ESJ Social Sciences

Peer-reviewed

The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making: A Critical Literature Review

Khalil Anwar Hussein
Department of Business Management, College of Humanities,
University of Raparin, Raniya, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Doi:10.19044/esj.2024.v20n4p21

Submitted: 22 December 2023
Accepted: 30 January 2024
Published: 29 February 2024

Cite As:
Hussein K.A. (2024). *The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making: A Critical Literature Review*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 20 (4), 21. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n4p21

Abstract

This paper focuses on studying organizational justice on managers' decision making. The process of decision making plays a substantial role in the life of each organization because the results affect all employees at all levels. Making decisions is considered the most significant and intricate managerial task. In addition, it might become more problematic when executives work with people across cultures since individuals from varied cultural backgrounds view issues differently. Decisions that are formed by senior managers are mostly imperative and impactful to the way an organization works. However, senior managers' decisions may have negative effects. In addition, organizational fairness is complex and refers to the fair and right treatment of persons within an organization. As a result, people would like fairness as it recompenses them for their input. Poor organizational justice is a considerable reason for negative responses from staff because they have a strong sense of inequality. Often, ethical dilemmas result from intricate circumstances and discrepancies in values within organizations. Hence, this theoretical paper is designed to investigate the salient literature to develop a holistic overview portraying the individual level of perceived organizational justice. It also indicates its prominent consequences based on a critical review of previous related studies.

Keywords: Decision making, senior managers, organizational justice, employees, ethical dilemmas, ethical treatment

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

Introduction

A decision involves choosing a choice among numerous alternatives. Thus, Knights and Willmott (2007) stated that decision making is the process of making choices from among two or more alternatives. In addition, it can be noted that managers will typically make numerous decisions, some of them being strategic and others operational. Therefore, making decisions is a matter of a considerable responsibility not only for the organization itself, but for their workers and other stakeholders (Negulescu & Doval, 2014). The process of making decision plays a pivotal role in the life of each organization, especially because the consequences affect most employees throughout the company (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2010).

Using the facts at hand at the moment, executives spend their time selecting amongst several courses of action (Dixon, 1997). Similarly, decision making is deemed to be the most important of all activities carried out by the management of an organization, as it has a substantial effect on the organization's future development and its ongoing presence in the field (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995). Consequently, making decision is regarded as an important and multifaceted managerial task (Rodrigues, 2001). Often, it could become difficult when executives work with persons across cultures. This is because people from different cultural backgrounds view matters in different ways. Nevertheless, although decisions are made at each organizational level, the most significant decisions are those which have the key effect, and they are made at the uppermost level in line with an organization policy (Rodrigues, 2001).

It is deemed that decisions made by senior managers are the most vital and effective to the way an organization operates. The values of senior managers' decisions could cause development in an organization's profits and surge the likelihood to beat competitors (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2010). For example, when management and product changes were implemented by Carlos Ghosn, this led to change in the debt-ridden Nissan into one of the most lucrative firms globally (Daft *et al*., 2010). On the other hand, Buchanan and Huczynski (2010) stated that senior executives' decisions may have harmful significances and may bring about the organization being taken over. Chiefly, executives are anxious with the decision making process, which plays a pivotal role in attaining an organization's important aims. Salaman (2002) stressed that making such decisions needs obligation and commitment. Therefore, for current organizations to achieve their roles successfully and competently, the procedure of decision making uses much managerial time. Similarly, executives are appointed and placed at different levels to organize and coordinate employees' activities and efforts (Khan Sherwani, 2006).

Whenever an organization needs similarities to be made or explanations to be given for different action between two or more individuals,

