

# Confrontational Phases and Imperfections of Organizational-Injustice in the workspace (Validation from Government-Sector Development Financial Institutions of Pakistan)

**MIRZA MUHAMMAD ALI BAIG**

PhD Scholar (Business Administration), Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: [dralibaig514@gmail.com](mailto:dralibaig514@gmail.com)

**Dr. SAJJAD HUSSAIN**

Assistant Professor of Business Administration, Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: [sajjad.hussain@fui.edu.pk](mailto:sajjad.hussain@fui.edu.pk)

**IFTIKHAR HUSSAIN**

Sr. Lecturer of Business Administration, Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: [iftikhar.hussain@fui.edu.pk](mailto:iftikhar.hussain@fui.edu.pk)

## Abstract

*This investigation examines the sources pertained to organizational-injustice (ORIJ) and by what means this injustice effects workers' occupation consequences in government sector development financial institutions in Pakistan. Two-models remained developed and observed aiming at justifying the investigation objectives. Information was acquired by means of a simple random sampling method. Sample comprised of 253 personnel of government sector development financial institutions occupied time-tested questionnaires. Adoption of Multiple regression for checking hypothesis. For appraising ORIJ indirect influence on Organizational-performance due to workers' job-dissatisfaction; Preacher and Hayes of mediation test was adopted. The consequences reveal that ORIJ negatively influences affective-commitment and perceived-organizational-performance. Furthermore, job-dissatisfaction influences the association in organizational-injustice, perceived-organizational-performance, and affective-commitment. Prior to this study, some investigations have revealed the reasons and significances of ORIJ in the other emerging economies.*

**Keywords:** Organizational-injustice (ORIJ), Job-Dissatisfaction (JBDS), Affective-commitment (AFCT), Perceived-ORPF (PROP), Distributive-Injustice (DBIJ), Procedural-Injustice (PRIJ), Interactional-Injustice (IAIJ), Organizational-Performance (ORPF).

## Introduction

Parker et al., (2005) determined the negative influence of presumed bias on structural-commitment and occupational-satisfaction. There seems an association within compensation and performance in government-sector development financial institutions, thus government-sector personnel lead to pinpoint injustice regarding their occupation relied upon observation of discriminating conduct by themselves (Zia, 2020; Moment, 2020; Neupane, 2019; Ali, 2019; Abuhashesh et al., 2019; Aslam, 2015; Arfeen, 2015; Mohti & Rahman, 2015; Ambrose, 2002; Schminke & Seabright, 2002). Workers whosoever observe discriminating conduct would raise complaints or objecting contrary to presumed bias. Additionally, discriminating conduct has negative influence on the performance of workers. These members of staff may become displeased with their occupations, call in sickness, reveal low level of affiliation and eventually, it may be pursued to resign the association (Abuhashesh et al., 2019; Aslam et al., 2016; Imran, 2015; Aslam, 2015; Mohti, 2015; Arfeen, 2015). The administration pertaining government-owned development financial

institutions can be incapable to facilitate staff regarding facilities they are required for efficiently performing their jobs. Furthermore, government sector development financial institutions are discourteous to their staff for assigning them extra duties without honorarium, which lead to job displeasure and has negative impact on AFCT as well as PROP (Ali, 2019; Bilal, 2017; Aslam et al., 2015; Rehman, 2017; Muqadas, 2017; Aslam, 2017).

In comparison with, the staff become more concerned, contended and pleased with their jobs provided they may experience good compensation, timely promotion, medical and hospitalization facilities for families (Abuhashesh et al., 2019). Palaiologos, 2011; Papazekos, 2011 and Panayotopoulou, 2011) have as well determined the degree of performance evaluation approach along with its execution ought to be streamlined through workers competencies, dedication, skills, conduct as well as targets to uplift occupational-satisfaction by themselves. Government-Sector development financial institution also rarely associate compensation with performance due to severe political influence, favoritism, personal grudges and practices by predecessors. Moreover, workers having suitable capability compellingly transferred to those departments that are overburdened with workload, so that eventually causes of JBDS and level down workers commitment. Greenberg and Alge, (1998) by virtue of Human resources has discovered the burning issue of organizational justice has attained leading significance to examine the causes of negativity in workspace.

Numerous studies prudently evaluated ORIJ to be an inconvenience and got its negative influences toward ability of workers to please by means of job required (Neupane, 2019; Ali, 2019; Bilal et al., 2017; Cope et al., 2010; Steensma, 2001; Vermunt, 2001; Aslam, 2017; Muqadas, 2017; Rehman, 2017; Maslach, 2008; Leiter, 2008). Workers whosoever dealt discriminately may face huge volume of JBDS and acquittal (turnover) objectives that take to greater replacement-cost in terms of induction, selection, direction as well as cost on training for the new incumbents (Zia 2020; Moment, 2020 ; Abuhashesh et al., 2019; Bilal et al., 2017; Aslam, 2016; Imran, 2016; Rehman, 2016; Sulu, 2010; Ceylan et al., 2010; Kaynak, 2010; Tracey et al., 2000).

Compassionate, enthusiastic and intellectual personnel hold transactional approach likewise in time promotion, pay allowances and yearly appraisals. Wherein, dedicated and skillful workers in government sector development financial institution of Pakistan are compensated at the same level as the non-committed workers do, just on the terms of seniority and that leads of ORIJ. Additionally, inspection & audit investigations for practical anomalies specifically when workers are overburdened; remote chances for promotion; and no yearly increments or rewards due to practical mistakes may lead towards ORIJ that may enhance the manifestation of adverse occupational outcomes (Neupane, 2019; Ali, 2019; Bilal et al., 2017; Shan et al., 2015).

