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Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of organizational justice on job performance intention via the mediating influence of high-performance human resource practices (HPHRPs) in a developing context. Equity theory and expectancy theory are widely employed in many disciplines but seldom applied to job performance among Pakistan Telecommunication Company Limited (PTCL). The respondents in this study were 377 employees working in PTCL. Partial least square (PLS), specifically structural equation modeling was used for the data analysis. The study found a significant direct and indirect influence of distributive justice (DJ) on job performance through the partial mediating role of selective staffing and extensive training. Procedural justice (PJ) also, directly and indirectly, influenced job performance through the partial mediating role of the incentive reward. While interactional justice (IJ), result-oriented appraisal, employment security had an insignificant influence on job performance. Organizational justice has to be synergized with HPHRPs to enhance job performance. The results of this study would augment the body of knowledge of job performance in developed and under-developing countries.
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Introduction

The concept of job performance is logically an essential part of managerial and organizational psychology, which is an important factor for human resource management (HRM) outcomes (Campbell, 1990). Borman and Motowidlo (1997) viewed job performance as a behavioral action performed by the employees of an organization. Employees and their performance are valuable assets of every organization as
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they can construct or destroy the reputation of the organization, which could also affect profitability (Hameed & Waheed 2011; Elnaga & Imran, 2013). A critical literature review study in USA by Kim et al. (2013) confirmed that more research is needed to find the antecedents of work engagement and job performance. Over the last decade, many studies were conducted regarding the administration of job performance in the developed countries. Besides this, in developing and underdeveloped countries, proper attention has not been given to job performance as argued by Ibrahim and Al Falasi (2014), and Kim (2017). The study of Kim (2017) revealed that more in-depth work is required to identify additional factors that could be responsible for job performance enhancement.

The term organizational justice means the role of fairness in organizations and it is closely related to employees’ perceptions of fair treatment in the organization (Oh & Jeong, 2013). Previous research had explored the importance of employers’ and employees’ relationships by relating organizational justice with job performance (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). Organizational justice is made up of three dimensions; DJ, PJ and IJ (Adams, 1965; Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). The study of Mehmood and Ahmad (2012) found that DJ, PJ, and IJ are positively and significantly associated with job performance. Several other studies used organizational justice for different outcomes such as leader-member exchange and job performance (Zeb et al., 2019), employees commitment (Shawabkeh, Al-Lozi & Masa'deh 2019), conflict management and employees relation (Sahoo & Sahoo, 2019), and Islamic work ethic (Farid et al. 2019).

On the other side, HPHRPs also have influence on several employees’ responses, including employees self-perceived work outcome (Hadi et al. (2014), employees’ creative performance (Salman et al., 2016), employees satisfaction and performance (Lestari et al., 2018) job performance (Haryono et al., 2019), and psychological climate and work engagement (Kataria, Garg, & Rastogi, 2019). The study of Saa-Perez and Garcia-Falcon, (2002) claimed that HPHRPs are the basic practices by which organizations could influence employee’s knowledge and skill to achieve organizational goals (Collins & Clark, 2003). HPHRPs have been previously used for different outcomes such as organizational commitment (Mostafa & Gould-Williams, 2014), employees’ resilience and engagement (Cooke et al., 2019), and organizational citizenship behavior (Pham et al., 2019). Heffner and Dundon (2012) used organizational justice as a mediating variable between HPHRPs and employee performance outcomes. They further concluded that HPHRPs predict both job performance and organizational justice dimensions. The current study has a notable contribution, as it empirically examined the influence of organizational justice dimensions on job performance with the mediating role of HPHR practice. This study endeavors the two research questions; first, do organizational justice dimensions influence job performance? Second, do HPHRPs mediate the relationships between organizational justice dimensions and job performance?

Rarely research in the field of organizational justice has been conducted on PTCL. Besides, examining organizational justice theories in the unique cultural context of the developing country will provide some new insights on theories of organizational justice that have been mainly examined and developed in developed countries. The current study will help decision-makers of PTCL to better realize the links among organizational justice, HPHRPs, and job performance, which may raise productivity and organizational performance.