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

the decisions should be taken professionally with fairness. Therefore, according to Cropanzano and Molina (2015), when employees believe that they have been treated justly, they tend to show lower levels of stress, higher job performance, and better work attitudes. In view of the study of Eberlin and Tatum (2005), organizational justice is not straightforward but belongs to the fair and right treatment of persons in an organization. It could also be claimed that employees are constantly confronted with fair or unfair decisions based on subjective criteria and personal judgments (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020). Individuals want fairness because it rewards them for their contributions (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Hence, Mengstie (2020) argued that the first virtue in social institutions is organizational fairness. Whenever workers are rewarded for completing a task successfully, they not only pride themselves at their act, but they also gain pleasure at the recognition voiced via the reward. This implies that workers are more likely to keep on completing tasks to such higher levels (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Organizational fairness refers to the distribution of responsibilities, human rights, and profits in a method that is just and equal to all employees. Mengstie (2020) stated that organizational fairness is one of the determinant factors for an effective use of human resources and a key predictor of organizational success. It is crucial to consider how employees see justice in light of Zayer and Benabdelhadi's (2020) research. This is because a sense of fairness will foster loyalty to the organization, believe in executives, accept choices, and increase work satisfaction while simultaneously enhancing the appearance of good behaviours like cooperation, politeness, and performance (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015). On the other side, an employee's perception of unfairness will have well-known impacts including greater absenteeism, a reduced willingness to embrace change, turnover, and even theft (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020).

1.1 Importance of the Research

The managerial decision making and organizational justice have been investigated by many researchers. However, in order to contribute to this important body of literature, the author of this paper intends to discuss how consideration to fairness might affect decision making. The paper highlights some of the ethical quandaries, which arise from endeavoring to treat all individuals justly and alike.

1.2 Research Questions

1. Why should organizations' managers attempt to make just decisions?
2. What are the benefits of organizational justice to management and employees?

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

3. What are the ethical dilemmas that arise from attempting to treat all individuals fairly and equally?

1.3 Methodology

Scientific researches aim to solve problems relating to a specific field. This theoretical paper presents a holistic view of the field of organizational fairness at the individual level perception; it synthesizes the gist of the literature review. Thus, the paper design is aimed to discuss and provide a critical review of previous related studies. As a result, the most significant studies in the field of organizational justice would be better exposed and analyzed.

1.4 Research Objective

Consequently, this research attempts to provide answers to the above research questions. The significant purpose developed for this paper is to find out the benefits of organizational fairness to management and workers.

1.5 Research Structure

The remainder of the research is divided into the following sections: Section 2 shows the decision-making process. Section 3 will attempt to describe decision-making approaches. Section 4 will identify organizational justice and its benefits. Section 5 will discuss the dimensions of organizational justice, while section 6 includes ethical dilemmas of justice. Finally, the research will conclude with an overview of all the points discussed throughout.

2. Decision-Making Process

A decision is a logical selection made on the basis of established causal relationships (Daft *et al.*, 2010). Although decision making is important for managers, it is becoming more decentralized as organizations become flatter (Brooks, 2003). Effective decision making is needed across the board. Making decisions is an important activity for organizations since poor judgements have a detrimental impact on the organization's future (Daft *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, this is mostly for choices made by the most powerful executives, who have the authority to contest the most important choices meant to achieve an organization's goals. One example of how decisions made at the top affect an organization's orientation is the extremely ambitious expansion strategy that the UK's RBS banking group under Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Fred Goodwin started (Daft *et al.*, 2010). Another perspective on this would be to assert that the progress of an organization is consistently shaped by the decisions of experienced professionals who have demonstrated wisdom in their past choices (Linstead *et al.*, 2009). This suggests that an organization's success is influenced by the calibre of its judgements and quality of decisions.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

According to Schermerhorn *et al*. (2012), decision-making techniques may be classified as either non-programmed or programmed. Non-programmed judgements are made to deal with one-of-a-kind situations, whereas programmed decisions are made regularly in response to reoccurring events and difficulties. Executives in organizations may use either a programmed or a non-programmed decision-making process when making choices (Schermerhorn *et al*., 2012). It follows that both procedures are influenced by the culture of the society where the choice is being taken. For instance, CEOs in nations with a generally low tolerance for ambiguity, like Germany and Japan, try to minimize the use of non-programmed judgements by following standard operating procedures (Rodrigues, 2001). In countries like the United States and Norway that have a relatively high threshold for uncertainty, executives look for responsibility when making non-programmed judgements (Rodrigues, 2001).

3. Decision-Making Approaches

Before a final decision is made, a complicated process called decision-making may go through a lot of different stages (Linstead *et al*., 2009). Therefore, there are a few methods for making decisions, which will now be covered.

