International Conference on Rural Development and Entrepreneurship (ICORE 2026)
Proceedings
Vol. 08 Year 2026, 790 – 800

PERCEIVED JUSTICE AND EMPLOYEE WORK ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

Aditya Tindi Sawiji[1*], Ratno Purnomo[2]

[12]Magister Management, Jenderal Soedirman University, Indonesia

[*]Email corresponding author: aditya.sawiji@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

Abstract

Perceived organizational justice is widely recognized as a critical determinant of employee attitudes and behaviors, yet a comprehensive synthesis of its multidimensional effects across diverse organizational contexts remains limited. This systematic literature review (SLR) aims to examine how perceived justice encompassing distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational dimensions influences employees' work attitudes and behaviors in organizational contexts, and to identify contextual factors that moderate or mediate these relationships. Following the SPIDER framework and PRISMA 2020 guidelines, a structured database search was conducted, yielding 43 studies for full-text quality appraisal using the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist. Applying a strict methodological threshold (JBI score ≥75% with all mandatory criteria met), 14 high-quality empirical studies published between 2016 and 2025 were included for data extraction and synthesis. Findings reveal that perceived justice consistently and significantly predicts turnover intention (negatively), organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, job performance, quality of working life, and employee mental health. Seven mediating mechanisms were identified including empowerment, work engagement, organizational commitment, affective commitment, and self-efficacy while no adequately designed moderator study was found, highlighting a critical gap. Distributive justice emerged as the primary predictor of withdrawal behaviors, whereas procedural justice most consistently predicted performance outcomes. The review concludes with theoretical implications grounded in Social Exchange Theory, Equity Theory, and the Job Demands-Resources model, and proposes an agenda for future longitudinal and boundary condition research.

Keywords: perceived justice, organizational justice, work attitudes, employee behavior, systematic literature review

INTRODUCTION

Organizational justice defined as employees' subjective evaluation of the fairness of organizational policies, decisions, and treatment received from supervisors and the organization as a whole has emerged as one of the most extensively studied constructs in organizational behavior and human resource management research (Colquitt et al., 2001; Greenberg, 1987). Beginning with Adams' (1965) foundational work on equity theory, scholarly interest in workplace fairness has expanded substantially to encompass four conceptually distinct dimensions: distributive justice (the perceived fairness of outcomes), procedural justice (the perceived fairness of decision-making processes), interpersonal justice (the perceived degree of respect and dignity in treatment), and informational justice (the perceived adequacy of explanations and transparency of information) (Colquitt, 2001).

The significance of perceived justice in organizational life is well-documented. Employees who perceive their organization as fair demonstrate higher levels of motivation, commitment, and discretionary effort, while those who perceive injustice are more likely to engage in withdrawal behaviors, reduce their performance, and report lower well-being (Greenberg, 1990; Moorman,

1991). Despite this broad consensus, the empirical literature on perceived justice has grown in a somewhat fragmented manner, with individual studies examining specific justice dimensions in isolated contexts, making cross-contextual synthesis difficult. A systematic and rigorous synthesis of accumulated evidence one that covers all four justice dimensions, multiple outcome categories, and identifies mediating mechanisms is therefore warranted and timely.

The present study addresses this gap through a systematic literature review (SLR) governed by the SPIDER framework (Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation, Research type) and conducted in accordance with PRISMA 2020 guidelines. The guiding research question is: How does perceived justice encompassing distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational dimensions influence employees' work attitudes and behaviors in organizational contexts, and what contextual factors moderate or mediate these relationships?

This SLR makes three specific contributions to the literature. First, it provides a comprehensive and methodologically rigorous synthesis of perceived justice effects across multiple outcome domains, extending beyond the scope of prior narrative reviews. Second, it systematically maps the mediating mechanisms through which justice perceptions translate into behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Third, it identifies critical gaps in the existing evidence base particularly the absence of moderator research and longitudinal designs and proposes a concrete agenda for future inquiry. These contributions carry both theoretical implications for justice theory and practical implications for HRM practitioners seeking to design fair organizational systems.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION

Perceived Organizational Justice: Conceptual Overview

The concept of organizational justice was systematically developed by Greenberg (1987), who coined the term to describe the study of fairness in work organizations. Colquitt (2001) subsequently established the multidimensional structure of organizational justice that now dominates the field, distinguishing distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice as four empirically separable yet conceptually related dimensions. Distributive justice concerns the perceived equity of tangible outcomes such as pay, promotions, and task assignments (Adams, 1965). Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the formal processes used to determine those outcomes, including consistency, bias suppression, and representativeness (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Interpersonal and informational justice collectively termed interactional justice by Bies and Moag (1986) capture relational aspects of fairness, specifically the respectfulness of treatment and the adequacy of organizational communications, respectively.

