



Examining the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Administrative Staff Performance: A Case Study of Kabul University

Zubair Azimi¹, Hikmatullah Wahidi², Sayed Nematullah Hashimi³, Hamdullah Quraishi⁴

^{1,3,4}*Kabul University, Department of Public Policy, Faculty of Public Policy & Administration, Kabul, AF*

²*Kabul University, Department of Development Studies, Faculty of Public Policy & Administration, Kabul, AF*

Received: Nov 2, 2025

Revised: Dec 14, 2025

Accepted: Jan 17, 2026

Published: Jan 17, 2026

Keywords

- Distributive Justice
- Employee Performance
- Interactional Justice
- Organizational Justice
- Procedural Justice

Abstract: The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and employee performance among administrative staff of Kabul University. This study is applied in nature and descriptive-correlational in terms of data collection method. The statistical population included all administrative staff of Kabul University, a total of 393 people. Using simple random sampling and Morgan table, a sample of 196 people was selected. Standard questionnaires including the organizational justice questionnaire of Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and the employee performance questionnaire of Hersey and Goldsmith (1981) were used to collect data. The reliability of the questionnaires was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha and a coefficient of 0.80 was obtained. The content validity of both questionnaires was evaluated by several management experts. The Spearman correlation analysis revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between organizational justice and employee performance ($r = 0.618, p = 0.000$). The initial sub-hypotheses yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.327, with a significance level of 0.000, thereby implying a positive relationship between distributive justice and employee performance. Concerning the second sub-hypotheses, the correlation coefficient was 0.5350, with a significance level of 0.000, which suggests a moderate positive relationship between procedural justice and employee performance. Furthermore, the third sub-hypotheses produced a correlation coefficient of 0.850, accompanied by a significance level of 0.000, thus indicating a strong positive correlation between interactional justice and employee performance. Consequently, these results suggest that the effective implementation of organizational justice cultivates increased employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which subsequently enhances organizational effectiveness.

To Cite this Article: Azimi, Z., Wahidi, H., Hashimi, S. N. & Quraishi, H (2026). Examining the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Administrative Staff Performance: A Case Study of Kabul University. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 3(1), 15-31.

<https://doi.org/10.62810/jssh.v3i1.215>



Copyright © 2026 Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

The university is the most important place for learning, research, and social agreement. It is the most important place for the well-being and intellectual growth of societies (Rabasa, 2021). Universities are complex institutions that not only provide higher education but also

✉ Corresponding author E-mail: hikmatullahwahidi@yahoo.com

Available online at <https://jssh.edu.af/jssh/article/view/215>

rely on good communication between academics, students, and administrative personnel to carry out their tasks (Barnett, 2022). In this structure, administrative personnel are a key asset for the company, universities and other people-oriented institutions work hard to improve their performance. Organizational performance is the sum of all the actions of employees over a certain period of time that help the company reach its important goals (Motowildo, 2003). More specifically, performance is the level to which people or groups meet expectations by completing tasks according to set standards and goals (Wardana et al., 2023). Improving performance is necessary for an organization to be successful and competitive (Riak & Bill, 2022).

Scholarly literature has always stressed that many organizational characteristics affect employee performance. Organizational fairness, in particular, has been a focus of research in the social and behavioral sciences. For decades, people have known that justice affects how well employees do their jobs. This shows that it is both a basic human value and a vital factor in how well an organization works (Farjad & Hosseini, 2018). Organizational justice is the sense of fairness in an organization's rules, practices, and how employees are treated by their coworkers (Farmer et al., 2003).

When workers think and behave according to practices that are fairer to the firm, it helps the company do better (Lee & Rhee, 2023). People who work for public organizations, where there are severe regulations and not enough resources, come up with their own opinions on fairness depending on the manner in which they feel about the organization and their private sentiments (Wilkin, 2023). Kabul University has a long history and an excellent track record in the country, but it has to do better and reach international standards. Because of this, it is necessary for businesses to put money into fair and open human resource processes, such as recruiting, maintaining workers, and helping them develop (Harper et al., 2009). This will help schools remain ahead of the competition and reach their educational objectives. Not much study has been done on how equality at work affects how Afghan public workers conduct their duties. It is really important to fill this gap so that institutions can do better and leaders may employ evidence-based solutions.

