

THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADER AND MEMBER (LMX) IN THE SERVICE SECTOR

Tatjana VANIĆ

City administration for economy, Rumenačka 110a, Novi Sad, Serbia,
e-mail: ttjn_vnc@yahoo.co.uk, e-mail: tt1@mail.ru

Igor STAMENKOVIĆ

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Science, Novi Sad, Serbia,
e-mail: igorrrogi@yahoo.com

Aleksandra VUJKO*

Novi Sad School of Business, Vladimira Perića Valtera 4, 21000, Novi Sad, Vojvodina,
Serbia; South Ural State University, Institute of Sports, Tourism and Service, 76 Lenin Ave.,
Chelyabinsk 454080, Russia, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Jovana
Dučića 23a, Banja Luka 78000, Republic of Srpska, e-mail: aleksandravujko@yahoo.com

Tamara GAJIĆ

Novi Sad School of Business, Vladimira Perića Valtera 4, 21000 Novi Sad;
University of Business Studies, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Jovana
Dučića 23a, Banja Luka 78000, Republic of Srpska, e-mail: tamara.gajic.1977@gmail.com

Mirjana DELIĆ JOVIĆ

University of Business Studies, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Jovana
Dučića 23a, Banja Luka 78000, Republic of Srpska, e-mail: mdelicjovic@yahoo.com

Citation: Vanić, T., Stamenković, I., Vujko, A., Gajić, T. & Delić Jović, M. (2019). THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADER AND MEMBER (LMX) IN THE SERVICE SECTOR. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 27(4), 1296–1306. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.27415-434>

Abstract: This research examines individual and organizational qualities in the relations of leaders and followers and their perception of the dimensions of organizational justice. Past results of various studies have shown that organizational justice has a positively influences LMX realities, but also that it is a predictor of the quality level of LMX. The analysis covered 200 respondents in the service sector in Serbia, and correlation and regression were used to achieve the research objectives. This study showed that from demographic characteristics, only certain age groups were different in the perception of distribution and procedural justice. The findings can be used to implement new techniques in an organizational context, i.e. the introduction of new "tools" by the leaders.

Key words: Organizational justice, LMX, Sector, Service

* * * * *

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

The concept of fairness and justice is becoming an increasingly important construct in behavior and organizational management for a number of consequences that can produce (personal and organizational). In recent decades, the concept of justice and fairness studied by many researchers. Justice was investigated by examining the reactions of individuals to decision-making, procedures, and the relevance of their superiors.

Many studies have shown that the perception of fairness differs from the feeling of favorable outcome or satisfaction with the outcome (Colquitt, 2012). Organizational justice is a term used to describe the role of justice, and deals with the ways in which employees in the organization are treated. Employee organizations are influenced by the perception of fair treatment in several ways (Srivastava, 2015). According to Cropanzano with associates (2007) justice defines the very essence of the relationship of the individual towards the management, creating significant mutual benefit. In other words, the perception of justice refers to the leadership that most often has the assumption that justice in the heads of employees means only to obtain desirable results, but do not distinguish the outcome of the benefits with the outcome of justice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational justice

The fairness of the impact assessment has been identified as an important criterion for assessing its efficiency and utility for organizations (Erdogan, 2002). In the literature, organizational justice in which the center of equity is distributed and the procedure for the distribution of outcomes-the fairness of the decision-making is called distributive justice (Adams, 1965). The second dimension is named after Thibaut and Walker (1975) where the fairness of the decision-making process is called procedural justice. The third dimension was noticed by Bies and Moag (1986) in the context of employment, that the decision-making process itself has three aspects: procedure, decision and interpersonal interaction. From this, the term interaction justice emerged. Some authors have agreed that interaction justice is an extension of procedural justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993), while others have accepted a three-dimensional model of organizational justice.

Tables 1. Basic statistics and scaling factors of seasonal effects for observed series (Data source: Cropanzano et al., 2007)

Distributive justice	Procedural justice	Interactional justice
The suitability of the outcome	The convenience of the distribution process	The convenience of treatment that one receives information from superiors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awarding employees on the basis of their contribution; - Submit every employee with a balanced remuneration; - Providing help on the basis of personal requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All employees are treated the same, without the separation of individuals or groups; - References are based on accurate information and all have the necessary information; - There are complaints processes or other mechanisms for error correction; - Norms of professional behavior are respected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Treat the employee with dignity, kindness and respect; - Exchange relevant information with employees.

