies, while the systematic review itself is considered a secondary study (Kitchenham, 2004).

According to Humphrey (2011), qualitative review articles are great because they do not just review the literature. They organize it, frame it, and provide a roadmap for the future. (Robinson & Lowe, 2015) stressed the importance of conducting systematic reviews of previous studies, rather than relying solely on conventional reviews, which can present limitations in terms of comprehensiveness, bias, and quality. A systematic review offers advantages by providing detailed information on the review process, including keywords used, collection of articles, replication, and confirmation of results (Mohamed Shaffril, Ahmad, Samsuddin, Samah & Hamdan, 2020).
2.1 Literary Search

In order to carry out a systematic review of the literature on organizational justice and its relationship with certain constructs, steps were defined according to the PRISMA method. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow chart is a visual representation that allows the selection process of papers in a systematic review to be identified. It provides information on the total number of papers found during the initial search, as well as the number of papers that were selected or excluded throughout the systematic review process. PRISMA assists in the transparency and documentation of the selection process of the studies included in the systematic review (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2010).

Thus, following this choice due to the credibility, acceptability, and comprehensiveness of the report, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the papers were defined by the authors of this systematic review, based on the PRISMA guide. This research seeks to verify the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and the most diverse constructs related to the social exchange theory, whether they are mediating constructs or final constructs.

This research seeks to verify not only the relationship between each dimension of organizational justice and certain constructs but also to understand the focal point of these studies and how these constructs are related to each of these dimensions.

2.2 Selection Criteria

The systematic search strategies are based on those adopted by researchers conducting literature reviews using PRISMA. These included three phases, namely identification, screening, and eligibility.

2.2.1 Identification

These were used in the search for papers using the query (un) fairness OR (in)justice”) AND organizational AND procedural AND distributive AND (interactional OR interpersonal OR informational) AND (cooperation OR alliance OR commitment OR trust OR coopetition OR cooperation OR reciprocity). The two main databases searched, using keywords for related papers, included Scopus and Web of Science (WoS). Scopus and WoS are considered
two of the leading academic research databases with a comprehensive overview of relevant academic publications in various areas related to organizational justice and the social exchange theory, and both Web of Science and Scopus index a large number of high-quality, high-impact journals. The search resulted in the identification of 356 papers, out of which 206 correspond to the Web of Science database and 150 refer to Scopus. The search was carried out in March 2023.

2.2.2 Screening

The 356 papers were then screened by period (2015-2023) and language (English and Portuguese). This screening excluded 166 papers, resulting in a total of 190 papers. Subsequently, using the R Studio tool, duplicate papers between the databases were rejected, resulting in a total of 41 identical items excluded. The screening then removed a total of 207 papers, leaving 149 for further verification.

2.2.3 Eligibility

In order to identify eligible papers, the titles and abstracts of all 149 remaining papers were reviewed. In this first selection, papers that did not meet the scope of this research, papers that were fundamentally theoretical, review papers, bibliometrics, and systematic meta-analysis were excluded, as well as papers that were not accessible. Papers dealing with the dimensions of organizational justice as mediating or dependent variables were also excluded.

After this initial selection, 59 papers were excluded.

A second selection was made by analyzing the final construct analyzed in each paper. When this analysis was carried out, 34 papers were excluded as the final construct analyzed was not compatible with the aim of this research. Thus, papers that dealt with relational performance, employee performance, ethical behavior, or ethical climate, feelings of alienation, and creativity of the participants as dependent variables were excluded.

Thus, the final sample of papers included in the quantitative and qualitative analysis of this research totaled 56 papers. For the quantitative analysis, descriptive statistics were used to analyze and tabulate the main results. For the qualitative analysis, a complete reading of the papers was carried out to identify which dimensions of organizational justice were analyzed, which were the final and mediating constructs, and, consequently, the relationship between the dimensions and these constructs. The results are shown in the following section.
Results

3.1 Quantitative Overview of the Papers Reviewed

In this section, we will present a quantitative analysis of the 56 papers in the sample found. This analysis was carried out using Bibliometrix, a statistical software package developed for the R programming environment.