These four dimensions, while conceptually distinct, operate in concert to shape employees' overall sense of organizational fairness. Employees continuously and dynamically evaluate fairness signals from multiple sources the organization, direct supervisors, and co-workers and integrate these evaluations into holistic justice perceptions that ultimately influence their psychological states and behavioral responses (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009).

Theoretical Frameworks

Three major theoretical frameworks inform the expected relationships between perceived justice and employee outcomes. **Social Exchange Theory (SET)** (Blau, 1964) is the most widely applied framework, positing that employees who perceive fair treatment engage in reciprocal behaviors as a form of exchange. Fair organizations are repaid with loyalty, commitment, and discretionary effort, while unfair ones incur withdrawal, disengagement, and turnover. SET thus provides the primary explanatory mechanism for the OJ–OCB, OJ–commitment, and OJ–turnover intention relationships documented in the empirical literature.

Equity Theory (Adams, 1965) specifically addresses distributive justice, proposing that employees compare their input-to-outcome ratios with those of relevant comparison others. Perceived inequity whether over- or under-reward generates cognitive dissonance that motivates

corrective action, including reduced effort, withdrawal, or actual turnover. This theory grounds the prediction that distributive justice carries particular weight in predicting withdrawal behaviors.

The **Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory** (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) provides a complementary framework by positioning organizational justice as a *job resource* that buffers the negative effects of job demands and fuels employee motivation, engagement, and well-being. This framework is particularly relevant for explaining perceived justice effects on outcomes such as work engagement, mental health, and quality of working life, as job resources are theorized to promote growth, learning, and psychological safety.

Perceived Justice and Work Attitudes and Behaviors: Evidence from Prior Research

Extant meta-analytic evidence consistently supports the relationship between organizational justice and key work outcomes. Colquitt et al. (2001), in a foundational meta-analysis of 183 studies, demonstrated that justice dimensions differentially predicted organizational commitment, OCB, performance, and withdrawal behaviors, with procedural and distributive justice explaining the largest unique variance in outcome categories. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) similarly confirmed that organizational justice was among the strongest predictors of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior. More recent meta-analyses have further delineated the differential effects of justice dimensions on specific outcomes, reinforcing the importance of examining justice at the dimensional rather than aggregate level (Hauenstein et al., 2001; Rupp et al., 2014).

Despite this meta-analytic evidence, individual primary studies particularly those from non-Western and specialized organizational contexts have proliferated in recent years, warranting an updated and geographically broader synthesis. The present SLR addresses this need by drawing on empirical studies published between 2016 and 2025, focusing on studies that meet stringent quality appraisal criteria.

RESEARCH METHODS

Review Design and Guiding Framework

This study employs a **systematic literature review (SLR)** design, conducted in accordance with the *PRISMA 2020 (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses)* guidelines (Page et al., 2021). The review protocol was structured using the **SPIDER framework** (Cooke et al., 2012), which is specifically suited to social science and behavioral research involving heterogeneous study designs. The SPIDER components for this review were as follows: Sample (employees in public and private sector organizations across industries and countries), Phenomenon of Interest (perceived organizational justice encompassing distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational dimensions), Design (all empirical designs including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods), Evaluation (work attitudes and behaviors including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCB, turnover intention, and job performance), and Research Type (peer-reviewed empirical studies published between 2016 and 2026).