In his research, Greenberg (1993) separated interaction justice into two components, interpersonal justice (treatment of respect and dignity by the superiors) and informational

justice (the accuracy and completeness of the information the superiors collect). Research has shown that employees evaluate the three dimensions of organizational justice, outcome justice (distributive justice), the justice of the formal distribution process (procedural justice) and justice for interpersonal relations (interaction justice).

Distributive justice refers to the perception of the fairness of the outcome that an employee receives in the organization. Outcomes can be distributed on the basis of equality (impartiality), need and individual contributions to the fairness of distribution by comparison with others (Adams, 1965). The diversity of distribution results in perception perceived by employees that they are not treated equally, and distribution justice is a predictor associated with reactions (cognitive, affective behavioral responses) to certain results (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In an organizational context, fairness tends to provide individual awards for a well-accomplished work assignment, and equity tends to build loyalty in the organization (Cropanzano et al., 2007). Employees react to the outcome of the allocation, comparing their outcomes with respect to others, if those relationships match, the employee feels equity (Colquitt, 2012). According to the same researcher, distributive justice was defined as the degree to which the corresponding distribution rule was followed in the context of decision making. In addition to Thibaut and Walker's (1975) equity in the adoption process, many authors considered Leventhal's (1980) procedural justice in the context of resource allocation decisions (Greenberg, 2000; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, Cropanzano et al., 2007, Colquitt, 2012). Leventhal (1980) argues that the distribution process can be regarded as fair when several rules are respected, including consistency, impartiality, accuracy, correctness and ethics. Procedural justice is a measure of assessing whether the adoption process is fair, it does not imply the results itself, but rather determines certain principles, regulating the roles of employees in the decision-making process (Cropanzano et al., 2007). If employees have the perception that the decision-making procedure is favorable, and the researchers call it a fair process, employees show greater loyalty and contribute to the interests of both leaders and organizations. Interaction justice is defined as the quality of interpersonal procedures during the adoption of organizational procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986).

In the case of interaction justice there are different opinions of the researchers. The mentioned Bies and Moag consider it to be the third dimension of organizational justice from the perspective of personal relationships, not in the context of the decision makers (superiors). However, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) estimated that there is a high correlation between procedural and interaction justice. A different concept was introduced by Greenberg (1993), looking at interaction justice from the point of view of interspersal and informative justice. Interaction justice as a third dimension is important because the focus is on interpersonal relations both with the employee and the superior, and the superior's treatment of employees (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). As a four-dimensional construct: distribution, procedural, informative and interpersonal justice was presented by Colquitt et al. (2001) (read more in this study).

The importance of fairness of procedures is reflected in enabling individuals to control the results. If the importance of the group is valued, Lind and Tyler (1988) have indicated that individuals have a desire to be worthy members of the group, and the fairness of procedures are desirable as they indicate that individuals are valued. The last three decades of studies of procedural justice and interaction justice were investigated from two ways, the entire organization and supervisor. Moorman (1991) distinguishes procedural and interaction of justice by assuming that superior behavior can only affect interaction with justice, but not procedural justice. In support of the above, Masterson

and associates (2000) point out that procedural justice is the fairness of the organization, and interaction justice is the justness of the superiors. This definition equates the direction (control vs. organization) and the type (procedural versus interaction) of justice, which can cause problems in assessing performance (Erdogan, 2002). It is assumed that evaluates the effect, and if it does not apply the set of organizational criteria, the procedure itself is not fair and the results of the work are not positive. Interaction justice is defined as the equity of interpersonal relationships where employees expect to be treated with respect. However, interaction justice differs from procedural justice in the implementation of procedures. Procedural justice evaluates the flow of the procedure, and in interaction justice the way of communication is assessed. Since distributive justice is based on equality, it is not possible to determine the differences between different types of inequality (Erdogan, 2002). Cropanzano et al. (2007) points out that we can distinguish three distribution rules that can lead to distributive justice if applied: equality (for each one), impartiality (for everyone in accordance with contributions) and needs (for each in line with priorities).

LMX

The quality dimension LMX points to attitudes that are present in the exchange of relationships (loyalty, support and trust among members of the diads), while the dimension of the oriented binding behavior (influences, freedom and innovation). The LMX model is based on the concept of a different quality of the leader and followers, or that the leaders within the organization form two groups of followers, depending on how they treat them (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987).

This differentiation within the organization increases the time limit for the realization of work tasks, with which all the leaders face the job (Graen, 1976). Due to constraints, the leaders develop close relationships with only a few employees, while with the rest of the group they have a formal authority.