Wherein, its primarily important regarding induction and retaining staff with AFCT for the institution as well as willingness to present far more than the associations' expectations. Till then in Pakistan's government sector development financial institutions during induction procedure, personal feelings, believes, practices, kickbacks, undue favours and nepotism are severely prevailed that results in practical injustice (Neupane, 2019; Ali, 2019; Bilal et al., 2017; Muqadas, 2017 Rehman, 2017; Aslam, 2017; Aslam et al., 2016). Furthermore, owing to favoritism and lobbying of top-level executives, erudite and skillful personnel usually never considered for key-positions as well as transfers that may create negative impact on occupational-outcomes of such workers (Moment, 2020; Aslam et al. 2015).

Owing to scarcity of proper measure along with available standards, it's hardly difficult to develop patent communication about career-progression and short-tenure facilities (benefits) for staff within government-sector development financial institutions. Furthermore, junior staff such as Class-IV workers are presumed as operational head's personal subordinates that take to the feelings of dishonours in junior workers. According to Greenberg, (2006) the exploitation by the administration take to psychological agony and badly distresses self-respect and position. Furthermost past studies derived that organizational justice or

equality has significant influence on workers occupational satisfaction, performance, conduct and willingness to continue with the association (Moment, 2020 ; Bilal et al., 2017; Fields, 2000; Chiu, 2000; Pang, 2000; Spector, 2001; Cohen Charash, 2001; Shan, 2015). While there seems limited novel literature exists, which has examined in what way ORIJ influence occupational outcomes as well as occupational displeasure. However, this study has led to demonstrate the influence of ORIJ on PROP along with AFCT in public sector development financial institutions of Pakistan.

## Literature Review

Shan, (2015), Ilyas, (2016) and Muqadas, (2017) claimed it that less developed republics workforces provoke thoughtful profitable and socio-political contests that devour confrontational effect on employment upshots. All the public sector development financial institutions of Pakistan are facing various challenges likewise reorganization, deregulation, technical upgradation, downscaling and privatization that professionals can come across to access the retention, downsizing and privatization as most of the development financial institutions hire the workforce on temporary basis that may lessen the commitment of workforce and they may observe the bias (Sims et al., 1994; Rousseau et al., 1995). Public sector development financial institutions employees imagine fair assessment, persistent increases in their livelihood (monetary or non-monetary), employees' contribution in the decision-making process, rational treatment, faith in employees, distribution of reward and significant information sharing about career progression. On the contrary employers too strive for anticipating more endurance for uncertainty and value inflexible director and control of the administration.

According to Parker et al., (2005) and Muqadas et al., (2017) institutional uprightness is customarily researched in institutional behavior, administration and applied psychology. Greenberg (1987) discovered institutional fairness terminology for performance-assessment that administrators need to be aware of prejudice at the time of carrying out enactment assessments. Fairness means the base for holding faithful staffs in addition to certifies vigorous labor atmosphere for institutional associates (Aslam, 2015; Aslam, 2016). Justice is equally beneficial for employees, employers and overall society. The prevailing study elaborates institutional bias as the staff presume or perceived about the employers or administrators' prejudice (Ambrose et al., 2002; Bilal et al., 2017; Moment, 2020). Former studies have displayed the three kinds of institutional prejudice that are PRIJ (injustice), DBIJ (injustice) and IAIJ (injustice) (Wright et al., 2010; Tetrick et al., 2012; Robbins, 2012). Distributive bias or injustice states that the procedure where prejudicial means are adopted to earmark the outcomes across members of the staff; who wouldn't get the predictable outcomes, particularly whenever the associated results of them relating with the former workforces owing to that business portrayal (Ford & Huang, 2014). Global injustice transpires whenever personnel obtain scarce evidence as well as social exploitation by administration.

Shan et al., (2015) stated that this remains demonstrated the developments regarding award structure as well as for respect be able to take an optimistic effect proceeding awareness of objectivity of staff. Experts have determined the importance of institutional justice that may increase institutional obligation and faith, expands social conscience behavior and enactment, enhancing customer satisfaction and reducing institutional clashes (Bowen et al., 2007). As rare revisions clarified that when an institute, communication morality stands moderately extraordinary, then damaging influence of distributive and procedural decency be able to diminish (Goldman, 2003; Cropanzano et al., 2007). Unmerited elevation, gratitude conventions, assortment of infertile workers, imperfect occasions for professional growth, and fragile collaborative associations are destructively inclined on organizational enactment and employee obligation. Former investigation has discovered importance of employer-employee associations by concerning the managerial impartiality to worker's gratification, job outcomes, workers' outlooks obligation, and objective to halt (Fields et al., 2000, Cropanzano, 2007; Kathairi et al., 2013; Alsam, Imran et al., 2016). Procedural fairness is measured an imperative administrative commitment conjecturer (Hashim et al., 2011) while distributive uprightness is a momentous conjecturer of compensation and employment contentment aftermaths (Rehman et al., 2017). Greenberg (2009) exposed in a revision owing to ritual and global

uprightness absolutely impact regarding employment consequences. Cropanzana, (2007) have discovered bi-organizational-justice-measure i.e., procedural as well as distributive justices as well as impact on occupation aftermaths. An additional study inspected noteworthy association in procedural justice and administrative-commitment (Bilal et al., 2017; Muqadas et al., 2017; McFarlin, 1992; Sweeney, 1992).