To address the identified gaps, we have conducted a study with a sample of PTCL employees. Same sample has been used for both organizational justice and authentic leadership as published earlier in International Journal Of Public Leadership (Zeb et al., 2020). It is difficult to adjust both constructs in a single paper.
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Firstly, the conceptual model and hypotheses are presented. Secondly, the methodology, including, the sample size, survey instrument validity, and result of SEM are presented. Thirdly, the discussion of the main findings allows us to return them to the primary implications of this study, its limitations and its future outlooks.

Theory and hypotheses development
This subsequent section reviews studies that lead to the formulation of hypotheses of this study.

Organizational justice and Job Performance
The term organizational justice is considered as the role of fairness in organizations and it is closely related to employees’ perceptions of fair treatment in the organization (Oh and Jeong, 2013). Organizational justice has been regarded as valuable for both individual employee and organization effectiveness (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). In several developing and underdeveloped countries, there are many political, social, technological and economic issues are existed where unfairness can speed up the ill-fated event in the work environment (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Organizational justice plays an extensive role in assisting the organization to gain a competitive advantage over competitors; it is possible with the role of a fair and balanced relationship between employers and employees (Randeree, 2008). The term organizational justice is derived from equity theory and expectancy theory. Employees are motivated and satisfied whenever they feel that their inputs are being fairly rewarded means that there is a fair balance between input and output. Expectancy theory process exchange of relationship between performance and outcomes and great effort increase the motivation.

Previous research has found that organizational justice is important in influencing employee’s job outcomes (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Al Rawashdeh, 2013; Abbas et al., 2020). Cropanzano et al. (2007) and Greenberg (1990) posited that injustice in the organization split up the bonds of a group of employees and affect their performance. They further stated that organizational justice promotes involvement and collectivism and makes a sense in employees to work in one team. The organizational justice has a negative link to workplace sabotage and employees’ larceny (Greenberg 1993; Ambrose, Seabright & Schminke, 2002; Suliman and Kathairi, 2013), Prior literature has proved that unfair treatment in the organization discourages committed employees (Brockner, Tyler, Cooper, & Schneider 1992; Cropanzano et al., 2007). Furthermore, Cropanzano et al. (2007) have also proved a positive association between organizational justice and job performance, employees’ satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and employees’ commitment.

Several studies have been conducted on the relationship between organizational justice and JP, and it has been proved that when employees are overpaid, the performance of employees will start to increase, and when they are underpaid the performance of employees will start decrease (Masterson et al., 2000; Adams & Freedman, 1976; Greenberg, 1982; Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999). Fields, Pang, and Chiu (2000), Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) and Zeb et al. (2019) studied three types of organizational justice; DJ, PJ, and IJ respectively.

DJ is related to equity theory and it explained that employees compare their performance with reward if there is any difference occurs in the results they feel injustice (Homans, 1961). The substantial role of DJ brings satisfaction that all employees’ received incentives and rewards base on their services concerning
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and PJ, and the relationship between job performance and PJ was insignificant but DJ significantly influences job performance. He also found that intention to quit was negatively affected by PJ and DJ.

The fair exchange of managers and subordinates relationships representing IJ (Masterson et al., 2000), the manager should handle HR practices in such a way to provide expected outcomes. Kilroy and Dundon (2015) observed that different style of management affects employees’ perceptions towards human resource fairness and justice. Seok Kang, Sung Kim and Won Lee (2006), and Chang (2014) supported a positive association between organizational justice dimension and HPHRPs. Hence the following hypothesis is proposed.

H2: The relationships between organizational justice dimensions and HPHRPs are positive and significant.