Most people agree that companies that treat their workers fairly do better and are more productive in today's competitive world (Chou et al., 2013). Organizational justice is how workers feel about how effectively the activities, choices, and relationships of the company follow rules of fairness and equality (Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). It encompasses perceptions of fairness about procedures, outcomes, and interpersonal interactions (Greenberg, 1990). It is widely acknowledged that it is a complex concept including distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). People's own ideas about how companies function affect these perceptions, which have a huge influence on how workers feel and how successfully they accomplish their jobs (Croppanzano & Ambrose, 2015). Researchers discuss four principal forms of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and informational justice (Croppanzano & Ambrose,

2015). Each component elucidates the influence of individuals' perceptions of justice on their attitudes, behaviors, and organizational outcomes.

Distributive justice, which first appeared in the mid-1960s, is the concept that an organization need to equitably divide its resources, incentives, and chances (Nikiuluw et al., 2019). Research indicates that distributive justice significantly influences employee performance in various settings (Khan et al., 2023). Moreover, studies suggest that it can have both direct and indirect effects. These effects are influenced by factors like job satisfaction and commitment within the organization (Tyofyan et al., 2022; & Dalimunthe et al., 2023). According to theories of interpersonal interaction and social justice in organizations, employees who feel a greater sense of distributive justice, especially in the public sector, tend to be more committed. This commitment positively affects their attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, distributive justice is a key factor that influences employee performance and the overall results of the organization (Harijanto et al., 2022)

Procedural justice refers to employees' perceptions of the fairness of organizational decision-making processes, while distributive justice, based on Adams' equity theory, focuses on the fairness of resource allocation. Employees are more likely to accept unequal outcomes when procedures are perceived as fair and impartial (Haqiqi et al., 2009). Trust in fair processes encourages employees to consider long-term consequences and tolerate unfavorable decisions (Greenberg, 1987; Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). Conversely, perceptions of unfairness, prejudice, or unethical practices cultivate sentiments of injustice, thereby diminishing dedication, confidence, and productivity (Leventhal, 1980; Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). Empirical investigations corroborate a positive correlation between procedural justice and employee performance, underscoring its significance in augmenting organizational efficacy (Kim & Park, 2017).

Interactive justice, represents an important aspect of organizational justice that focuses on fair interpersonal behavior and transparent information sharing, as distinct from distributive and procedural justice (Bies, 2015). Empirical evidence shows that fair and respectful interactions increase acceptance of managerial decisions and tolerance of unfavorable consequences (Greenberg, 1994), thereby improving employee performance (Roop and Cropanzano, 2002). Recent studies further confirm the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and performance, highlighting its important role in promoting constructive employee behavior and organizational effectiveness (Dos Santos et al., 2023).

Performance is often characterized as the achievement or success of designated activities and tasks (Haqiqi et al., 2009). People frequently think of it as the outcome of how hard you work, how well you are at your job, and how you see your position (Trense, 2010). Organizational performance is the degree to which the outputs of an organization match its aims and objectives (Kim et al., 2013). It also shows how well people are working together to reach those goals (Yu, 2023). Performance assessment is necessary for comprehending organizational processes and facilitating informed management choices and remedial

measures when required (Jenatabadi, 2015). To improve employee performance, you need to find the right performance assessment indicators and understand the main things that affect how well the organization works. These are the most important things to do to make the company work better overall. The historical history of organizational performance studies is categorized into six sub-areas, as shown in Table 1, illustrating the progression of theoretical frameworks regarding organizational performance indicators (Jenatabadi, 2015).

Table 1. Evolution of Theories on Organizational Performance Indicators

No.	Organizational Performance Indicator	Researchers	Period
1	Effectiveness is knowing that reaching objectives is a key part of how well an organization does its job.	Etzioni, Chandler, & Thompson	1960s
2	Agreement: Putting customer satisfaction first when judging how well a business is doing	Lawrence & Lorsch	1969s
3	Make sure your employees are happy, motivated, and able to reach the company's objectives.	Leighton, Katz, & Kahn	1970s
4	Paying attention to how well resources are used and how well objectives are met	Giorgopoulos & Tannenbaum	1980s
5	Considering the needs of workers and other stakeholders, such as shareholders, customers, and employees	Adams, Harrison, & Freeman	1990s
6	Focus on agreement (stakeholder satisfaction), efficacy, and efficiency.	Peterson	Early 21st century