Conferring upon the investigators such as Kaynak, (2010); Ceylan, & Sulu, (2010); justice envisages manifold employment effects that is gross revenue objectives, work anxiety, workstation disruption, conviction and organizational assurance. In divergence, Sulu et al. (2010) have examined an adverse association in procedural as well as distributive bias with organizational obligation. Furthermore, it discovered the distributive prejudice increases worker's gross revenue objective (Hassan at al., 2011) Nevertheless, scholars have not discovered an association in organizational obligation and interactional-justice. On the contrary, Lambert, (2007); Hogan and Griffin (2007) examined that technical (procedural) as well as distributive-justice take substantial impact on occupation anxiety as well as organizational obligation. Crow, Lee, and Joo (2012) display and inspected remarkable as well as suggestive association concerned with organizational commitment covering by organizational-justice. Also, they resolute that job-satisfaction as well as distributive-justice have limited intermediating influence onto the unintended linkage of commitment as well as organizational-justice. Whereas, Elanain (2009) takes proposed in this revision that administration be able to convey enhancement in occupation gratification as well as organizational-commitment concluded enriched distributive as well as procedural-justices. Established on the widespread literature mentioned above, subsequent hypotheses are identified. John Gardner, (1996) defined injustice as injustice.

H1x: DBIJ is adversely associated to AFCT.

H2x: PRIJ is inversely associated to AFCT.

H3x: IAIJ is adversely associated to AFCT.

According to Shan et al. (2015) all proportions of organizational integrities are knowingly connected with organizational enactment. Nonetheless, the investigators have explored the robust correlation within interactional justice along with commitment. Consequently, some alternative investigation has examined the various dimensions of organizational-justice, wherein interactional-justice is deemed as the performance's optimum predictor (Cropanzana et al., 2007). Lately the Cheng (20 14) has urged that the organizational/organizational-justice perception has extremely associated with performance assessments on the contrary, Greenberg (2010) founded that staffs who exposed to injustices suffering personal and intellectual disorders. They remained discontented too with ultimate degree of reducing their organizational commitment.

**H4<sup>x</sup>** : DBIJ is negatively associated to PROP.

**H5<sup>x</sup>** : PRIJ is inversely associated to PROP.

**H6<sup>x</sup>**: IAIJ is negatively associated to PROP.

**H1<sup>y</sup>** : JBDS intervenes the association concerning DBIJ and AFCT.

**H2<sup>y</sup>**: JBDS intervenes the association concerning PRIJ and AFCT.

**H3<sup>y</sup>**: JBDS intervenes the association concerning IAIJ and AFCT.

According to Palaiologos, (2011) that interactional as well as procedural justices as a feature of organizational-justice take substantial effect on job-satisfaction and all of its categories. On the contrary, Ambrose, (2002) discovered organizational bias as a foundation of JBDS. Likewise, Gim et al., (2013) claimed that badly distributed rewards may have negative influence on occupational-satisfaction, AFCT and workers' turnover objective. Some other study revealed that unjustified yearly evaluation system is the main reason of injustice that take to JBDS of personnel (Kirk et al., 1992). Former study also discovered that mistreatment of controller intensifies the violence in place of work and JBDS (Baron, Neuman, and



Geddes, 1999). Beugré (2005) stated about ORIJ perception is deemed as a prime predictor to JBDS as well as hostile conduct of workers towards administration.

H4y: JBDS intervenes the association concerning DBIJ and ORPF.

H5y: JBDS intervenes the association concerning PRIJ and ORPF.

H6y: JBDS intervenes the association concerning IAIJ and ORPF.

## **Research Methodology**

### **Sample**

The intention to select the government-oriented development financial institutions staff is constantly varying surroundings, multiparty anxiety and technical development cause of denationalization. Population of existing revision comprised of workforces employed onto various places (that is, administrative as well as non-administrative) within Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited, SME Bank Limited and House Building Finance Corporation from districts Lahore, Kasur and Sheikhupura. 675 employees were taken from government-oriented development financial institutions regarding Pakistan. The frame of population in total comprised of 580 personnel of three constituencies Lahore, Kasur and Sheikhupura.

### **Sample size: Bias**

Size of Sample is measured noteworthy that comprises in 200 to 400 respondents' range that correspondingly drops the partiality available in descriptive outcomes (Hair, 2010). 373 personnel ought to engage as a size of sample from the 675 workers of populace frame. Moreover, simple-random-sampling (probability-sampling) method arranged as population-frame is recognized.

### **Methods**

ORIJ observation's questionnaire established by Colquitt (2001) and that has been used extensively to quantity bias perception overcome in the association. These scales were transformed into inverse declarations. The JBDS measure established by (Seashore *et al.*, 1982) was reused from former investigation. Whereas the AFCT measure (Meyer *et al.*, 1990) and the measure of PROP (Delaney *et al.*, 1996) were adopted.

Structured questionnaire used to collect respondents' data. Questionnaires remain controlled regarding staffs pertained to Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited, SME Bank Limited and House Building Finance Corporation of Pakistan of three districts. About 373 questionnaires were sent through courier as well as e-mail. Overall, of 285 questionnaires had been acknowledged wherein 32 questionnaires stayed unfinished with 12 percent missing values, consequently such survey-questions were predisposed of (Hair, 2010).

