NEW PERSPECTIVE ON ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE (OJ) AND POSITIVE ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR (POB): A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Syamsul Hadi^{1*}, Supardi²

^{1*}Department of Management Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa, Yogyakarta, Indonesia; ²Department of Management Universitas Muhammadiyah Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia.

Email: ^{1*}syamsul.hadi@ustjogja.ac.id, ²supardi@umkudus.ac.id

Article History: Received on 24th July 2020, Revised on 15th August 2020, Published on 29th August 2020

Abstract

Purpose of the study: This paper aims to discover the new perspective of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB) using a systematic review.

Methodology: This study is based on 5.530 articles from the Digital library ScienceDirect, Proquest, EBSCOhost, JSTOR, Springer. This study uses articles published in 2011 - 2020 relating to OJ and POB with a systematic review method.

Findings: Results from new perspectives of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB) are explored. Besides, procedural and distributive justice have the highest correlation in POB, followed by interpersonal Justice (IPJ) and informational justice (IFJ). In terms of POB outcomes, organizational commitment has the highest frequency as an OJ outcome, followed by OCB, job satisfaction, organizational trust, work performance, and the most rarely is pay satisfaction.

Applications of this study: This paper identifies the configuration of thematic clusters in OJ and POB, the evolution of both fields in determining strategy policy needed, and in placing new research appropriately to avoid getting trapped in the wilderness of science.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This is the first paper to jointly analyze clarity of the new perspective and conceptualization of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB).

Keywords: *Organizational Justice, Systematic Review, Positive Organizational Behavior, A New Perspective, Digital Library.*

INTRODUCTION

Employees' perceptions of justice determine the quality of the exchange of relations with the organization (Swalhi et al., 2017). When employees feel treated fairly by the organization and their authorities, they will feel obliged to create positive behavior in return (Ghosh et al., 2017). Organizational justice, unfortunately, has different dimensions that are not yet conclusive. Many of the researchers propose various aspects of organizational justice. Five, four, three, two, and even one point, also have different outcomes (Akram, Lei, Haider, Hussain, & Puig, 2017; Colquitt, 2001, 2008; Ajala, 2016; Bayarçelik & Findikli, 2016; Karam et al., 2019; Pan et al., 2018; Zoghbi M. de L & Ting D., 2017). Typology of determining organizational justice outcomes refers to McFarlin & Sweeney (1992) and developed by Colquitt et al. (2013), which show the personal outcome, including pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. Organizational outcomes include organizational commitment, job performance, organizational trust, and OCB. That encouraged the research to answer the question, "what are the new perspectives of organizational justice and positive organizational behavior?" using systematic reviews as an essential source in summarizing evidence on a particular topic (Briner et al., 2009; Garg et al., 2008).

This study aims to find new perspectives of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB) using systematic reviews. The resource article from digital library ScienceDirect, Proquest, EBSCOhost, JSTOR, and Springer publications from 2011 to 2020 to analyze clarity the new perspective and conceptualization of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB). In the next section will be explained methods, discussion, up to future research.

METHODOLOGY

A systematic review is a rigorous procedure in identifying, assessing and synthesizing all relevant research results related to the research questions, specific topics, or phenomena of concern by using strategies to limit bias (Briner et al., 2009; Garg et al., 2008; Kitchenham, 2004), as well as being the "gold standard" in assimilating and digesting research (Oxman et al., 1994; Remme, 2004). Humphrey (2011) also emphasizes the importance of developing literacy through systematic review to find a technical frame for further investigation and to place new research activities appropriately (Kitchenham, 2004), and also used in social science (Cooper, 2016; Hadi & Supardi, 2020; Supardi & Hadi, 2020).

Population

The keywords are developed from the research question using Boolean operator (*AND*, *OR*, *NOT*, *AND NOT*) as conjunctions in a search process. The search keywords deliberately do not include keywords that are not related to organizational justice or positive organizational behavior outcomes. The sources keywords used in this paper are from various research sources [Viswesvaran & Ones \(2002\)](#), [Fassina et al. \(2008\)](#), [Li & Cropanzano \(2009\)](#), [Colquitt et al. \(2013\)](#), [Rupp et al. \(2014\)](#), [Karam et al. \(2019\)](#) and [McFarlin & Sweeney \(1992\)](#) and described in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1: Keywords on Articles Search in Digital Libraries and Operational Definitions

No	Keywords
1	Organizational Justice
2	Distributive justice
3	Procedural Justice
4	Interactional Justice
5	Interpersonal justice
6	Informational justice
7	Organizational trust
8	Job performance
9	Organizational commitment
10	Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)
11	Job satisfaction
12	Pay satisfaction

The keywords of this systematic review are: "*Organizational Justice*" or "*Distributive justice*" or "*Procedural Justice*" or "*Interactional Justice*" or "*Interpersonal justice*" or "*Informational justice*" and "*Pay satisfaction*" or "*Job satisfaction*" or "*Organizational commitment*" or "*Job performance*" or "*Organizational trust*" or "*Organizational Citizenship Behavior*." The result of articles from each digital library, i.e., Science Direct obtained 1.120 articles, ProQuest obtained 1.373 articles, EBSCOhost obtained 1.385 articles, and the last JSTOR obtained 1.024 articles. Therefore, the total articles added by 1 article of subject matter experts are 5.530 articles.

Samples

The population of 5.530 articles evaluated using inclusion and exclusion criteria to get candidate sample articles in this systematic review. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were designed more broadly to identify in sample selection that can illustrate the study design, population, intervention, and results [\(Petticrew & Roberts, 2006\)](#). The operational description source of exclusion criteria from the dissertation of [Priola \(2016\)](#), [Wharton \(2016\)](#), [Lo \(2016\)](#), [Baqai \(2017\)](#), and the systematic review book by [Gough et al. \(2012\)](#) and described in Table 2.

Table 2: Operational Description of Exclusion and Inclusion Criteria

Criteria	Description
Article title	Remove articles that do not have the words "organizational justice" and "Positive Organizational Behavior."
English languages	Delete articles that are not in English
Text complete	Remove incomplete articles or resource constraints
Articles duplication	Remove duplicate articles
Abstracts	Remove articles that do not specifically address the relationship between OJ (Organizational Justice) and POB (Positive Organizational Behavior)
Empirical study	Remove articles that include empirical research.

The inclusion and exclusion processes were included in the PRISMA diagram in Figure 1 [\(Moher et al., 2009\)](#).