Search Strategy

A structured electronic search was conducted in the Scopus database using the following Boolean search string applied to Title, Abstract, and Keywords (TITLE-ABS-KEY):

TITLE-ABS-KEY (("perceived justice" OR "organizational justice" OR "distributive justice" OR "procedural justice" OR "interactional justice" OR "interpersonal justice" OR "informational justice" OR "fairness perception" OR "justice perception" OR "perceived fairness") AND ("job satisfaction" OR "organizational commitment" OR "employee commitment" OR "turnover intention" OR "work engagement" OR "organizational citizenship behavior" OR "OCB" OR "employee performance" OR "job performance" OR "work behavior" OR "work attitude"

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were included if they: (I1) involved employees or workers in public or private organizational contexts; (I2) examined perceived organizational justice as a primary variable across at least one dimension; (I3) employed an empirical design (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods); (I4) measured at least one work attitude or behavior outcome; and (I5) were peer-reviewed, published in English between 2016 and 2026. Studies were excluded if: (E1) the sample was non-organizational (e.g., consumers, students, patients); (E2) perceived justice was mentioned only marginally without empirical measurement; (E3) the study was non-empirical (conceptual, editorial, book review); (E4) the outcome did not involve employee attitudes or behaviors; (E5) the study was published before 2016; (E6) written in a language other than English; or (E7) the full text was inaccessible after reasonable retrieval effort.

Study Selection and Quality Appraisal

The initial search yielded 43 studies for full-text screening and quality appraisal. Quality was assessed using the *JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Cross-Sectional Studies* (8 items) and the *JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Qualitative Research* (10 items), selected based on each study's research design. A stringent quality threshold was applied: studies were included only if they achieved a JBI score of ≥75% (i.e., ≥6 of 8 items met) AND met all four mandatory criteria (Q2: adequate sample description; Q6: confounding strategy stated; Q8: appropriate statistical analysis; and either Q3 or Q7: instrument validity/reliability reported). Additionally, studies without an identifiable publication year were excluded. Application of this strict threshold resulted in the final inclusion of **14 high-quality studies** for data extraction and synthesis.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Data were extracted from each included study using a standardized extraction form capturing: author and year, research objective, research design, research setting (country/sector), population and sample characteristics, treatment variables (IV/exposure including justice dimensions and any mediators/moderators), outcome variables (dependent variables), key findings (direction and significance of relationships), and reported study limitations. Synthesis was conducted using *narrative synthesis* (Popay et al., 2006), organizing findings thematically by outcome category, mediating mechanisms, and theoretical grounding, given the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures that precluded meta-analytic pooling.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Included Studies

A total of 14 empirical studies published between 2016 and 2025 were included following rigorous JBI quality appraisal. The studies represent a combined sample of approximately 3,880 participants drawn from 12 countries across four major geographical regions: East Asia (South Korea, China; n=4 studies), Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam; n=4), South and Middle East Asia (India, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq; n=4), and Europe and Africa (Türkiye, Ethiopia; n=2). The included studies are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Included Studies

No	Author (Year)	Country	Sector	N	Design	OJ Role
1	Şenbursa & Türkeli (2023)	Türkiye	Maritime	290	Mixed-Methods	IV
2	Kim & Jeong (2021)	South Korea	Sports	371	Quantitative	IV
3	Alshammari (2023)	Saudi Arabia	Multi-sector	NR	Quantitative	IV
4	Das & Mohanty (2023)	India	Higher Education	NR	Quantitative	IV

5	Lee et al. (2016)	South Korea	Healthcare	300	Quantitative	IV
6	Zhou & Ma (2022)	China	Education	>500	Mixed-Methods	IV
7	Mengstie (2020)	Ethiopia	Healthcare	197	Mixed-Methods	IV
8	Widodo et al. (2025)	Indonesia	Education	385	Quantitative	IV
9	Zuo et al. (2020)	China	Higher Education	425	Quantitative	Mediator
10	Mahfouz et al. (2022)	Malaysia	Construction	603	Quantitative	IV
11	Ansari et al. (2025)	Iran	Healthcare	376	Quantitative	IV
12	Cao & Dong (2024)	Vietnam	Industry	262	Quantitative	Mediator
13	Agustin et al. (2022)	Indonesia	Healthcare	278	Quantitative	IV
14	Shaalan et al. (2025)	Iraq	Manufacturing	293	Quantitative	Mediator

Note. *IV = Independent Variable; NR = Not Reported; OJ = Organizational Justice; Mixed-Methods = quantitative survey combined with semi-structured interviews.*

Regarding research design, 11 studies (79%) employed a quantitative cross-sectional approach, while three studies (21%) used mixed-methods designs. The dominance of cross-sectional survey-based research reflects the prevailing methodological tradition in organizational justice research. Organizational justice functioned as a primary independent variable in 10 studies, as a mediating variable in three studies (Zuo et al., 2020; Cao & Dong, 2024; Shaalan et al., 2025), and as a primary IV with additional mediating mechanisms in one study (Ansari et al., 2025). This positional variability underscores the theoretical versatility of perceived justice as a construct within organizational behavior models.

