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Abstract

Job performance is one of the most critical subjects in literature due to its crucial role in the success of organizations. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of organizational justice on job performance among academic staff. The study employed a quantitative method to analyse the data collected at three Iraqi public universities located in Baghdad by using questionnaires. Stratified sampling technique was used to ensure the equal distribution of the samples among the three universities’ academic staff. Only 197 responses were valid to be analysed by using Smart PLS. The findings showed that distributive justice and interactional justice positively impacted on academic performance and ability to increase the performance, while procedural justice did not impact on academic performance. However, distributive justice had a higher impact on the job performance of academic staff compared to interactional justice. The findings of this study imply that decision-makers at universities should pay more attention to the fair distribution of resources, payment, promotion and training to increase job performance.
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Introduction

Job performance (JP) is one of the important subjects in the literature. It becomes a primary interest to both managers and researchers due to its crucial role in the success of organizations. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the mechanisms that affect job performance, particularly among academic staff. This research attempts to expand the existing literature by offering a more detailed understanding of how organizational justice (OJ) influences JP. Many factors affecting JP of employees were studied previously but limited studies have examined the effect of OJ on JP among academic staff. Meanwhile, OJ remained a neglected topic in studies concerning higher education institutions. Higher education institutions are essential in any country. Education influences a country’s systemic growth and development of qualified graduates because higher education is the final stage of training a young person gets before
starting a career (Ahmad & Jameel, 2020; Alaaraj, Mohamed, & Bustamam, 2017a, 2017b, 2016; Rabayaa & Obaid, 2019). Academic staff at a university perform specific functions of teaching, research, supervision, publication and community service. For a country’s development, these functions are significant because teaching and scientific advances in research have the capacity to build the competitive advantage of the business. Additionally, students will also have the opportunity to develop new ideas through the teaching and learning process provided by the academic staff (Abba & Mugizi, 2018; Alaaraj, Mohamed, & Ahmad Bustamam, 2018). These findings signify a crucial role of academic staff performance on developing a country. In further support, Colquitt et al. (2013) stressed the importance of OJ on JP as he proved the significant influence of OJ. In order to motivate organization members to optimize their success in their roles, OJ must be a central consideration of the top management. Justice promotes voluntary involvement by organization members and directly affects the organizations’ and individuals’ performance. Most previous studies paid more attention to identify the impact OJ on performance appraisal (Byrne, Pitts, Wilson, & Steiner, 2012; Massoudi, Jameel, & Ahmad, 2020; Onselogu & Adaobi P., 2017; Raefw & Thabit, 2015; Thabit Hassan Thabit & Raefw, 2016; Tinuke, 2015), but limited studies were conducted to determine the impact of OJ on JP especially in the educational field (Arab & Atan, 2018). The bulk of studies has been carried out in western countries on the effect of OJ on JP, while limited studies have been conducted in middle east countries (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Thabit & Raefw, 2018), particularly in Iraq (Arab & Atan, 2018). Nevertheless, it is worth to note that western countries have a different culture compared to the middle east countries like Iraq. In parallel, Li and Cropanzan (2009) and Schilpzand, Martins, Kirkman, Lowe, and Chen (2013) reported that the conceptions of justice rely on the values and standards of the local culture. The principles and rules that exist in Iraq vary to that of western countries because individualism, collectivism, or a detachment from authority or equality could be interpreted differently across cultures. Meanwhile, the procedural justice has been selected as the primary indicator of JP in most studies (Chien, Lawler, & Uen, 2010; J. A. Colquitt, 2001; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Thabit & Jasim, 2016, 2019; Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott, & Livingston, 2009).

University performance is primarily determined by academic staff activities such as publication, conference, research, and community service. A high percentage of these activities depends on the performance of the academicians at universities. According to Yousefi and Abdullah (2019) publication is a significant part of the work done by academic staff. The university ranking highly depends on academic productivity such as publication, conference, teaching performance, and community services performed by the academic staff of the university (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019, 2020a). Unfortunately, Iraqi universities are suffering from low ranks compared to other regional universities (Webometric, 2020). Among the reasons for such situation is that a university ranking highly depends on academic staff performance in term of research productivity (Jameel & Ahmad, 2020b; Mousa, Jameel, & Ahmad, 2019), but the number of publications of Iraqi universities collected by a reliable database is only 28,091 (SJR, 2020), thus resulting in low ranks for Iraqi universities. In response, this study was conducted to measure the impact of OJ on JP of academic staff in the context of Iraq.