The evolution of scientific production can be seen in Graphic 1. The year 2019 had the highest number of publications with 10 papers, followed by 2015 (9 papers) and 2017 and 2021 with 7 papers each.

![Graphic 1. Publication per year](Source: Survey result (2023)).

Graphic 2 shows the most cited papers. The paper The Impact of Justice on Collaborative and Opportunistic Behaviors in Supply Chain Relationships (Huo, Wang & Tian, 2016) published in 2016 in the International Journal of Production Economics stands out, with 63 citations, followed by Influence of Firm’s Recovery Endeavors upon Privacy Breach on Online Customer Behavior (Choi, Kim & Jiang, 2016) and The Influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment in Portugal’s Hotel Industry (Lopez-Cabarcos, Machado-Lopes-Sampaio-de Pinho & Vazquez-Rodriguez, 2015), with 41 citations each.
Another important aspect to analyze is where these papers are being published. To this end, the study also shows the distribution of publications by journals. This sample is present in more than 50 different journals, with Employee Relations, International Journal of Business and Society, Journal of Management Development, and Sustainability standing out with two publications each. When analyzing the country of origin of the corresponding authors, the sample is made up of authors from 22 different countries, with China, the United States, Korea, Malaysia, and Turkey standing out.

The Bibliometrix's "Co-occurrence Network" function reveals the co-occurrence structure between terms or keywords in a set of bibliographic documents. This analysis is useful for identifying the relationship between the most frequently mentioned terms and understanding the interconnections among different concepts in a research area. Figure 1 shows the structure of the terms found in the analyzed sample, whose network reveals the relationships and associations between the terms that occur together frequently in the analyzed sample. Each term is represented by a node in the network, and the nodes are connected by edges that indicate the frequency or strength of the association between the terms. The width or weight of the edges can be proportional to the strength of the association. The results show the strength of the terms related to the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) and their relationship with the other terms.
Figure 1. Co-occurrence Structure  
Source: Survey Result (2023).

The quantitative analysis of the papers allows the reader to see graphically and illustratively the evolution of the themes and whether it is an old subject that is still on the rise or whether it is in decline. By analyzing the content of the papers, it is possible to identify the main thematic clusters and understand their evolution.

The combination of quantitative analysis and content analysis offers a comprehensive view of the scientific landscape, allowing the reader to understand the evolution of themes, identify relevant topics and understand the state of the art in specific areas of research. The next section explores content analysis in an attempt to detail the results of the papers analyzed.

3.2 Content Analysis

This section presents the content analysis of 56 papers, seeking to detail the characteristics and gaps in the subject matter. A meta-analysis review by Colquit et al (2013) revealed that the significant relationships between justice and task performance and citizenship behavior were mediated by indicators of social exchange quality (trust, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and leader-member exchange). The intention of this work, even though it is not a meta-analysis review, is to update the results coming from the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and some indicators of the quality of social exchange.

It was possible to identify a great interest in understanding Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and its relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice, whether focusing on the behavior of employees and their managers, students, teachers, and nurses, and even analyzing the behavior of banking institutions (Al-Ali, Qalaja & Abu-Rumman, 2019; Daly, Dubose, Owyr-Hosseini, Baik & Stark, 2015; Donglong, Taejun, Julie
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Most studies used the 3-dimensional model and only Yuen Onn et al. (2018) analyzed the effect of the 4 dimensions on OCB and work engagement, using trust as the mediating construct. By applying a questionnaire to 800 Malaysian teachers, Yuen Onn et al. (2018) analyzed whether trust mediates the relationship between organizational justice and OCB, as well as its dimensions (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) and OCB. Using structural equation modeling, the authors confirmed that trust can mediate the relationship between organizational justice and voluntary and spontaneous actions among teachers in Malaysia, concluding that trust is playing a central role in cultivating a culture of OCB practice among teachers in the school setting. The research highlights that organizational justice as well as the 4 dimensions are significantly related to trust and, as a result, lead to OCB. Such implications are pertinent to the fact that managers and the Ministry of Education (MOE) should be aware of the essentiality of fairness and the imperative in the school environment, in terms of established policies, rules, and regulations, as well as practices.