Hershey and Goldsmith's study is one of the most important ones on the many aspects of how well an organization works. According to the ACHIEVE model, they split organizational performance into seven areas (Hershey & Goldsmith, 1980):

- Ability: This is the knowledge, work experience, and natural talent that lets someone do their job well.
- Role Clarity (Cognition): This part is all about knowing what your precise objectives and work plans are, what your priorities are, and how to accept duties, including when, when, and how to do them.
- Organizational Support: This includes the help that workers need to do their jobs well and on time. Budget allocations, equipment, tools, and other resources that are needed to help work get done are some of the most important variables.
- Motivation: This is the internal drive that makes people want to do things outside of themselves. It may be physical, intellectual, or artistic. Motivation is what drives people to do things that help the organization reach its objectives.
- Performance Appraisal: This aspect encompasses both official and informal feedback systems that enable people to assess their daily job outcomes, facilitate improvement, and acknowledge accomplishments.
- Credibility: Making sure that choices are in line with established laws, norms, and acknowledged company principles gives actions uniformity and validity.

- Environmental Compliance: This is the organization's capacity to manage and react to outside elements that have a direct impact on performance, such as competition, changes in the market, social and cultural issues, policies, laws, and rules.

Organizational justice, which includes distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational aspects, significantly influences employees' workplace attitudes, motivations, and actions (Greenberg, 1990; Colquitt, 2001). Employees who perceive fairness in resource distribution, organizational processes, interpersonal interactions, and information dissemination are more inclined to experience feelings of value and commitment. In accordance with social exchange theory, equitable treatment from the organization fosters employee responses characterized by increased effort, commitment, and performance, whereas perceived injustice can diminish motivation and work efficiency (Blau, 2017). Empirical research consistently corroborates these theoretical viewpoints, demonstrating that elevated perceptions of organizational justice correlate with enhanced job performance, satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2015). Conversely, procedural justice cultivates trust in the impartiality of organizational processes. Furthermore, interactional justice enhances interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, information justice, which promotes transparency and openness, contributes to these effects, ultimately leading to improved performance, the main-hypothesis is:

- There is a significant positive relationship between organizational justice and employee performance.

Distributive justice, as defined by (Colquitt, 2001), pertains to the perceived equity inherent in the allocation of outcomes, encompassing aspects like compensation, benefits, and acknowledgment. Employees who believe their contributions are justly acknowledged and compensated tend to experience heightened feelings of value, motivation, and dedication to the attainment of organizational objectives. Research supports the idea that fairly distributing resources is linked to better job performance, increased commitment, and higher overall satisfaction (Arumdan, 2022; Colquitt et al., 2001). Employees who believe that rewards and recognition are commensurate with their efforts are more likely to exhibit higher levels of performance, the first subsequent sub-hypothesis is;

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between distributive justice and employee performance.

Procedural justice pertains to the perceived equity inherent in organizational decision-making processes and procedures (Khtatbeh et al., 2020). Transparent, consistent, and unbiased procedures foster employee trust in the organization, mitigate stress, and encourage accountability. Empirical investigations indicate that equitable workplace procedures correlate with heightened employee motivation, enhanced teamwork, and improved job performance (Khtatbeh et al., 2020; Arumdan, 2022). Consequently, when employees perceive organizational procedures as fair, they are more likely to demonstrate increased engagement and commitment to achieving superior performance. In accordance with this premise, the second subsequent sub-hypothesis is:

H2: There is significant positive relationship exists between procedural justice and employee performance.

Interactional justice involves the fairness and quality of interpersonal treatment that employees receive from their superiors and colleagues; this includes respect, dignity, and transparency (Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2015). Positive interpersonal interactions improve job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and a sense of belonging, which in turn enhances employee performance (Khtatbeh et al., 2020; Arumdan, 2022). Employees who feel respected and valued in their daily interactions are more motivated to help their organization succeed. The results support a positive connection between interactional justice and performance, the third subsequent sub-hypothesis is:

H3: There is a significant positive relationship between interactional justice and employee performance.