Therefore, out of 253 questionnaires, data stood investigated for this existing study. Ultimately 68 percent reply rate was considered. 82 percent of respondents remained male and 18 percent female. However, 113 comebacks were exemplified those in 18 - 28 years, 57 respondents were in 29 - 39 years age bracket, 51 respondents were in 40-49 and 32 respondents comprised of 50-60 years age bracket. As per educational status, around 137 respondents were with the master's degrees holders, 74 respondents with bachelor degrees and 42 respondents with professional diplomas or certifications. Owing to designation in institute 135 respondents regarding this investigation were by means of administrative status along with 118-respondents having non-administrative status. Subsequently, the aptitude of respondents, 145 respondents represented 7 - 15 years' experience bracket and rest of 108 symbolized below 6 years' skills.

## Results and Analysis

Reliability test executed for checking uniformity, which relates “Degree to that instrument produces, similar effects on frequent judgements” (Durrheim et al., 1999). Conferring to a revision, exceptional as well as adequate reliability-range is 0.06 – 0.09 or other (Mallery et al., 2003) owing to this review, the rate of alpha arises in 0.801 – 0.827 ranges, which used to be measured satisfactory. In Table-2, outcomes of descriptive-statistics i.e. mean, standard-deviation, and correlation coefficients were identified. Mean-values of ORIJ components nominate diverse in justices. The test of Pearson’s correlation was functional to proceeds correlation upshots after projected hypotheses pertained to this revision.

Table 1: Reliability and Descriptive Statistics

Constructs	Alpha	Mean	Std. Dev.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>DBIJ</b>	0.801	3.49	1.15					
<b>PRIJ</b>	0.818	3.41	1.03	0.357"				
<b>IAIJ</b>	0.829	3.39	1.07	0.189"	0.278"			
<b>JBDS</b>	0.821	3.48	1.23	0.186"	0.252"	0.211"		
<b>AFCT</b>	0.831	2.59	1.03	0.258"	0.277"	0.421"	0.243"	
<b>PROP</b>	0.836	2.63	1.01	0.267"	0.339"	0.231"	0.296"	0.291"

(\*) Two-tailed test values 'p < 0.05 and "p < 0.01. It has been presumed that there are three ranges in relationships week from 0.10 to 0.29; medium from 0.30 to 0.49 and strong from 0.50 to 1 (Cohen, 2013).

Table 2 Multiple Regression Outcomes

Statistics	Model-I: DBIJ, PRIJ, IAIJ & AFCT			Model-II: DBIJ, PRIJ, IAIJ & PROP		
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	21.3			14.6		
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	21.4			14.5		
<b>Model Significance</b>	.000			.000		
<b>F-Value</b>	23.12			14.61		
	<b>DBIJ &amp; AFCT</b>	<b>PRIJ &amp; AFCT</b>	<b>IAIJ &amp; AFCT</b>	<b>DBIJ &amp; PROP</b>	<b>PRIJ &amp; PROP</b>	<b>IAIJ &amp; PROP</b>
<b>Standardized Beta</b>	-13.1	-11.7	-33.7	-15.9	-23.1	-12.1
<b>Un-Standardized Beta</b>	-11.6	-11.7	-33.5	-13.8	-22.9	-11.4
<b>Significance Value</b>	0.17	-0.35	.000	0.02	.000	0.02

(\*) Independent Variables: DBIJ; PRIJ; IAIJ

Dependent Variables: AFCT; PROP

### Model-1:

In model, the value of R<sup>2</sup> shown the 21.3 percent variation in independent variable pertained to emotional obligation. Wherein, F and P values concerned with linear hypotheses stayed examined adequate as well as substantial. Outcomes regarding Model-I remained presented an important however adverse association in distributive, procedural as well as interactive injustice through AFCT.

Consequence discovered too that Interactive injustice premeditated standardized regression value extra important in comparison to other.

## Model-2

Owing to Model-II, R2 value revealed the 14.6 percent deviation in PROP as independent-variables. Likewise, P-value as well as F value into Model-II stayed too establish substantial. Distributive and IAIJ termed extensively weedy destructive association with PROP. Whereas, PRIJ described the fairly resilient association with PROP.

Table 3: Mediation Test (DBIJ, AFCT and JBDS)

Statistical Description	A <sup>a</sup> Route	B <sup>a</sup> Route	C <sup>a</sup> Route	C <sup>a</sup> Route
	X-M	M(X)-M	X-Y	X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.2001	-0.1711	-0.233	-0.1986
P-Value	0.0023	0.0008	0.000	0.0002
T-Value	3.0401	-3.3625	-4.293	-3.667
R <sup>2</sup>			0.1081	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1011	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			14.2451	

(\*) X: DBIJ; M: JBDS; Y: AFCT; p\* < 0.05, p\*\* < 0.01, p\*\*\* < 0.001;  
5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% level of confidence.

To testify the indirect influence Mediation regression test established by adopting Preacher and Hayes (2004). However, the test of DBIJ indirect influence onto AFCT by JBDS was measured. The Aa-Route effects discovered optimistic association into DBIJ and JBDS wherein the outcomes regarding Ba-Route discovered adverse association for AFCT and JBDS. In addition to the outcomes of Ca-Route outcomes nominated that DBIJ had negative-influence on AFCT. The estimated C'a (Ca-Route) fallouts exposed that JBDS reduced the DBIJ's negative influence on AFCT. The C'a (Ca-Route) outcomes intensely proved the existence of restricted mediation influence. Moreover, the significance-value regarding hypotheses, F value, and R2 value established approval as well as strength pertained to predicted hypothesis in this study.