The Influence of Perceived Justice on Turnover Intention and Intention to Leave

Turnover intention and its occupational analog, intention to leave the profession — emerged as the most frequently studied outcome in this review, examined in five studies (Mengstie, 2020; Zhou & Ma, 2022; Lee et al., 2016; Widodo et al., 2025; Agustin et al., 2022). Across all five studies, perceived organizational justice demonstrated a consistent and statistically significant negative relationship with turnover intention, indicating that employees who perceive higher levels of organizational fairness are less inclined to leave their organizations. This finding is highly consistent with Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), which predicts that employees reciprocate perceived fairness with continued organizational membership.

Mengstie (2020) found that the four justice dimensions collectively explained an additional 9.9% of variance in turnover intention (ΔR^2=.099, p<.05) among Ethiopian healthcare workers, with distributive justice emerging as the strongest individual predictor (β=−.23, p<.05). These findings suggest that how rewards and outcomes are distributed carries particular salience for healthcare workers' retention decisions. Convergent evidence was provided by Lee et al. (2016), who reported a significant negative direct effect of perceived OJ on turnover intention (r=−.357, p=.004) among South Korean nurses in a structural equation model. Agustin et al. (2022) corroborated these findings in Indonesia, documenting that high OJ was independently and negatively associated with nurses' intention to leave (β=−0.144; 95% CI=−0.19 to −0.10; p<.001) after controlling for workload. In an educational context, Zhou & Ma (2022) demonstrated that OJ accounted for 20% of the variance in turnover intention among Chinese primary and secondary school teachers, with salary satisfaction partially mediating this relationship. Widodo et al. (2025) further confirmed the OJ–turnover intention relationship through a serial mediation pathway, wherein OJ first reduced turnover intention by building affective commitment, which then cultivated OCB behaviors, collectively diminishing the motivation to leave.

Taken together, these findings establish perceived justice as a **robust cross-contextual predictor of reduced turnover intention** across healthcare, education, and construction sectors in both developed and developing country contexts. The consistency of this relationship across widely

varying organizational environments strengthens confidence in its generalizability and supports investment in fairness-enhancing HRM practices as a core retention strategy.

The Influence of Perceived Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Three studies directly examined the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Alshammari, 2023; Das & Mohanty, 2023; Widodo et al., 2025). All three consistently reported significant positive relationships, indicating that employees who perceive greater organizational fairness are more likely to engage in discretionary behaviors that benefit the organization and their colleagues beyond formal job requirements. This pattern aligns strongly with Social Exchange Theory, wherein perceived fair treatment is "repaid" through voluntary citizenship contributions.

Alshammari (2023) demonstrated that all three examined justice dimensions distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness each independently and positively predicted OCB among female workers across organizations in Saudi Arabia. This finding is particularly noteworthy in that it extends the justice–OCB relationship to a gender-specific and culturally distinct context where female workforce participation carries unique organizational significance. Das & Mohanty (2023) similarly found that perceived OJ significantly predicted all five OCB dimensions (altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and sportsmanship) among faculty members of higher educational institutions in India, underscoring that justice perceptions shape the full spectrum of citizenship behaviors in academic professional contexts. Widodo et al. (2025) further established that OCB functioned as a **serial mediator** in the OJ → turnover intention chain, with perceived justice first generating citizenship behaviors, which subsequently reduced the motivation to leave. This mediating function of OCB enriches understanding of how justice perceptions cascade through behavioral mechanisms to produce attitudinal outcomes.

The Influence of Perceived Justice on Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was examined as a dependent variable in three studies (Şenbursa & Türkeli, 2023; Lee et al., 2016; Mahfouz et al., 2022), all of which reported significant positive relationships with perceived justice. The convergence of findings across three culturally distinct contexts Turkish maritime, South Korean healthcare, and Malaysian construction lends strong cross-cultural validity to the OJ–commitment relationship.

