Effect of Organizational Justice on Faculty Trust in University Education Faculties

¹ Nosheena Tahseen, ² Muhammad Saeed Akhtar

¹ PhD Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore
² Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore
(Email: nosheena.tahseen@gmail.com)

The study was aimed to find out the effect of organizational justice on faculty trust in university teacher-education faculties in the Punjab province of Pakistan. The sample of the study comprised of 285 teacher-educators (lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors) of twelve universities, eight in public and four in the private sector, offering at least masters degree program in Education. Stratified proportionate random sampling was used to select the sample. The instruments of data collection were adapted for the study based on Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) by Neihoff and Moorman, and Faculty Trust Scale (FTS) by Hoy and Tachannen-Moran. Two hundred thirty eight teacher-educators with a return rate of 83.5% responded. Data collected through the survey were analysed applying descriptive, correlation, and regression analysis. The results of the study showed that organizational justice on the whole and each of its dimension viz. distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, significantly and positively predicted faculty trust. Furthermore, no significant difference was found between public and private universities with regards to the effect of organizational justice on faculty trust.

Keywords: *organizational justice, faculty trust, teacher-education*

Introduction

Justice is an essential human need for social harmony. Positive perceptions regarding fairness in societal affairs can lead to contentment and forbearance, while negative perceptions might cause chaos and disarray in the society. So matters of justice not only affect an individual, but also society on the whole. In this connection, social institutions are responsible for creating such settings in which people are able to live and interact in a positive manner. Rawls (1999) rightly described justice as the "first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought" (p. 3). Though, the study of justice as a philosophical and theological subject is being discussed since the period of Plato and Socrates (Ryan, 1993), the scientific work, however, started with the initial work by Adams (1965) on his "equity theory", which was later studied in diverse organizational contexts. Greenberg (1990a), renowned for his work in the area of organizational

justice, acknowledged Adams's pioneer research work which helped future researchers to study around the theme of "fairness as a consideration in the workplace" (p. 400). To this aspect, organizations have adapted the concept of social justice, which in due course, developed into the term "organizational justice". Greenberg (1991) identified it as a nucleus value of the social organizations. By the passage of time, the issue of "justice as fairness" (Rawls, 1999, p. 3) became a sharp outline of studies, particularly in the area of behavioral and administrative science. Moorman (1991), one of the most influential in this area, observed that organizational justice, in fact, concerns "with the ways in which employees determine, if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those determinations influence other work-related variables" (p. 845). The central point, however, is employees' self-satisfaction toward efficient organizational functioning. The problem

becomes decisive when fairness is absent from the work-place, especially in the case where employees compare their work with their colleagues. To this effect, Williams (1999) argued that employees having satisfaction, in general, behave positively toward the overall organizational working. This is so when their efforts and outcomes are either at the same proportion or better in comparison with others. On the contrary, if the employees perceive that their colleagues who work less, but receive more outcomes (gains), their level of satisfaction will either diminish or reduce. As a result, they, as members of organization, will behave negatively towards the fulfillment of organizational goals. Poole (2007) endorsed Williams' arguments and concluded that studies on organizational justice have almost in consensus that "fairness" is significant toward an effective organizational working and employees' personal satisfaction.

Literature indicates that, though the work-related outcomes of organizational justice are several, a key aspect in an educational organization is faculty trust. In the absence or lack of trust, the effective and harmonious functioning of any organization is only a dream. Hoy and Tarter (2004) interpreted trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 253). Zeffane and Al-Zarooni (2008) argued that trust concerns to the individual's perception regarding justice, veracity, honesty, and the other individual's strength. They recommended that the heads should promote trust by respecting the employees' concerns. This is essential, as without building trust between the employee and the head, social relations in the work context are difficult to build on. Daly and Chrispeels (2008) observed that trust is one of the most important factors toward the healthy institutional climate. In a similar direction, Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) found that employees, who were treated with fairness, developed more mutual trust and cooperative working relations. This establishes that when the organizational outcome is fair, a higher employees' trust is developed. Tschannen-Moran (2009), a distinguished scholar in the field of faculty trust, confirmed that "where trust was higher among teachers, there was a high trust in students and their parents" (p. 240).