High-performance human resource practices and job performance

The phrase HPHRs is generally taken to refer to HR practices that have positive effects on the performance of an enterprise, typically a business enterprise. Ambrose and Schminke (2003) opined that HPHRPs put together many HR practices and predicted results in a change in employees’ attitudes and behaviors. The literature on the topic highlighted that HPHRPs have a significant role in the business fields and employees related issues (Chang & Chen, 2011; Ang et al., 2013). Sun, Aryee and Law (2007) posited that HPHRPs is a signal of long-term investment in employees. Boon et al (2014) claimed that for organizations to get expected outcomes from employees, it is essential for every corporate sector to establish a long-term and mutually organized relationship with employees. Tian et al. (2016) stressed that HR practices are prominent factors in the development of embeddedness and job performance. Job performance and competitive advantage are significantly influenced by the successive role of HRM practices (Khan, 2010). Zeb et al. (2018a), Wayne Mondy, Noe, (2005), Singh (2004), and Tomazevicet al. (2014) identified several basic HRM practices; selective staffing, extensive training, ES, that enhanced job performance.

Selective staffing is a process of findings, assessing, and hiring the right people in the right job (Pahos & Galanaki, 2018). Zeb et al. (2018a) emphasized that for expected job performance, a manager should develop the system of SS in the organization to hire competent employees. They found the selection of employees positively and significantly influenced job performance. The term extensive training is teaching or development of an individual’s skill and knowledge to enable work competency and performance. The study of Zeb et al. (2018a) stressed that training methods should be conducted to increase the level of job performance. Kraja et al. (2015) defined employment security as protection against employment loss. They further stressed that work performance is enhanced by proper availability of employment security. result-oriented appraisal is a systematic approach to assessing the employee’s work performance in a measurable way (Cumming, 1993). The main purpose of result-oriented appraisal is to increase self-esteem and increase motivation (Hassan, 2016). Singh (2004) concluded that result-oriented appraisal enhances growth and transparent performance evaluation and motivate employees’ desirable performance to achieve organizational objectives. Lastly, incentive reward includes all types of financial and non-financial rewards. Day et al. (2014), Tomazevicet al. (2014) and and Zeb et al. (2018b) claimed that reward is a basic instrument of an organization that is used for new employees and producing desired work performance. Prior influential motivation theories, like Hall & Lawler’s discrepancy theory (1971), Vroom’s expectancy theory (1964), and Adams’s equity theory (1965) stated that reward discouraging undesirable issues like absenteeism and turnover intention and stimulate employees behavior and attitudes.
Organizational justice enhances job performance through high-performance human resource practices (Hourani, Williams & Kress, 2006). The conceptual model of the study is shown in Figure 1. HPHRPs are the embodiment factors of organizational justice, therefore, on the basis of contingency approach, HPHRPs are used as mediating variables between organizational justice and job performance. The following hypotheses are proposed based on the supporting literature.

H3: The relationship between HPHRPs and job performance is positive and significant.

H4: The relationship between organizational justice dimensions and job performance are positive and significantly mediated by HPHRPs.

**Figure 1. Conceptual model**

### Method

#### Sample procedure

This study employed a convenience sampling technique in different regional offices of PTCL. A total of 407 (81.4%) questionnaires were retrieved and 30 (7%) were rejected due to missing data and incomplete information. Thereby, 377 (75%) responses were used for the final analysis refer to Table 1. Gender distribution indicated that about 80% of the employees were males and 19% were females. The result also shows that more than 60% of the respondents were married and aged between 30 and 49 years were high. Furthermore, more than 60% of the respondents have intermediate and bachelor education. Data further indicated that more than 60% of the respondents were grade 2 and grade 3 officers. However, more than 40% of respondents have 4 to 6 and 10 to 12 years of experience. Respondents recorded their level of agreement with each survey item on a five-point Likert Scale with responses ranging from 1; strongly agree to 5; strongly disagree. PLS-SEM was used for confirmatory factor analysis.
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### Table 1. Profile of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.9356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>80.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>.4859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>37.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>62.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>.6823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under 29 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>47.480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>41.644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 years and Above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>.9389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>38.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M.Phil/Ph.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>.8060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>53.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of working experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>1.3607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29.973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13-15 years or above</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zeb et al. (2020)