Quality and relevance assessment of 48 articles above applies TAPUPAS (Transparency, Accuracy, Purposivity, Utility, Propriety, Accessibility, and Specificity) developed by [Pawson & Social Care Institute for Excellence \(2003\)](#). Quality and relevance used in those articles have overall high and medium quality and relevance [\(Priola, 2016\)](#). Finally, only 34 articles that passed this test were used as data for this systematic review.

Figure 1: Information Flow of *Systematic Review (PRISMA)*

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

Analysis of Relationship of Organizational Justice and Positive Organizational Behavior

This article aims to identify organizational justice (OJ), which is related to positive organizational behavior (POB). Frequency Vote Counting is used to identify promising organizational justice as a candidate theme for in-depth thematic synthesis by looking at the correlation coefficients between specific organizational justice and positive organizational behavior published in each study. The names of the research variables (that are the original terminology used by the authors of the article) have resulted from the translation of variables through thematic synthesis—the relationship between organizational justice variables and positive organizational behavior in Table 3.

Each organizational justice dimension, the correlation coefficients published in the study dataset, is calculated to determine the number of:

1. Statistically significant positive correlations,
2. Statistically significant negative correlations, and
3. Insignificant correlations with one of six positive organizational behavior at the level of significance of each article by looking at the level of significance and alpha 0.05. This process reveals positive relations in all relationships.

Table 3: Correlations between Organizational Justice (OJ) and Positive Organizational Behavior (POB)

OJ	POB	Cor. Coef.	Level sig.	Conclusion
Distributive Justice	Pay Level Satisfaction	.64	.01	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.70	.01	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.22	.01	Significant
	Job Commitment	.19	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.640	.01	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.250	.001	Significant
	Normative Commitment	.310	.001	Significant
	Continuance Commitment	.000	.001	Significant
	OCB-S	.47	.01	Significant
	OCB-O	.12	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.70	.01	Significant
	OCB	.46	.05	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.444	.05	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.51	.001	Significant
	Organizational Commitment.	.48	.001	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.22	.01	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.257	.01	Significant
	Career Commitment	.186	.01	Significant

	Job Performance	.593	.01	Significant
	OCBS	.482	.05	Significant
	OCB	.076	.05	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.54	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.531	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.04	.05	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.354	.01	Significant
	OCB	.44	.01	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.47	.01	Significant
Procedural Justice	Pay Level Satisfaction	.52	.01	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.70	.01	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.24	.01	Significant
	JobCommitment	.24	.01	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.640	.01	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.300	.001	Significant
	Normative Commitment	.389	.001	Significant
	Continuance Commitment	.000	.001	Significant
	OCB-S	.41	.01	Significant
	O CB-O	.15	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.69	.01	Significant
	OCB	.51	.05	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.462	.05	Significant
	Work Satisfaction	.24	.001	Significant
	Job Performance	.33	.001	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.51	.001	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.44	.001	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.29	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.604	.01	Significant
	OCB-S	.482	.05	Significant
	OCB	.201	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.43	.01	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.57	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.530	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.13	.05	Significant
Interpersonal Justice	Organizational Trust	.440	.01	Significant
	OCB	.18	.01	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.70	.01	Significant
	Job Satisfaction	.08	.05	Significant
	JobCommitment	.17	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.640	.01	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.253	.001	Significant
	Normative Commitment	.121	.001	Significant
	Continuance Commitment	.029	.001	Significant
	OCB-S	.56	.01	Significant
	OCB-O	.21	.01	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.71	.01	Significant
	OCB	.50	.05	Significant
	Job-Satisfaction	.472	.05	Significant
	Job-Performance	.574	.01	Significant
	OCB-S	.561	.05	Significant
	OCB	.080	.05	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	.44	.01	Significant
	Affective Commitment	.58	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.19	.05	Significant
	Job Performance	.454	.01	Significant
	Job Performance	.21	.01	Significant
	Organizational Trust	.391	.01	Significant
Informational Justice	Job Performance	.563	.01	Significant
	OCB-S	.473	.05	Significant

Job Performance	.12	.01	Significant
-----------------	-----	-----	-------------

There are numbers of articles as written by [Chen et al. \(2015\)](#), [Demir et al. \(2017\)](#), [Kamani & Namdari \(2012\)](#) dan [Lambert & Hogan \(2013\)](#) in the dataset which does not show the value of correlation and level of significance between organizational justice and positive organizational behavior explicitly. However, it reveals the influence between the dimensions of organizational justice and dimensions of positive organizational behavior. In contrast to [Firozi et al. \(2017\)](#), the article he wrote did not directly show a correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction but showed the dimensions of the job; thus, it could not be included in organizational justice and positive organizational behavior.

[Jiang et al. \(2015\)](#) use three types of country samples to see organizational justice and positive organizational behavior, including China, Korea, and Australia. Data reduction is needed including in the correlation. Therefore, the researchers take the research sample data of [Jiang et al. \(2015\)](#) from China as the most significant sample of two other countries.

The procedure of Frequency Vote Counting reveals that four organizational justice has positive correlation categories, including (a) distributive justice, (b) procedural justice, (c) interpersonal justice, and (d) informational justice. These dimensions of organizational justice show a statistically significant correlation with positive organizational behavior in evaluating the significance of four organizational justice. This article uses the Pearson correlation coefficient to see the effect size ([Cohen, 1988](#)).

The study's effect size is determined by a conventional definition of a correlation coefficient of 0.1, indicating a small effect size. A correlation coefficient of 0.3, a medium effect size, and a correlation coefficient of 0.5 show a big effect size—these conventional effect sizes from the average value in published studies. To get a medium to large effect size, a correlation coefficient ≥ 0.30 can be used. ([Cohen & Cohen, 2003](#); [Rosenthal & Rosnow, 2008](#)).

The data in this article show the study that has small effect size that is the correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction $0.22 P < 0.01$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Job satisfaction $0.257 P < 0.01$ ([Kim, 2016](#)), Job Commitment $0.19 p < 0.05$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Career commitment $0.186 p < 0.01$ ([Kim, 2016](#)), Continuance commitment $0.000 p < 0.01$ ([López-Cabarcos et al., 2014](#)), OCBO $0.12 P < 0.05$ ([Chen & Jin, 2014](#)), Job satisfaction $0.22 p < 0.01$ ([Khan et al., 2013](#)), OCB $0.076 p < 0.05$ ([Mashi, 2017](#)), Job performance $0.04 P < 0.05$ ([Swalhi et al., 2017](#)).