Zayed et al. (2022) used affective organizational commitment (AOC) as a mediating construct to understand this same relationship between OCB and the dimensions of organizational justice. The results confirmed that the different dimensions of justice have significant and positive relationships with AOC. The findings prove that each dimension of justice is a significant predictor of the five dimensions of OCB, either directly or indirectly through OCB (i.e., mediating variable). By analyzing Kuwaiti civil servants, the paper concludes that it is essential to improve employees' perceptions of justice in different contexts by developing their levels of transparency and creating methods of explaining organizational procedures and sharing information with employees. In addition, leaders should treat employees fairly and work diligently on different aspects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice to promote an increase in AOC (Zayed et al., 2022).

Elamin and Tlaiss (2015) explored OCBs, perceived organizational justice, and the relationship between them among managers in Saudi Arabia through a self-report questionnaire survey. Although Saudi Arabian managers reported a relatively high level of OCB in general, courtesy was highly prioritized, followed by civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism, and sportsmanship. Considering organizational justice, the results also showed Saudi Arabian managers' relatively high levels of commitment to organizational citizenship, with interactional justice emerging as most strongly related to managers' citizenship behavior.
Finally, the study found that distributive justice tends to be a stronger predictor of OCB than procedural justice. In other words, the justice of personal outcomes is more important than the justice of company procedures in the Saudi Arabian context (Elamin & Tlaiss, 2015).

Still focusing on OCB, two studies used Islamic ethics as a mediating factor. Farid et al. (2019), based on the social exchange theory, interviewed nurses in Pakistan to confirm the hypothesis that perceptions of justice predicted organizational citizenship behavior and work engagement. In addition, the Islamic work ethic strengthened the relationship between justice perceptions and citizenship behavior and moderated the relationship between interactional justice and work engagement.

This result is in line with research conducted in financial institutions in Pakistan, where Rana et al. (2018) concluded that the Islamic work ethic does not moderate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. In this case, the three dimensions of justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) also showed a positive connection with organizational citizenship behavior, with emphasis on interactional justice, which provided greater dominance in this promotion than the other dimensions. The mediating variable, Islamic work ethic, proved to be non-significant, i.e., it is only an autonomous character for the development of organizational citizenship behavior (Rana et al., 2018).

Still focusing on the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and OCB, Teresa et al. (2020) included the three types of organizational commitment (continuous, normative, and affective) as a mediating variable. While distributive justice and interactional justice have positive influences on continuous and affective commitment, only distributive justice leads to normative commitment. Since the focus of the study is hotel industry employees, it is important to recognize that employees perceive the justice of the decision outcome (distributive justice) that encourages all three aspects of organizational commitment. In addition, encouraging managers to have fair interpersonal interactions with hotel employees and treat them with politeness, dignity, and respect is a key issue due to the potential to increase employee awareness of the costs associated with leaving the hotel (“ongoing commitment”) and employee willingness to remain working at the hotel (“affective commitment”) (Teresa et al., 2020).

Organizational commitment was also the mediating variable in the study by Donglon et al. (2019). When analyzing members of the University of Shandong province (China), the three dimensions of organizational justice were positively correlated with organizational commitment, however, affective commitment was positively associated only with OCB-I (OCB-individual) and not with OCB-O (OCB-organization). This may indicate that the
university faculty in this study think of organizations as human communities or informal social networks where they work and live together, rather than as physical buildings, policies, rules, structures, or formal systems (Donglong et al., 2020).

Organizational commitment also appears as the final construct in several research studies. This analysis can be direct, without a mediating variable as in the research (Costa Oliveira, Martins de Paiva, da Rocha Torres & Rodrigues Pereira, 2022) or with variable acting as a mediator, such as job satisfaction (Lopez-Cabarcos et al., 2015; Kee & Chung, 2021; Mohammadi, Yektayar & Dehkordi, 2016; Ridaryanto, 2020).

Costa Oliveira et al. (2022) analyzed the relationship between perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and the organizational commitment of civil servants in the Public Prosecutor's Office of Minas Gerais (Brazil). They found that the dimensions of justice directly influence affective commitment and that, while interactional and distributive justice are less significant, procedural justice is more precise and expressive in explaining this behavior.