**Measures**

All the study constructs were measured on previously tested questionnaires. Three dimensions measured organizational justice; DJ with 3 items, e.g. one item, “I believe my level of pay is fair”, PJ with 4 items, e.g. one item, “Our organization has procedures to collect information for decisions accurately and thoroughly”, IJ was measured with 3 items, e.g. one item, “When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration”. The alpha values were 0.94, 0.94, and 0.88 (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). HPHR practice; selective staffing was measured by 4 items, e.g. one item, “Great effort is taken to select the right person”, extensive training was measured by 4 items, e.g. one item, “Extensive training programs are provided for individuals in customer contact or front-line jobs”, employment security was measured by 2 items, e.g. one item, “Employees in this job can be expected to stay with this organization for as long as they wish”, result-oriented appraisal was measured by 3 items, e.g. one item, “Performance is more often measured with objective, quantifiable results.”, and incentive reward measured by 2 items, e.g. one item “Individuals in this job receive bonuses based on the profit of the organization”. These HPHRs were previously developed by Sun et al. (2007). The alpha values of employment security and incentive reward were 0.55, 0.50, and other constructs’ reliability were greater than 0.70. Nunnally (1978) and Bae and Lawler (2000), reliability values between .50 and .60 are considered adequate in the early stage of questionnaire development. Job performance was measured by four dimen-
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Organizational justice dimensions: 4 items, e.g. one item measured task performance, “I adequately complete assigned duties”, extrarole behavior by 4 items, e.g. one item, “I tried to help and support coworkers” organization and co-worker support by 3 items, e.g. one item, “I help other employees who have heavy workloads.” and cognitive and motivational efforts was by 3 items, e.g. one item, “I maintain concentration when working hour is long”. The alpha values were 0.94, 0.89, 0.88, and 0.90 (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012).

Control variables

Variables such as gender, age, marital status, education, up-gradation and experience in this study were taken as control variables, refer to Table 1. The inclusion of control variable pollutes results and associations among study constructs. Roth et al. (2012) claimed that in the context of job performance, males are related higher for up-gradation as compare to females. Padmanabhan and Magesh (2016) highlighted that unmarried persons perform very well as compared to married persons. Cook et al. (2013) emphasized that age and experience have been a significant impact on job performance. Tattoo, M. T. (1998) stressed that education is a basic factor for behavior. Therefore, this study is using gender, age, marital status, education, up-gradation and experience as control variables.

Common variance method

This study employed a cross-sectional research design. Data were collected through previously tested questioners. Podsakoff et al. (2003) and Zeb et al., (2021) claimed that cross-sectional research design might introduce common method bias. Therefore, this study used Harman’s one-factor test for identification of common method bias. The first factor extracted only 39.38 percent of the total variance. While one factor contributing to more than 50% of the total variance is considered a sign of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The results indicated that bias is not likely to be a serious problem in further analysis.

Results

Measurement model analysis

Results of the measurement model of organizational justice dimensions, HPHRPs and job performance presents the C.R, AVE, and factor loadings values refer to Figure 2 and Table 2. All steps of PLS-SEM has been carried out according to the guidelines of (Marin-Garcia, & Alfalla-Luque, 2019). The C.R values of all constructs ranging from 0.807 to 0.904 were greater than the recommended 0.6, even though at signifying high-level of internal consistency of the measurement model. The AVE value of all constructs ranging from 0.577 to 0.825 was above 0.50 threshold. Moreover, the entire items of all constructs factor loadings ranging from 0.641 to 0.951 were 0.001 level of significance with alpha values ranging from 0.751 to 0.819 were considered normal and good.
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Figure 2. measurement model
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Table 2. Results of the structural model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha values</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>C.R</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha values</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>OJ.D1</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>H.P11</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.D2</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.P12</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.D3</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.P13</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>OJ.P4</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>H.R14</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.P5</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.R15</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.P6</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>J.TP1</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.P7</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.TP2</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>OJ.18</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td></td>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>J.ERB5</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.19</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.ERB6</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OJ.110</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.ERB8</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>H.S1</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>J.OCS9</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.S2</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.OCS10</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.S3</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CME</td>
<td>J.OCS11</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.S4</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.CME12</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>H.T5</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.CME13</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.T6</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.CME14</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.T7</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.T8</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>H.E9</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E10</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributive justice (DJ); Procedural justice (PJ); International justice (IJ); Selective staffing (SS); Extensive training (ET); Employment security (ES); Result oriented appraisal (ROA); Incentive reward (IR); Task performance (TP); Extra role behavior (ERB); Organization and co-worker support (OCS); Cognitive and motivational efforts (CME); Job performance (JP)
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**Discriminant validity**