The correlation between procedural justice that has a small effect size on positive organizational behavior is the correlation between procedural justice and Job satisfaction $0.24 p < 0.01$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Job Commitment $0.24 p < 0.01$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Continuance commitment $0.000 p < 0.01$ ([López-Cabarcos et al., 2014](#)), OCBO $0.15 P < 0.05$ ([Chen & Jin, 2014](#)), Work satisfaction $0.24 P < 0.01$ ([Gillet et al., 2013](#)), Job satisfaction $0.29 P < 0.01$ ([Khan et al., 2013](#)), Job performance $0.13 p < 0.05$ ([Swalhi et al., 2017](#)), OCB $0.18 p < 0.01$ ([Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011](#)), OCB $0.201 p < 0.05$ Signifikan ([Mashi, 2017](#)).

The correlation between interpersonal justice that has small effect size in positive organizational behavior is the correlation between interpersonal justice and Job satisfaction $0.08 p < 0.05$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Job Commitment $0.17 p < 0.05$ ([Boateng & Hsieh, 2019](#)), Continuance commitment $0.029 p < 0.01$ ([López-Cabarcos et al., 2014](#)), OCBO $0.21 P < 0.01$ ([Chen & Jin, 2014](#)), OCB $0.080 p < 0.05$ ([Mashi, 2017](#)), Job performance $0.19 p < 0.05$ ([Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015](#)), Job performance $0.21 p < 0.01$ ([Swalhi et al., 2017](#)). Finally, the correlation between informational justice that has a small effect size on organizational positive behavior is informational justice dan Job performance $0.12 p < 0.01$ ([Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015](#)), Affective commitment $0.253 p < 0.001$, Normative commitment $0.121 p < 0.001$ Signifika ([López-Cabarcos et al., 2014](#)).

Therefore, as many as 23 correlations of organizational justice and positive organizational behavior have small effect sizes and deleted from further consideration in Systematic Review. The reason is that management practitioners must focus on providing organizational justice, which has the strongest correlation with positive organizational behavior rather than those with weak correlation.

Positive organizational behavior in this study, including *pay satisfaction*, has similarity to *pay level satisfaction* ([Arya et al., 2017](#)); thus, all related to pay satisfaction included in one theme that is *pay satisfaction*. *Organizational commitment* has a detail naming interpretation but still in the organization level such as Affective commitment, Normative commitment ([López-Cabarcos et al., 2014](#)), Career commitment ([Kim, 2016](#)), Affective commitment ([Moon et al., 2014](#)), and Job commitment ([Chou et al., 2013](#)). Therefore all related to the commitment is included in one theme that is *Organizational commitment*. *Organizational trust* has a similarity to affective trust and cognitive trust ([Lee et al., 2015](#)). Therefore, all related to trust is included in one theme that is organizational trust. Likewise, OCB is also known as OCB-S ([Chen & Jin, 2014](#); [Lim & Loosemore, 2017](#)), therefore all related to OCB is include in one theme that is OCB (*Organizational Citizenship Behavior*).

Frequency Vote Counting (estimation effect size) identifies four organizational justice as potential candidate themes for the final stages of thematic synthesis: (a) distributive justice, (b) procedural justice, (c) interpersonal justice, and (d) informational justice. Whereas the outcomes of organizational positive outcome behaviors are: *pay satisfaction*, *job*

satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance, organizational trust, and OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior), which are configured in Figure 2.

Figure 2: New Configuration of Organizational Justice and Positive Organizational Behavior

New Perspectives of Organizational Justice

At this stage, the addition of sub-Node the Nvivo12 plus is performed on each independent variable and the dependent variable to determine the themes of organizational justice and positive organizational behavior. The results of articles in this dataset included in the table according to the issue of organizational justice and positive organizational behavior—the theme of organizational justice and operational definitions in Table 4. Descriptive topics resulted from organizational justice are distributive, procedural, interactional, interpersonal, and informational justice.

Table 4: Descriptive Theme of Organizational Justice

OJ	Conceptual	Operational Definition	Sources of Operational Definitions
Distributive Justice	Organizational Perspectives:	Fairness of resources allocation	Person or individual referenced "fairness of outcomes" (employee reactions to the amount and <i>Equity</i> of compensation received) (Arya et al., 2017).
	Fairness in which organization distributes resources based on individuals' efforts or performance in the organization	distribution (outcome) and reward of individuals within the organization	Distributive justice Focuses the fairness in the outcome (Ashraf et al., 2017).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of the ends achieved (Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).
			Organizational justice is expected to give an equal share of the outcomes (rewards and costs) (Buluc & Gunes, 2014).
			Distributive justice is fairness by which the firm distributes resources based on employee effort or performance (López, Machado, & Vázquez, 2015).
			Distributive justice is treated fairly in the allocation of rewards (Chen & Jin, 2014).
			Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of the reward allocation (Chen et al., 2015).
			The employee feels that the results of this distribution are fair (Cheng, 2014).
			Distributive justice is Employee perceptions about the fairness of outcomes, including pay, promotion, rewards, allocation of tasks, and the work itself (Chou et al., 2013).
			Distributive justice is Equality and fairness of the methods in which reward is distributed (Fatimah et al., 2011).
		Distributive justice is the perceived justice of the	