Literature Review

Organizational Justice

The discussion about the organizational justice was initiated by the researchers around the question of fairness. Greenberg (1990b) argued that "fairness is a desired social identity, and that people seek to present themselves as fair to themselves and others" (p. 111). Meaning thereby that if the staff members in an organization perceive the outcome as fair, they will perceive the "fairness of outcomes" as well as "fairness of procedures"; but if there are imbalances between the inputs (expectations) and outcomes (rewards), there would be complete dissatisfaction among the staff members (Cohen & Greenberg, 1982). The review of literature shows that there are three interchangeable terms viz. justice, fairness, and equity. However, fairness was commonly used by the researchers in discussing organizational justice.

There has been extensive research on justice over the last forty years, mostly in the organizational perspective. The major finding of these researches reflects that what a person in the organization perceives or experiences with regard to fairness, is organizational justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In more simple words, the fairness description in the organizational work context is, in fact, justice. The major question in these studies was to identify as to whether or not the organizational decisions regarding the employees were fair. Also to examine their perceptions of fairness with the way they were treated. In this way, employees' behavior about justice or fairness became a major field of study in different types of organizations. Barling and Philips (1993) summarized that organizational justice studies had been, in general, "guided by the notion that employees who believe they are treated fairly will be favorably disposed toward the organization and engage in pro-social behavior on behalf of the organization" (p. 649).

The organizational justice theory argues as how people "socially construct the incidents of justice and injustice through the perceptions of employees in organizations who make judgments about the actions of organizational leaders" (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997, as cited in Poole, 2007, p. 727). In this perspective, an act of the organizational head, in the opinion of the employees, is fair only if they perceive that as fair. In this

context, the organizational justice looks subjective, as one person perceives an act as just, but the other person may perceive the same act as unjust. However, research indicates that "justice is also socially constructed; therefore coherent, long-standing groups (such as employee groups) often develop shared conceptions of what constitutes justice" (Tyler & Lind, 1992, as cited in Poole, 2007, p. 727). The theory identifies three dimensions of organizational justice viz. distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. In conclusion, research endorses the theoretical view that organizational justice is a construct which is multi-dimensional. Although, the dimensionality aspect is still under debate, the studies mostly rely on 3-dimension typology (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Faculty Trust

Trust is a perennial value, which plays an essential role toward comprehending the human behavior. For healthy organization, leaders' major role is to develop trust environment, so that every individual works for organizational success. Towards this viewpoint, Fukuyama (1995) argued that the organizations mostly depend on the success of mutual trust which is rooted in fundamental values of honesty and cooperation. Fukuyama concludes that a high trust society has more potential to organize work-place much better. However, he cautions that "low trust societies, by contrast, must fence in and isolate their workers with a series of bureaucratic rules" (p. 31).

With regards to defining trust, Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) described it as "willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor the other party" (p. 712). Almost with the same meaning, Hoy and Miskel (2004) came up with a comprehensive definition, which is being followed by most of the researchers. They defined trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the later party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 192). Hoy and Tarter (2004) further made a multifaceted definition of trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is

benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 253). Faculty trust is a term specifically used in the context of educational institutions. According to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003), faculty trust covers three dimensions of teachers' trust i.e. trust in the head, trust in colleagues, and trust in clients.

Organizational Justice and Trust

The research synthesis associating justice with trust is presented here. Mayer et al., (1995) in their study found that interpersonal treatment (component of interactional justice) given to the employees resulted in promoting their trust. In another study, Brockner and Siegel (1996 as cited in Jeong, 2009) found that there was significant relationship between "positive employee views of process and procedures" and "higher employee levels of trust in the organization". Colquitt (2001) identified that interpersonal fairness to employees resulted in trust for their management. In the similar direction, Greenberg and Cropanzano (2001) contended that the interactional justice (information sharing) in the organization led to trust. These studies correspond with the research findings concluded by earlier studies of Mayer et al., and Brockner and Siegel, cited in Jeong (2009). Kernan and Hanges (2002) found that "procedural justice was strongly related to interpersonal and interactional justice (which ultimately) added to the prediction of trust in organization" (p. 916). Consistent with this finding, Albrecht and Travaglione (2003) concluded that the fairness in organizational policies and procedures (procedural justice) is a major factor that determines organizational trust. Thornhill and Saunders (2003) endorsed that if there is no fairness in interactional justice, there is no chance of trust. The review shows that most of the studies with regard to procedural justice (an important component of organizational justice), confirm a very positive relationship with generating trust. For example, Mariam (2011) cited Bews and Uys (2002) who concluded that the procedural fairness (justice) is a major factor toward generating trust. In Chinese context, Wong, Ngo, and Wong (2006) investigated the relationship of perceived organizational justice, trust, and OCB among Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprise. The study found that both distributive justice and procedural justice showed a stronger effect on trust in organizations (p. 344). With regards to the impact of procedural justice on