Discriminant validity was examined after the convergent validity of all measurement constructs, refer to Table 3. The square root of AVE of each construct is greater than the correlation of other latent constructs that implies adequate discriminant validity as recommended by Hair et al. (2014) and Byrne (2010) respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>CME</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IJ</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>ROA</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goodness of Fitness**

The following formula was used to determine the goodness of fit ($Q^2$);


$$= 1 – ((1 – 223)(1 – 0.150)(1 – 0.091)(1 – 0.041)(1 – 0.086)(1 – 0.067))$$

$$= 1 – ((0.777)(0.085)(0.909)(0.959)(0.914)(0.933))$$

$$= 1 – 0.491$$

$$= 0.509$$

All the study endogenous variables’ R2 values were shown in above formula, refer to Table 4. Predictive $Q^2$ was used to determine the predictive relevance. The Q2 value 50.9 % deserves that the diversity of data that can be explained by the model. While, 49.1 % is explained by other variables which were exempted from the model error.

**Coefficient of determination**

The coefficient of determinations ($R^2$) in the measurement model explains that only 22.3% of the total variance in job performance can be explained by organizational justice and HPHRPs refer to Table 4. Furthermore, the c efficient of determinations explains that the total variance of the following HPHRPs can be explained by organizational justicr: selective staffing, 15%; extensive training, 9.1%; employment security, 4.1%; result-oriented appraisal, 8.6%; and incentive reward, 6.7%.

**Structural path coefficient analysis**

The results of the path coefficient after bootstrapping were presented, refer to Table 4 and Table 5. The DJ and PJ ($β = 0.141, 0.077, t = 4.686, 2.289, P = .000, 0.023$) positive and significantly influenced job performance. On another side, influenced of IJ ($β = 0.031, t = 1.130, P = 0.258$) on job performance was insignificant.
Table 4. Summary results of direct relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The direct effects of OJ dimensions on job performance</td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>4.686</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The direct effects of OJ dimensions on HPHRPs</td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; H.S</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>7.903</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; H.T</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; H.E</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; H.P</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.D -&gt; H.R</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; H.S</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; H.T</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; H.E</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; H.P</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.P -&gt; H.R</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; H.S</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; H.T</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; H.E</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>2.178</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; H.P</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.I.J -&gt; H.R</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The direct effects of HPHRPs on job performance</td>
<td>H.S -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>3.035</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.T -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.P -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.R -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < 0.05; p < 0.01; \)

The influenced of DJ (\( \beta = 0.337, 0.203, 0.190, 0.105, t = 7.903, 3.883, 3.292, 1.964, p = 0.000, 0.000, 0.001, 0.051 \)) on SS, extensive training result-oriented appraisal were positive and significant. On another hand, DJ (\( \beta = 0.108, t = 1.742, 0.085 \)) has insignificant influenced on job extensive training. The influenced of PJ (\( \beta = 0.002, 0.035, t = 0.039, 0.650, p = 0.069, 0.516 \)) on selective staffing and employment security were insignificant. On the other side, PJ (\( \beta = 0.144, 0.119, 0.210, t = 2.238, 2.267, 3.383 \)) were positive and significant influenced on extensive training result-oriented appraisal, incentive reward.