This result follows the same line of research by Ridaryanto (2020) who concluded that while procedural justice has been shown to empirically influence organizational commitment, distributive justice had no effect in not encouraging organizational commitment in the Jakarta public accounting firm. On the other hand, when analyzing the effect of the mediating variable job satisfaction, the authors concluded that job satisfaction has no empirical effect on organizational commitment.

In line with this study, Lopez-Cabarcos et al. (2015) concluded that job satisfaction directly influenced all three types of commitment (affective, continuity, and normative) and had a mediating effect on the relationship between commitment and distributive justice, and interactional justice. Out of the three types of justice, procedural justice is related to all the components of organizational commitment, distributive justice is not related to any of them, and interactional justice is not related to affective commitment, and, in fact, is negatively related to normative and continuity commitment. The authors reinforced the importance of job satisfaction in connection with employee commitment. If employees realize that they will be recognized for their work and feel justice in the recognition-compensation relationship, their levels of satisfaction and commitment may increase. Lack of organizational justice in any organization results in non-commitment to the organization and dissatisfaction with people's work, and in order to avoid problems within the organization, managers must ensure organizational justice before making any decisions (Mohammadi, Yektayar & Dehkordi, 2016).
Job turnover can also be correlated with perceptions of justice and organizational commitment. Distributive and interactional injustice is associated with organizational commitment, job satisfaction and higher turnover intention. While procedural injustice has a direct negative influence on job satisfaction, job satisfaction has a mediating effect on the relationship between organizational injustice, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Such results serve as guidelines to help managers better understand organizational behaviors, specifically on how to minimize employee turnover, improve job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and make better decisions in managing perceived distributional and interactional injustice when developing their workforce (Kee & Chung, 2021).

Affective organizational commitment is another final construct that is recurrent in the sample of papers analyzed in this research. It can be analyzed individually (Gomes, Mellahi, Sahadev & Harvey, 2017), or through mediating variables such as perceived organizational support (POS) (Nazir, Shafi, Atif, Qun & Abdullah, 2019; Tan, Choong & Choe, 2020), relationality (Benoit, Alejandro, Foreman, Chelariu & Bergman, 2019), group cohesion (Ha & Ha, 2015), and leadership style (Lee & Wei, 2017).

The results show that organizational justice, both procedural and interactional, has a strong relationship with commitment (affective and calculative) (Gomes et al., 2017). In addition to affective commitment, organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) is also significantly related to employees’ innovative behavior. Organizational justice stimulates employees’ affective commitment and innovative behavior, either as a direct effect or through the mediation of perceived organizational support (POS) (Nazir et al., 2019). POS mediates the relationship between organizational justice and affective commitment, as well as the relationship between supervisory support and affective commitment (Tan, Choong & Choe, 2020).

Interactional justice has a robust impact on affective commitment, and team leadership can moderate this relationship. Employees’ affective commitment strongly depends on interactional justice and whether or not employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by their managers (Lee & Wei, 2017).

Organizational justice also has a positive impact when related directly to job satisfaction (Alneyadi, Nusari, Ameen & Bhaumik, 2019). Job satisfaction is an emotional and affective response resulting from the extent to which a person derives pleasure from their work (Muchinsky, 2000).

By analyzing the behavior of 500 Indonesian civil servants, Muhammad et al. (2019) concluded that organizational justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction.
and affective commitment among civil servants, and furthermore, job satisfaction has a significant effect on affective commitment. According to the authors, by concluding that the level of employees' affective commitment is affected by job satisfaction, it is essential that leaders continue to seek wise solutions to keep all employees satisfied, including by implementing the philosophy of the three justices (procedural, distributive, and interactional).

A similar result was found when analyzing 298 workers from the retail, hotel, and construction industries in Croatia (Bakotic & Bulog, 2021). The research showed that interactional justice, distributive justice, and relationship-oriented leadership behavior have an almost equally powerful impact on job satisfaction. Such results suggest that a better and deeper understanding of the link among leadership orientation, organizational justice, and job satisfaction allows management to be effective in rapidly changing organizational circumstances to stimulate employees to work effectively.