The main objective of this study is;

- To investigate the correlation between organizational justice and the performance of administrative staff, and to delineate the principal elements of organizational justice that facilitate the improvement of staff performance at Kabul University.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a descriptive-correlational method. The research included all administrative staff at Kabul University, totaling 393 employees. A simple random sampling method was used, and a sample of 196 people was selected, following Morgan's table. Data analysis incorporated both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. To assess the study's hypotheses, Spearman's correlation coefficient was utilized in the inferential analysis. Furthermore, the content validity of the questionnaires was ascertained through consultations with multiple management specialists. We assessed reliability using Cronbach's alpha, calculated with SPSS software (version 25). Data were collected using standardized, validated questionnaires administered in person. A high proportion of the distributed questionnaires were returned fully completed.

The research instruments included the Employee Performance Questionnaire developed by Hersey and Goldsmith (1981) and the Organizational Justice Questionnaire designed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), both of which are described in detail in the following section.

Employee Performance Questionnaire

Employee performance was assessed using the standardized Employee Performance Questionnaire, which Hersey and Goldsmith developed in 1981. This questionnaire contains 42 questions divided into seven components: Ability (1-5 items), role clarity (5-11 items), organizational support (12-16 items), motivation (17-22 items), performance appraisal (23-31 items), credibility (32-37 items), and environmental (38-42 items). The questionnaire was scored using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 meant "Strongly Disagree" and 5 meant

"Strongly Agree." Cronbach's alpha was used to check the questionnaire's reliability, and it was found to be 0.80.

Organizational Justice Questionnaire

The Organizational Justice Questionnaire was developed by Niehoff & Moorman (1993). This questionnaire consists of three components: distributive justice (43-48 items), procedural justice (49-55 items), and interactional justice (56-62 items). It includes 20 items in total. To score the questionnaire, a five-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire's reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of 0.80.

FINDINGS

Table 3: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov

Variables	Statistic	Sig.
Distributive Justice	0.110	.000
Procedural Justice	0.086	.003
Interactional Justice	0.070	.034
Employee's Performance	0.57	200

Based on Table 3, the dependent variable (employee performance) exhibited a normal distribution. In contrast, the components of organizational justice did not. Therefore, Spearman's correlation coefficient was employed to test the hypotheses, as it is more appropriate for variables that do not meet the assumption of normality. This method allows for a precise evaluation of the connections between different aspects of organizational justice and how well employees perform.

Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	20–25	72	40.9%
	26–30	68	38.6%
	31–35	20	11.4%
	Above 35	16	9.1%
	Total	176	100%
Education	High School	32	18.2%
	Bachelor's	93	52.8%
	Master's	43	24.4%
	Doctorate	8	4.5%
	Total	176	100%
Work Experience	Less than 5 years	49	27.8%
	6–10 years	53	30.1%

11–15 years	49	27.8%
More than 15 years	25	14.2%
Total	176	100%

Table 4 presents the demographic profile of the study's participants. Regarding age, the largest group, comprising 40.9% of the sample, falls within the 20-25 age bracket. This is succeeded by the 26-30 age group, which accounts for 38.6% of the participants. Furthermore, 11.4% of the participants are aged 31-35, while those over 35 years old represent 9.1% of the sample. This shows that the sample consists mainly of young employees.

In terms of educational background, most participants have a bachelor's degree (52.8%), while 24.4% have a master's degree, 18.2% have completed high school education, and 4.5% have a doctorate. These findings show that the majority of participants are well-educated and that higher education levels are common in the sample.

In terms of work experience, 30.1% of the participants have 6-10 years of experience, 27.8% have less than 5 years, and 27.8% have 11-15 years of experience. Only 14.2% of participants had more than 15 years of experience. While this distribution shows a balanced mix of employees with varying levels of professional experience, the largest group had moderate experience. Overall, the demographic profile indicates that the study sample consisted mostly of young, educated employees with moderate work experience.

Hypotheses Testing

Table 5. Spearman's Correlation Results for Examining the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Performance

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Significance
Organizational Justice Employee's Performance	0.618**	0.000

Table 5 shows a significant positive, relationship between organizational justice and employee performance. The Spearman correlation coefficient, which was computed as 0.618 (Sig = 0.000), indicates a statistically significant positive correlation between organizational justice and employee performance. As a result, the null is rejected, and the main- is validated at the 95% confidence level. This main- proposes a significant positive relationship between organizational justice and employee performance within Kabul University.

