Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance: Mediating Role of Emotional Intelligence: An Analysis of Public Sector Organizations of Pakistan

Adil Tahir Pracha*, Summera Malik†, Malik Faisal Azeem‡ and Robina Yasmin§

Abstract

The current study purposely investigated the relationship of organizational justices with employee performance with the mediating role of emotional intelligence in three public sector organizations of Pakistan with the reason of addressing the potential issues associated with employee performance which have not been addressed yet in Pakistani context. Quantitative data collection from three public sector organizations of Pakistan i.e. State Bank of Pakistan (SBP), NADRA and OGDCL, using a self-administered questionnaire survey method, the study followed simple random sampling technique with the sample of 342 questionnaires. The study results designated that organizational justice is positively associated with employee performance with the mediating role of emotional intelligence which exhibits that there is a dire need to address emotional intelligence which is inevitable between the relationship of organizational justice and employee performance.
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Introduction

The concept of Organizational Justice (OJ) underlines the managers’ decisions, perceived equality, impact of justice, and the relationship between individuals and the environment they are in with some objectivity in organizations. According to Sert, Elci, Uslu, and Şener (2014), enforcement of rules, policies and procedures upon employee may create the perception of injustice/unfairness which may result in workplace problems. People evaluate justice in their organizations and respond to justice or injustice considering the basic concerns for understanding the
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organizational behavior (Yaghoubi, Saghaian Nejad, Abolghasem Gorji, Norozi, & Rezaie, 2009). Ability to accomplish goals (either personal or organizational) by using organizational resources proficiently leads to the increased employee performance (Daft, 2001). Injustice in rewards, compensation and unfair treatment against other employees affect the performance of the both i.e. employee and the organization. People respond positively towards their work associated outcomes if receive impartial treatment from their managers and additionally efforts by management in the area of organizational justice results in low level of discrimination (Cho, 2017)

According to Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001), employee dissatisfaction due to unjust interactions with the supervisors results in the decreased employee performance. Activities performed by individuals over a period of time are measured against organizations’ standards and procedures to acquire rewards, support and expected efforts by employee(Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998). According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), emotional intelligence can be interpreted as the capacity to screen one's own particular and others' emotions and feelings. (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) focus on self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness (empathy), and social abilities (relationship management) associated with emotional intelligence. Due to injustice interactions with the supervisors, dissatisfaction prevails which results in decreased employee performance (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). The study focuses upon the examination of the relationship between OJ with EP with the mediating role of EI in three public sector organizations of Pakistan with the reason of addressing the potential issues associated with employee performance and have not been addressed yet in Pakistani context.

The first selected organization for the current study is National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA) which is one of the leading integrated systems, provides operating solutions for global identification system for corporate and public-sector clients. NADRA employed approximately 17103 employees with 365 multi-biometric registration centers, 189 mobile vans, 199 semi-mobile units, two data-centers and 95 million computerized national identity cards (CNIC) issued to contribute toward the
biggest databases incorporated around the globe. The second selected organization is State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) which is the central bank of Pakistan constituted under Order 1948 with the liability to control the issue of certified receipts and keeping of money reserves with a perspective to securing fiscal security and credit arrangement for further purposes in Pakistan. In 1994 SBP was given full autonomy for financial sector reforms and currently has U.S $ 12.03 billion reserves. SPB-PMD (State Bank of Pakistan Personnel Management Department) continued to advance its strategic contribution towards attainment of organizational objectives by providing them appropriate training, leadership development and reliable succession planning. The total number of employees at SBP was approximately 3,106 in 2014. The third selected organization is Oil and Gas Development Company Limited (OGDCL), a multinational gas and lubricant exploration company of Pakistan. OGDCL was incorporated under the Ordinance dated 20th September 1961. In 2013, its annual income was Rs. 223.365 billion and benefits before assessment taking off was Rs. 90.777 billion. OGDCL has total strength of 10,297 employees out of which 246 are working on contract basis with daily production, including share from joint ventures averaged 39,659 barrels (6,305.3 m3) of oil; 937 million cubic feet (26,500,000 m3) of gas, and 358 metric tons of liquefied petroleum gas.

Objectives of the study:
1. To explore the relationship of Organizational Justice and its dimensions (Distributive, Procedural, Interactional justice) with Employee Performance
2. To evaluate how do emotions play a role of mediator between Organizational Justice and Employee Performance.