**Literature review**

**Academic performance**

The term academic is usually associated with school, university, or any
higher-learning institution. It involves human academic activities in a structured educational environment. Meanwhile, performance is activity, implementation, and production. Performance is referred to as an accomplishment under current circumstances that subsume the mechanism of obtaining and using knowledge and skills structure and a host of successful, motivational, and stylistic factors influencing the ultimate responses (Fletcher & Williams, 1996). Armstrong (2010) defined performance as an achievement, implementation, success, and the efficiency of anything ordered or done contributing to outputs/outcomes (accomplishment). Jameel and Ahmad (2019a) defined performance as the execution of specific tasks calculated against predetermined reliability, completeness, cost, and space requirements. Reaching the optimum level of employees’ or teams’ participation is a critical factor for an organisation as it helps achieve maximum organizational performance and objectives (Duyan & Yildiz, 2018; Jameel & Ahmad, 2019). The performance of staff is one of the most prominent variables that affect the operational sciences of the independent variables because they play an essential role in the organizational success (Al Shobaki, Abu-Naser, Amuna, & El Talla, 2018; Jameel & Ahmad, 2020b; Thabit, Raewf, Abdulrahman, & Younis, 2016). The performance of a university depends on the level of academic activities, including teaching, academic publications, and social contributions (Jameel & Ahmad, 2020; Onuselogu & Adaobi, 2017). Abba and Mugizi (2018) emphasized that education, research/publication, and community service were essential for the growth of any nation internationally since these roles specifically promote social welfare, financial literacy, safety and decreases crime in communities (M. A.-A. Ahmad & Jameel, 2018; Preece, 2011). Research is one of the reasons why universities were founded, leading to new information discovery, the production of technology, enhanced service quality, increased educational prestige, and economic value. The performance of universities is mostly calculated by the efforts of academic and non-academic staff. Academic staff at a university comprised people who carry out educational work at the university, including teaching, research, and, in some instances, administrations. Therefore, educational achievements are the primary criteria used to assess a university academic performance (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019; Onuselogu & Adaobi P., 2017; Raewf & Thabit, 2018). According to Abba and Mugizi (2018), Igbojekwe and Ugo-Okoro (2015), and Tinuke (2015) determinants of academic performance include staff skills, material resources, teaching, publication, research, and community service. Publication is a significant part of the work done by academic staff. High levels of organizational stressors may seem to be decreasing by publishing efforts (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019; Yousefi & Abdulllah, 2019). However, the value of teaching performance allows higher education institutions to prepare students and provide the foundation for their potential JP. While a number of studies have measured the performance of academic staff, limited studies have been conducted in Iraqi universities. Therefore, this study attempted to fill the gap by studying the Iraqi education setting.

Organizational justice

Throughout recent years, the social justice study has attracted significant interest of scholars. Studying justice in psychology began with Adams’ dissertation on equity theory (Adams, 1963) which assumed fairness in performance. Nevertheless, considering the importance that researchers assign to justice in corporate existence, reproduction, and expansion of this research area was unavoidable. OJ captures a wide range of workplace attitudes and highlights the importance of equality and equity as a
prerequisite for organisations to function effectively. Moreover, OJ could decrease job stress (Greenberg, 2004; Ghran, Jameel & Ahmad, 2019; Jameel, Mahmood, & Jwmnaa, 2020). In corroboration with Karem, Mahmood, Jameel, and Ahmad (2019), and Lee, Kim, Son, and Kim (2015) OJ is a vital element in the development and maintenance of a sustainable labour environment defined as a member’s sense of moral property of the way they are treated.

The early concept of OJ consisted of two dimensions namely distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ) (Leventhal, 1980). Later, Bies and Moag (1986) proposed the third dimension of justice which was interactional justice (IJ). Greenberg (1990) categorized interactional justice into two parts; interpersonal justice and informational justice. This study focused on the main three dimensions of justice (DJ, PJ, and IJ) but IJ also covered the other two dimensions proposed by Greenberg (1990).