Table 4: Mediation Test (PRIJ, JBDS and AFCT)

Statistical Description	A <sup>b</sup> Route	B <sup>b</sup> Route	C <sup>b</sup> Route	C <sup>b</sup> Route
	X-M	M(X)-M	X-Y	X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.3095	-0.1552	-0.2846	-0.2365
P-Value	0.000	0.0029	0.000	0.0002
T-Value	3.246	-2.0063	-3.6882	-2.8233
R <sup>2</sup>			0.1121	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1049	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			14.8611	

(\*) X: PRIJ; M: JBDS; Y: AFCT; p\* < 0.05, p\*\* < 0.01, p\*\*\* < 0.001;  
5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% level of confidence.

Mediation test of investigators i.e., Preacher and Hayes (2004) stayed castoff to assess indirect-influence of PRIJ as well as AFCT through mediating influence regarding JBDS. At First,  $A^b$ -Route stands assessed such specify substantial optimistic association in PRIJ with JBDS. Whereas,  $B^b$ -Route exposed the negative relationship amid JBDS and AFCT.

In table 5,  $C^b$ -Route discovered that PRIJ has substantial negative effect on AFCT. In lieu of mediator influence,  $C^b$  ( $C^b$ -Route) is estimated. The results showed such JBDS declines negative influence regarding PRIJ onto the variable pertained to AFCT. This  $C^b$  ( $C^b$ -Route) evaluation correspondingly termed that restricted mediation influence remained establish considerably. Consequently values i.e., P-value,  $R^2$  value, as well as F-values stand substantial enough to admit anticipated hypothesis.

Table 5: Mediation Test (JBDS, IAIJ and AFCT)

Statistical Description	A <sup>c</sup> - Route X-M	B <sup>c</sup> - Route M(X)-M	C <sup>c</sup> - Route X-Y	C <sup>c</sup> - Route X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.2443	-0.137	-0.4073	-0.371
P-Value	0.0007	0.0047	0.000	.000
T-Value	2.4523	-1.8379	-6.3997	-5.7281
R <sup>2</sup>			0.201	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1973	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			32.1724	

(\*) X: IAIJ; M: JBDS; Y: AFCT;  $p^* < 0.05$ ,  $p^{**} < 0.01$ ,  $p^{***} < 0.001$ ;  
5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% level of confidence

$A^c$ -Route consequences presented a rational optimistic linkage in IAIJ as well as JBDS. Furthermore,  $B^c$ -Route recognized the negative relationship in JBDS and AFCT.  $C^c$ -Route demonstrated that PRIJ has adequate negative influence on AFCT. Subsequently estimating  $C^c$  ( $C^c$ -Route) consequences it is associated and certain that JBDS declines the negative influence existing in incidental relationship of PRIJ and AFCT. Afterward associating the consequences, it is displayed that restricted mediation occurred considerably. Therefore, comprehensive F- value, P-value, as well as  $R^2$  stand adequate to admit projected hypothesis.

Table 6: Mediation Test (JBDS, DBIJ and PROP)

Statistical Description	A <sup>d</sup> - Route X-M	B <sup>d</sup> - Route M(X)-M	C <sup>d</sup> - Route X-Y	C <sup>d</sup> - Route X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.2001	-0.2102	-0.2421	-0.2001
P-Value	0.0024	0.000	0.000	0.0002
T-Value	3.0409	-4.2853	-4.5746	-3.837
R <sup>2</sup>			0.1393	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1326	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			20.3679	

(\*) X: DBIJ; M: JBDS; Y: PROP;  $p^* < 0.05$ ,  $p^{**} < 0.01$ ,  $p^{***} < 0.001$ ;  
5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% level of confidence.



Outcomes underlined owing to restricted mediation into variables initiate considerably. Therefore, F-value,  $R^2$  as well as comprehensive P-value, remain too essential to admit anticipated hypothesis.

Table 7: Mediation Test (JBDS, PRIJ and PROP)

Statistical Description	A <sup>e</sup> - Route X-M	B <sup>e</sup> - Route M(X)-M	C <sup>e</sup> - Route X-Y	C <sup>e</sup> - Route X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.3097	-0.1853	-0.3345	-0.2771
P-Value	0.000	0.0002	0.000	0.000
T-Value	4.2483	-3.7762	-5.7342	-4.7069
R <sup>2</sup>			0.161	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1561	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			24.439	

(\*) X: PRIJ; M: JBDS Y: PROP;  $p^* < 0.05$ ,  $p^{**} < 0.01$ ,  $p^{***} < 0.001$ ;

It was discovered that JBDS declines the negative influence of PRIJ on PROP. It may be validated there remains such restricted mediation existing in C<sup>e</sup> (C<sup>e</sup>- Route). Thus, total worth of P, F and R<sup>2</sup> stand substantial.

Table 8: Mediation Test (JBDS, IAIJ and PROP)

Statistical Description	A <sup>f</sup> - Route X-M	B <sup>f</sup> - Route M(X)-M	C <sup>f</sup> - Route X-Y	C <sup>f</sup> - Route X(M)-Y
Un-Standardized Beta	0.2441	-0.2145	-0.2204	-0.1679
P-Value	0.0007	0.000	0.0002	0.0034
T-Value	3.4523	-4.3009	-3.8071	-2.9331
R <sup>2</sup>			0.1191	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>			0.1121	
Significance Value			0.000	
F-Value			17.0015	

(\*) X: IAIJ; M: JBDS Y: PROP;  $p^* < 0.05$ ,  $p^{**} < 0.01$ ,  $p^{***} < 0.001$ ;

5000 times bootstrapping for mediation test on 95% level of confidence.