Literature Review

Organizational Justice (OJ):
Justice is considered as an essential component in understanding organizational behavior (Van den Bos, 2001). OJ is associated with employees’ perception regarding fair treatment by their organization (Wang, Lu, & Siu, 2015). According to (Adams, 1965), justice is an individual's observations about the decency of choices and policymaking procedures inside of associations and the impacts of those recognitions on conduct. According to
McDowall and Fletcher (2004), study i.e. (Greenberg & Bies, 1992) introduced the concept “Organizational Justice” which refers to the perceptions of people with regard to fairness in organizational settings. They believed that managers’ behavior can influence the performance effectively through their fairness in interaction, their behavior, and unbiased distribution of rewards and resources among employees.

Equity has three-dimensions i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional justice (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004). McDowall and Fletcher (2004) further narrate that organizational justice creates an impact on work-related variable and clarifies that why workers counter against discriminatory results/improper procedures and cooperation (Alsalem & Alhaiani, 2007). Justice, according to Ohana (2014) is spread in the organization by spreading its signals of actions related to justice. According to Moorman (1991), “Justice is the basis of all appropriate actions to maintain fairness in the organization among employees to be self-motivated and satisfied to produce better performance.” According to Hannam and Narayan (2015) employees who are intrinsically motivated considered their environment as fair compared to the participants who did not take interest in their task. Fair behaviors at work is identified in three elements of justice i.e. distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001). Organization justice is undoubtedly an important characteristic because the employees having negative behavior toward organizational practices are de-motivated which leads them toward adverse individual and organizational outcomes furthermore organizational justice positively impacts the link between job demands on turnover intentions also organizational justice reinforce the role of job control (Proost, Verboon, & Van Ruysseveldt, 2015).

OJ broadly covers three dimensions; Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional justice. Distributive Justice (DJ) is the amounts of reimbursement receives is perceived to be impartially distributed among employees, whereas Procedural Justice (PJ) talks about the fairness among organizational procedures and their outcomes (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Interactional Justice (IJ), is an impartial treatment that one receives against others employee in any organization. IJ includes two sub-
dimensions i.e. Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice (Dusterhoff, Cunningham, & MacGregor, 2014; Walumbwa, Cropanzano, & Hartnell, 2009). Interpersonal Justice is defined as the unbiased admiration and dignity that one gets from their supervisor and informational justice talks about to the procurement of accepting satisfactory data and social inclusion between supervisor and employee. Studies i.e. (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001) confirmed the division of organizational justice into distributive, procedural, and interactional justice by inspecting the biasness in organizational settings which is truly considered as injustice by the employees. OJ acumen instigate new thinking patterns regarding justice and its effect on employee attitudes, particularly while organizational change phases (Marzucco, Marique, Stinglhamber, De Roeck, & Hansez, 2014).

**Distributive Justice (DJ):** Distributive Justice (DJ) exhibits the positive perception of employees toward rewards such as compensation or promotions as per their expectations. DJ is the intended equality regarding results as appropriate reimbursement against employee efforts and opportunities for career advancement (Demers & Wang, 2010). According to a study i.e. (Ohana & Meyer, 2016) distributive justice positively links to the organization affective commitment.

**Procedural Justice (PJ):** Folger and Konovsky (1989) state that the rewards among the employees distributed on the bases of fair practices and values is PJ. According to Erdogan (2003), PJ is identified the decency of methods by which execution is assessed. PJ is also concerned with the degree of the basic components of policy-making (assignment procedure), encouragement of workers’ voice, suitability of criteria, and the accuracy of the data i.e. used to land at a decisional result (Aryee, Chen, & Budhwar, 2004) which ultimately leads to enhanced employee performance. Van Dijke, De Cremer, Brebels, and Van Quaquebeke (2015) suggested factors in order to effectively implement procedural justice and it stimulates employee cooperation.
**Interactional Justice (IJ):** According to Moorman (1991), the manner in which procedures are carried out fairly is known as IJ. A justifiable account in decisions process given to the employees would affect their overall performance as well as the performance of their organization. According to Huang and Huang (2016) procedural justice strengthens the interactional justice-silence relationship. Employees are given importance during their interpersonal interaction with their managers, the way they should be treated. A quality of interrelated attitude while making pre and post decisions in interaction among employees refer to IJ (Poole, 2007). IJ also refers to an interpersonal behaviors while demonstrating the organizational procedures and delivering their outcome (Hoffman & Kelley, 2000). Interactional equity is characterized as the nature of communication that an individual acquires during the enactment for the establishment of authoritative methodology (Yılmaz & Taşdan, 2009).