Lee et al. (2016) reported the largest direct effect, with perceived OJ exhibiting a path coefficient of r=.608 (p=.004) toward organizational commitment in a structural equation model the strongest relationship in their model among South Korean hospital nurses. Şenbursa & Türkeli (2023) corroborated this finding in the Turkish maritime industry, demonstrating that OJ scale scores significantly predicted commitment through linear regression. Mahfouz et al. (2022) extended this literature by demonstrating that organizational commitment serves as a **full mediator** in the OJ → intention to stay relationship among Malaysian construction engineers (n=603), providing evidence that perceived justice builds emotional attachment and normative bonds with the organization, which in turn makes employees more inclined to remain. This sequential OJ → commitment → retention pathway has direct practical implications, suggesting that organizations seeking to improve retention must address not merely surface-level justice perceptions but the deeper commitment mechanisms that justice perceptions engender.

The Influence of Perceived Justice on Job Performance and Sustainable Performance

Three studies examined perceived justice in relation to performance outcomes (Kim & Jeong, 2021; Zuo et al., 2020; Shaalan et al., 2025), collectively providing evidence that justice perceptions whether as independent variables or as mediating mechanisms contribute meaningfully to both task and contextual performance dimensions.

Kim & Jeong (2021) found that procedural justice (β=significant) and interactional justice (β=significant) each independently predicted job performance in a sample of 371 South Korean professional sports industry employees, even after controlling for empowerment. Notably,

empowerment fully mediated the interactional justice → job performance pathway, indicating that the performance-enhancing effect of interactional justice operates primarily through employees' psychological sense of competence and autonomy. Shaalan et al. (2025) positioned organizational justice as a **key mediating variable** linking leaders' motivational language to sustainable employee performance (task and relational dimensions) among Iraqi manufacturing workers, demonstrating that leadership communication shapes justice perceptions, which in turn generate sustained performance. Zuo et al. (2020) similarly showed that OJ mediated the transformational leadership → job satisfaction relationship in Chinese private university faculties, suggesting that transformational leaders improve employee outcomes partly by cultivating perceptions of fairness.

The Influence of Perceived Justice on Well-Being Outcomes

Two studies extended the perceived justice literature into the domain of employee well-being, specifically examining quality of working life (QWL) and employee mental health (Ansari et al., 2025; Cao & Dong, 2024). Both reported significant positive relationships, indicating that justice perceptions promote not only behavioral performance but also the subjective experiential quality of employees' work lives.

Ansari et al. (2025) found that OJ positively predicted QWL (PLS-SEM, significant path) among 376 Iranian operating room nurses, with professional values and self-efficacy serving as dual mediators. Their finding that 57.8% of nurses reported moderate OJ levels concurrent with moderate QWL levels suggests that incremental improvements in fairness perceptions could yield meaningful well-being gains in high-stress healthcare environments. Grounded in JD-R theory, Cao & Dong (2024) demonstrated that OJ functioned as a job resource that enhanced work engagement, which in turn promoted employee mental health among 262 Vietnamese industrial employees (complementary mediation, seven hypotheses supported via PLS-SEM). This finding bridges organizational justice scholarship with occupational health psychology, highlighting the *preventive role* of perceived justice in sustaining employee psychological health.

Mediating Mechanisms: Contextual Factors in the Justice–Outcome Relationship

Addressing the second part of the research question, nine of the 14 included studies (64%) identified mediating variables through which perceived justice influences work attitudes and behaviors. The identified mediators empowerment (Kim & Jeong, 2021; Lee et al., 2016), organizational and affective commitment (Lee et al., 2016; Mahfouz et al., 2022; Widodo et al., 2025), work engagement (Cao & Dong, 2024), salary satisfaction (Zhou & Ma, 2022), professional values and self-efficacy (Ansari et al., 2025), and psychological capital (Zuo et al., 2020) collectively map the **psychological and attitudinal pathways** through which justice perceptions translate into behavioral outcomes.

Notably, no study in this review tested a moderating variable with sufficient methodological rigor to meet the inclusion threshold. This finding constitutes a critical gap in the perceived justice literature: the *boundary conditions* under which justice effects are stronger or weaker such as cultural values (e.g., power distance, collectivism), leader–member exchange quality, or individual-level dispositions remain empirically uncharted territory. Future research should deliberately design studies to test moderated mediation models that capture both the mechanisms and the conditions of perceived justice effects.