The members of the group are characterized by high quality exchange with the leader, high degree of mutual trust, respect and commitment. Out-group members have a low level of exchange with their leader, where operational performance down to the basics of the activity given a description of their work (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). It is the leader who decides which trainees are placed in which group based on the values, behavior, age and gender structure, level of education and expertise, feelings and other characteristics of the follower. With an in-group leader, there are significantly stronger connections than with out-group members. In-group followers have a greater degree of responsibility, they are committed to the leader and organizational goals, invest more effort and are generally in higher positions directly to the leader.

Out-group members are only executors of work tasks and are characterized by a very formal relationship with the leader. An important factor that can affect the perception of fairness in the organization is the quality level of LMX. The high level of exchange is characterized by a high degree of mutual positive influence, loyalty, contributions, but also the obligation to exchange professional respect and trust, while otherwise low LMX quality is observed, often describing the conditions of the "out-group" (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Schriesheim et al., 1999). Different perceptions of justice are very important for the development of a quality relationship within the organization (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000). If the shared obligations and trust came from justice, the result is a high level of LMX. Exchange of Leaders and Followers - LMX has a dyadic relationship between the presumed and employed, and the higher quality of these relationships improves the organization's efficiency.

Organizational justice - LMX and sector services

One of the important consequences of the high level of organizational justice is commitment to the organization, one of the consequences and a high level of services provided (Nicolaidis, 2008). That is, it enables an organization to have an important competitive advantage in the service market, but it is also an important factor in assessing the quality of the services provided. On the one hand, interactive and distributive justice are most relevant for the development of interpersonal relationships, while procedural justice is more relevant in the development of employee and organization relationships (Masterson et al., 2000). Justice is an important factor that affects the behavior of employees, so equity is necessary in every aspect of the organization, because it affects the performance of an organization. A significant number of research is focused on organizational structures and organizational behavior in the service sector, due to the importance of the human factor in business outcomes. The perception of organizational justice in the work environment can be explained as a trust in the organization with satisfaction of the job and belief in the existence of reasonable (fair) behavior, and it represents the relationship between the employee and the organization. Scandura (1999) pointed out that in-group members perform higher-level jobs if they estimate that the leader was honest in procedures, or that a lack of effective communication between the leader and a member in the perception of organizational justice can slow down the development of high quality LMX. During his research of organizational justice Lee (2001) emphasized the key role of communication in shaping the perception of justice, where employees have lower perceptions of procedural justice, have lower exchange, but also less exchange information, ideas and resources. Also, Cropanzano et al. (2002) found that interaction justice is a larger predictor of LMX, than procedural justice, because procedures in the process of procedural justice offer employees control over the results they have received, but also whether the outcomes are fair. Interaction justice is often associated with results on a personal level (Cropanzano et al., 2002) and with satisfaction with work. In the analysis (Dulebohn et al., 2012) procedural and distributive justice are treated as perceptual outcomes of LMX. Employees whose perception is "weak" in interaction justice, manifested through communication with their superiors, recorded a lower quality of LMX (Williams et al., 2016), because interaction justice is more closely related to the dynamics of relationships within the leader-member relationship.

H1 - All three dimensions of organizational justice are in a positive correlation with the LMX construct.

H2-Predictors LMX are all three dimensions of organizational justice.

METHODOLOGY

Sample and procedures

The questionnaire was received by 270 employees from the service sector (tourist agencies, hotels, restaurants, cafes - bars, public companies, city administration) and 200 questionnaires returned full (74%). Distribution of questionnaires was done electronically and analogously on the territory of Serbia. The questionnaires have been translated from English to Serbian. The sample includes 64% of women and 36% of men, the average age of life is 38.2, or 47% of the respondents are from the age group "30-44". Out of the total number of questionnaires received, 8 respondents did not complete the age of life (4%). The university degree had 111 respondents (55.5%), followed by high school 31 participants (15.5%). The average years of service are 7.85 years, or the most represented is the group of year of service "6-10" from 29%. Demographic characteristics of the sample are given in Table 2.

Tables 2. Characteristics of the sample

	N	%
Gender		
Male	72	36.0
female	128	64.0
Age		
18-29	43	21.5
30-44	94	47.0
45+	55	27.5
Education		
Primary school	1	0.5
Secondary school	31	15.5
College	28	14.0
University	111	55.5
MSci	21	10.5
PhD	8	4.0
Length of services		
Up 5	93	46.5
6-10	58	29.0
11-15	25	12.5
16-20	12	6.0
21+	11	5.5

Measurements

Organizational justice (OJ) - was measured using Niehoff and Moorman (1993) construct in three dimensions. The questionnaire contains 20 observations measured by Likert scale (1 - generally I do not agree to 5 - completely agree).