employees' trust, Dolan, Tzafrir, and Baruch (2005) found a significant 'influence of procedural justice as a determinant of employees' trust in their organization. Lambert, Hogan, and Griffin's (2007) confirmed that "fairness at work-place had strong impact on employees' performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust" (p. 644). Ngod (2008), in a Malaysian study proposed a model of fairness and trust. As a result of literature review, he argued that "procedural justice directly influences trust. Trust in turn, exerts direct influence on organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction ---- The conclusions have strong support in both theoretical and empirical literature" (p. 93). Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani's (2009) also endorsed the earlier research that fair organizational treatment (justice) to the employees led to more trust in management. Rezaian, Givi, Givi, and Nasraboadi (2010) conducted a study at a hospital in Tehran (Iran) and confirmed the significant effect of organizational justice on trust. Colquitt, Scott, Jeffery and LePine (2007) in their research paper have rightly observed that "trust has become an important topic of inquiry in a variety of disciplines, including management, ethics, sociology, psychology, and economics" (p. 909). Though, the observation skips the specific field of education, the disciplines referred to by Colquitt and colleagues are the foundation areas and also the neighboring disciplines of Education, thus making their research findings applicable to the field of education. In most of the studies, there is confirmation of the general finding that organizational justice (fairness) has definite influence on employees' trust.

Methodology

The paradigm of the study was quantitative in nature. The data were collected through survey instruments, and then assessed using descriptive, correlation and regression analyses.

Participants of the Study

The population of the study comprised of teacher-educators (lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors) working in teacher-education institutes (offering at least masters degree program in Education) in twelve universities in the Punjab province (*N*=380). Out of twelve universities, eight were in the public sector, while four in the private sector (Public *N*=344; Private *N*=36). The rationale for selecting teacher-educators of universities in the Punjab province was: (i) a greater number of universities in Punjab; (ii) a greater number of universities (more than half), having teacher-education faculties/ departments; and (iii) consideration for time and cost of getting data from other provinces.

The technique for selecting the sample of the study was stratified proportionate random sampling. The technique ensured the presence of key subgroups within the sample; representation of small subgroup/s in the population (in the present study, the teacher-educators of private sector universities); and higher statistical precision, as variability in subgroups is lower as compared to when a sample is taken from the entire population as whole. The entire target population was divided into two strata/subgroups i.e. public and private. Seventy-five percent (75%) proportionate samples (the same proportion/fraction for each stratum, irrespective of the size of stratum in the total population) were randomly taken from each stratum. In this way, "subgroups in the population are represented in the sample in the same proportion that they exist in the population" (Gay, 2000, pp. 116-117). The sample of the study, thus, comprised of 285 teacher-educators (Public n=258; Private n=27).

Instruments of the Study

Based on the review of related literature, two instruments of data collection (for each variable of the study), comprising of self-report questions were adapted in the context of teacher-education faculties in universities in Pakistan. For each item of these instruments, the participants of the study responded to a 6-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The Likert scale was a right method for the respondents to express easily a broader array of opinion/perception. Table 1 shows the variables, original scales, their dimensions, and the total number of items included in each scale.

Table 1

Variables of the study, original scale and its dimensions, and number of items in the adapted scale

Variables of the Study	Original Scale	Scale Dimensions	Items in the Modified Scale
Organizational Justice (*Independent*)	20-item Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) by Niehoff and Moorman (1993)	Distributive Justice Procedural Justice Interactional justice	23
Faculty Trust (*Dependent*)	26-item Faculty Trust Scale (FTS) by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003)	Trust in heads Trust in colleagues Trust in students	27

Organizational Justice Scale (OJS). Organizational justice was the independent variable of the study. Based on the review of literature/measures, Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) scale was adapted for this particular study. The scale measures organizational justice across its three dimensions, i.e. distributive justice; procedural justice; and interactional justice. The reliability of the scale is well established and has been in use for the last two decades. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the reliability of this scale is .95.

Faculty Trust Scale (FTS). Faculty trust was the dependent variable of the study. Based on the review of literature/measures, Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's scale (2003) was adapted. The scale measures faculty trust across its three domains i.e. trust in heads, trust in colleagues, and trust in clients with reference to six facets: vulnerability; benevolence; reliability; competence; honesty; and openness. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability of the scale is .98.