The outcomes of A<sup>f</sup>- Route pointed-out that there was rational positive association in IAIJ as well as JBDS. However, it discovered that JBDS as mediator decline the IAIJ negatively influenced on PROP. Likewise, this evaluation directed the occurrence of substantial restricted mediation. Therefore, values pertained to R<sup>2</sup>, P, as well as F remain adequate substantial to admit specified hypothesis.

## Discussion

Investigators established two models that is linear as well as mediation models for dealing this study. Questionnaires were communicated to 373-memebers of staff out of whom just 253 acknowledges. Reliability and Factor-analysis conveyed to test construct-validity and internal-consistency concerning entire variables structured-questionnaire conferring to establish standard relied upon Joseph F. Hair, (2009). After adopting multiple regression procedure, three hypotheses were accounted for based upon significance-value and unstandardized-beta. DBIJ (H1x) and PRIJ (H2x) had slight negative relationship

with workers AFCT. However, (H3x) hypothesis verified that PRIJ has strongly negative impact on workers' AFCT in comparison to DBIJ and PRIJ. The hypotheses had constant and uniform values in comparing with the earlier investigations (Bilal, et al., 2017; Sulu et al., 2010; Lambert et al., 2007). According to Fields, (2000) and Al-Rawashdeh, (2013) three supplementary hypotheses (H4x, H5x, as well as H6x) of linear-model got verified relied upon significance-value and unstandardized-beta. DBIJ (H4x) as well as IAIJs (H6x) have inverse relationship with PROP. (H5x) hypothesis has strongly negative relationship with PROP. Hence, the consequences of hypotheses H1x, H2x, and H3x had uniformity with past studies (Bilal et al., 2017; Muqadas, 2016).

Preacher and Hayes (2004) Regression-mediation test adopted for testing indirect-influence concerning three-dimensions of organizational-injustice that is distributive, procedural and IAIJs owing to the JBDS proceeding professional upshots. The impact pertaining partial-mediation of hypotheses ( $H1^y$ ,  $H2^y$  and  $H3^y$ ) were evaluated and verified the indirect relationship in AFCT, organizational-injustice by JBDS. Hypotheses ( $H4^y$ ,  $H5^y$  and  $H6^y$ ) initiated that JBDS is moderately mediate on organizational-injustice as well as ORPF that had negatively associated. The study revealed the mediating effect of JBDS that was hardly observed in developed countries of West. It seems an exclusively novel concept involved relating to AFCT, organizational-injustice, and PROP derived through government sector development financial institutions of Pakistan.

## Conclusion

Employees of Development Financial Institutions are opposing the injustice significantly in government sector institutions on account of gender, favoritism, rivalry, preferentialism, unwarranted prejudiced from administration and unification that cause anxiety, apprehension, insecurity and discomfiture state of mind. These would certainly distress workforces as well as performance of structure. Injustice in institutions is one of extreme obstacle that deterioration the performance of workers in diverse means. Consequently, organizational-injustice is measured the rudimentary organizational base of JBDS. In existing study, staffs of Development Financial Institutions are the main target of injustice prevailed in public sector institutions of Pakistan regarding sex, creed, nepotism, political inspiration and bias. Hence workforces of government sector development financial institutions have great mental state of indecision, humiliation, trauma and angst that take to phenomenal failure in ORPF. In this revision, a theoretical acumen has established though applied placement and a widespread literature.

## Implications

According to Schmitt et al., Dörfel, (1999); Muqadas et al., Ahmad et al., (2017); Rehman et al., (2017); Greenberg, (2010); Muqadas et al., (2017); Ambrose et al., (2002) the existing of literature on organizational-injustices are associated to the workspace disruption, professional strength threat and discrepancies, JBDS, unmannerly administration, emotional welfare and occupational satisfaction. Foregoing literature in standpoint of injustices have not been inspected the consequence of organizational-injustice on occupation outcomes, that is AFCT, JBDS, and ORPF of government sector development financial institutions in Pakistan as an emerging economy. Administration ought to take prompt notice to eradicate the injustices accomplished in the corresponding institutions so that AFCT and performance level regarding government sector development financial institutions can be inflated.

## Limitations and Future Directions

Numerous restrictions of contemporary study ought to be noted in anxious debate. Foremost, data is assembled from three districts pertained to province Punjab so consequences might not be generalized to all

the four provinces as well as the government sector development financial institutions. Henceforth, it stands commended aimed at accumulating data pertaining various countries of SAARC (South Asian Association. for Regional Cooperation) for attaining generalizability. Furthermore, outcomes remain deduced in restricted manner in addition to problem of causation stays elevated as it stands based upon cross-sectional revision wherein data would be composed one-time. Subsequently, forthcoming research be able to accompany by expending longitudinal design. Likewise, existing exploration verified that organizational-injustice influences on AFCT with  $R^2=22.3\%$  and on ORPF with  $R^2=15.6\%$ .