3.1 Rational Decision-Making

The three processes of rational decision-making, according to Linstead *et al*. (2009), are identifying the issue, choosing an acceptable decision-making approach, and listing potential remedies. In this approach, participants first agree to follow the decision-making procedure and ensure that everyone is aware of the guidelines. The foundation of rational decision-making is the premise that decision makers are fully informed, completely objective, and unified in their pursuit of the best possible conclusion after carefully weighing all potential outcomes (Linstead *et al*., 2009). According to Brooks (2003), this model is used to explain microeconomic behaviour, such as how, for all other things being equal, a rise in price is likely to result in a person opting to reduce his or her demand for a goods or service. Moreover, according to Ahmad *et al*. (2021), the model of rational decision-making does not account for any unfeasible elements in this regard. Any ethical issues raised by a choice have been completely disregarded. Additionally, it disregards the importance of a person's connections, commitments, or emotional sentiments. It makes the best decision possible while taking into account the limits (Ahmad *et al*., 2021).

This paradigm, meanwhile, has several drawbacks. As a result, numerous decision-makers are constrained in the amount of information they can access owing to cost or time constraints, and they also experience issues

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

with their capacity to understand the information that is made accessible to them (Moorhead & Gryphon, 1995). According to McShane and Von Glinow (2005), this paradigm appears rational on the surface since it assumes that the designated decision-makers are the best equipped to make these choices and have access to all relevant data. Subsequently, they frequently struggle to identify issues since there is no enough knowledge to properly weigh all the potential consequences and select the best course of action. Additionally, another limitation is that the decision makers cannot possibly know all the probable consequences of a specific decision (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005).

3.2 Bounded Rationality

According to the constrained rational decision-making paradigm, people make choices based on limited information, including the cognitive and reasoning capacities of their brains (Ahmad *et al*., 2021). For instance, there is a limited amount of time available for making a particular decision (Daft, 2015). Bounded rationality thus acknowledges that in certain situations, it is improbable that a comprehensive understanding of the situation would be achieved and that it is challenging to anticipate the effects of all possible options (Ahmad *et al*., 2021). When managers approach decision making with restricted rationality, they make adequate rather than perfect decisions (Bloisi *et al*., 2007). As a result, while utilising this technique, the decision maker's perspective has a big impact on the process and the other options discovered (Ahmad *et al*., 2021). Administrators cannot evaluate each option carefully due to the little time available, which limits their ability to be sensible. An executive may have fifty ties to choose from, but due to time constraints, they should make a prompt decision (Daft, 2015).

3.3 The "Garbage Can" Model

The "Garbage Can" model focuses on making decisions in line with the various organizational decision-making styles (Bloisi *et al*., 2007). According to Daft *et al*. (2010), this is one way in which the pattern of decision making inside organizations may be described. As a result, the "garbage can" model was created and can be used to generate and orchestrate the change that is wanted within organizations (Daft, 2015). Therefore, the process of decision making is not viewed as a sequence of steps that begin with a challenge and finish with a solution, but this model has its own special qualities (Bloisi *et al*., 2007). The main drawback of this paradigm, however, is that it may be possible to identify an issue without necessarily producing a solution to it (Daft *et al*., 2010). Consequently, this model's distinctive feature is that it does not rely on a conventional hierarchy to reach a choice (Daft, 2015). Consequently, certain issues are resolved by chance, and at times,

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

recommendations are offered in the absence of a specific problem, or decisions are made without achieving the desired outcome (Daft *et al*., 2010).

4. Organizational Justice

According to Mengstie (2020), the concept of organizational justice is a recent phenomenon, while the inception of fairness dates back to ancient years. Scholarly interest in the area of organizational fairness emerged in the 1970s (Mengstie, 2020). The members of an organization's judgements of the fairness and justice of organizational procedures are referred to as organizational justice (Roy, 2022). Khan Sherwani (2006) argued that organizations are composed of individuals, and these individuals represent one of the most valuable assets of the organizations. Justice encompasses social transformation and the enhancement of human lives through socioeconomic quality, protection of human rights, and satisfaction of basic human needs (Roy, 2022). This goes beyond the confined confines of control, retribution, and punishment. Thus, organizational fairness is the individual's view and assessment of what is fair or unfair in the workplace (Cropanzano *et al*., 2007). Additionally, Adam's equity theory (1963, 1965) was developed to first understand fairness in organizations based on the employee's impression of equal distribution of results and allocations (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020). As a consequence, it might be claimed that justice and equity are closely related to each other.