Adapting/modifying the Instruments. Both instruments were modified according to the context of teacher-education in Pakistan's university environment. Although, the original instruments were standardized, valid, and reliable, yet it was important to find out the validity and reliability of the modified instruments in Pakistan's university setup in teacher-education faculties. For this purpose, under the guidance of a panel of experts, the draft instruments were modified with reference to the language, clarity of items, professional authenticity, and university context. The panel of experts consisted of six university teachers having specialization in educational administration, organizational behavior, and educational research.

In case of Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), three new items were added, considering the university setting: (i) Item # 6 (Distributive Justice: "I feel that my representation in the departmental committees is fair"); (ii) Item # 13 (Procedural Justice: "The Head follows strict procedures in recommending teachers for participation in the national/international conferences in an unbiased manner"); and (iii) Item # 14 (Procedural Justice: "The Head follows strict procedures in permitting teachers to pursue for higher studies (local/abroad)". With the addition of three new items, the total number of items in the modified OJS became 23 as against 20 items in the original scale.

In case of Faculty Trust Scale (FTS), although, the original scale was already in the education perspective, it was in School context. However, as the overall theme of the scale was around the "process of education", the panel of experts advised to accept it for university teacher-education institutions also. It was also advised by the panel of experts that, in the university scenario, items on "trust in students" would be more relevant, instead of "trust in parents". Accordingly, six new items/statements, considering the university setup and by replacing the items on "trust in parents", were added: (i) Item # 17 (Trust in colleagues: "The research work conducted by teachers of this department is reliable"); (ii) Item # 18 (Trust in colleagues: "Teachers in this department can discuss openly any research-related problem with their colleagues"); (iii) Item # 22 (Trust in Students:

"Students here are open with their peers and teachers"); (iv) Item # 25 (Trust in Students: "I can rely on the students to be well-disciplined"); (v) Item # 26 (Trust in Students: "When asked for feedback, I believe that my students give honest response"); and (vi) Item # 27 (Trust in Students: "Students do not bully/ harass their peers and teachers"). With this, the numbers of items became 27 as against 26 in the original scale.

Data Collection

Prior to administering the instruments at macro level, a pilot study was conducted. The respondents ($n = 42$; not part of the sample of the study) were university teachers in the faculties of education. After finalizing the instruments, the survey on a large scale was conducted. The researcher obtained 238 completed questionnaires (with a response rate of 83.5%). The final analytic sample, thus, resulted in an effective response rate of 62.6% out of the total target population.

Results

The data collected were tabulated and analyzed using the statistical software package SPSS. In order to answer research questions, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. To test the hypotheses, regression analysis was applied. All the hypotheses were tested at (= 0.05). Results are presented in tables followed by interpretations.

Perceptions regarding Organizational Justice

What was the state of Organizational Justice as perceived by university teacher-educators?

Distributive Justice Perceptions. The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Distributive Justice are presented in Table 2:

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Distributive Justice

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
1.	My work schedule is fair.	4.85	1.125
2.	I think that my level of pay is fair.	4.34	1.37
3.	I consider my work load is fair.	4.49	1.263
4.	Overall, the rewards I receive here are fair.	4.34	1.214
5.	I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.	4.66	1.032

N=238

The Table 2 shows that, item # 1 "*My work schedule is fair*" has the highest Mean score i.e. *M* = 4.85. The range of Mean scores (4.34 to 4.85) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Procedural Justice Perceptions. The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Procedural Justice are presented in Table 3:

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Procedural Justice

No.	Statement	Me	SD
1.	I feel that my representation in departmental committees is fair.	4.3	1.203
2.	The Head is able to make decisions in an unbiased manner.	4.3	1.370
3.	My Head makes sure that concerns of teachers are heard before job decisions are made.	4.2	1.345
4.	To make job decisions, my Head collects accurate and complete information.	4.2	1.253
5.	When requested by teachers, my Head clarifies and provides additional information about any decisions.	4.4	1.21
6.	All job decisions are applied consistently across all concerned teachers.	4.1	1.34
7.	Teachers are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the Head.	3.9	1.274
8.	The Head recommends/nominates teachers, for participation in national/international conferences, in an unbiased manner.	4.1	1.41