## References

- Abuhashesh, M., Al-Dmour, R., & Masa'deh, R. (2019). Factors that affect Employees Job Satisfaction and Performance to Increase Customers Satisfactions. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2019, 1-23.
- Abu Elanain, H. M. (2009). Job characteristics, work attitudes and behaviors in a non-western context: Distributive justice as a mediator. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(5), 457-477.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 1-422-436.
- Ambad, S. N. A., & Bahron, A. (2012). Psychological empowerment: The influence on organizational commitment among employees in the construction sector. *Journal of Global Business Management*, 8(2), 73-81.
- Aguinis, H. (2004). *Regression analysis for categorical moderators*: Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- ALDamoe, F. M. A., Yazam, M., & Ahmid, K. B. (2012). The mediating effect of HRM outcomes (employee retention) on the relationship between HRM practices and organizational performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 2(1), 75-88.
- Ali, Y. S. (2019). Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees in Bangladesh: A Comparative Study Between Private and State-Owned Banks. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 21, 18-24.
- Al Rawashdeh, E. T. (2013). Organizational justice and its impact upon job performance in the Jordanian customs department. *International Management Review*, 9(2), 29-35.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 947-965.
- Aslam, U., Ilyas, M., Imran, M. K., & Rahman, U. U. (2016). Detrimental effects of cynicism on organizational change: an interactive model of organizational cynicism (a study of employees in public sector organizations). *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 29(4), 580-598.
- Aslam, U., Arfeen, M., Mohti, W., & Rahman, U. U. (2015). *Organizational cynicism and its impact on privatization (evidence from federal government agency of Pakistan)*. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 9(4), 401-425.
- Alsam, U., Rehman, C. A., & Imran, M. K. (2016). Intelligence and Managerial Performance: An Interactive Role of Knowledge Sharing Culture. *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(3), 598-617.
- Aslam, U., Mohti, W., Imran, M. K., & Arfeen, M. I. (2015). Impact of personality and organizational context on employees 'job outcomes. *Pakistan Business Review*, 17(3), 603-623.
- Baron, R. A., Neuman, J. H., & Geddes, D. (1999). Social and personal determinants of workplace aggression: Evidence for the impact of perceived injustice and the Type A behavior pattern. *Aggressive behavior*, 25(4), 281-296.
- Beugré, C. D. (2005). Reacting aggressively to injustice at work: A cognitive stage model. *Journal of business and psychology*, 20(2), 291-301.
- Batool, S. (2013). Developing Organizational Commitment and Organizational Justice to amplify Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Banking Sector. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, 7(3), 646-655.

- Bilal, R.A., Rafi, N., & Khalid, S., (2017). Detrimental Causes and Consequences of Organizational Injustice in the Workplace (Evidence from Public Sector Organizations). *Pakistan Business Review*, 19(1), 114-137.
- Bilal, R.A., Muqadas, F., & Khalid, S. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction with Mediating Role of Psychological Ownership. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies*, 5(2), 63-74.
- Ceylan, A., & Sulu, S. (2011). Organizational injustice and work alienation. *E+ M Ekonomie a Management*, 2, 65-78.
- Cheng, S. Y. (2014). The mediating role of organizational justice on the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), 1131-1148.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 386.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*: Sage publications.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- Cropanzana, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 21 No. 4 34-48.
- Crow, M. S., Lee, C.-B., & Joo, J.-J. (2012). Organizational justice and organizational commitment among South Korean police officers: An investigation of job satisfaction as a mediator. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 35(2), 402-423.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45(3), 305-317.
- Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949-969.
- Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 395-406.
- Faheem, M. A., & Mahmud, N. (2015). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance and Job Satisfaction of Employees: Evidence from a Public Sector Hospital of Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 342-352.
- Fulford, M. D. (2005). That's not fair! The test of a model of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among hotel employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 4(1), 73-84.
- Fields, D., Pang, M., & Chiu, C. (2000). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of employee outcomes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 547-562.
- Ford, M. T., & Huan g, J. (2014). The health consequences of organizational injustice. *Contemporary Occupational Health Psychology: Global Perspectives on Research and Practice*, Volume 3, 35-50.
- Gim, G., & Desa, N. M. (2013). The Impact of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Affective Commitment on Turnover Intention among Public and Private Sector Employees in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4 (6), 487-492.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 91(1), 58.
- Greenberg, J. (2009). Everybody talks about organizational justice, but nobody does anything about it. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2(2), 181-195.