- Distribution justice was measured with 5 observations;
- Procedural justice was measured with 6 statements and
- Interaction justice was measured with 9 statements.

Leader member exchange Questionnaire (LMX-7) - Measuring the quality of employee relationship with the superiors according to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) is most often used to research theoretical issues, and is filled in by leaders and followers.

The quality of the leader and successor exchange was measured by the LMX-7 questionnaire with a standard five-step Likert scale (I do not agree at all - I completely agree). Respondents were offered seven statements (ajtemma). The questionnaire is homogeneous and has one dimension. Results obtained by LMX-7 have the following meaning: very high of 30-35, high 25-29, medium 20-24, low 15-19 and very low 7-14. The results in the upper range indicate stronger, better exchanges of leaders and followers, and the results in the lower ranges indicate a lower quality exchange. Control variables - half, years of age, years of service and level of education were used, because demographic characteristics can influence the perception of justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Data analysis

Distribution, procedural and interaction justice was used in this study for predictor variables. The criterion variable is LMX. All demographic-control variables, half, year of life, year of service and level of education, were used to determine whether there are significantities. The study data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlations, regression multiple analyzes, and genrectoral variance analysis. Pyrson's correlation coefficient is the established relationships / relationships for the indicated variables, while by regression the contribution of each predictor of variable in the explanation of the

criterion of the variable was tested. Anova was used to determine whether there were differences between control variables, LMX, and three dimensions of organizational justice.

RESULTS

The average overall response for the LMX-7 construct is 22 and concluded that the relationship between the leader and the followers in the service sector of medium quality. Descriptive statistics and correlation of variables are presented in Table 3. Employees in the service sector assessed the procedural justice as the lowest. The decision-making procedure, information collected by the superiors, but also the consistency of the implementation of decisions on all employees is not at a significant level. At the examined sample, interaction justice is at the most important level, because the focus is on interpersonal relations - the interaction between employees and the client, as well as all employees within the organization. The correlation between the level of exchange of leaders and followers and all three dimensions of organizational justice is significant. Pearson's correlation coefficient revealed the following:

a weaker link between LMX levels and distributive justice ($r(200) = .56, \rho < 0.01$);

a moderate correlation between the level of LMX and procedural justice ($r(200) = .74, \rho < 0.01$) i

high linkage between LMX levels and interaction justice ($r(200) = .80, \rho < 0.01$)

The results showed that there is a significant connection between all three dimensions of organizational justice, and the weaker connection ($r(200) = .50, \rho < 0.01$) between procedural and distributive justice, then a weaker connection ($r(200) = .53, \rho < 0.01$) between the interaction and distribution, while the high correlation between interaction and procedural justice was observed ($r(200) = .83, \rho < 0.01$).

Tables 3. Mean, standard deviation, correlation among variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4
DJ	3.27	.83	(.74)			
PJ	3.06	.81	.50**	(.70)		
IJ	3.36	1.08	.53**	.83**	(.97)	
LMX	3.14	1.04	.56**	.74**	.80**	(.94)

N=200; **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; M-mean; SD-standard deviation;

()-Cronbach alpha; LMX-Leader-member exchange; DJ-Distributive justice;

PJ-Procedural justice; IJ-Interacional justice.

Tables 4. Multiple regression model

Model	R	R ²	Variables	β	t	ρ
SS	.82	.67	DJ	.12	2.55	.01
			PJ	.22	3.01	.00
			IJ	.55	7.24	.00

Note: Dependent variable is LMX; SS-service sector; significant at the 0.05 level;

R²-coeff. determination; ρ -value < .05; β -beta standard regression coeff.

The coefficient of multiple correlation (Table 4) is $R = .82$, while the prediction criterion describes about 67% of the variability of the criterion variable. Based on the results obtained, it can be said that there is a high level of correlation between the criteria and the predictor variables. Statistically significant beta coefficient with a criterion variable have all three dimensions of organizational justice, distribution, procedural and interaction justice ($R^2 = .82, F(3,196) = 134.29, \rho < .05$), that is, the higher β coefficient, in so far as the intensity of the prediction more significant. The

The Role of Organizational Justice in Relationship
Between Leader and Member (Lmx) in the Service Sector

obtained results show that the perception of justice in the service sector significantly influences the quality of the level of exchange of leaders and employees.