			distribution of organizational outcomes (Firozi et al., 2017).
			Distributive justice focuses on an individual's beliefs that they have received a fair amount of valued work-related outcomes (Kamani & Namdari, 2012).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of the outcomes (Karakus et al., 2014).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of outcome distributions or allocations (Khan et al., 2013).
			The perceived fairness of outcomes, such as pay or promotions in organizations (Kim, 2016).
			Distributive justice is the perception of fairness in outcomes (Lambert & Hogan, 2013).
			Distributive justice is the distribution of resources and decision outcomes, which affects an individual's well-being (Lee et al., 2015).
			The allocation of rewards based on their inputs given (Lim & Loosemore, 2017).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of decision outcomes (Mashi, 2017).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of the outcomes or rewards an employee receives (Moon et al., 2014).
			Distributive justice is the allocation of resources (Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015).
			Fairness of the outcomes or rewards (salaries, promotions, etc.) an employee receives (Rafael et al., 2017).
			Distributive justice is perceived fairness of outcomes distributed to employees (Suifan et al., 2017).
			Distributive justice is the judgments of <i>Equity</i> regarding the outcome (reward) (Swalhi et al., 2017).
			Distributive justice is fairness in terms of distribution's allocation (Tjahjono, 2014).
			Distributive justice is fairness in terms of the distribution process activity results (outcomes) and awards (reward) to the members of the organization (Tjahjono et al., 2019).
			Distributive justice is the fairness of outcomes (Tlaiss & Elamin, 2015).
Procedural Justice	Organizational Perspectives: Fairness in which the organization establishes the procedures and methods used in determining the distribution of individual performance results within the organization.	Fairness of procedures and processes (decision-making) used in allocating resources to achieve outcomes and rewards in individuals within the organization	Procedural justice is the fairness of the means', i.e., employee reactions to procedures used to determine compensation (Arya et al., 2017).
			The fairness of the means used to achieve those ends (Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).
			Procedural justice is how the outcomes are distributed (Buluc & Gunes, 2014).
			Procedural justice is the process through which decisions affecting employees (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014).
			Procedural justice is the process by which the outcomes are determined as fair. (Chou et al., 2013).
	Individual Perspectives: Individuals in organizations use procedures and methods to determine the results		Procedural justice is the degree of fairness in decisions made by leaders to determine outcomes (Firozi et al., 2017).
			Procedural justice is correct and fair procedures in allocating outcomes (Gillet et al., 2013).
			Procedural justice is regarding the distribution of resources as fair (Kamani & Namdari, 2012).
			Fairness of methods and rules on which decisions in the organization are based (Karakus et al., 2014).
			Procedural justice is the fairness of the process of making outcome decisions (Kim, 2016).
			Procedural justice is the fairness of the processes by which

Interactional Justice			substantial reward and punishment decisions are made (Lambert & Hogan, 2013).
			Procedural justice is the fairness of the processes and procedures used in allocating the outcome (Lee et al., 2015).
			Procedural justice is justice about the policies, processes, and procedures through which decisions are made in construction Projects (Lim & Loosemore, 2017).
			Decision-making procedures are used to determine the distribution of the outcome (Mashi, 2017).
			The fairness of organizational policy is used to make allocation decisions (Moon et al., 2014).
			Fairness of the process involved in the allocation of outcomes (Shan et al., 2015).
			Procedural justice is the fairness of the decision-making process by which outcomes are distributed (Suifan et al., 2017).
			Procedural justice is the fairness of procedural elements within a social system that regulates the allocation of resources (Swalhi et al., 2017).
			Justice is assessed under the rules or policies and procedures in decision-making in the organization (Tjahjono et al., 2019).
			Procedural justice is the mechanisms and procedures (Tjahjono & Palupi, 2017).
			Procedural justice is the processes leading to resource allocation or decision-making as accurate, ethical, and fair (Tlaiss & Elamin, 2015).
			Procedural justice is fairness in the processes through which decisions are reached (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014).
			Procedural justice is the method which employees used to determine the outcomes (Yuan et al., 2016).
			Procedural justice is the process of making outcome allocations decisions (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).
			The extent to which decisions impact individuals treated with dignity and respect (Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).
			Interactional justice is the perceptions of informal treatment-experienced when procedures are implemented (Cheng, 2014).
			Interactional justice is fair interpersonal treatment from management (Chen & Jin, 2014).
			Interpersonal interactions occur among employees, emphasizing whether people are treated with dignity, courtesy, and respect (Cheng, 2014).
			The quality of the interpersonal treatment is received when procedures are implemented (Chou et al., 2013).
			Interpersonal behaviors that supervisors display when planning for procedural justice (Kamani & Namdari, 2012).
			Interpersonal relationships between employees and their supervisors are quality and fairness (Karakus et al., 2014).
			Interactional justice is how workers are treated within the organization by supervisors, managers, and administrators (Lambert & Hogan, 2013).
			Interactional justice is interpersonal treatment and sharing and providing information regarding important decisions (Lee et al., 2015).
			Interactional justice is the perceived quality relations within the organizational hierarchy (Minibas-Poussard et al., 2017).
		Organizational Perspectives:	Justice in which the organization interacts and communicates during the distribution of procedures and methods.
	Individual Perspectives:	Individuals in the organization affected by the implementation of procedures and methods are treated with dignity and accompanied	
	Informal Treatment Fairness	(interpersonal) is fair (dignified, respectful, honest, and polite) to individuals in the organization when procedures are planned and carried out.	

Interpersonal Justice	Organizational Perspectives: Justice in which an organization treats interpersonal relationships during the distribution of procedures and methods.	Interpersonal treatment fairness between superordinates and subordinates with sincere, courtesy, politeness, and dignity when planning and carrying out the outcome in the organization.	Interactional justice is perceived fairness of the treatment during the enactment of organizational procedures or the explanation of those procedures (Moon et al., 2014).
			Interactional justice is perceived fairness of the treatment during the enactment of organizational procedures or the explanation of those procedures (Rafael et al., 2017).
			That contract with the fairness of treatment during the <i>Social Exchange</i> process (Shan et al., 2015).
			Treat subordinates with honesty, justification, propriety, and respect (Suifan et al., 2017).
			Interactional justice is the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the implementation of specific procedures (Swalhi et al., 2017).
			Interactional justice is interpersonal dynamics and perceptions of the quality of communication between employees and the employer during decision-making processes (Tlaiss & Elamin, 2015).
			Interpersonal justice captures the sincerity of supervisor communications (Arya et al., 2017).
			Interpersonal justice is how an employee is treated by his or her supervisors and peers (Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).
			Interpersonal justice is sincerity and respect (Firozi et al., 2017).
			Interpersonal justice is the interpersonal behaviors that supervisors display when planning for procedural justice (Kamani & Namdari, 2012).
Informational Justice	Individual Perspectives: Individuals in the organization affected by the implementation of procedures and methods are treated with dignity and accompanied.		Interpersonal justice is the perceived fairness of the interpersonal manner and treatment employed in delivering outcomes, including dignity or respect (Kim, 2016).
			Interpersonal justice is treating others with politeness, impropriety, dignity, and respect (Lee et al., 2015).
			People felt valued and treated with dignity, politeness, and respect (Lim & Loosemore, 2017).
			Interpersonal justice is perceptions of fairness concerning whether employees are adequately treated, with dignity, politeness, and respect within an organization (Moon et al., 2014).
			Employees experience social interaction with superiors as respectful and empathetic (Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015).
			Interpersonal justice is the perception of fairness concerning whether employees are adequately treated, with dignity and respect within an organization (Rafael et al., 2017).
			Interpersonal justice is treating employees with respect, dignity, and courtesy (Shan et al., 2015).
			Interpersonal justice is treating employees with respect and dignity (Suifan et al., 2017).
			Interpersonal justice is the degree to which employees are given proper and respectful treatment in the organization (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014).
			adequate and honest explanations for enacted decisions (Arya et al., 2017).
Informational Justice	Organizational Perspectives: Justice organization explains why the organization uses those procedures and methods to individuals in the organization	Fairness felt by an adequate, relevant, and honest explanation of the decision why the outcomes distributed with specific procedures	Informational justice explains why specific rules, regulations, and procedures were adopted and why outcomes are distributed in a particular manner (Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).
			Informational justice is an adequate, honest explanation (Firozi et al., 2017).
			Informational justice explanations provide people that convey why procedures are used in a certain way or why

Perspectives:

Individuals in the organization affected by the implementation of procedures and methods gave an adequate, relevant, and honest explanation

outcomes are distributed in a particular fashion ([Kamani & Namdari, 2012](#)).