Table 6. Spearman's Correlation Results for Examining the Relationship between Distributive Justice and Employee Performance

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Significance
Distributive Justice Employee's Performance	0.327**	0.000

Table 6 shows a weak but positive relationship between distributive justice and employee performance. The Spearman correlation coefficient, which was computed as 0.327 (Sig = 0.000), indicates a statistically significant positive correlation between distributive justice and employee performance. As a result, the null is rejected, and the initial sub- is validated at the 95% confidence level. This sub- proposes a significant positive relationship between perceptions of distributive justice and employee performance within Kabul University.

Table 7. Spearman's Correlation Results for Examining the Relationship between Procedural Justice and Employee Performance

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Significance
Procedural Justice Employee's Performance	**5350.	0.000

Table 7 shows a significant positive, relationship between procedural justice and employee performance. The Spearman correlation coefficient, which was computed as 0.5350 (Sig = 0.000), indicates a statistically significant positive correlation between procedural justice and employee performance. As a result, the null is rejected, and the initial sub- is validated at the 95% confidence level. This sub- proposes a significant positive relationship between procedural justice and employee performance within Kabul University.

Table 8. Spearman's Correlation Results for Examining the Relationship between Interactional Justice and Employee Performance

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Significance
Interactional Justice Employee's Performance	0.850**	0.000

Table 8 shows significant positive, relationship between interactional justice and employee performance. The Spearman correlation coefficient, which was computed as 0.850 (Sig = 0.000), indicates a statistically significant positive correlation between interactional justice and employee performance. As a result, the null is rejected, and the initial sub- is supported at the 95% confidence level. This sub- proposes a significant, strong positive relationship between interactional justice and employee performance within Kabul University.

Table 9. Summary of Spearman's Correlation Test on the Relationship between Organizational Justice Components and Employee Performance

Variables	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Employee's Performance	Organizational Justice
Distributive Justice	1.000				
Procedural Justice	.620**	1.000			
Interactional Justice	.440**	.618**	1.000		
Employee Performance	.327**	.535**	.645**	1.000	
Organizational Justice	.782**	.869**	.850**	.618**	1.000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Table 10: Summary of Hypotheses and Findings

Hypotheses No.	Type of Justice	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance Level (p)	Nature of Relationship	Summary Interpretation of Findings
Main Hypotheses		0.618	0.000	Positive, Moderate	A positive relationship exists between organizational justice and employee performance
Sub-Hypotheses 1	Distributive Justice	0.327	0.000	Positive, Weak	Distributive justice has a weak but significant positive relationship with employee performance.
Sub-Hypotheses 2	Procedural Justice	0.535	0.000	Positive, Moderate	Procedural justice has a moderate, significant positive relationship with employee performance.
Sub-Hypotheses 3	Interactional Justice	0.850	0.000	Positive, Strong	Interactional justice has a strong, significant positive relationship with employee performance.

DISCUSSION

This investigation seeks to explore the correlation between the performance of administrative personnel at Kabul University and their perceptions of organizational fairness. Employing Spearman correlation analysis, a positive association was identified between these two variables, thus supporting the assertion that an enhanced perception of fairness within the organization is linked to superior employee performance.

Therefore, the main of the study, which indicates the existence of a positive and strong relationship between employee performance and their perception of organizational justice, was confirmed. The results obtained are consistent with the research conducted by (Colquitt et al., 2001; Nix & Wolf, 2016; Mehmud & Ahmad, 2016; & Shrestha et al., 2024). When fairness and justice are established in the organizational structure, the result positively affects the performance of employees of the educational institution. Employees who feel that they work in a fair organizational environment are usually more motivated, more satisfied with their work, and more committed to the organization. This situation ultimately leads to improved performance outcomes.

The research findings also shows a positive relationship between distributive justice and employee performance, which is consistent with research conducted by (Mehmood & Ahmad, 2016; Shrestha et al., & 2024; & O'Callaghan et al., 2024) and research conducted by (Pakpahan et al., 2020). According to exchange theory, individuals expect the organization to compensate them for what they bring to the organization, including educational credentials, expertise, skills, abilities, and anything else, and this compensation for services is mostly through rewards and job benefits. Therefore, meeting employees' expectations in terms of distributive justice can be an important step toward greater employee satisfaction and, as a result, greater motivation in their behavior and performance on the job. The study's findings also show a positive relationship between procedural justice and employee performance. This is consistent with the work of (Mehmood & Ahmad, 2016; Shrestha et al., 2024; & O'Callaghan et al., 2024). However, these results differ from those of (Pakpahan et al., 2020).