Analysis of the variance (Tables 5 and 6) shows that the main effect of the dimensions of organizational justice and the group of years of life is $F(3, 196) = 3.17$, $p < .05$, for distributive justice it is $\eta^2 = .033$, that is, for procedural justice $\eta^2 = .032$. Post-hoc analysis by Dunnett's test shows differences in age group "18-29" and group years "45+" ($p = .04$) in distributive justice, while the difference in age group "30-44" and group years "45+" are significantly different ($p = .05$) for procedural justice. The effect of size (η) for groups of years in both dimensions of justice is small.

Table 5. One-way ANOVA between dimension of organizational justice and age groups

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
DJ	Between Groups	4.30	2	2.15	3.17	.04
	Within Groups	128.15	189	.68		
	Total	132.45	191			
PJ	Between Groups	3.82	2	1.91	3.15	.05
	Within Groups	114.78	189	.61		
	Total	118.60	191			
IJ	Between Groups	4.87	2	2.43	2.11	.12
	Within Groups	217.70	189	1.15		
	Total	222.56	191			

Table 6. Multiple comparisons between dimension of organizational justice age groups

Dependent Variable	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
DJ	18-29	45+	.40*	.17	.03	.03	.77
	30-44	45+	.08	.14	.77	-.23	.39
PJ	18-29	45+	.33	.16	.07	-.02	.68
	30-44	45+	.30*	.13	.04	.01	.60
IJ	18-29	45+	.34	.22	.21	-.15	.82
	30-44	45+	.36	.18	.09	-.05	.76

Note: *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level;

Dunnett t-tests treat one group as a control, and compare all other groups against it.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents, such as gender, years of service and level of education, do not have significant differences with the perceptions of all three dimensions of organizational justice, nor with the dimension of LMX.

DISCUSSION

The relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice can be interpreted to mean that, although it is a service sector, the structure of the organization, as well as their appearance on the market, is different. In organizations that are market-oriented (tourist agencies, hotels, cafes, restaurants, etc.), all three components of justice are important because it is an important client, as well as profit.

On the other hand, public organizations (public companies, administration, etc.) that are not profit-oriented, an important dimension of justice is interactive because

they depend on good interpersonal relationships. The perception of organizational justice has three aspects of procedure, decision and interpersonal relations. All three dimensions of organizational justice are in significant correlation with the level of exchange between leaders and followers in the service sector. Recent LMX quality studies have shown that in- and out group members can influence the perception of all three dimensions of organizational justice, but individually (Scandura, 1999; Jackson, 2008). As already highlighted in the work, high quality of exchange of leaders and followers is accompanied by trust, commitment and respect, which is associated with procedural and interaction justice. In contrast, the low quality of LMX can be described by the care of an individual for himself, as well as the care for his own outcomes, which is reflected in the weaker perception of distributive justice.

If members of the group consider their superiors to have equal relations with them, according to the implementation of procedures, the distribution of information, then members of the group will share the same perceptions about the justice of the leaders (Colquitt et al., 2001; Mayer, 2004; Colquitt et al., 2005). Such findings were obtained on a sample of a smaller scale and demographically homogenous, as is the case in this study. However, Erodgan et al. (2006) commented that the relationship between LMX and procedural justice is possible if leaders are empowered to devise a process flow, that there are conceptual overlaps of procedural and interaction justice that complicates research within a single study. In the last decade, the role of intermediaries (mediators) in the dimensions of organizational justice between LMX and other constructs, such as job satisfaction, organizational behavior, dedication, etc., was the most explored. H1 hypothesis is fully confirmed.

Although the assumption that the dimensions of organizational justice are predictors of the LMX level, the obtained results confirm the hypothesis H2. LMX level quality predictors are all three dimensions of organizational justice, that is, employees perceive righteousness and influence the quality of relationships with their superiors. According to Masterson and associates (2000) interactive justice is a powerful predictor of the LMX level in relation to other dimensions of organizational justice, which was confirmed on the sample tested. By looking at the service sector, leaders treat their employees appropriately, and the decisions they make are expected, and therefore affect the quality of exchanges between leaders and followers, as beta coefficients are significant. Although this is not the case in all service subsectors, most of the examined questions of relations with their superiors are assessed by interpersonal relations.

Characteristics such as gender, age, year of work and level of education in relation to the dimensions of organizational justice and LMX, in this study have different results. Significance was recorded only between years of age in distributive and procedural justice. The analysis of the variance showed that other characteristics of the examinees have no significant relationship with interaction justice and LMX.