**Emotional Intelligence (EI)**

Intelligence is the capacity and aptitude to learn and embrace the environmental changes (Sternberg & Detterman, 1986; Terman, 1921; Wechsler, 1997). Intelligence is also known as the ability to judge ‘true’ from ‘false’. EI, according to (Mathew & Gupta, 2015) is considering emotions as an asset as they convey something. Wechsler (1940) initially describes intelligence as an impact as opposed to a reason. Studies (Mayer & Geher, 1996; Mayer & Salovey, 1993) define the term EI under the category of social intelligence which demonstrates the ability to monitor and control emotions and attitudes against the provided information about oneself and others’ to take appropriate measures and actions on it. (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) state that EI is the aptitude to recognize and manage self-emotions and the emotions of others, for the individual self-motivation to manage their relationship with other. Employees’ Emotional intelligence positively effects the organizational performance (Adetula, 2016). According to Al- Hamdan, Oweidat, Al- Faouri, and Codier (2017) a positive relationship exists between emotional intelligence and job performance.

Literature exhibits a significant relationship between employee performance and justice in the organizations. OJ literature also demonstrate that the perceived fairness can influence
behaviors, manners and attitudes of employees in the organization (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001). The practices of fair rewards provision, unbiased appreciation and appropriate feedback provision to the employees are compared among the employees which can be illustrated in the following equation:

\[
\text{Individual outputs} \quad \text{Other individual outputs} \\
\text{Individual inputs} \quad = \quad \text{Other individual inputs}
\]

Equity Theory demonstrates that the individuals compare their inputs and results from the inputs and results of others. Inputs are what they contribute into their occupation and results are what they attain consequently (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Employees become de-motivated and dissatisfied if they have a feeling of unfair treatment in comparison with other employees in their organization. Consequently, employees cognitively react if distribution of rewards and compensations is fair or unfair, an employee feel satisfied or dissatisfied and show their commitment toward organizations followed by their behavioral intension to stay or quit the organization (Mowday & Colwell, 2003). According to Meisler and Vigoda-Gadot (2014), emotional intelligence has significant association with organizational politics and employee behavior and their work attitude.

**Employee Performance (EP)** is defined as an employee aptitude to use resources efficiently and effectively to accomplish (personal or organizational) objectives (Daft, 2001). According to Adams (1965), employees seek social equity in distribution of rewards for their performance. Pradhan, Jena, and Bhattacharya (2016) confirm the association of EI with job performance with the focus on feelings. Thus if performance of individuals increases, organizational effectiveness will also be enhanced (Champathes, 2006). Emotional intelligence (EI) is positively associated with leader member exchange theory with the demonstration of positive forward planning of procedural and distributive justice (Karim, 2011).

Literature shows that valid connections exist between employee emotional intelligence and performance (Altındağ & Kösedagi, 2015; Goleman & Cherniss, 2001; Kahn, 1990; Sony & Mekoth, 2016). Moreover, Quebbeman and Rozell (2002) describe...
the strong connection of EI with behavioral results and justice perception. Vakola, Tsousis, and Nikolaou (2004) narrate that intellectual abilities add to a greater knowledge for implementing fair procedure in organization. EI is a noteworthy standard regarding advancement, performance and enlisting of people.

**Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis**

![Figure 1: Theoretical Model](image)

**Research Hypothesis**

The research formulated three hypotheses i.e. 

- **H1**: Organizational Justices has significance impact on Employee Performance.
- **H2**: Organizational Justice has significant impact on Emotional Intelligence.
- **H3**: There is a mediating role of Emotional Intelligence between the relationship of Organizational Justice and Employee Performance.

**Research Methodology**

Methodology adopted for the current study was quantitative and the data was collected from three public sector organizations of Pakistan. Out of 400 distributed questionnaires 342 were received fit for analysis. The data was collected through self-administered survey using simple random sampling technique from the employees of said three public sectors organizations i.e. SBP, NADRA and OGDCL. List of the employee was randomized using a randomization function in MS Excel by their employers. The study settings were non-contrived and unit of analysis was the employee working in the said public sector organization in Pakistan.