4.1 Benefits of Organizational Justice

Justice typically includes the comparison process between two or more individuals (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015; Eberlin *et al*., 2008). In general, when individuals perceive that they have been treated fairly, they respond more positively –both for themselves and for their employers. However, they respond less well when they perceive unfairness (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015). Fairness in this sense refers to giving people what they truly deserve (Bloisi *et al*., 2007), and as such, it serves as a powerful employee motivator (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). In contrast to injustice, which drives people apart, justice may foster community and help groups come together (Cropanzano *et al*., 2007). The fundamental lesson of justice is that people should always be treated fairly, especially when it comes to the distribution of organizational fairness. Hence, a sense of procedural or distributive injustice may have a significant negative influence on the firm and its workforce (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005). This is difficult, though, as it seems that everyone has a different perspective on what is reasonable and fair in certain situations, motivated by personal interests.

Furthermore, it should be noted that beliefs about justice or injustice directly affect workers and the organization (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005).

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

Injustice is something that everyone has surely experienced at some point, whether it be at work or school. Regardless of when or where the alleged unfairness occurred, the outcomes are typically the same: dejection, rage, and a desire to end the perceived injustice (Moorhead & Gryphon, 1995). Additionally, because it makes them feel good, everyone wants to be treated fairly in life, especially at work. According to Cropanzano *et al*. (2007), fairness actually has a significant impact since consistent justice enforces interpersonal ties.

According to Cropanzano and Molina (2015), employees respond favourably to equity because it encourages them to uphold the status quo in order to preserve the productivity levels of their company. Due to their disparate performance, even if two employees are the same gender, they should be compensated differentially (Cropanzano *et al*., 2007). Compensation should be exactly proportionate to contribution. Moreover, an opposing viewpoint holds that disparities in contributions and performance between two individuals are frequently invoked as justifications for unfair treatment. Although inequity is the belief that someone is treated unjustly, equity practices lead people to believe they are treated fairly in comparison to others inside the organization (Bloisi *et al*., 2007).

5. Organizational Justice Dimensions

Three components of organizational fairness—procedural, interactional, and distributive—are involved in producing solutions to cope with specific situations (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020).

5.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice, as defined by Zayer and Benabdelhadi (2020), is the process of collecting and evaluating incentives and resource allocations inside an organization. The equitable allocation of organizational resources is a precondition of distributive justice. It influences how employees feel about salary, promotions, and other outcomes (Choudhry *et al*., 2011). Distribution justice often refers to the equitable disbursement of compensation and other benefits according to merit, and its key tenet is "equal pay for work of equal value" (Linstead *et al*., 2009: 370). Thus, distributive justice is concerned with the fairness of the results that employees experience. For example, during George H. W. Bush's 1992 visit, Japanese CEOs questioned the distributive justice of maintaining the high pay of American CEOs when some businesses were under strain and need to make layoffs (Nelson & Quick, 2013). The equality concept, on the other hand, is criticized by Pollock (1994) because it fails to take into account what is fair, such as when two employees with equivalent qualifications and promotion aspirations are involved. Similar to

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

this, McShane and Von Glinow (2005) claim that equity, not equality, is the fundamental idea guiding distributive fairness.

Distributive justice relates to how individuals assess what they get or, more broadly, how they believe an allocation to be fair. As a result, it was likely the first sort of fairness to catch the attention of organizational fairness specialists, and it still does (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015). Distributive fairness is also a method of making decisions in which every person is treated equally, regardless of their gender, age, or ethnicity (Schermerhorn *et al*., 2012). According to the equity theory, people evaluate their accomplishments in relation to one another (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The basic argument is that distributive justice is assessed according to referent standards. However, if people use various frames of reference, they may experience different degrees of fairness with the same results (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).

5.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice can be defined as the decency of the actions, processes, and methods used to reach the ultimate judgement (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to Cropanzano and Molina (2015), procedural fairness is the process of making judgements or the collection of rules that are used when allocating resources. For example, in many countries, one means to decide disagreements is through trials. Choudhry *et al*. (2011) define procedural fairness as the feeling of equality with reference to the laws and procedures utilised in the process of rewarding or punishing. Employees are more likely to believe that incentives and punishments are distributed fairly when they feel that the approach is equitable (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).