The influenced of IJ (\( \beta = 0.051, 0.058, 0.098, -0.015, t = 1.050, 1.090, 1.629, 0.266, p = 0.290, 0.276, 0.103, 0.790 \)) on SS, extensive training, result-oriented appraisal, and incentive reward were insignificant. On the side, IJ (\( \beta = 0.133, t = 2.178, p = 0.790 \)) has significant influenced on employment security. The influenced of SS, extensive training and incentive reward (\( \beta = 0.163, 0.189, 0.169, t = 3.035, 3.093, 2.547, p = 0.002, 0.002, 0.001 \)) were significant on job performance. While, employment security and result-oriented appraisal (\( \beta = 0.023, 0.144, t = 0.419, 1.746, p = 0.675 \)) were insignificant influenced on job performance. Selective staffing and extensive training (\( \beta = 0.061, 0.038, t = 2.725, 2.424, p 0.006, 0.015 \)), mediated the relationships between DJ and IP, while, employment security, result-oriented appraisal and incentive reward were not mediated the relationships between distribute justice and job job.
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Performance. Selective staffing, extensive training, employment security, and result-oriented appraisal ($\beta = 0.000, 0.027, 0.001, t = 0.036, 1.473, 0.204, 1.249, p = 0.971, 0.141, 0.838, 0.212$) were not mediated the relationships between PJ and job performance, while, incentive reward ($\beta = 0.038, t = 1.983, p = 0.016$), mediated the relationships between PJ and job performance. Furthermore, selective staffing, extensive training, ES, result-oriented appraisal, and incentive reward ($\beta = 0.008, 0.011, 0.003, 0.001, -0.003, t = 0.898, 0.998, 0.349, 1.056, 0.252, p = 0.347, 0.318, 0.727, 0.291, 0.801$) were not mediated the relationship between PJ and job performance.

Table 5. Summary results of indirect relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>$\beta$ values</th>
<th>$t$ values</th>
<th>$p$ values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The indirect effect of OJ dimensions on JP with the mediating role of HPHRPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OJ.D -&gt; H.S -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D -&gt; H.T -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D -&gt; H.E -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D -&gt; H.P -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D -&gt; H.R -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.P -&gt; H.S -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.P -&gt; H.T -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.P -&gt; H.E -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.P -&gt; H.P -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.P -&gt; H.R -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.I -&gt; H.S -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.I -&gt; H.T -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.I -&gt; H.E -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.I -&gt; H.P -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.I -&gt; H.R -&gt; J.P</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and conclusion

The result shows that DJ has a significant impact on job performance at PTCL. The result is consistent with previous research study of Shan et al. (2015), Kalay (2016); Iqbal (2017); Kirshnan et al. (2018) that found that DJ positively influenced job performance. Although, the findings of the study were contrary to the meta-analysis findings of Aboagye (2015); Swalhi et al. (2017) concluded that PJ and IJ significantly predicted job performance. The statistical analysis shows that PTCL’s employees considered their work schedule, pay and workload as fair. The employees who received fair reward most probably performed well at PTCL. Therefore PTCL management must improve DJ because it is a significant factor for job performance improvement. The per capita income of Pakistani citizens is low; hence, the majority of Pakistani citizens give more consideration to DJ.

The findings of the study also revealed that PJ also has a positive and significant impact on job performance. The findings were similar to the studies of Wang (2010), Aboagye (2015), Niazi and Hassan (2016), Iqbal (2017) that indicated PJ significantly influences job performance. The findings of the study were not in line with previous studies like these of Cropanzano (2002), Kalay (2016), Krishnan et al. (2018), Ashraf et al. (2018) where their findings claimed that PJ does not influence job performance. Western societies give more consideration to rules and procedures within organizations and therefore,
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they are more sensitive to the aspect of PJ (Wang et al. (2010). However, on the other hand, Eastern societies give more attention to pay and the material results they gain through labor, knowledge, skills and may; therefore, they are more preference to DJ (Wang et al., 2010). The findings of the study stressed that PJ is a motivational factor of J job performance at PTCL. The process of training and development, promotion, and work environment should be developed with a fair process, to enhance job performance.