N=238

Table 3 shows that item # 5 "*When requested by teachers, my Head clarifies and provides additional information about any decisions*" has the highest mean score i.e. *M* = 4.42. Again, like perceptions regarding *Distributive Justice*, the range of Mean scores (3.94 to 4.42) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Interactional Justice Perceptions. The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Interactional Justice are presented in Table 4:

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Interactional Justice

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
1.	The Head follows strict procedures in permitting teachers to pursue for higher studies (local/abroad).	3.91	1.394
2.	When decisions are made about my job, the Head treats me with kindness and consideration.	4.59	1.14
3.	When decisions are made about my job, the Head treats me with respect and dignity.	4.66	1.17
4.	When decisions are made about my job, the Head takes care of my personal needs.	4.36	1.245

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
5.	When decisions are made about my job, the Head deals with me in a truthful manner.	4.46	1.233
6.	When decisions are made about my job, the Head shows concern for my rights as a teacher.	4.39	1.24
7.	Concerning decisions made about my job, the Head discusses the implications of the decisions with me.	4.25	1.28
8.	The Head offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.	4.28	1.245
9.	When making decisions about my job, the Head offers explanations that make sense to me.	4.22	1.235
10.	My Head explains clearly any decisions made about my job.	4.24	1.25

N=238

Table 4 shows that item # 3 "*When decisions are made about my job, the Head treats me with respect and dignity*" has the highest mean score i.e. *M* = 4.66. Again, like perceptions regarding *Distributive Justice* and *Procedural Justice*, the range of Mean scores (3.91 to 4.66) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Faculty Trust among University Teacher-Educators

What was the level of Faculty Trust among university teacher-educators?

Faculty Trust in Institutional Head.

The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Institutional Head are presented in Table 5:

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Institutional Head

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
1.	I have faith in the honesty/ integrity of the Head.	4.72	1.26
2.	The Head acts in the best interests of teachers.	4.59	1.261
3.	The Head informs teachers what is really going on in the department.	4.49	1.30
4.	I have trust in the Head.	4.73	1.21
5.	The Head shows concern for the teachers.	4.67	1.16
6.	I have confidence in most of the Head's actions.	4.57	1.24
7.	I can rely on the Head.	4.55	1.262
8.	The Head has competence and expertise in accomplishing his/her job.	4.70	1.224

N=238

Table 5 shows that item # 4 "*I have trust in the Head*" has the highest Mean score i.e. *M* = 4.73. The range of Mean scores (4.49 to 4.73) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Faculty Trust in Colleagues. The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Colleagues are presented in Table 6:

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Colleagues

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
1.	Teachers in this department look out for each other.	4.51	1.103
2.	Teachers in this department trust each other.	4.37	1.203
3.	Even in difficult situations, I can depend on my colleagues.	4.40	1.182
4.	I have faith in the integrity/honesty of my colleagues.	4.61	.97
5.	I have confidence in my colleagues.	4.58	.984
6.	Teachers in this department do their jobs well.	4.65	.95
7.	When my colleagues tell me something about any activities/developments department, I can believe it.	4.73	.92
8.	Teachers in this department are open with each other.	4.28	1.202
9.	The research work conducted by teachers of this department is reliable.	4.47	1.124
10.	Teachers in this department can discuss openly any research-problems with their colleagues.	4.36	1.23

N=238

Table 6 shows that item # 7 "*When my colleagues tell me something about any activities/developments in the department, I can believe it*" has the highest Mean score i.e. *M* = 4.73. The range of Mean scores (4.28 to 4.73) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Faculty Trust in Students. The descriptive statistics for the perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Students are presented in Table 7:

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceptions regarding Faculty Trust in Students

No.	Statement	Mean	SD
1.	I have trust in my students.	4.68	.97
2.	Students are reliable in their work commitments.	4.41	1.04
3.	Students in my department care about each other.	4.49	1.033
4.	Students here are open with their teachers and peers.	4.47	1.002
5.	I believe students of this department are competent learners.	4.46	1.0
6.	When students in my department tell me something, I can believe it.	4.27	1.0
7.	I can rely on the students to be well-disciplined.	4.46	.94
8.	When asked for feedback, I believe that my students give honest response.	4.45	1.03
9.	Students do not bully/harass their peers and teachers.	4.51	1.10

N=238

Table 7 shows that item # 1 "*I have trust in my students*", has highest Mean score i.e. *M* = 4.68. The range of Mean scores (4.27 to 4.68) indicates that the distribution of scores is centered between the scale marks *Somewhat Agree* (4.0) to *Agree* (5.0).