The Differential Salience of Justice Dimensions

A consistent cross-study pattern emerges regarding the differential predictive weight of specific justice dimensions. **Distributive justice** most strongly predicted withdrawal behaviors (particularly turnover intention), consistent with equity-theoretical predictions that employees disengage when they perceive their outcomes as unfair relative to their contributions (Mengstie, 2020; Zhou & Ma, 2022). **Procedural justice** most consistently predicted performance outcomes and organizational citizenship behaviors, reflecting the process-oriented nature of this dimension employees who perceive fair decision-making processes are more likely to engage with and

contribute to organizational goals (Kim & Jeong, 2021; Das & Mohanty, 2023). **Interactional justice** (encompassing both interpersonal and informational sub-dimensions) most strongly predicted empowerment and psychological mediating mechanisms, suggesting that the relational quality of organizational treatment shapes employees' psychological resources and identity more profoundly than outcome or process fairness alone (Kim & Jeong, 2021; Mengstie, 2020). This dimensional differentiation has important practical implications: different fairness-targeted interventions are needed for different organizational objectives.

CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This systematic literature review synthesized evidence from 14 high-quality empirical studies to examine how perceived organizational justice influences employees' work attitudes and behaviors, and to identify contextual factors that mediate or moderate these relationships. The following four overarching conclusions emerge from the synthesis.

First, perceived organizational justice is a **robust and cross-contextually consistent predictor** of employee work attitudes and behaviors. Across 12 countries, multiple sectors, and diverse organizational contexts, higher perceived justice is systematically associated with reduced turnover intention and intention to leave, higher organizational citizenship behavior, stronger organizational commitment, improved job and sustainable performance, better quality of working life, and improved employee mental health. No included study reported a null or negative overall justice–outcome relationship, indicating high internal consistency of the evidence base.

Second, the influence of perceived justice on outcomes is **predominantly mediated by psychological and attitudinal mechanisms**. Seven distinct mediators were identified: empowerment, organizational commitment, affective commitment, OCB (as part of a serial chain), work engagement, salary satisfaction, professional values and self-efficacy, and psychological capital. This mediated landscape indicates that justice perceptions do not directly cause behavioral changes; rather, they first reshape employees' internal psychological states and organizational bonds, which then produce observable behavioral and attitudinal shifts.

Third, specific justice dimensions carry **differential predictive weight** depending on the outcome domain. Distributive justice most strongly predicts withdrawal behaviors; procedural justice most consistently predicts performance and citizenship behaviors; and interactional justice is most strongly associated with empowerment and mediating mechanisms. This dimensional specificity has meaningful theoretical and practical implications for both justice theory and HRM intervention design.

Fourth, significant **methodological and contextual gaps** remain. The dominance of cross-sectional designs precludes causal inference; the absence of rigorously designed moderator studies leaves boundary conditions unexplored; and the concentration of evidence in healthcare and education sectors within Asian contexts limits global generalizability. Future SLRs and meta-analyses should prioritize longitudinal designs, moderated mediation frameworks, and studies from underrepresented sectors and regions.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, this review reinforces the explanatory power of Social Exchange Theory and Equity Theory as primary frameworks for understanding justice outcome relationships, while demonstrating the complementary value of JD-R theory for explaining well-being-related outcomes. The identification of seven distinct mediators across 14 studies enriches justice theory by mapping the psychological pathways through which fairness perceptions produce behavioral consequences.

Practically, the findings carry clear implications for HRM practitioners. Organizations seeking to reduce turnover and improve commitment should invest in distributive fairness by ensuring

equitable and transparent reward allocation systems. Those seeking to promote citizenship behaviors and performance should attend to procedural and interactional fairness through consistent, bias-free decision-making processes and respectful leadership communication. The identification of empowerment and work engagement as key mediators further suggests that fairness-enhancing practices should be complemented by autonomy-supporting leadership and meaningful job design to maximize attitudinal and behavioral outcomes.

Limitations

This review is subject to several limitations. First, the strict quality appraisal threshold (JBI ≥75% with mandatory criteria), while ensuring methodological rigor, resulted in the exclusion of 29 of 43 full-text studies, potentially limiting the breadth of synthesis. Second, the review was restricted to English-language publications in the Scopus database, which may introduce language bias and exclude relevant studies indexed in other databases (e.g., Web of Science, PsycINFO). Third, the narrative synthesis approach, necessitated by the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures, precludes the precision of effect size estimation available through meta-analysis. Fourth, as all 14 included studies employed cross-sectional designs, the causal direction of all reported relationships remains empirically unconfirmed.