**Distributive justice**
DJ includes the allocation of incentives for work related to outputs. It is based on the theory of equity, in which expectations of unequal allocation of job incentives compared to work contributions could create tension among the employees. Distributive fairness is the degree to which the individuals in an institution perceived about the distribution of resources (Greenberg, 1990). DJ relates to the justice of particular results relative to that obtained by others (Farndale, Hope-Hailey, & Kelliher, 2011; Jameel, Mahmood, et al., 2020; Karem et al., 2019). DJ primarily applies to the organization performance.

**Procedural justice**
The degree to which uniformity occurs in the Decision-Making Process (DMP) of an institution, and to what extent the views of representatives are expressed in the DMP is known as PJ (Greenberg, 1990). PJ applies to whether DMP maintains consistency and whether beneficiaries of these judgments receive fair treatment (Byrne et al., 2012; Karem et al., 2019). The procedural justice refers to the facets of corporate transition processes. Also, PJ represents the formal expectations and performance of the communication partnerships in the DMP; PJ is distinct from IJ as it illustrates the informal connections between the DMP unit and the approving institution (Ghram et al., 2019; Jameel, Ahmad, & Karem, 2020; Jameel, Mahmood, et al., 2020; Yu, Lee, Han, & Kim, 2019).

**Interactional justice**
IJ is characterized as the degree of respect and sensitive treatment obtained by participants in an institution when decision-makers perform certain procedures that affect them (Ghram et al., 2019; Jameel, Mahmood, et al., 2020; Yu el al., 2019). IJ addresses the association between workers and the institution and the treatment on individuals (Tyler, 1989). However, IJ is often perceived as an element of PJ which refers to how one is handled during the execution of a system or policy (e.g. with respect and dignity) and stresses the interaction and social process dimensions (Bies & Moag, 1986).

**Hypothesis development**
Organizational Justice and Job Performance

The universities are the only organizations centred on dual-core functions of information development and dissemination through research, teaching, and community engagement processes (Yousefi & Abdullah, 2019). Several researchers indicated that performance and engagement at work were two significant findings related to the sense of justice (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Colquitt, 2001; Zapata-Phelan et al.,
2009). Concerning the impact of DJ on employee performance, Adam's equity theory may provide the best theoretical framework established (Adams, 1963; Colquitt, 2001; Wei & Lee, 2015). According to the equality philosophy, fairness emerges based on the proportionality of an individual's income/outcome arrangement (effort, skill, and work/prizes) relative to others. When the input/output level of a participant is less than the input/output of other participants, they will feel dissatisfied and negatively will reflect on JP. If an individual feels they are treated fairly, they would be more likely to perform and to be more comfortable in the workplace. Therefore, individuals will likely be dissatisfied and attempted to restore fairness by limiting their output and altering their quantity and quality of work (Latham & Pinder, 2005). When individuals agree that social and mental requirements such as speech, respect, and dignity (dimensions of PJ and IJ) are fairly treated, it will generally result in higher performance and stronger feeling. If organisations develop high-quality communication agreements with their workers by handling them equally and allowing them to make decisions about their outcomes (fair processes), employees are more fulfilled and more likely to work to achieve a better standard of JP. Individuals are expected to show an unacceptable work performance and feel dissatisfied if they perceived that there is a low exchange relation. Therefore, JP should be correlated with substantive justice insofar as it is involved in the relationships of individuals with their employers and interactional justice insofar, as it is influenced by the relations of individuals with their superiors or supervisors (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Chien et al., 2010; Wei & Lee, 2015).