Effect of Organizational Justice on Faculty Trust
Is there any effect of Organizational Justice on Faculty Trust? In other words, does Organizational Justice predict the outcome variable Faculty Trust?

In order to study the effect of Organizational Justice on Faculty Trust, following null hypotheses were formulated (significance level set at = 0.05):

H_01. There is no significant effect of distributive justice on faculty trust. In order to test this hypothesis, regression analysis was applied. The *Model Summary* (Table 8) shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Faculty Trust) is explained by the model. The *Regression Coefficients* are presented in Table 9.

Table 8
Model Summary (N = 238)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig.
1	.519	.270	.267	16.774	87.15	.000

Notes. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive_Total; Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 9

Regression Coefficients^a (N = 238)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			LB	UB
1	(Constant)	72.385	5.372		13.476	.000	61.803	82.968
	Distributive_Total	1.826	.196	.519	9.335	.000	1.440	2.211

a. Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

The data presented in Table 8 shows that the model explains 27.0% of the variance in the faculty trust. The 'Adjusted R Square' value is 0.267 (as compared to R Square = .270). Therefore, the linear regression analysis reveals that Distributive Justice significantly and positively predicts the outcome variable Faculty Trust i.e. Adjusted R Square = .267, $F (1, 236) = 87.146$, $p < .0005$ (Sig. = .000), 95% CI [1.440, 2.211]. In other words, there is strong evidence to conclude that higher levels of perceived Distributive Justice lead to higher predictions of Faculty Trust. The model reaches statistical significance at $= 0.05$, thus rejecting the null hypothesis that '*there is no significant effect of distributive justice on faculty trust*'.

H$_0$2. There is no significant effect of procedural justice on faculty trust. In order to test this hypothesis, regression analysis was applied. The *Model Summary* (Table 10) shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Faculty Trust) is explained by the model. The *Regression Coefficients* are presented in Table 11.

Table 10
Model Summary (N = 238)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig.
1	.61	.48	.48	14.10	220.48	.000

Notes. Predictors: (Constant), Procedural_Total; Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 11

Regression Coefficients^a (N = 238)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			LB	UB
1	(Constant)	67.371	3.76		17.93	.000	59.967	74.78
	Procedural_Total	1.64	.11	.696	14.85	.000	1.421	1.85

a. Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 10 shows that the model explains 48.4% of the variance in the faculty trust. The 'Adjusted R Square' value is 0.482 (as compared to R Square = .484). Therefore, the linear regression analysis

reveals that Procedural Justice significantly and positively predicts the outcome variable Faculty Trust i.e. Adjusted R Square = .482, F (1, 235) = 220.481, $p < .0005$ (Sig. = .000), 95% CI [1.421, 1.855]. In other words, there is strong evidence to conclude that higher levels of perceived Procedural Justice lead to higher predictions of Faculty Trust. The model reaches statistical significance at = 0.05, thus rejecting the null hypothesis that '*there is*

no significant effect of procedural justice on faculty trust'.

H₀3. There is no significant effect of interactional justice on faculty trust. In order to test this hypothesis, regression analysis was applied. The *Model Summary* (Table 12) shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Faculty Trust) is explained by the model. The *Regression Coefficients* are presented in Table 13.

Table 12
Model Summary (N = 238)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig.
1	.72	.51	.51	13.72	246.08	.000

Notes. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional_Total; Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 13

Regression Coefficients^a (N = 238)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	LB	UB
1	(Constant)	64.37	3.75		17.17	.000	56.98	71.76
	Interactional_Total	1.45	.09	.72	15.69	.000	1.27	1.64

a. Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 12 shows that the model explains 51.2% of the variance in the faculty trust. The 'Adjusted R Square' value is 0.509 (as compared to R Square = .512). Therefore, the linear regression analysis reveals that Interactional Justice significantly and positively predicts the outcome variable Faculty Trust i.e. Adjusted R Square = .509, F (1, 235) = 246.077, $p < .0005$ (Sig. = .000), 95% CI [1.271, 1.636]. In other words, there is strong evidence to conclude that higher levels of perceived Interactional Justice lead to higher predictions of Faculty Trust. The model reaches statistical significance at =

0.05, thus rejecting the null hypothesis that '*there is no significant effect of interactional justice on faculty trust*'.