The concept of procedural justice states that all members of an organization should be subject to the same standards of conduct (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005). When attempting to explain employee motivation and conduct, distributive justice was long believed to be more significant than procedural fairness (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020; Al-Douri, 2020). Since it was believed that individuals would seek fairness for its own sake rather than as a means of amassing riches, procedural justice, like distributive justice, appears to be essential in understanding individuals' conduct and attitudes (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005). Procedural justice, which focuses mostly on how justice is seen as well as the processes and procedures used to determine decisions, is therefore inextricably related to moral and ethical ideas.

According to Zayer and Benabdelhadi (2020), there are two aspects to justice via procedure. The ability to shape the process of decision making is the first, and the ability to modify the final result is the second. When employees believe they have the right to speak out and voice their ideas during

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

the decision-making process, procedural fairness is achieved (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015). The ability to voice individual's ideas and reasons throughout a procedure is known as process control (Al-Douri, 2020).

5.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is defined as the social facet of procedural justice. This third element of organizational fairness is thought to be the most straightforward because it deals with how people are treated within the firms (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020). Both Cropanzano and Molina (2015) argued that in spite of the formal results and actions, people assess justice through social or communication standards. That is, they look to how they were preserved by others. Similar to this, there is a considerable debate over the international judicial system (Al-Douri, 2020). Numerous academics mix interpersonal and informational justice, as noted by Cropanzano and Molina (2015). The first one has to do with how people are treated in terms of respect and decency. A transaction that is interpersonally just would avoid personal attachments, refrain from needless harshness, avoid intolerance, and so forth. When anything goes wrong, it is particularly important to provide relevant evidence and explanations as part of informational justice (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).

When communication and implementation procedures are included in the process' conceptualization, interactional fairness is recognized as a component of the decision-making process (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Thus, this show whether executives treat everyone with respect and honesty, distributes information fairly and equally, and communicates consistently with various individuals. The justice of the interpersonal treatment one receives from consultant is referred to as interactional justice (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001). In addition, four pivotal criteria of interactional justice includes: rationale, veracity, deference, and appropriateness (Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020).

It is now important to move on to the topic of how justice influences decision making. Individuals should be treated fairly in businesses since it is believed that fairness significantly influences how employees feel and behave towards the business. The profound sense of justice and fairness held by employees should be a fundamental consideration in managerial decision-making (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005). McShane and Von Glinow (2005) stated that the organization's distribution criteria should be well understood by decision makers since, for instance, workers who perceive unfairness in the incentive structure may become less conscientious. On the other hand, given that most individuals have different perspectives on the importance of input and outcome, this might end up being one of the biggest obstacles (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005).

Nevertheless, it is essential for the creation and efficient functioning of an organization that all people be treated fairly and equitably, regardless of how complicated the organization may be (Pettinger, 2010). Thus, in certain places such as Taiwan, firms believe that the gender that is more essential to their work should obtain the most benefit, notwithstanding allegations that males are paid more than women for comparable labour (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005). However, employees cannot be held accountable for problems that are beyond their control since, in reality, these difficulties cannot be fixed because accountability is arbitrary and varies depending on the context (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2010). As a result, distributive fairness focuses on the concept that everyone should be treated equally and that the law should be applied uniformly to everyone.

6. Ethical Dilemma

Ethical dilemma is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as a circumstance in which a challenging choice has to be made between two ways of working, either of which involves contravening a moral standard (Nnamani & Stückelberger, 2019). According to Bloisi *et al*. (2007), ethical dilemma can be defined as a topic or condition faced by a person, including complex attitudes and perspectives towards ethical behaviour. The dilemma most of the time surrounding fairness deals with decision making when faced with numerous and contradictory ethical demands from persons, mainly when majority of the needs are not met (Tota & Shehu, 2012). In essence, an ethical dilemma is a challenging situation where an individual or organization must decide on the appropriate course of action to take (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005). It could be claimed that an ethical conundrum is a choice between two (or more) bad or between two (or more) good solutions (Nnamani & Stückelberger, 2019). Thus, an ethical conundrum is not a choice between bad and good solutions.

In addition, Bloisi *et al*. (2007) stated that individuals are frequently treated in a different way in business in respect of commitments and rewards. Hence, these changes are considered reasonable if based on rational standards such as fair dealings and performance. Additionally, a more multipart issue might occur, principally in global commerce, due to cross-cultural differences in what is considered reasonable, for example the issue of corruption and scandal (Tota & Shehu, 2012). Thus, this happens progressively in trades and governments, which influences and violates the whole economy. It becomes very challenging to resolve in certain states due to the unique cultural context and observation (Nnamani & Stückelberger, 2019).