- Greenberg, J. (2010). Organizational injustice as an occupational health risk. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 205-243.
- Greenberg, J., & Alge, B. J. (1998). *Aggressive reactions to workplace injustice*. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Monographs in organizational behavior and industrial relations, Vol. 23, Parts A & B. Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior* (p. 83–117). Elsevier Science/JAI Press
- Griffin, M. A., & Neal, A. (2000). Perceptions of safety at work: a framework for linking safety climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 5(3), 347.
- Hair, J. F. (2009). Multivariate data analysis.
- Hair, J. F. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*: Prentice Hall.
- Hassan, A., & Hashim, J. (2011). Role of organizational justice in determining work outcomes of national and expatriate academic staff in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21(1), 82-93.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover: Putting a price on the learning curve. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 14-14.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2013). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 256-269.
- [https://www.hbcp.com.pk/page/about\\_us/company\\_profile](https://www.hbcp.com.pk/page/about_us/company_profile)
- <https://www.smebank.org/about-us/banks-management/>
- <https://ztbl.com.pk/economic-data/financial-statement/>;
- Imran, M. K., Rehman, C. A., Aslam, U., & Bilal, A. R. (2016). "What's organization knowledge management strategy for successful change implementation?", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 29 Iss: 7, pp.1097 - 1117
- Imran, M. K., Iqbal, S.M., Aslam, U., & Muqadas, F., (2018). Organizational politics and performance outcomes: Investigating the Buffering Effect of Organizational Justice. *Pakistan Business Review*, 20(1), 47-58.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: the mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(3), 395-404.
- Kankaanranta, T., Nummi, T., Vainiomäki, J., Halila, H., Hyppölä, H., Isokoski, M., Virjo, I. (2007). The role of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction and demographic factors on physicians' intentions to switch work sector from public to private. *Health Policy*, 83(1), 50-64.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(6), 644-656.
- Malik, M. E., & Naeem, B. (2011). Role of perceived organizational justice in job satisfaction: Evidence from higher education institutions of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, 3(8), 662-673.
- Moliner, C., Martínez-Tur, V., Peiró, J. M., Ramos, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). Relationships between organizational justice and burnout at the work-unit level. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 12(2), 99.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(3), 498.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with *personal and organizational outcomes*. *Academy of Management journal*, 35(3), 626-637.
- Moment, B., (2020). Employee Disengagement from The Perspective Of Frontline Employees: A Hotel Case Study In Zimbabwe. *Journal of Management & Administration*, Vol. 1 No. 1 (2020), 73-100.
- Muqadas, F., Ilyas, M., & Aslam, U. (2016). Antecedents of knowledge sharing and its impact on employees' creativity and work performance. *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(3), 655-674.



- Muqadas, F., Rehman, M., Aslam, U., & Rahman, U. U. (2017). Exploring the Challenges, Trends, and Issues for Knowledge Sharing: A Study on Employees in Public Sector Universities. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 47(1), 2-15.
- Muqadas, F., Rehman, C. A., & Aslam, U. (2017). Organizational justice and employee's job dissatisfaction: a moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(4), 848-864.
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International journal of hospitality management*, 29(1), 33-41.
- Nasir, M., & Bashir, A. (2012). Examining workplace deviance in public sector organizations of Pakistan. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 39(4), 240-253.
- Neupane, B. (2019). A Study on Factors Influencing the Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees in Nepal (With special reference to Kathmandu, Lalitpur, and Bhaktapur District). *NCC JOURNAL*, 4, 9-15.
- Okechukwu, C. A., Souza, K., Davis, K. D., & de Castro, A. B. (2014). Discrimination, harassment, abuse, and bullying in the workplace: Contribution of workplace injustice to occupational health disparities. *American journal of industrial medicine*, 57(5), 573-586.
- Palaiologos, A., Papazekos, P., & Panayotopoulou, L. (2011). Organizational Justice and employee satisfaction in performance appraisal. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35(8), 826-840.
- Parker, R. J., & Kohlmeyer, J. M. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: A research note *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30(4), 357-369.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Quinn, R. E., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1997). The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational dynamics*, 26(2), 37-49.
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage.
- Schmitt, M., & Dörfel, M. (1999). Procedural injustice at work, justice sensitivity, job satisfaction and psychosomatic wellbeing. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(4), 443-453.
- Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). *Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Shabbir, M. S. (2014). The impact of human resource practices on employee perceived performance in pharmaceutical sector of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business management*, 8(15), 626-632.
- Shan, S., Ishaq, H. M., Shaheen, M. A., & O'Connor, S. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Performance in Libraries: Mediating Role of Leader-Member Exchange Relationship. *Library Management*, 36(1/2).
- Sims, R. R. (1994). Human resource management's role in clarifying psychological contract. *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 373-382.
- Sulu, S., Ceylan, A., & Kaynak, R. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship between organizational injustice and organizational commitment: Implications for healthcare professionals. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(8), p27.
- Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (1999). Social constructionist methods. *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*, 147-172.
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Reexamining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25-42.
- Tsui, A. S., Ashford, S. J., Clair, L. S., & Xin, K. R. (1995). Dealing with discrepant expectations: Response strategies and managerial effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(6), 1515-1543.
- Ullah, R. (2013). Organizational Justice and employee work attitudes assessing the mediating role of internal organizational trust in Pakistani Public Sector Universities. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1).

- Utami, A. F., Bangun, Y. R., & Lantu, D. C. (2014). Understanding the role of emotional intelligence and trust to the relationship between organizational politics and organizational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 115, 378-386.
- VanYperen, N. W., Hagedoorn, M., Zweers, M., & Postma, S. (2000). Injustice and employees' destructive responses: The mediating role of state negative affect. *Social Justice Research*, 13(3), 291-312.
- Vargas, M. I. R. (2015). Determinant Factors for Small Business to Achieve Innovation, High Performance and Competitiveness: Organizational Learning and Leadership Style. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 169, 43-52.
- Vermunt, R., & Steensma, H. (2001). Stress and justice in organizations: *An exploration into justice processes with the aim to find mechanisms to reduce stress*. Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice, 2, 27-48.
- Witt, L. (1998). Enhancing organizational goal congruence: A solution to organizational politics. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(4), 666-674.
- Wood, G. (2017). Reflections on business ethics through 1992-2017. *European Business Review*, 29(6), 628-641.
- Yean, T. F. (2016). Organizational Justice: A Conceptual Discussion. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 798-803.
- Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1472-1481.
- Zia, R. S., (2020). Job Satisfaction of Employees in Banking Sector of Afghanistan. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development*-Vol. 3 No. 3 (2020). 179-197.