H₀4. There is no significant effect of organizational justice on faculty trust. In order to test this hypothesis, regression analysis was applied. The *Model Summary* (Table 14) shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Faculty Trust) is explained by the model. The *Regression Coefficients* are presented in Table 15.

Table 14
Model Summary (N = 238)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig.
1	.74	.55	.54	13.23	283.69	.000

Notes. Predictors: (Constant), OJS_Total; Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 15

Regression Coefficients[a] (N = 238)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			LB	UB
1	(Constant)	53.578	4.122		12.997	.000	45.457	61.699
	OJS_Total	.686	.041	.739	16.843	.000	.606	.767

a. Dependent Variable: FTS_Total

Table 14 shows that the model explains 54.6% of the variance in the faculty trust. The 'Adjusted R Square' value is 0.544 (as compared to R Square = .546). Therefore, the linear regression analysis reveals that Organizational Justice significantly and positively predicts the outcome variable Faculty Trust i.e. Adjusted R Square = .544, F (1, 236) = 283.694, $p < .0005$ (Sig. = .000), 95% CI [.606, .767]. In other words, there is strong evidence to conclude that higher levels of perceived Organizational Justice lead to higher predictions of Faculty Trust. The model reaches statistical significance at = 0.05, thus rejecting the null hypothesis that '*there is no significant effect of organizational justice on faculty trust*'.

$H_0$5. There is no significant difference between public-private universities with reference to the effect of organizational justice on faculty trust. In order to test this hypothesis, the statistical formula used was proposed by Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, and Piquero (1998), based on the work of Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995). The difference between causal effect for public universities ($b_1 = 0.666$, s.e. = 0.043), and private universities ($b_2 = 0.750$, s.e. = 0.131), is calculated as follows:

$$Z = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{\dagger_{b_1}^2 + \dagger_{b_2}^2}} = \frac{0.666 - 0.750}{\sqrt{(0.043)^2 + (0.131)^2}} = -0.609$$

The Z value shows that the difference between public and private universities, with regards to the effect of organizational justice on faculty trust, is not statistically significant.

Discussion

The results of the present study show that organizational justice with all its dimensions (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) has significant positive contribution in generating faculty trust. The data analysis reveals that organizational justice significantly and positively predicts the outcome variable. This indicates that there is strong evidence to conclude that higher levels of perceived organizational justice, with all its dimensions, lead to higher predictions of faculty trust. The findings are in line with Yilmaz and AltinKurt (2012) who carried out their research in Turkish secondary schools and found the significant positive relationship between organizational justice and faculty trust. The current study is also in line with Lambert et al. (2007) who confirmed that fairness at work-place has a strong impact on employees'

organizational trust. Although the study by Lambert et al. is in the context of business management, it equally applies to other types of "social systems" (a term used by Luthans, 1995, p. 16) including the "educational systems". To this aspect, Owens (1991) presented a good deal of literature on organizational behavior in education, applying business theories and models. It can, however, be argued that since most of the modern education systems of the world are under the influence of pragmatic philosophies, the findings of the studies conducted in purely business and market management context can also be applied to modern systems of education in the broader sense. The present study's findings are in line with the work of Taschnnan-Moran (2001) who observed that the schools having a high level of trust show greater collaboration between the faculty and the principal. Her study confirmed the significant role of faculty trust in educational settings. The current study, though in university context, fully corresponds with Taschnnan-Moran's research. This indicates that cross-cultural individual perceptions are almost the same whether in university or in a school environment.

Although, the present study provides significant results, there are some limitations to the study as well. Foremost, the study is limited to teacher-education faculties only. The studies from other faculties might give different results due to variability of sample and context. Secondly, due to the nature of cross-sectional survey data, one must be cautious about the causality conclusions. For future researches, using longitudinal data to replicate these causal relations can be valuable in this regard. Thirdly, the study is limited to the Pakistan's Punjab province only. Future research at higher education level need to cover all universities of Pakistan recognized by HEC (Higher Education Commission of Pakistan) to better comprehend the causal relations at a broader level.