Bloisi *et al*. (2007) stressed that whenever executives of an organization face contrary and inconsistent standards, ethical dilemmas happen. For instance, the sellers might face a problem due to their information of the authenticity of a merchandise. As a result, he might tell a potential buyer the truth and accordingly lose the sale. Furthermore, other reason behind the rise of ethical problems belongs to a person's constitutional rights; any individual has the right to be preserved with respect and fairness (Nnamani & Stückelberger, 2019). A disapproval of this claim is that an employee's rights are not adequate to make ethical choices, as communal costs require to be measured; a person rights should not to be prioritized irrespective of sensible cost. Hence, it might be that a person's rights conflict with those of another (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005).

Tota and Shehu (2012) stated that the notions of right and wrong are increasingly being interpreted currently to comprise the more subtle and challenging questions of equity and Justice. In addition, the issue involving right and wrong may develop into an ethical conundrum since it is difficult to determine what is right or wrong under such circumstances. For instance, the value conflict for a beauty product salesman is between being truthful with customers and sticking to management objectives (Tota & Shehu, 2012). The issue may be that every action or decision frequently appears wrong (Daft *et al.*, 2010). Furthermore, competing moral measures might likewise produce ethical problems. For instance, the manager of research for an electronics company indorses a woman to the post of chief of the design group, based on advanced information and better suitability in comparison with other members (Bloisi *et al.*, 2007). Nonetheless, the team's male members are serious about a female leader. It is reasonable to endorse the woman based on her advantages, but the organization's success is substantial to keep the reputation of the administrator (Tota & Shehu, 2012).

Conclusion

In summary, decision making is fundamental to the whole task of management, and it is strictly linked to the management processes of scheduling and problem solving. Decent decisions are dependent on good information. Thus, an active and well-organized management information system should improve the decision's quality at all levels of the organization. Likewise, making decision is concerned with those who make decision, the procedures towards getting reasonable and equitable results, and the exercise of power within organizations.

Decisions frequently made by executives, specifically at advanced level, might lead to affected and possibly harmful changes in an organization. Due to the vast influence that decisions can make, the ones who make decisions should possess the appropriate involvement and contextual, as they are very important for the ongoing presence of the organization in its corresponding scope. It has also been emphasized that supervisors and managers should be in charge of the results of the decisions and even those

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

decisions, which are different from their goals. In order to predict and effectively manage the likely attitudinal, behavioural and counterproductive feedbacks, decision makers should place a high priority on organizational justice perceptions. This allows them to understand and analyze the relevant influences of the employee's perception and evaluation of justice.

Organizational justice, which goes beyond being fair and doing the right thing to maintain a climate of competitive advantage and organizational success, is thus a wise strategic investment. It generates significant advantages for both organizations and employees. In addition, it can be argued that organizational justice is meaningfully vital. This is because it belonged to and influences the serious processes of an organization, such as performance and work approval.

Poor organizational fairness is an important reason of harmful feedback from workers, since they have a strong sense of unfairness. Nevertheless, it could be claimed that organizational fairness is not straightforward. Many decisions may be pragmatically made with the director's personal benefit in mind. However, if fairness is to be assessed, decisions should be grounded in a concept of what is reasonable. Nevertheless, such decisions may not satisfy everyone. Thus, workers are the most significant asset of organizations. This is because the long-term viability and effectiveness of each organization fundamentally depends on the competencies, skills, expertise and proactive behaviours, which include perception of organizational fairness.

Ethical dilemmas were also discussed, which typically come from complicated circumstances and divergent organizational principles. It could be highlighted that each aspect of business may become a possible area for ethical dilemmas. Thus, in order to solve ethical problems, organizations should develop ethical standards for their workers. As a result, it is thought that greater research in this field is necessary given the relevance of justice to organizations as a whole. Executives should be made aware of organizational justice due to their core responsibility to treat employees fairly.

Conflict of Interest: The author reported no conflict of interest.

Data Availability: All of the data are included in the content of the paper.

Funding Statement: The author did not obtain any funding for this research.