Informational justice is the perceived fairness of the appropriate explanation or justification of outcomes ([Kim, 2016](#)).

Informational justice is fairness related to providing adequate and truthful explanations about procedures and outcomes ([Lee et al., 2015](#)).

Informational justice is the perceived fairness of which employees have an adequate explanation and rationale for the decision from the authority ([Moon et al., 2014](#)).

Employees receive all necessary information ([Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015](#)).

Informational justice is the perceived fairness of which employees have an adequate explanation and rationale for the decision from the authority ([Rafael et al., 2017](#)).

Informational justice is sharing relevant and proper information with employees ([Shan et al., 2015](#)).

Informational justice is providing candid, honest explanations ([Suifan et al., 2017](#)).

The extent to which explanations are given is compatible with the decisions reached ([Tziner & Sharoni, 2014](#)).

New perspectives of organizational justice from the dataset produce five descriptive themes. However, from those five descriptive themes of organizational justice above, they are categorized into four specific topics. The definition of interactional justice has similarities with interpersonal justice. Those four descriptive themes of organizational justice are including distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice. These results explicitly supported by a meta-analysis conducted ([Colquitt, 2001, 2008; Colquitt et al., 2013; Fassina et al., 2008; Karam et al., 2019](#)), and systematic review from [Hadi, Tjahjono, El Qadri, et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Hadi, Tjahjono, & Palupi \(2020\)](#).

The operational definition of those four themes of organizational justice explained as follows: (a) Distributive justice, justice of resource allocation in the distribution process (outcome) and Rewards to individuals in the organization (such as compensation justice, promotion, rewards, assignments, evaluations, and penalties), (b) Procedural justice, procedural justice and the decision-making process used in allocating resources to achieve outcomes and rewards for the individuals within the organization, (c) interpersonal justice, interpersonal treatment justice between superiors to subordinates with sincerity, respect, courtesy, dignity when planning and implementing outcomes in the organization, (d) Informational Justice, justice that felt from an adequate, relevant, and honest explanation of the decision why the consequences distributed with specific procedures. Those themes are still related to contemporary management and research practices. None considered outdated because they are still consistently used in the last nine years or until 2019, as a dimension of organizational justice.

New Perspectives on Positive Organizational Behavior (POB)

The approach of data reduction aims to facilitate research analysis and synthesis ([Priola, 2016](#)). The operational definition of positive organizational behavior follows the principles of thematic synthesis from dataset studies, beginning with analyzing, coding, and translating into general conceptualizations based on their research instruments (for example, what they study and measure). The process of converting dataset studies is by grouping organizational positive behavioral themes contained in each dataset study. The findings of the POB descriptive theme from the dataset are: pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, organizational trust, job performance, organizational commitment, and OCB.

The definitions of the POB dimension have sources to show the actual descriptions of various dataset studies. Descriptive themes, operational definitions, and sources of original definitions in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive Themes of Positive Organizational Behavior (POB)

POB	Conceptual	Operational Definition	Original Definitions Sources
Pay satisfaction	Individuals in the organization will be satisfied with the payment when the perception of the pay they get is in line with their	Attitude/ feelings (positive/negative) which employees have	The amount of overall positive or negative affect (or feelings) that employees have toward their pay (Arya et al., 2017).
		Sikap/perasaan (positif/negatif) yang dimiliki karyawan atas jumlah upah mereka saat	The pay-level dimension represents satisfaction with current direct compensation (pay). The pay raise dimension represents changes in pay level. The pay structure dimension focuses on pay rates for different jobs (Arya et al., 2017).

	expectations.	ini, perubahan tingkat upah, dan metode pemberian upah pada karyawan	
Job satisfaction	Individuals in the organization are satisfied and pleasant for the assessment of the experience in their work.	Attitudes/feelings (positive/negative), pleasant, and satisfied with the assessment of experience in their works/careers.	The positive or pleasant experience results from an individual's commitment to their work-related skills (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014).
			Job satisfaction is a mood that is positive and contented, which resulted from the assessment of their experiences and job (Demir et al., 2017).
			Job satisfaction is an individual's attitude towards his work (Fatimah et al., 2011).
			Job satisfaction is a pleasant and positive emotional reaction to experiences in one's job and career (Firozi et al., 2017).
			Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience (Kim, 2016).
			Job satisfaction is the degree to which workers are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs (Mashi, 2017).
			Job satisfaction is how employees feel about different aspects and segments of their jobs (Suifan et al., 2017).
			Employees' attitudes or opinions on work itself and related environments are a whole emotional reaction to their work roles (Yuan et al., 2016).
Organizational trust	Individuals in the organization have a strong belief that they will get results guarantee in the future when they work and bind themselves to the organization.	Belief to work and bind selves to an organization by the expectation held by individuals or groups to get the guarantee in the future	Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job and job experience (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).
			What the received by employees from their organization, which, in turn, leads to a perceived assurance of agreeable expectations in the future (Biswas & Kapil, 2017).
			Horizontal trust is a relationship between peers in similar working environments. Vertical trust is the relationship that an individual employee forms with a supervisor, senior managers, or organization (Chen et al., 2015).
			Organizational trust is the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to another party's actions based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action necessary to the trustor (Tlaiss & Elamin, 2015).
Job performance	Job performance is individual work contributes to the organization, which is appropriate to the primary function of work formally.	Employees' result of job performance which is determined in the tasks description to fulfill organizational goals	Organizational trust as expectancy by an individual or a group, the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).
			Evaluated in terms of proficiency with which an individual carries out the tasks prescribed in his or her role descriptions (Lee et al., 2015).
			Actions, behavior, and outcomes that an employee contributes to fulfilling organizational goals (Otto & Mamatoglu, 2015).
			Job performance enacts the duties and responsibilities of a given role (Swalhi et al., 2017).
			Behaviors are assessed by a formal employee evaluation system and those outlined in the employee job description. (Swalhi et al., 2017).