Directions for Future Research

Future research should address the identified gaps through the following priorities: (1) **longitudinal and experimental designs** that enable causal inference about the direction and stability of justice outcome relationships over time; (2) **moderated mediation studies** that systematically test boundary conditions (e.g., power distance, LMX quality, personality) on the justice–outcome link; (3) **studies in underrepresented sectors** (technology, financial services, gig economy) and regions (Western Europe, North America, Sub-Saharan Africa); (4) **dimensional specificity research** that explicitly compares the predictive weight of all four justice dimensions including informational justice, which remains understudied on a common set of outcomes; and (5) **intervention-based research** that tests the effectiveness of fairness-enhancing organizational programs on measurable employee and organizational outcomes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

Agustin, R., Ananditha, A. C., Rias, Y. A., & Thongsalab, J. (2022). The relationship between perceived workload and organizational justice toward nurses' intention to leave their profession. Jurnal Keperawatan Soedirman, 17(3), 106–111. https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jks.2022.17.3.6570

Alshammari, H. (2023). Effect of organizational justice on organization citizenship behavior of female employees in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 10(6), 158–163. https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.06.019

Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(2), 491–500.

Ansari, S., Mohebbi, Z., Torabizadeh, C., & Hesam Abadi, A. K. (2025). The mediating role of professional values and self-efficacy in the relationship between organizational justice and quality of working life among nurses in southwestern Iran. BMC Nursing, 24, 471. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03111-y

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. Wiley.

Cao, V. Q., & Dong, C. N. T. (2024). The mediating role of work engagement in the impact of authentic leadership and organizational justice on employee mental health. Cogent Psychology, 11(1), 2432740. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2024.2432740

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86(2), 278–321.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 425–445.

Cooke, A., Smith, D., & Booth, A. (2012). Beyond PICO: The SPIDER tool for qualitative evidence synthesis. Qualitative Health Research, 22(10), 1435–1443.

Das, L., & Mohanty, S. (2023). Impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior: Empirical evidence from higher educational institutions. Journal of Economic and Social Behavior, 8(2), 32–49. https://doi.org/10.1344/jesb2023.8.2.36704

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9–22.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16(2), 399–432.

Kim, S.-K., & Jeong, Y. (2021). Developing the healthy and competitive organization in the sports environment: Focused on the relationships between organizational justice, empowerment and job performance. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(17), 9142. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18179142

Lee, K. E., Kim, J. H., & Kim, M. J. (2016). Influence of perceived organizational justice on empowerment, organizational commitment and turnover intention in the hospital nurses. Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 9(20). https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i20/94702

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research (pp. 27–55). Plenum.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. Plenum.

Mahfouz, S., Halim, M. S. A., Bahkia, A. S., & Alias, N. (2022). The impact of organizational justice on intention to stay: The mediating role of organizational commitment. Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review, 6(1), 139–149. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv6i1p10

Mengstie, M. M. (2020). Perceived organizational justice and turnover intention among hospital healthcare workers. BMC Psychology, 8, 19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-0387-8

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(6), 845–855.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., … Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71.

Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K., & Duffy, S. (2006). Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. ESRC Methods Programme.

Şenbursa, N., & Türkeli, R. T. (2023). Analysis of organizational justice in relation to organizational commitment in a Turkish shipyard organization. Journal of ETA Maritime Science, 11(2), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.4274/jems.2023.57689

Shaalan, M. A., Al-Ameedi, D. A. M., Haddawee, A. H., Mahdi, M. H., & Oleiwi, H. A. (2025). The role of leaders' motivational language on employee sustainable performance: The mediating role of organizational justice. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 15(4), 108–119. https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2025.IJISS.15.4.12

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Erlbaum.

Widodo, W., Muhdaliha, E., Firdaus, P. M., Rojikun, A., & Tarmizi, A. (2025). Revealing the effect of quality of work life and organizational justice on Indonesian teachers' turnover intention: A serial mediation. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 23(3). https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.23(3).2025.36

Zhou, H., & Ma, J. (2022). Organizational justice and teachers' turnover intention in primary and secondary schools: The importance of sustainable salary management. Sustainability, 14(20), 13314. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013314

Zuo, C., Wongvanichtawee, C., & Chollathanrattanapong, J. (2020). The effects of the transformational leadership model on teachers' organizational justice and job satisfaction in private universities in Shandong Province. International Journal of Asian Business and Information Management, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.4018/IJABIM.341796