When employees perceive procedures and work practices as equitable and transparent, their motivation and dedication are substantially heightened, thereby mitigating stress and anxiety. These positive circumstances foster greater collaboration and teamwork, while simultaneously diminishing the probability of conflict. Furthermore, administrative staff operating within a fair environment, governed by established procedures, are more predisposed to accountability and responsibility, which, in turn, contributes to improved work quality and performance outcomes.

Another dimension of organizational justice, namely interactional or transactional justice, is also the subject of the third of this study, which, considering the findings, shows a positive and significant relationship with employee performance. The results align with the work of (Colquitt et al., 2001; Nix & Wolf, 2016; Mehmood & Ahmad, 2016; & Shrestha et al., 2024). Respectful and fair treatment increases employees' job satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Also, interactional justice can help strengthen positive relationships between colleagues and improve the atmosphere of cooperation. Therefore, a fair and respectful work environment naturally enhances the performance of office workers. Therefore, paying attention to interactional justice is equally important and, along with procedural justice, can lead to better results in the performance of Kabul University's administrative staff.

CONCLUSION

Today, employees are always interacting with the organization they work in, and a sense of organizational justice, as one of the basic needs, provides a suitable platform for their development and promotion, their better performance, and thereby improving the quality of services and improving the standard of living in society. In this regard, the present study examined the effect of organizational justice on the performance of administrative staff at Kabul University, and its results indicate the existence of a positive and strong relationship between the components of organizational justice and employee performance. As a result, the main of the study was confirmed, and the importance of employees' perception of organizational justice and its effect on their job satisfaction and motivation was emphasized.

Since the research findings indicate the existence of a significant positive relationship between distributive justice and employee performance, it can be said that employees who feel that their compensation for services is fair and proportionate to their efforts and capabilities are usually more satisfied with their work and are more committed to the university. Therefore, by establishing and implementing transparent and fair policies on the distribution of rewards and holding regular consultative meetings with employees, university leadership can listen to their opinions and take them into account in improving the fairness and justice policy at the university level, thereby improving employee performance and increasing the efficiency of the administration. It should also be remembered that periodic assessments of the sense of distributive justice can also contribute to continuous improvement in this area.

Of course, it should be noted that procedural justice also plays a key role in improving the performance of administrative staff. When employees feel that organizational procedures and practices are fair and transparent, this feeling leads to increased motivation and reduced stress and anxiety. Therefore, it is essential that procedures and bills are continuously reviewed, documented, and clarified in order to achieve justice, and training courses are held to familiarize employees with these procedures. Rather, it is necessary to create effective mechanisms to collect opinions from employees about these documents to help them continuously improve them and thereby help improve the feelings and performance of employees. The completion of the justice triangle requires not only the observation of justice in resource distribution and procedures, but also the reflection of justice in interactions and behavior. Research indicates that both interactional justice and transactional justice significantly impact the performance of administrative staff at Kabul University. Other research conducted in the field also shows that an environment that encourages respectful and fair interactions can strengthen the feeling of value and respect in employees. To create such an environment, it is recommended that the university can develop a culture of positive interaction and organize team-building programs and activities to promote a sense of cooperation and solidarity among employees and promote a sense of fair treatment, which can help improve interactions and reduce tensions in the workplace by paying attention to the cultural and personality diversity of employees.

Finally, it can be concluded that the results of this study indicate that organizational justice improves employee performance, increases job satisfaction, creates and improves motivation, and ultimately reduces the rate of leaving the organization. This justice also increases organizational interest and commitment and can ultimately improve the overall productivity of organizations. Therefore, paying attention to the principles and dimensions of organizational justice as a key factor in improving the performance and efficiency of organizations is essential.

The present study's findings are subject to certain limitations that should be acknowledged when interpreting and extrapolating the results. Specifically, Kabul University's administrative personnel exclusively provided the data, and temporal and financial constraints limited the research. While the response rate was roughly 95%, the non-participation of certain key stakeholders is noteworthy.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

This research paper was a collaborative effort among the four co-authors, each contributing distinct and significant components to the study.

- Zubair Azimi conceptualized and supervised the study and took primary responsibility for major sections, including data collection, the Introduction, and literature review.
- Hikmatullah Wahidi contributed to specific sections of the article and was responsible for preparing and organizing the conclusion, limitations, suggestions, reference list, language editing and prepared the final manuscript.