Empirical studies have consistently shown that DJ significantly predicted JP (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Colquitt, 2001; Shan, Ishaq, & Shaheen, 2006). It should be remembered that according to the OJ as stated in prior studies, the workforce does not claim their organisation as fair solely based on DJ, but they will focus and examine the PJ and IJ too. However, many findings showed that PJ had a substantial impact on JP (Chien et al., 2010; Colquitt, 2001; Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). Likewise, according to Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000), employees perceived PJ as having the power to increase JP and organizational engagement. Meanwhile, a limited number of studies have so far examined the effect of IJ on JP (Colquitt, 2001; Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). It was expected that workers who experienced high rates of IJ would continue to show in-role JP, particularly given political facts, since they believe the superior to take care of them and that they are respected and appreciated (Tyler, 1989). The vaguest relationship lies between the presumed relationship between IJ and JP. IJ relation to JP remains unclear, and correlation experiments between these two factors produced mixed results. Some studies reported that IJ was not related and did not have an impact on JP (Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). However, Fernandes and Awamleh (2006) reported that the three dimensions of OJ did not have an impact on the self-perceived performance of expatriates, but some other research found a significant positive relationship (Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). According to the above-mentioned arguments, the study proposes the following hypotheses.

H1: Distributive justice has a positive and significant impact on Job Performance among academic staff
H2: Procedural justice has a positive and
significant impact on Job Performance among academic staff
H3: Interactional justice has a positive and significant impact on Job Performance among academic staff

Methodology
The study employed a quantitative method to examine the impact of OJ on JP of academic staff at three Iraqi public universities located in Baghdad during the academic year 2019-2020. The data were collected by using a self-administered questionnaire and a stratified sampling technique was used to ensure equal representation of the academic staff from the three universities.

The population of the academic staff at the three universities was 476 and according to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), if the population fell in the range of 460 to 480, the sample size should be 214. Altogether, 198 out of 214 questionnaires returned, and after checking for missing value and incomplete responses, only 197 questionnaires were valid to be analysed by using Smart PLS which is recommended for sample size less than 200 (Chin, 2010).

The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section contained demographic questions, and the second section included 20 items where OJ dimensions carried 15 items and JP carried 5 items. Five-point Likert scales were used from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

Instrument
The questions were adapted from previous studies, as follows:
Job Performance: 5 items (Abba & Mugizi, 2018; Musah et al., 2016; Shan et al., 2006)
Organizational Justice consists of three dimensions:
Distributive justice: 5 items (Lee et al., 2015; Shan et al., 2006)
Procedural justice: 5 items (Lee et al., 2015; Shan et al., 2006)
Interactional justice: 5 items (Lee et al., 2015; Shan et al., 2006)

Results
Since the study employed the Smart PLS to analyse the data, there were two main steps conducted as per recommendation by Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt (2016) namely the measurement model and structural model.

Information of respondents
The majority of response is male (60%), and followed by the female (40%). This result is not uncommon due to the fact of culture. However, most of the respondents were between 30 to 40 years old (32%) and followed by 41-50 years old (27%). 20% of the respondents aged between 51-65 years old less and 12% were more than 66 years old. Lastly, 8% of the respondents were less than 29 years old. The qualifications showed that 55% of the academic staff possessed a Ph.D., and 45% graduated from a Master’s degree. Finally, regarding the academic position, 37% of the respondents were Assistant Professor and followed by 32% Assistant Lecturer. Meanwhile, 14% of them were in the Lecturer position and only 17% were professors.

Model measurement
The purpose of this step is to measure the validity, reliability, and discriminations of the items. To ensure these requirements, the convergent validity and discrimination validity were tested.

Convergent Validity consists of three tests. The first one is the average variance extracted (AVE) which reflects the total amount of variation in the indicators of the latent construct. The second one is the composite reliability (CR) and Cronbach’s Alpha is preferred to ensure the internal consistency among items. The third one is factor loadings.

The cutoff values for acceptable CR and
Cronbach's Alpha should be 0.70 or above

### TABLE 1. CONVERGENT VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Outer loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha &gt; 0.7</th>
<th>CR &gt; 0.7</th>
<th>(AVE)&gt;0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>JP1</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP2</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>DJ1</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ2</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ3</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ4</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ5</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>IJ1</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IJ2</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IJ3</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IJ4</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IJ5</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>PJ1</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PJ2</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PJ3</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PJ4</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PJ5</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2 FORNELL–LARCKER CRITERION DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>constructs</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td><strong>0.839</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td><strong>0.86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td><strong>0.853</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td><strong>0.854</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hair et al., 2016), while AVE should be 0.50 or above (Hair et al., 2016). Factor loadings should be > 0.70 (Hair et al., 2016).