CONCLUSION

A quality relationship between leaders and followers produces a series of consensus, such as a positive relationship with job satisfaction, organizational attachment and excellence, and reduces the intention of employees to change or leave the organization. Resources (people and money) in today's business environment have a crucial importance for the survival of the organization on the market in the service sector.

The perception of justice is seen by employees through an exchange-communication, primarily with their superiors, but also with associates. In the service sector, an indicator of the level of exchange between managers and employees are all

three dimensions of organizational justice, distribution, procedural and interaction justice. Regardless of the fact that the services are the main "product" of this sector, the functioning, and the very organizational outcomes themselves are significantly related to organizational justice. If employees see themselves as part of an organization, they are likely to manage successes and failures with the organization. In such an environment, management plays an inescapable role. Researchers have opinions on justice, that it does not fully allow for the concept of organizational justice to be perceived as there is no concrete measure to assess the contribution of employees in the organization, and that it is therefore difficult to give a concrete answer to justice (Cropanzano et al., 2001).

LIMITATIONS

This study examines the relationship between organizational justice and LMX in the service sector. The sample taken is relatively small, so the group is homogeneous, only one sector is tested. The results obtained should not be generalized, but the number of samples and constructs should be increased, in order to examine relations more closely.

REFERENCE

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267–299. New York: Academic Press.
- Bayles, M. D. (1990). *Procedural justice: Allocating to individuals*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer academic publishers.
- Bies, R. J., Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1, 43–55.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278–321.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H. & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425–445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J. & Scott, B. A. (2005). Organizational justice: Where do we stand? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice Mahwah*, 589 – 619. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2012). Organizational Justice. In S.W.J. Kozlowski (Ed.). *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology*, 1, 526-547. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cropanzano, R. & Byrne, Z. S. (2000). Workplace justice and the dilemma of organizational citizenship. In M. Van Vugt, M. Snyder, T. R. Tyler & A. Biel (Eds.), *Cooperation in modern society: Promoting the welfare of communities, states and organizations*, 142–161. NY: Rutledge.
- Cropanzano, R. & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 12, 317–372. New York: Wiley.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A. & Chen, P.Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, 27, 3, 324-351.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E. & Gilliland, S.W., (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34-48.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G. & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership with informal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dienesch, R.M. & Liden, R.C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 618-634.
- Dulebohn, J.H., Bommer, W.H., Liden, R.C., Brouer, R.L. & Ferris, G.R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38 (6), 1715-1759.
- Erdogan, B., (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 555-578.
- Graen, B. G. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. Dunnette (ed.). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Grean, B. G. & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175-208.
- Graen, B. G. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective, *Management Department Faculty Publications*, Paper 57, Nebraska.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81–103.
- Jackson, E. M. (2008). Integrating leader-member exchange and organizational justice: Why justice depends on relationship quality. College of Arts and Sciences, University of South Florida, Department of Arts. University of South Florida.
- Lee, J. (2001). Leader-member exchange, perceived organizational justice, and cooperative communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14 (4), 574-589.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, and R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research*, 27–55. New York: Plenum Press.
- Liden, R. C. & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: an empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43–72.
- Lind, E. A. & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M. & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738–748.
- Mayer, D. M. (2004). Are you in or out? A group-level examination of the effects of LMX on justice and customer satisfaction. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Nicolaides, A. (2008). Services quality, empowerment and ethics in the South African hospitality and tourism industry and the road ahead using ISO 9000/1, *University of Zululand*, Mhlathuze.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527–556.
- Samad, S. (2006). Procedural and distributive justice: differential effects on employees' work outcomes. *The Business Review*, Cambridge, 5 (2), 212-218.
- Scandura, T.A. (1999). Rethinking leader-member exchange: an organizational justice perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10 (1), 25-40.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L. & Cogliser, C.C. (1999). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Research: A Comprehensive Review of Theory, Measurement, and Data-Analytic Practices. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 63-113.
- Srivastava, U. R. (2015). Multiple Dimensions of Organizational Justice and Work-Related Outcomes among Health-Care Professionals. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 5, 666-685.
- Sweeney, P. D. & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23–40.
- Thibaut, J. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williams, E. A., Scandura, T. A., Pissarias, S. & Woods, J. M. (2016). Justice perceptions, leader-member exchange, and upward influence tactics. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37 (7), 1000-1015.

Submitted:
04.06.2019

Revised:
13.12.2019

Accepted and published online
16.12.2019