- Sayed Nematullah Hashimi investigated and analyzed the data
- Hamdullah Quraishi carried out error correction throughout the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors sincerely thank the administrative staff of Kabul University for their participation, the university management for their support, and academic mentors and colleagues for their guidance and feedback. We also appreciate the encouragement of family and friends; whose support was invaluable throughout the research process.

FUNDING INFORMATION

No funding was received for this manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no financial, commercial, or personal conflicts of interest related to the publication of this article.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

Alqahtani, M. S. (2022). The Impact of Interactional Justice on Employees' Job Performance and Assisting Behaviour. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, 19(3), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v19i3.5321>

Armstrong, M. (2007). Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines (S. Safari & A. Vahabian, Trans.). Tehran: Jihad Daneshgahi Organization.

Arumdan, K. (2022). The effect of organizational justice and employee satisfaction: A bibliometric analysis of the literature. *Asian Journal of Economics and Business*, 1(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.53402/ajebm.v1i3.245>

Barnett, R. (2022,). Universidad: 245 definiciones. *Ebate Universitario*, 12(21), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.59471/debate20227>

Bies, R. J. (2015). Interactional justice: Looking backward, looking forward. In R. S. Cropanzano & M. L. Ambrose (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*. *Oxford University Press*, 1, 89–108, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199981410.013.4>

Blau, P. (2017). Exchange and power in social life. Routledge.

Chou, S.-C., Chou, T.-Y., Jiang, J., & Kelin, G. (2013). The organizational citizenship behavior of IS personnel: Does organizational justice matter? *Information & Management*, 50(8), 627–633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.02.002>

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., and Ng, K. Y. (2001), Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>

Corpanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. (2015). Organizational justice: Where we have been and where we are going. The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace. *Oxford University Press*, 1021–1039 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199603329.013.0049>

Dalimunthe, L., Limakrisna, N., & Lusiana. (2023). Employee Performance Model Through Job Satisfaction: Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice at the Padang Sidempuan City Health Office. *International journal of social science and business*, 7(2), 397-405. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijssb.v7i2.53739>

Dos Santos, E. A., Venturini, L. D., Sallaberry, J. D., Klein, L., & Flach, L. (2023). Organizational fairness and task performance: a study of different activities and positions in the justice sector. *Rev UFSM*, 16(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.5902/1983465972136>

Farmer, S., Beehr, T., & Love, K. (2003). Becoming an undercover police officer: A note on fairness perceptions, behavior, and attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 4(24), 373-387. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.196>

Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257990>

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of management*, 16(2), 399-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>

Greenberg, J. (1994). Using Socially Fair Treatment to Promote Acceptance of a Work Site Smoking Ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2(79), 288-297. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.288>

Haqiqi, M. A., Ahmadi, I., & Raminmehr, H. (2009). Examining the effect of organizational justice on employee performance. *Organizational Culture Management*, 7(20), 79–101. <https://sid.ir/paper/196355/fa>

Harijanto, D., Dharmanegara, I.B., & Pardesa, H. A. (2022). Does Distributive Justice Really Make Public Officers Feel More Obligated in Their Jobs? *Innovation Business Management and Accounting Journal*, 1(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.56070/ibmaj.v1i1.1>

HARPER, S., GRAY, S., & NORTH, S. (2009). Getting the most from staff: Using talents to the full. In A Practical Guide to University and College Management, 235-256. Routledge.

Hayati, D., Arshadi, N., & Neisi, A. (2012). The effect of income satisfaction on turnover intention: The mediating role of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job motivation. *Psychological Achievements. Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 19(1), 19–42. <https://sid.ir/paper/186641/fa>

Jenatabadi, H. S. (2015). An Overview of Organizational Performance Index: Definitions and Measurements, Social science research network. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 1-10 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2599439>

Khan, I., Alvi, A., & Khan, M. (2023). Role of Distributive Justice in the Relationship between Inspirational Motivation and Employee Performance. *Sukkur IBA Journal of Management and Business*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.30537/sijmb.v9i2.637>

Khtatbeh, M. M., Mahomed, A. S. B., bin Ab Rahman, S., & Mohamed, R. (2020). The mediating role of procedural justice on the relationship between job analysis and employee performance in Jordan Industrial Estates. *Helijon*, 6(10). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.helijon.2020.e04973>