Organizational Commitment

Durable consistency individuals belief for the benefit of the organization and to maintain membership in the organization

Employees' emotional attachment to the organization provides an extra effort consistently for the benefit of the organization and firm belief to maintain their membership in the organization.

Organizational commitment is a term that aims to explain human attitudes and behaviors at work—an employee's affective or emotional reactions to the organization (Buluc, 2014).

An employee's attachment to an organization, leads individuals to act consistently with their beliefs and strengthens their involvement in the organization (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014).

An employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Cheng, 2014).

The psychological state of employees identifies with their organization's philosophy and goals (Chen et al., 2015).

Organizational commitment is a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with a particular job (Chou et al., 2013).

Organizational commitment is the level of the individual's inclusion of themselves to organ processes and identifying themselves with the organization (Demir et al., 2017).

'emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Jiang et al., 2015).

Organizational commitment is an individual's psychological attachment to an organization (Kim, 2016).

Organizational commitment is a psychological state characterizing an employee's relationship with the organization and with implications for the decision to stay as a member of the organization or not (Minibas-Poussard et al., 2017).

Organizational commitment is an employee's positive emotional attachment to the organization, and the bond between the employee and the organization (Moon et al., 2014).

Organizational commitment is the psychological tie that features the individual's relationship with the organization (Rafael et al., 2017).

Psychological connection employees possess defined by their desire to remain and sustain in an organization by accepting the organization's values and goals and cherishing them personally (Suifan et al., 2017).

The type of positive attitude and behavior that an organization like the most since it is a form of bond between employee and organization based on vision, values, and emotional bound (Tjahjono, 2014).

Organizational commitment is a willingness to exert extra effort for the organization's benefit and a strong desire to maintain membership (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).

Organizational
Citizenship Behavior

Individual behaviors that are discretionary (informal) encourage an organization to be more productive and efficient

New extra roles (beyond the roles, helping, participating, sportsmanship, politeness) achieve organizational goals, which are not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system

An extra-role behavior, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, promotes the organization's efficient and effective functioning (Chen & Jin, 2014).

Employees' discretionary behaviors, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that, in aggregate, promote the organization (Chou et al., 2013).

OCB is a behavior that goes beyond the job's formal

without leaving but can encourage the primary organizational functions function of duties. efficiently and effectively.	requirements is beneficial to the organization (Fatimah et al., 2011). Individuals' extra-role behaviors persistent step toward achieving organizational goals with extra effort and not only prepare the grounds for such an achievement but they also protect the organization in one way or another (Kamani & Namdari, 2012). OCB is an extra-role behavior of going above and beyond what is expected in an organization (Lambert & Hogan, 2013). OCB is conscientiousness (i.e., behaviors that go beyond those expected by specific role requirements), altruism (i.e., behaviors that help other members), civic virtue (i.e., behaviors that entail political participation). Sportsmanship (i.e., behaviors that avoid complaining and aggravating unpleasant situations) and courtesy (i.e., behaviors that prevent problems from occurring) (Lim & Loosemore, 2017). Individual behavior that is discretionary not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the organization's effective functioning" (Mashi, 2017). This discretionary behavior, which is neither formally recognized nor rewarded (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014).
---	--

Descriptive themes of positive organizational behavior (POB) from the dataset result in 6 descriptive themes. These explicitly supported by the study of [McFarlin & Sweeney \(1992\)](#) stated that organizational justice outcomes have two outcomes, including individual outcome and organizational outcome. Those six descriptive themes by two parts, namely individual outcome, and organizational outcome. The most dominant individual outcomes are pay and job satisfaction. In contrast, the most dominant organizational outcomes are organizational trust, job performance, organizational commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), that is supported by a meta-analysis conducted by [Colquitt \(2001, 2008\)](#), [Colquitt et al. \(2013\)](#), and [Karam et al. \(2019\)](#).

The operational definitions of the six positive organizational behavioral (POB) themes are as follows: (a) Pay Satisfaction: Attitudes/feelings (positive/negative) that employees have over their current wages, changes in wage rates, and methods of remuneration to employees. (b) Job satisfaction: Attitudes/feelings (positive/negative), pleasant, and satisfied with the assessment of experience in their works/careers. (c) Organizational Trust: Trust to work and bind themselves to the organization expected that the trust held by an individual or group receives guarantees in the future. (d) Performance: Contribution of employees' performance results determined in the job description in meeting organizational goals. (e) Organizational Commitment: Individual behaviors that are discretionary (informal) encourage an organization to be more productive and efficient without leaving the primary function of duties. (f) Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): Extra roles (beyond the roles, helping, participating, sportsmanship, politeness) achieve organizational goals by the formal reward system but can encourage organizational functions efficiently and effectively. Those themes are still relevant to contemporary management and research practices. They are not considered outdated because they are still consistently used in the last nine years or until 2020 as a positive outcome dimension of organizational justice.

CONCLUSION

New perspectives of organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB) are procedural and distributive justice have the highest or salience correlation in POB, followed by interpersonal Justice (IPJ) and informational justice (IFJ). In terms of POB outcomes, organizational commitment has the highest level of frequency as an OJ outcome, followed by OCB, job satisfaction, organizational trust, work performance, and the most rarely is pay satisfaction. Interpersonal justice does not affect pay satisfaction, and informational justice only affects on OCB, job performance, and pay satisfaction.

This research provides a rational basis in the selection of configuration recommendations to create and determine strategic policies. This systematic review also creates new perspectives on organizational justice (OJ) and positive organizational behavior (POB). Researchers don't get caught in the scientific wilderness and make sure that "fish don't fly and birds don't swim" in the scientific puzzle ([Cooper, 2016](#)). The development of information and communication technology is faster and easier to operate the search and filtering of organizational justice articles and positive

organizational behavior more quickly and efficiently, which has been provided in each digital library. It remains whether we can operate it or not.