The study sample (Uma & Roger, 2003) shown in the table 1.

**Table 1: Population Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>ISB</th>
<th>RWP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Managerial Sciences</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Volume XI Number 03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A questionnaire with 31 items was used which were structured as a research instrument. The questionnaire included 20-item related Organizational Justice (OJ) in which 5 items (Colquitt, 2001) of Procedural Justice (PJ), 5 items of Distributive Justice (DJ), 10 items of Interactional and Informative Justice (IJ) (Colquitt, 2001) were used. Moreover, 6 items of Emotional Intelligence (EI) (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001) and 5 items of Employee Performance (EP) were used in the questionnaire. The study used a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagreed to 5 = Strongly Agreed.

**Analysis and Results**

**Descriptive Statistics:** Descriptive statistics illustrate demographics of the respondents mentioned questionnaire information included organization, gender, age, education, designation, departments and experience of respondents. Total number responses are 342 out of 400 questionnaires distributed among the employees of the said public sector organizations.

**Table 2: Research Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1 - 5 year</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>6 - 10 year</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 - 15 year</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 - 25 year</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26 – above year</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Not Provided (NP)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>M-Phil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability:** The reliability instrument is measured through Cronbach’s alpha and split-half method. The study examines reliability which
shows the Cronbach’s alpha ranges from 0.647 to 0.923 with overall total alpha value are 0.946 as shown in Table 3. The ranges show greater internal consistency of the construct. The values of Cronbach’s alpha were analyzed independently and collectively.

**Table 3: Reliability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation: The Correlation analysis is used to measure the relationship among the variable. The results exhibited the positive and strong correlation among the selected study variables.

**Table 4: Pearson Correlation (r)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.782**</td>
<td>0.864**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.782**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.694**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.864**</td>
<td>0.694**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigation of results demonstrates that OJ correlates with EI at 0.782 levels, whereas it correlates with EP at 0.864 which shows strong positive correlation. Each variable shows significance at all levels. Therefore, it can be concluded from the table 4, that the organizational justice has a positive relationship with employee performance and emotional intelligence. Employees’ perception of fairness in each organizational practice is effectively confirmed positive relationship. When employee perception regarding justice is high, greater employee satisfaction is attained and when the justice perception is low, there will be greater dissatisfaction.

**Regression and Mediation**

Emotional Intelligence (EI) acts as a mediator in the model whereas organizational justice has been placed as independent and employee performance as dependent variable.
Fig 1. Regression and Mediation
Equations
(1) \[ Y = \beta + \beta x_1 + e \]
\[ Y = EP \]
\[ X = OJ \]
(2) \[ Y = \beta + \beta x_1 + e \]
\[ Y = EI \]
\[ X = HR \]
(3) \[ Y = \beta + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + e \]
\[ Y = EP \]
\[ x_1 = OJ \]
\[ x_2 = EI \]

Table 5: Standardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>31.646</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Model Summary of Independent Variable Organizational Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.864 a</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Standardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a (2) Organizational Justice (OJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (3) Emotional Intelligence (EI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance (EP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Model summary of Independent Variable Organizational Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.782*</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Standardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>23.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: EI

Table 10: Model summary of Independent Variable Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.694*</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Standardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>18.890</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>17.767</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: EP

Table 12: Model summary of Independent Variable Organizational Justice & Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889*</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
a \cdot b = 0.782 \cdot 0.694 \\
= 0.54 \\
\]

\[
c \cdot c' = 0.864 - 0.320 \\
= 0.54 \\
\]

Hence for mediation \(a \cdot b = c \cdot c'\)

\[
0.54 = 0.54 \\
\]

Therefore partial mediation exists.
Discussion

**H1. There is the significant impact of Organization Justice on Employee Performance.**

The path ‘c’ which is equation (1) indicated a positive correlation exists between Organization Justice (OJ) and Employee Performance (EP). Beta value i.e. 0.864 means 1 unit increase in Organization Justice will increase 0.864 units in Employee Performance. In addition to this the T-value (i.e. t=31.646 > 2) shows that H1 is accepted and Organization Justice (OJ) has a significant positive impact on Employee Performance (EP).