The results of CR and Alpha exceeded the recommended level 0.70 with high internal consistency. Similarly, AVE > 0.50 (see Table 1). All items loading exceeded the recommended level 0.70 as shown in Figure 1 and Table 1 depicted the factor loading values.

**Discriminant validity**

Our study employed two criteria to assess discriminant validity. The first one is the Fornell-Larcker Criterion whereas the second one is the cross-loadings. All discrimination results met the acceptable level.

The boldface values in Table 2 showed each factor that was highly correlated with itself than others and this criterion was achieved as essential for validity discrimination. Second, cross-loading for each item in the same factor should have a high correlation among themselves, and this criterion is achieved and illustrated in bold font (see Table 3). Overall, each factor in this study had a high square root of AVE compared to other factors (Fornell...
Job performance (JP) is one of the important staff. Meanwhile, OJ remained a less, it is worth to note that western Steiner, 2012; Massoudi, Jameel, & top management. Justice promotes volunteerism on developing a country. In Additionally, students will also have the research, supervision, publication and (Jameel & Ahmad, 2020b; Mousa, 2020). Among the reasons for such depends on academic productivity such countries because individualism, collectivism Kirkman, Lowe, and Chen (2013) report education institutions to prepare students and provide the foundation for achievements are the primary criteria success, and the efficiency of anything higher-learning institution. It involves interactions between workers and the institution and Interactional justice (Jameel, Ahmad, & Karem, 2020; Han, & Kim, 2019).)

2019 out of 214 questionnaires returned, 198 out of 214 questionnaires returned, 20% of the respondents aged 214 to 30 years old, 34% were 31 to 40 years old, 28% were 41 to 50 years old, 14% were 51 to 60 years old, and 14% were 61 and above years old. Among the respondents, 63% were male, 37% were female. Among the respondents, 63% were male, 37% were female. Among the respondents, 63% were male, 37% were female. The findings showed that Distributive justice (DJ) was positively related to job performance (JP) (Path coefficient = 0.377, T-Statistics 4.749 >1.96 and P-value <0.05) and Interactional justice (IJ) (Path coefficient = 0.215, T-Statistics 2.247 >1.96 and P-value <0.05) were significantly related to JP. Therefore, H1 and H3 were accepted. This result is in line with previous findings (Shan, Ishaq, & Shaheen, 2006; Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013).

The R2 (the coefficient of determination) of this study is 0.362 (see Figure 1) and this means 36% of the variation in JP was explained by OJ. According to Hair et al. (2016), this value is considered medium. bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples while the error estimated 0.05 and the confidence .95 and the T-Statistics should be above 1.96 to accept the hypothesis (Hair et al., 2016). The results showed two of three hypotheses were accepted. The R2 (the coefficient of determination) of this study is 0.362 (see Figure 1) and this means 36% of the variation in JP was explained by OJ. According to Hair et al. 2.247 >1.96 and P-value <0.05) were significantly related to JP. Therefore, H1 and H3 were accepted. This result is in line with previous findings (Shan, Ishaq, &Shaheen, 2006; Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). PJ (Path coefficient = 0.138, T-Statistics 1.840 < 1.96 and P-value 0.066 >0.05) was insignificantly related to JP. Thus, H2 was rejected. A similar finding was report-

**TABLE 3 CROSS LOADING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>constructs</th>
<th>DJ</th>
<th>IJ</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>PJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ1</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ2</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ3</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ4</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ5</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ1</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ2</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ3</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ4</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ5</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP1</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP2</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ1</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ3</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ4</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ5</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ed by Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006). The results are shown in Table 4 and Figure 1.

TABLE 4. PATH ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>T-Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice -&gt; Job Performance</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>4.746</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice -&gt; Job Performance</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interational Justice -&gt; Job Performance</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.362 Q² = 0.247

Figure 1. Structural Model

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study is to explore the role of Organizational Justice among academic staff at Iraqi public universities. Previous studies found inconsistent findings about the impact of Organizational Justice on Job Performance from both a positive and a negative perspective. Concerning the major impact of the elements of Organizational Justice, this paper concluded that Distributive justice and Interactional justice had significant and substantial contributions to the Job Performance of academic staff in the Iraqi context. Conversely, Procedural justice had an insignificant impact on Job Performance probably due to the universities and government policies.