FUTURE RESEARCH

This research highlights several fields for future research. [Briner et al. \(2009\)](#) state that systematic review provides a more explicit description of what is known and unknown under specific conditions of knowledge boundaries. Conducting systematic review also provides much broader insights about phenomena, such as the impact of the organizational justice on negative organizational behavior and the focus on the interpersonal and informational justice as the essential factors of interaction between organizations and individuals within the organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Nonfinancial support for the study.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

All authors contributed to this article, the first author, 70% focus on systematics, data management, and discussion. The second author focused 40% on the problem gap.

REFERENCES

1. Ajala, E. M. (2016). Perceived Correlation between Organisational Justice and Employees_ Organizational Citizenship Behaviours.pdf. *Ife Centre for Psychological Studies/Services, Ile-Ife, Nigeria*, 24(1), 1–11.
2. Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M. J., Hussain, S. T., & Puig, L. C. M. (2017). The effect of organizational justice on knowledge sharing: Empirical evidence from the Chinese telecommunications sector. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 2(3), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.09.002>
3. Arya, B., Mirchandani, D. A., & Harris, M. M. (2017). Personality and pay satisfaction: Exploring the influence of organizational justice and gender in South Africa. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(2), 219–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1282531>
4. Ashraf, M., Vveinhardt, J., Ahmed, R. R., Streimikiene, D., & Mangi, R. A. (2017). Exploring Intervening Influence of Interactional Justice between Procedural Justice and Job Performance: Evidence from South Asian Countries. *Www.Amfiteatruconomic.Ro*, 20(47), 169. <https://doi.org/10.24818/EA/2018/47/169>
5. Baqai, H. R. (2017). *Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction in K-12 Schools: A Systematic Review* [Dissertation]. University of Maryland University College.
6. Bayarçelik, E. B., & Findikli, M. A. (2016). The Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction on the Relation Between Organizational Justice Perception and Intention to Leave. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 403–411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.050>
7. Biswas, S., & Kapil, K. (2017). Linking perceived organizational support and organizational justice to employees' in-role performance and organizational cynicism through organizational trust: A field investigation in India. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(5), 696–711. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-04-2016-0052>
8. Boateng, F. D., & Hsieh, M.-L. (2019). Explaining Job Satisfaction and Commitment Among Prison Officers: The Role of Organizational Justice. *The Prison Journal*, 99(2), 172–193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885519825491>
9. Briner, R. B., Denyer, D., & Rousseau, D. M. (2009). Evidence-Based Management: Concept Cleanup Time? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2009.45590138>
10. Buluc, B., & Gunes, M. (2014). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment in Primary Schools. *The Anthropologist*, 18(1), 145–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2014.11891530>
11. Chen, H., & Jin, Y.-H. (2014). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Chinese Context: The Mediating Effects of Social Exchange Relationship. *Public Personnel Management*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014533897>
12. Chen, S.-Y., Wu, W.-C., Chang, C.-S., Lin, C.-T., Kung, J.-Y., Weng, H.-C., Lin, Y.-T., & Lee, S.-I. (2015). Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1016-8>
13. Cheng, S. Y. (Cheryl). (2014). The mediating role of organizational justice on the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), 1131–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.816864>
14. Chou, T.-Y., Chou, S. T., Jiang, J. J., & Klein, G. (2013). The organizational citizenship behavior of IS personnel: Does organizational justice matter? *Information & Management*, 50(2–3), 105–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.02.002>
15. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). L. Erlbaum Associates.
16. Cohen, J., & Cohen, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed). L. Erlbaum Associates.
17. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>

18. Colquitt, J. A. (2008). *Two decades of organizational justice: Findings, controversies, and future directions* (J. Barling & C. L. Cooper, Eds.; SAGE handbook of organizational behavior: micro approaches, Vol. 1). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448>
19. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199–236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757>
20. Cooper, H. M. (2016). *Research synthesis and meta analysis a step by step approach* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
21. Demir, M., Guney, S., Akyurek, S., Ugural, M., & Aslan, I. (2017). Effect of managers' organizational justice understanding on the level of employees' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Expert Projects Publishing House*, 58, 146–165.
22. Fassina, N. E., Jones, D. A., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2008). Meta-analytic tests of relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behavior: Testing agent-system and shared-variance models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(6), 805–828. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.494>
23. Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M., & Halim, F. W. (2011). The Relationships between Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job Satisfaction. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.*, 19, 115–121.
24. Firozi, M., Kazemi, A., & Sayadi, N. (2017). A Study of the Relationship between the Components of Organizational Justice and the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Physical Education Teachers. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.*, 25(2), 12.
25. Garg, A. X., Hackam, D., & Tonelli, M. (2008). Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: When One Study Is Just not Enough. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, 3(1), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.01430307>
26. Ghosh, D., Sekiguchi, T., & Gurunathan, L. (2017). Organizational embeddedness as a mediator between justice and in-role performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 75, 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.02.013>
27. Gillet, N., Colombat, P., Michinov, E., Pronost, A.-M., & Fouquereau, E. (2013). Procedural justice, supervisor autonomy support, work satisfaction, organizational identification, and job performance: The mediating role of need satisfaction and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12144>
28. Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (Eds.). (2012). *An introduction to systematic reviews*. SAGE.
29. Hadi, Syamsul, & Supardi. (2020). Revitalization Strategy for Small and Medium Enterprises after Corona Virus Disease Pandemic (Covid-19) in Yogyakarta. *Journal Of Xi'an University Of Architecture & Technology*, XII(IV). <https://doi.org/10.37896/JXAT12.04/1149>
30. Hadi, S., Tjahjono, H. K., El Qadri, Z. M., & Prajogo, W. (2020). The Influence of Organizational Justice, and Positive Organizational Behavior: Systematic Review and Call for Future Research. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 61, 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.61.67.84>
31. Hadi, S., Tjahjono, H. K., & Palupi, M. (2020). Study of Organizational Justice in SMEs, and Positive Consequences: Systematic Review. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(03), 14.
32. Humphrey, S. E. (2011). What does a great meta-analysis look like? *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1(2), 99–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386611401273>
33. Jiang, Z., Gollan, P. J., & Brooks, G. (2015). Relationships between organizational justice, organizational trust, and organizational commitment: A cross-cultural study of China, South Korea, and Australia. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(7), 973–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1128457>
34. Kamani, S. M. H., & Namdari, K. (2012). A Study Of The Relationship Between Organizational Justice And Support And Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 5(6), 355–368.
35. Karakus, M., Ustuner, M., & Toprak, M. (2014). Two alternative models on the relationships between organizational justice, organizational commitment, burnout, and job satisfaction of education supervisors. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 11(1), 1739 – 4341.
36. Karam, E. P., Hu, J., Davison, R. B., Juravich, M., Nahrgang, J. D., Humphrey, S. E., & Scott DeRue, D. (2019). Illuminating the 'Face' of Justice: A Meta-Analytic Examination of Leadership and Organizational Justice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(1), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12402>
37. Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2013). Organizational Justice and Job Outcomes: Moderating Role of Islamic Work Ethic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1937-2>
38. Kim, S. (2016). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between distributive justice and sports referees' job satisfaction and career commitment. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 20(2), 169–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2016.1147363>
39. Kitchenham, B. (2004). Procedures for Performing Systematic Reviews. *Software Engineering Group Department of Computer Science Keele University Keele, Staffs*, 33.

40. Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The Association of Distributive and Procedural Justice With Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Prison Journal*, 93(3), 313–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885513490491>
41. Lee, Y.-K., Kim, S., Son, M.-H., & Kim, M.-S. (2015). Linking Organizational Justice to Job Performance: Evidence from the Restaurant Industry in East Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(sup1), 1527–1544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2015.1016052>
42. Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Do East Asians Respond More/Less Strongly to Organizational Justice Than North Americans? A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(5), 787–805. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00825.x>
43. Lim, B. T. H., & Loosemore, M. (2017). The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(2), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.016>
44. Lo, F. F. (2016). *Transformational Leadership Behavior's Effect on Knowledge Application: A Systematic Review* [A Dissertation]. University of Maryland University College.
45. López-Cabarcos, M. Á., Machado-Lopes-Sampaio-de Pinho, A. I., & Vázquez-Rodríguez, P. (2014). The Influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment in Portugal's Hotel Industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 56(3), 258–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965514545680>
46. Mashi, M. S. (2017). The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Outcomes. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(16), 1351–1360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1388819>
47. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626–637. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256489>
48. Minibas-Poussard, J., Le Roy, J., & Erkmen, T. (2017). The moderating role of individual variables in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. *Personnel Review*, 46(8), 1635–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-12-2015-0311>
49. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
50. Moon, T.-W., Hur, W.-M., Ko, S.-H., Kim, J.-W., & Yoon, S.-W. (2014). Bridging corporate social responsibility and compassion at work: Relations to organizational justice and affective organizational commitment. *Career Development International*, 19(1), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2013-0060>
51. Otto, K., & Mamatoglu, N. (2015). Why Does Interactional Justice Promote Organizational Loyalty, Job Performance, and Prevent Mental Impairment? The Role of Social Support and Social Stressors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(2), 193–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.866535>
52. Oxman, A. D., Cook, D. J., & Guyati, G. H. (1994). Users' Guides to the Medical Literature. *JAMA*, 2(272), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1994.03520170077040>
53. Pan, X., Chen, M., Hao, Z., & Bi, W. (2018). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Positive Organizational Behavior: Evidence from a Large-Sample Survey and a Situational Experiment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02315>
54. Pawson, R., Boaz, A., Grayson, Lesley, Long, A., & Barnes, C. (2003). *Types and quality of knowledge in social care*. Social Care Institute for Excellence. www.scie.org.uk
55. Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Blackwell Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887>
56. Priola, E. J. (2016). *Managerial Communication Competencies That Enhance Employee Performance: A Systematic Review* (ProQuest) [A Dissertation]. University of Maryland University College.
57. Rafael, G., Gonçalves, G., Santos, J., Orgambidez-Ramos, A., & Sousa, C. (2017). Explanatory contribution of Social Responsibility and Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment: An exploratory study in a Higher Public Education institution. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 48(4), 470–480. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ppb-2017-0054>
58. Remme, J. H. F. (2004). Research for control: The onchocerciasis experience*. *Tropical Medicine and International Health*, 9(2), 243–254. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2003.01192.x>
59. Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (2008). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (3rd ed). McGraw-Hill.
60. Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123(2), 159–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.10.011>
61. Shan, S., Ishaq, H. M., & Shaheen, M. A. (2015). Impact of organizational justice on job performance in libraries: Mediating role of the leader-member exchange relationship. *Library Management*, 36(1/2), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-01-2014-0003>

62. Suifan, T. S., Diab, H., & Abdallah, A. B. (2017). Does organizational justice affect turnover-intention in a developing country? The mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(9), 1137–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2017-0048>
63. Supardi, & Hadi, S. (2020). New Perspective on the Resilience of SMEs Proactive, Adaptive, Reactive from Business Turbulence: A Systematic Review. *Journal Of Xi'an University Of Architecture & Technology*, XII(V). <https://doi.org/10.37896/JXAT12.05/1524>
64. Swalhi, A., Zgoulli, S., & Hofaidhllaoui, M. (2017). The influence of organizational justice on job performance: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(4), 542–559. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-11-2015-0162>
65. Tjahjono, H. K. (2014). The Fairness of Organization's Performance Appraisal Social Capital and The Impact Toward Affective Commitment. *Bisnis & Birokrasi Journal*, 21(3). <https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v21i3.4842>
66. Tjahjono, H. K., Fachrunnisa, O., & Palupi, M. (2019). Configuration of organizational justice and social capital: Their impact on satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of Business Excellence*, 17(3), 336. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2019.097957>
67. Tjahjono, H. K., & Palupi, M. (2017). A model of 3 concepts of justice and its impact toward affective commitment of disabling employees in Indonesia. *International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research*, 4(7), 8.
68. Tlaiss, H. A., & Elamin, A. M. (2015). Exploring organizational trust and organizational justice among junior and middle managers in Saudi Arabia: Trust in immediate supervisor as a mediator. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(9), 1042–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-10-2014-0129>
69. Tziner, A., & Sharoni, G. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, job stress, and workfamily conflict: Examination of their interrelationships with respondents from a non-Western culture. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, 30(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a5>
70. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2002). Examining the Construct of Organizational Justice: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Relations with Work Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38, 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015820708345>
71. Wharton, J. D. (2016). *Examining Employee Voice Behavior: A Systematic Review of Voice Antecedents* (ProQuest) [A Dissertation]. University of Maryland University College.
72. Yuan, G., Jia, L., & Zhao, J. (2016). Organizational identification moderates the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction. *Work*, 54(1), 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-162271>
73. Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1472–1481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.387>
74. Zoghbi M. de L, P., & Ting D., J. M. (2017). Task and contextual performance as reactions of hotel staff to labor outsourcing: The role of procedural justice. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 33, 51–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.09.007>