Lee, Hong and Lee (2023), when analyzing the effect of layoffs because of Covid-19, concluded the importance of organizational justice in mitigating the negative psychological shocks of layoffs. Employees' perceptions of organizational justice were positively related to job satisfaction and trust in management, while they were negatively related to their emotional exhaustion and cynicism. For both, those who remained employed and those who were dismissed, interactional justice (i.e., informational, and interpersonal justice) is most strongly associated with employees' psychological states and attitudes, procedural justice was associated only with survivors' cynicism and little evidence was found that distributive justice is associated with any of the psychological constructs analyzed (job satisfaction, trust in management, emotional exhaustion, and cynicism).

The relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction was also found to be non-significant in research with employees of a medium security prison in south-eastern Nigeria (Lambert, Tewksbury, Otu & Elechi, 2021). When exploring the effects of all three forms of organizational justice on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment, all three forms of justice had significant positive effects on commitment. However, only procedural, and interpersonal justice had positive effects on job satisfaction. This result is interesting since both procedural and interpersonal justice are more under the control of administrators and therefore easier to change, unlike distributive justice, which tends to be outside the direct control of correctional administrators.

Procedural justice had a greater impact on job satisfaction and attitudes when analyzing directors, deputy directors, and heads of agencies in Indonesia (Warman, Maarif, Sukamawati, Affandi & Mangundjaya, 2022) in the context of job turnover. Based on the
results, the authors recommend that the organization pay attention to and consider the development of organizational justice in all job turnover programs since if employees perceive a lack of organizational justice, especially procedural justice, this will lead to dissatisfaction, and they will leave the organization (turnover).

Turnover intentions present themselves as an insidious problem that impacts on the functioning of organizations and the well-being of their members and are therefore the subject of study related to organizational justice (Diego Vaamonde, Omar & Salessi, 2018; Olcer, 2015; Suifan, Diab & Abdallah, 2017).

Suifan, Diab and Abdallah (2017) concluded that although distributive justice had a significant negative effect on employees’ turnover intentions, both procedural and interactional justice were not predictors of turnover intention. On the other hand, Diego Vaamonde, Omar and Salessi (2018) pointed out that perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interpersonal justice are related to lower levels of burnout, which in turn promote greater job satisfaction and lower turnover among employees. In addition, perceptions of informational justice are positively related to job satisfaction, leading to lower employee turnover. On the other hand, Olcer (2018) found that both organizational commitment and job satisfaction had a mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and turnover intention; while job satisfaction fully mediated the relationship, the organizational commitment had only a partial mediating effect.

Justice is of great importance in producing pro-social motives or that reflect concern for others given the importance of cooperation, especially in engineering project dispute negotiations (Lu, Li & Wang, 2017). The results indicated that while distributive justice is related to cooperative behaviors, the impact of procedural and interactional justice is even more significant. However, Liu et al. (2017), when analyzing data from 122 subcontractors in China, showed that distributive justice and interactional justice positively affect willingness to cooperate, but procedural justice does not significantly affect this willingness.

Another recurring relationship is organizational justice and the worker's intention to remain with the company or retire. A survey of 3280 teachers in Turkey showed a negative relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and the intention to leave, as well as between organizational identification and the intention to leave. All dimensions of perceived organizational justice are positive predictors of organizational identification, while perceived distributive justice, perceived interpersonal justice, and organizational identification are negative predictors of intention to leave (Basar & Sigri, 2015).
A study in Finland showed that distributive, interactional, and procedural justice, as well as work engagement, are associated with the retirement intentions of nurses aged 50 and over who work in elderly care. The moderating effect of interactional justice on the association between work engagement and retirement intentions was strong, but the moderating effect of procedural justice on the association between work engagement and retirement intentions was also detected. These results suggest that both low interactional justice and low procedural justice intensify the association of low work engagement with early retirement intentions among older nurses (Sulander, Sinervo, Elovainio, Heponiemi, Helkama & Aalto 2016).