Distributive justice showed a high prediction on the Job Performance of the academic staff compared to IJ. The impact of Distributive justice on Job Performance is in line with prior studies (Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Ghran et al., 2019). This means the academic staff who received equal rewards were most likely to perform well at the university. The analysis of the data showed that
academics regard their time, workload, and salary level as equal. The reality is that the Iraqi public universities considered in this study followed the government-organization pay structure with fair pay for staff (academics/non-academics). However, Distributive justice centres on fairness allocation of wealth which includes wages, service expenses, and job security. Distributive justice may as well include other services such as office rooms, furnishings, travel support, and test rooms.

Procedural justice did not have significant impact on the Job Performance of the academic staff (P-Value 0.066 > 0.05 and T-statistics 1.840) which led to the rejection of the second hypothesis. This result is supported by the previous finding by Fernandes and Awamleh (2006). JP tends not to be linked to the conceptions of Procedural justice. This finding undermines in extensive part conventional study findings in this area, which typically suggest and show substantial positive ties between all facets of justice and success. In other words, expectations of justice affect or change the behaviour of people who continuously seek to restore justice by different means. However, procedural justice does not impact on Job Performance of the academic staff perhaps because the study was conducted in public universities, and it is understood that their continuing employment and career progress are dependent directly on government programs and policies and not on the universities itself.

H3 confirmed the impact of Interactional justice on Job Performance of the academic staff with T-statistics 2.247 >1.96 and P value 0.028 < 0.05. A similar result was reported by earlier studies (Shan et al., 2006; Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Ghran et al., 2019). Most academic staff acknowl-
edged that their Head of Department or Dean had provided them with adequate justification for the employment decision. For Interactional justice, the academic staff was asked whether or not their Head of Department or Dean treated them equally and most respondents thought that their Head of Department or Dean had treated them with respect, honesty, compassion, and truthfulness. Such results indicate that, while results of the study vary in relation to the relative essential of each element of justice in link to each result compared with studies conducted in non-middle east countries, the understanding of the three aspects of the justice system influences an employee’s patterns to react in order to achieve better performance in their work. Since the value of injustice is universal, former academics have indicated that judicial views on different work results continue to vary in cultural and national contexts (Schilpzand et al., 2013). The results summarized here suggest that academic staff attribute a higher value to interpersonal interactions obtained through processes and outcome decision-making by their Head of Department or Dean at university. Furthermore, the findings showed that assistance, integrity, respect, and consideration were the main reasons for achieving high-performance and comfortable employees.

Implications

The theoretical implication of this study is enriching the body of knowledge in the context of Iraq and academic context in developing countries. The study confirmed that the theory of OJ was applicable in the context of higher education. However, the practical implication indicated that DJ was more important to improve the academic staff performance. Besides, the Head of Department and the Dean are advised to enhance the DJ, where they
should equitably distribute the resource among academic staff. The IJ was shown to be important for academic staff, thus the Head of Department and the Dean should deal with academic staff with complete honesty and dignity.

Conclusion, Limitations, and Future work

The current study specifically addressed the academic staff’s understanding of OJ and the performance of their interaction with their superiors (Head of Department / Dean). The study focused on academic performance’s soft side to improve productive and useful behavior. The results show that university academics work effectively with their superiors (Head of Department / Dean). To ensure equality at universities, the current Head of Department / Dean must uphold the moral and ethical code of conduct by including all participants in the DMP. In addition, to ensure equality in the allocation of incentives and processes involved in the decision-making of recruitment, selection, training and development, and assessment of JP, it is equally necessary to ensure fairness in interpersonal interaction between the Head of Department / Dean and the academic staff. When academic staff perceived the Head of Department / Dean as being professional, trustworthy, real, and justifiable, they feel more confident and optimistic.

This study, like any other study, has several limitations. The study was conducted only in three universities located in Baghdad due to security issues and the inability to carry out research in more than those three universities. The study was conducted in public universities only, hence the results could not be generalized the result to private universities due to the difference in the nature of rules and regulations. Future studies can be conducted in more than three universities and cover private universities as well. The prospective study may examine the causal effect of OJ on JP by examining the mediating role.
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