References:

1. Ahmad, A., Alshurideh, M.T. & Al Kurdi, B.H. (2021). 'The Four Streams of Decision-Making Approaches: Brief Summary and

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

Discussion', *Advanced Machine Learning Technologies and Applications* pp. 570–580.
2. Al-Douri, Z. (2020). Organizational justice and its impact on job satisfaction: Evidence from transportation industry. *Management Science Letters*, *10*(2), 351-360.
3. Bloisi, W., Cook, C.W. & Hunsaker, P.L. (2007). *Management and Organisational Behaviour,* Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
4. Brooks, I. (2003). Organisational Behaviour: Individuals, Groups and Organization, Pearson Education: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
5. Buchanan, D.A. & Huczynski, A. A. (2010). *Organizational Behaviour,* Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
6. Byrne, Z.C. & Cropanzano, R. (2001). 'The history of Organizational Justice: The founders speak', *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* 2, pp. 3-26.
7. Choudhry, N., Philip, P. J. & Kumar, R. (2011). 'Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Effectiveness', *National Institute of Technology*, Vol 1, No 3. Pp18-24
8. 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.
9. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E. & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). 'The Management of Organizational Justice', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21 (4): 34-48.
10. Cropanzano, R. & Molina, A. (2015). 'Organizational Justice', International Encyclopaedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,2nd edition, Vol 17. Oxford: Elsevier. pp. 379–384
11. Daft, R.L., Murphy, J. & Willmott, H. (2010). *Organization: Theory and Design*, Andover: South-Western Cengage Learning.
12. Daft, R.L. (2015). *Organization theory and design*. USA: Cengage learning.
13. Dixon, R. (1997). The Management Task. Butterworth-Heinemann: The Institute of Management-Foundation.
14. Eberlin, R. & Tatum, B. C. (2005). 'Organizational Justice and Decision Making: When Good Intentions Are Not Enough', *Management Decision*, 43 (7/8): 1040-1048.
15. Eberlin, R. J. & Tatum, B. C. (2008). Making just decisions: organizational justice, decision making, and leadership. *Management Decision*, *46*(2), 310-329.
16. Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*, Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
17. Khan Sherwani, N.U. (2006). *Human Resource Management,* New Delhi: Galgotia.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

18. Knights, D. & Willmott, H. (2007). *Introducing Organizational Behaviour and Management,* Thomson: High Holborn House.
19. Linstead, S., Fulop, L. & Lilley, S. (2009). Management and Organization: A Critical Text, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
20. McShane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2005). Organizational Behavior. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
21. Mengstie, M.M. (2020). 'Perceived organizational justice and turnover intention among hospital healthcare workers', BMC Psychology, Volume 8.
22. Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R.W. (1995). Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations, Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin.
23. Negulescu, O. & Doval, E. (2014). 'The Quality of Decision Making Process Related to Organizations' Effectiveness', Procedia Economics and Finance 15, pp.858-863
24. Nelson, D.L. & Quick, J.C. (2013). *ORGB3*, Mason, Ohio: South-Western Cengage Learning.
25. Nnamani, T. & Stückelberger, C. (2019). *Resolving Ethical Dilemmas in Professional and Private Life*. 50 Cases from Africa for Teaching and Training, Geneva: Globethics.net.
26. Pettinger, R. (2010). Organizational behaviour: Performance management in practice. New York, NY: Routledge.
27. Pollock, J.M. (1994). Ethics in Crime and Justice: Dilemmas and Decisions, Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Publishing.
28. Rodrigues, C. (2001). International management: A cultural approach. USA: South- Western College Pub.
29. Roy, D. (2022). 'Development and Validation of an Empirical Instrument to assess Empathy Driven Organizational Justice systems in schools', Berkeley Review of Education, Vol 11 , 1, pp. 75–106.
30. Salaman, G. (2002). Decision Making for Business: A Reader, London: SAGE publications in association with the Open University.
31. Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J.G., Osborn, R.N., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational behaviour, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
32. Tota, I. & Shehu, H. (2012). 'The Dilemma of Business Ethics' Procedia Economics and Finance 3, pp. 555 – 559.
33. Zayer, C. & Benabdelhadi, A. (2020). 'The consequences of the perceived organizational justice: a holistic overview', International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics, Volume 1, 3, pp. 91-108.