**H2. There is significant impact of Organization Justice on Emotional Intelligence.**

Likewise path ‘a’ is an equation to verify the impact of Organization Justice (OJ) on Emotional Intelligence (EI). Beta value of path ‘a’ is 0.782 thus 1 unit increase Organization Justice (OJ) will increase 0.782 units of emotional intelligence (EI). Results directed towards positive association between OJ and EI. T-value = 23.167, which accepts the hypothesis i.e. H2 with its value > 2.

**H3. There is a mediating role of Emotional Intelligence between the relationship of Organizational Justice and Employee Performance.**

Third hypothesis demonstrated that emotional intelligence (EI) can be a mediator between organization justice (OJ) and employee performance (EP) in Pakistani context. Hence OJ and EP are positively associated with each other. The mediation test was run in which EP was taken as a dependent variable and path ‘b’ and ‘c’ were analyzed together. Beta value on path ‘b’ was 0.694 and path c’ was 0.320 which indicated that 1 unit increase in Organization Justice (OJ) would increase 0.369 units of Employee Performance (EP) and simultaneously 1 unit increase in Emotional Intelligence (EI), increases 0.694 unit in employee performance (EP). T-value of both paths is 31.646 and 17.767 i.e. >2 respectively confirms the hypothesis i.e. H3 for mediation.

\[ a \times b = c - c' \]

Hence both sides are equaled so partial mediation exist Emotional Intelligence (EI) plays a mediating role between Organization Justice (OJ) and Employee Performance (EP). Moreover, R2 value shows the impact of independent variables upon dependent variables i.e. how much variance an independent variable can bring in depended variable. R2 value = 0.847 which shows that 85% variation in dependent variable is explained by independent variable results shows that overall model is statistically significant.
Conclusion

The current study was led to investigate the relationship of Organizational Justices with Employee Performance with the mediating role of emotional intelligence between them. For this reason, three public sector organizations were chosen in the study. The consistency among study variables is acceptable and the regression analysis shows partial mediation exists among all variables. The Pearson Correlation test demonstrated positive correlation between Organizational Justice (i.e. Distributive, Interactional and Procedural justice) and employee performance following the rout of emotional intelligence in the selected public sector organizations of Pakistan. All three hypothesis have been accepted which show significant impact of Organizational Justice (OJ) and Employee Performance (EP) through the mediation of Emotional Intelligence. In order to improve the performance of the employees, organizations need to identify negative behaviors regarding unequal distribution of resources/assets, discrimination or bias information provision that should be eliminated to increase productivity. Descriptive statistics indicated that the majority of employees ensured positive perceptions regarding organizational justice in their respective organizations and indicated greater satisfaction toward perceived fairness in procedures, provision of rewards and interactions with their managers.

The study results designate that Organizational Justice (OJ) is positively associated with Employee Performance (EP) in Pakistani context which is also supported by the literature as Greenberg (1987) investigated that relationship between Organizational Justices (OJ) and Employee Performance (EP) exists. Moreover he also stated that fair actions, impartial feedback (information) and equal distribution of assets towards employees by the supervisors can influence their performance. According to Shan, Ishaq, and Shaheen (2015), employee needs and outcomes may vary thus need equitable treatment which will result in varying performance. The perceived fairness can influence individuals’ behaviors, and approaches. Studies i.e. Russell Cropanzano et al., (2001) also confirmed the perceived fairness can influence behaviors, manner and attitudes of employees in the organization. The study also revealed that there is a strong connection between employee emotional intelligence and performance (Campion et al., 1996; Goleman & Cherniss, 2001)

Recommendation, Limitations and Future Direction

The study findings conclude that Organizational Justice (OJ) factors positively affect employee performance in the selected public-sector organizations (i.e. State Bank of Pakistan (SBP), NADRA and
OGDCL) of Pakistan and fairness perception among employees can be enhanced through intellectual attitude in organization which leads to the enhanced employee performance. Keeping in view the study results, the said organizations should be more focused on improving emotional intellectual capabilities of their employees, should acknowledge the contribution and efforts of their employees and should provide equal opportunities to all the employees irrespective of any discrimination or biasness,

Future directions may cater for the comparative analysis of public and private sector organizations considering larger sample size. Moreover other dimensions of Organizational Justice (OJ) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) can also be incorporated in future research. Future research may have additional reasons to clarify the demographic group variations in the study.
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