The findings of this study also revealed that IJ has no significant effect on job performance at PTCL. The findings of this study was supported by the works of Warokka, Gallato and Moorthy (2012), Iqbal (2017), Swalhi et al. (2017), Niazi and Hassan (2016) they concluded that IJ has insignificantly influenced job performance. The findings of the study were not consistent with studies of Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001), Wang et al. (2010), Aboagye (2015), Shan Sidra (2015), Ashraf et al. (2018) and Krishnan et al. (2018) which found that among organizational justice; IJ is one of the most essential determinants of job performance. Most of the public schools in Turkey have 20 to 80 teachers and interaction among teacher and administrators were positive and the teacher may be less sensitive to the matter of IJ (Kalay, 2016). In the case of PTCL, interaction among employees is not good, because around 18,000 employees are working. Wang et al. (2010) also concluded that eastern employees gave more preference to DJ than procedural and IJ. Pakistan is a developing country and the per capita income of its citizen are low; most of the employees give more consideration to fair procedure of DJ as explained by equity and expectancy theory, Employees of PTCL need a fair system of input and output.

The Result of the study revealed that selective staffing significantly influenced job performance. The result is in line with previous studies that showed selective staffing positively influenced job performance (Chang & Chen, 2011; Zhang & Morris, 2014; Hassan, 2016). To meet the desired performance of employees, management of PTCL selective staffing should be developed in such a way that competent and productive employees could be hired. A poor selective staffing system will create a lot of problems, like high absenteeism, employees strike, and low performance. extensive training also influenced job performance of PTCL’s employees. The studies of Gordon (1992), Huselid (1995), Kotler and Armstrong (2006), Malik et al. (2012), Chang and Chen (2011) Georgiadis and Pitelis (2012), Omolo et al. (2013) Kaveri and Prabakaran (2013) and that of Ramdani Mellahi, Guermat and Kechad (2014) further supported the findings of this study and stressed that extensive training positively influenced job performance. Therefore, it is necessary for PTCL management to examine the system of extensive training, new methods of knowledge, skill, and abilities should introduce in the training system to improve job performance. Moreover, employment security has insignificantly influenced job performance. PTCL is a centralized government organization and there is full employment security. PTCL management cannot be easily terminated or dismiss employees from a job. Therefore, employment security has insignificantly influenced job performance at PTCL. Similarly, result-oriented appraisal also has insignificantly influenced on job performance. The findings are partially consistent with previous studies of Warokka, Gallato, and Moorthy (2012) and Zhang and Morris (2014) stressed that performance appraisal system predicted job performance. PTCL is a state-owned organization and many employees are working and they have no fear of performance appraisal system. The result has shown a positive insignificant influence on job performance. Lastly, IR is a motivational factor of HPHRPs and has significant influence on job performance at PTCL. Prior researchers also found a significant relationship between IR and job performance (Kerrin & Oliver 2002; Kaveri & Prabakaran 2013; Zhang & Morris 2014; Day et al. 2014; Tomazevic et al. 2014; Ramdani Mellahi, Guermat & Kechad, 2014). The majority of PTCL’s employees are financially weak and they give more preference to a proper system of reward. If PTCL treated employees
with well reward procedures their motivation towards organization will increase. Therefore, reasonable incentives and rewards should be provided to employees for expected performance.

Implications of the study

The results of the study have some theoretical, practical and policy implications for academicians, scholars, and practitioners. This study proposes and validates the organization model of job performance that highlights the role of organizational justice, and the role of HPHRPs as partial mediators. This model illuminated the complicated interactions among organizational justice, HPHRPs and indicated the degree of their importance as predictors of job performance. It also provides a reconceptualization of how various predictors of job performance interact. Related to the importance of DJ, PJ and HPHRPs as a predictor of JP; it is evident that it is a critical area that needs to be addressed by PTCL management to improve the performance of employees. The DJ, PJ and HPHRPs in PTCL should be directed in such a manner to improve the performance of employees. This study provides useful insights into PTCL policymakers. This study would be beneficial in terms of designing a sound organizational model of job performance to sustain in a competitive environment.