Kim, T., Lee GyeHee, L. G., Paek SoYon, P. S., & Lee SeungGil, L. S. (2013). Social capital, knowledge sharing, and organizational performance: what structural relationship do they have in hotels? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25 (5), 683–704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-jan-2012-0010>

Kim, W., & Park, J. (2017). Examining Structural Relationships between Work Engagement, Organizational Procedural Justice, Knowledge Sharing, and Innovative Work Behavior for Sustainable Organizations. *Sustainability*. 9(2), 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9020205>

Lee, H.-W., & Rhee, D.-Y. (2023). Effects of Organizational Justice on Employee Satisfaction: Integrating the Exchange and the Value-Based Perspectives. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5993. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075993>

Leventhal, G. (1980). What Should Be Done with Equity Theory in social exchange? *Springer*, 27–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5_2

Mehmood, N., & Ahmad, U. N. U. (2016). Organizational Justice and employee performance: Evidence from higher education sector in Pakistan. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 14(2), 48-56. <https://jurnalkemanusiaan.utm.my/index.php/kemanusiaan/article/view/87>

Moliner, C., Cropanzano, R., & Martínez-Tur, V. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE.

Motowido, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2003). Job performance. *Handbook of psychology. Industrial and organizational psychology*, 12(4), 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei1203>

Motowido, s. (2003). Job Performance, *Handbook of Psychology. industrial and organizational psychology*, (12), 39-55.

Nikiuluw, J., Tippe, S., & YAsin, M. (2019). Distributive Justice and Perceived Organization Support in Indonesian Port Employee. In Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Business, Law And Pedagogy, ICBLP 2019. *European Alliance for Innovation (EAI)*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.13-2-2019.2286575>

Nix, J., & Wolfe, S. E. (2016). Sensitivity to the Ferguson Effect: The role of managerial organizational justice. *Journal of criminal justice*, 47, 12-20.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.06.002>

O'Callaghan, M. (2024). The impact of procedural justice on employee turnover intentions and the role of two mediators. *Organization Management Journal*, 21(2), 75-87.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/omj-03-2023-1822>

Pakpahan, M., Eliyana, A., Hamidah, A. D., & Bayuwati, T. R. (2020). The role of organizational justice dimensions: enhancing work engagement and employee performance. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(9), 323-332.
<https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.10.1>

Rabasa, M. F. (2021). The University: between knowledge and the dignity of professional work in the face of market challenges. *Universidad Panamericana*, 28-41.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6298-9104>

Rajabi Farjad, H., & Hosseini, S. M. (2018). The effect of organizational justice on employee motivation and job performance (Case study: Staff of the Command Headquarters of Sistan and Baluchestan Border Guards). *Border Studies Research Journal*, 6(4), 47–67.
<https://sid.ir/paper/525801/fa>

Riak, G. A., & bill, D. a. (2022). The importance of an organization's performance in organizational growth. *IJRDO journal of social science and humanities research*, 8 (11), 79-80. <https://doi.org/10.53555/sshv.v8i11.5376>

Rupp, D., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1(89), 925–946.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-5978\(02\)00036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-5978(02)00036-5)

Trense, A. (2010). People in organizations: Foundations of organizational behavior (H. Shekarkan, Trans.). Tehran: Roshd.

Tyofyan, G., Tjahjono, H. K., & Susanto. (2022). The effect of distributive justice and motivation intrinsic to job satisfaction and employee performance in msmes in the culinary sector in the special region of YOGYAKARTA. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 1(8), 975-984. <https://doi.org/10.55324/ijoms.v1i8.163>

Wardana, M. A., Sudarmawan, I. W. E., Wibowo, T. S., & Pandiangan, H. (2023). Analysis of Organizational Justice, Competence, and Work Motivation to Improve Performance.

Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis, 5(2), 421-427.

<https://doi.org/10.37034/infeb.v5i2.589>

Wilkin, J. (2023). Justice: A Salient Virtue of Social Institutions. *Wieś i Rolnictwo* 198(1), 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.53098/wir012023/01b>

Wiseman, J., & Stillwell, A. (2022). Organizational Justice: Typology, Antecedents and Consequences. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1287-1295. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia2030086>

Yu, B. (2023). Antecedents of Organizational Performance: A Literature Review. *Advances in Economics. Management and Political Sciences*, 9(1), 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/9/20230345>