Despite the limitations of the study, it has made some significant contributions to the extant literature on organizational behavior in the context of higher-education institutions. The results of the study provide strong evidence that higher levels of perceived organizational justice, with all its dimensions, lead to higher predictions of faculty trust in teacher-education institutions. Another major contribution of the study is the adaptation of the organizational justice scale and the faculty trust scale for higher education institutions. The modified scales can be used not only in studies conducted in faculties other than teacher-education, but at the level of overall educational organization/s as well. This way, the researchers can not only explore whether the linkages found in the present study vary across different faculties/departments in the same organization, but also shed some light on the variability of causal relations across different educational institutions at the large scale. The researchers might also opt for a qualitative/mixed-method approach to further understand the perceptions of teachers to explore these organizational characteristics and their relationship. The major implication of the study is the crucial role of fairness in educational settings towards cultivating trust among teachers, thus leading to an amiable and effective work environment manifesting in achieving organizational goals.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berekowitz (Ed.), *Advances in ExperimentalSocial Psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Albrecht, S., & Travaglione, A. *(*2003) .Trust in public-sector senior management. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*(1), 76-92.

Bakhshi A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business Management, 4*(9), 145-154.

Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology, 127*(6), 649-656.

Bews, N., & Uys, T. (2002). The impact of organizational restructuring on perceptions of trustworthiness. South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 28, 19-26.

Brockner, J., & Siegel, P. (1996). Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive justice: The role of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), Trust in organizations (pp. 390- 413). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clogg, C. C., Petkova, E., & Haritou, A. (1995). Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*(5), 1261-1293.

Cohen, R. L., & Greenberg, J. (1982). The justice concept in social psychology. In J. Greenberg & R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior* (pp. 1-41). New York: Academic Press.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *86*, 278-324.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 386-400.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott., Jeffery, & LePine. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 909-927.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), Interactional review of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.

Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, N. (2008). A question of trust: Predictive conditions for adaptive and technical leadership in educational contexts. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 7, 30-63.

Dolan, S. L., Tzafrir, S., & Baruch, Y. (2005). Testing the causal relationships between procedural justice, trust and citizenship behavior. *Resources Humaines, 57,* 79-89.

Flores, F., & Solomon, R. C. (1998). Creating trust. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 8*, 205-232.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.

Gay, L. R. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Islamabad: National Book Foundation.

Greenberg, J. (1990a). Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, *16*(2), 399-432.

Greenberg, J. (1990b). Looking fair vs. being fair: Managing impressions of organizational justice. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *12*, 111-157.

Greenberg, J. (1991). Using explanations to manage impressions of performance appraisal fairness. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4*(1), 51-60.

Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2004). *Educational organizations, policy and reform: Research and measurement.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *18*, 250-259.

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Jeong, H. J. (2009). *Impact of organizational justice and job security on organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota). Retrieved from http://purl.umn.edu/54242

Kernan, M. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2002). Survivor reactions to reorganization: Antecedents and consequences of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 916-928.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Griffin, M. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*, 644-656.

Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Mariam, N. (2011). *Organizational justice, employee trust, employee commitment and service quality in Uganda revenue authority* (Master's thesis, Makerere University). Retrieved from www.mubs.ac.ug

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*,709-734.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions

influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845-855.

Ngod, O. E. (2008). Procedural justice and trust: The link in the transformational leadership-organizational outcomes relationship. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *4*(1), 82-100.

Niehoff, B., & Moorman, R. (1993). Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(3), 527-556.

Owens, R. G. (1991). *Organizational behavior in education*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology, 36*(4), 859-866.

Poole, W. L. (2007). Organizational justice as a framework for understanding union-management relations in education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *30*(3), 725-748.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rezaian, A, Givi, M. E. Givi, H.E. Nasraboadi, M. B. (2010). The mediating role of organizational commitment, satisfaction and trust. *Science Alert*: an open access publisher. Retrieved from: http://scialert.net/fulltext.

Ryan, A. (1993). *Justice*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Thornhill, A., & Saunders, M. N. (2003). Organizational justice, trust and the management of change: An exploration. *Personnel Review*, *32*(3), 360-75.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *39*(4), 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration*, *45*, 217-247.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *25*, 115-191.

Williams, S. (1999). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on performance. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*(2), 183-193.

Wong, Y. T., Ngo, H. Y., Wong, C. S. (2006). Perceived organizational justice, trust, and OCB: A study of Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprises. *Journal of World Business*. *41*(4), 344-355.

Yilmaz, K., & Altinkurt, Y. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviors in secondary schools in Turkey. *Advances in educational administration, 13*, 223-248.

Zeffane, R., & Al Zarooni, H. A. (2008). The influence of empowerment, commitment, job satisfaction and trust on perceived managers' performance. *International Journal of Business Excellence*, *1*(1/2), 193-209.