Limitations and future recommendations

This study was the first attempt to examine the mediation role of HPHRPs between organizational justice dimensions and job performance in a developing country. Hence some limitations issues are concerned with this study. This study employed a self-administrated survey for study constructs of organizational justice, HPHRPs and job performance which has an inherent subjectivity and biases which affect the generalization of the research. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) recommended that the use of previous scales causes the chances of an increase in the relationship between studies constructs. To minimize this problem Chang, Witteloostuijn and Eden (2010) stressed to avoid any type of preference is to introduce a scale for different constructs from other particular sources. The HPHRPs are used in this study are the most widely used but these practices are not representatives of all HPHRPs which are widely used and applicable in many organizations. This study could be further extended to other variables such as employees’ retention approaches, employees’ position in the chain of commands, social values, work atmosphere, and work-life balance. A qualitative or mixed mode study should be conducted in a private organization to achieve more refined results.
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Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D1</td>
<td>My work schedule is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D2</td>
<td>I believe my level of pay is fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ.D3</td>
<td>Generally, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Procedural justice**

OJ.P4  The decisions of my organization makes in the level of organization are in an unbiased manner.
OJ.P5  My organization makes sure that all employees' concerns are heard before job decisions are made.
OJ.P6  My organization has procedurals to collect information for making decisions accurately and thoroughly.
OJ.P7  My organization has procedurals that are designed to allow the requests for a clear explanation or additional information about a decision.

**Interactional justice**

OJ.18  When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.
OJ.19  When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor considers personal needs with the greatest care.
OJ.110 When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor treats me with a truthful manner.

**Selective staffing**

H.S1  In our organization great effort is taken to select the right person.
H.S2  In our organization long-term employee potential is emphasized.
H.S3  In our organization, considerable importance is placed on the staffing process.
H.S4  In our organization extensive efforts are made in selection.

**Extensive training**

H.T5  In our organization, extensive training programs are provided for individuals in customer contact or front-line jobs.
H.T6  In our organization employees in customer contact jobs will normally go through training programs every few years.
H.T7  In our organization, formal training programs are offered to teach new hires the skills they need to perform their job.
H.T8  In our organization, formal training programs are offered to employees in order to increase their promo ability.

**Employment security**

H.J9  In our organization, employees in the job can be expected to stay with this organization for as long as they wish.
H.J10 In our organization, job security is almost guaranteed to employees in the job.

**Employment security**

H.P11 In our organization, performance is more often measured with objective quantifiable results.
H.P12 In our organization, performance appraisals are based on objective quantifiable results.
H.P13 In our organization, employee appraisals emphasize long term and group-based achievement.

**Incentive rewards**

H.R14 In our organization, employee in this job receive bonuses based on the profit of the organization.
H.R15 In our organization, close tie or matching of pay to individual/group performance.

**Task performance**

J.TP1  I adequately complete assigned duties.
J.TP2  I performed tasks that were expected for me.
J.TP3  I fulfilled performance requirements of the job.
J.TP4  I attend to aspects of the job I am obligated to perform.

**Extra role behavior**

J.ERB5  I tried helping smooth out relationships with other employees.
J.ERB6  I tried to help and support coworkers.
J.ERB7  I avoids becoming angry or hostile with coworkers or supervisors.
J.ERB8  I help other employees who have heavy workloads.

**Organizational and co-worker support**

J.OCS9  I communicate with coworkers regarding work tasks.
J.OCS10  I help new employees get oriented with the department.
J.OCS11  I communicates any problems to the appropriate individual.

**Cognitive and motivational efforts**

J.CME12  I handles important details with sustained and focused attention.
J.CME13  I work with determination despite obstacles, setbacks, or frustrations.
J.CME14  I remain calm, self-assured, and organized when reacting to difficult situations.