Work engagement is a concept that reflects a positive way of thinking that relates to commitment and involvement with the organization, its enthusiasm and energy. Employees of a hospital in Turkey were evaluated and the conclusion was that the perception of organizational justice increases the level of work engagement of the staff in a statistically significant way. Regarding work engagement, the most significant effect was created by procedural justice, followed by distributive and interactional justice (Özer, Uğurluoğlu & Saygili, 2017). However, according to civil servants in Ghana, interactional justice was not related to any of the components of work engagement, while distributive and procedural justice were positively related to energy, dedication, and absorption (Kumasey, Delle & Hossain, 2021).

Differently from what has been analyzed so far and moving away from the company-employer relationship, Huo, Wang and Tian (2016) investigated how supplier fairness influences buyers’ specific investments and communication, which in turn influences the opportunistic behavior of both parties in the supply chain. By analyzing data from 240 companies in China, the results suggested that supplier procedural and distributive justice can increase buyer-specific investment. However, the supplier's interactional justice only improves the buyer's communication with the supplier. In addition, supplier opportunism is contained by buyer communication but increased by buyer-specific investment.

By analyzing online customer behavior, Choi, Kim and Jiang (2016) sought to explain how this customer behavior is influenced by a company’s recovery efforts when privacy violations occur. The results show that three types of justice perceptions, distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, jointly affect psychological responses - i.e., perceived breach and feelings of breach. In addition, psychological responses have been shown to be important in shaping post-incident outcomes, such as post-mouth-to-mouth and post-probability of exchange. Such studies are crucial because they offer researchers and
practitioners a useful conceptual tool for analyzing the effectiveness of organizational practices in recovering customer relationships after privacy breaches.

Based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the papers, it was possible to present a conceptual framework in Figure 2. In this figure, the dimensions are represented according to their influence on each construct, the larger the dimension, the greater its influence on that construct. The conceptual framework is a set of concepts that aim to represent, describe, and explain a particular phenomenon, be it an event, object, or process. This set of concepts can be built from elements called constructs, which have interrelationships and underpin the themes investigated, and may or may not include propositions or hypotheses (Zulfiquar & Kant, 2017; Meredith, 1993). The use of a framework enables the consistent development of knowledge on the subject, creating a solid theoretical basis that simplifies and addresses the complex challenges related to the object of study.

Figure 2. Conceptual Framework - The greater the dimension, the greater its influence on that construct. Source: Survey result (2023).

Conclusion

The analysis of this study made it possible to investigate the state of the art on organizational justice in order to carry out a review of the literature associated with the dimensions of organizational justice and its relationship with the most diverse constructs.
related to the theory of social exchange, such as trust, commitment, and cooperation, whether of employees, customers, or other agents.

The study made it possible to identify that studies are being carried out mainly in China and the United States, with the predominant studies using the three dimensions of justice. Generally speaking, the studies deal with the analysis of the dimensions using structural equation modeling, mainly to understand the behavior of employees or workers.

In the context of the theory of organizational justice addressed in this study, the consequences resulting from the perception of justice are presented. These consequences are described in terms that make it possible to make very specific predictions about the behavior of people involved in social interactions. The relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice is very specific, depending on the final dependent variable and especially the group being analyzed. In some situations, it was possible to see a divergence in the influence of one type of justice in relation to the same final construct, mainly due to the reality of the focus group. In general, the empirical support for the theory is gratifying but falls short of what is desirable. More research is needed. This is mainly because part of the support comes from data that leads to the formulation of parts of the theory. Direct tests of propositions made in the theory are needed, as well as empirical tests of new derivations of the theory.

It is suggested that future studies consider using national databases, as well as including keywords other than those used in this study. In addition, a meta-analysis could be carried out, using the quantitative variables of the selected studies, in order to complement the current study and obtain a more comprehensive view of the evolution of the topic and the methodologies used. It would also be interesting to establish additional criteria for the exclusion and inclusion of papers, as well as carrying out a content analysis that goes beyond the relationship between organizational justice and social theory constructs. These additional approaches could provide more detailed and in-depth information about organizational justice and its dimensions.
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