

The Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Members in Jordanian Universities: A Field Study

Hamed M. Doum^{1,2} & Ziad L. AlTahayneh^{1,3*}

*1 Faculty of Educational Sciences, Ajloun National University, Jordan,
Email: H.Doum@anu.edu.jo*

2 Ajloun University College, Al-Balqa Applied University, Jordan

*3 Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite
University, Zarqa, Jordan Email: tahayneh@anu.edu.jo*

This study examined the level of organizational justice practiced by college deans as perceived by faculty members, the level of faculty job satisfaction, and the impact of organizational justice on faculty job satisfaction in Jordanian universities. The study sample consisted of 123 faculty members from a private university who volunteered to complete an organizational justice scale and a general satisfaction scale administered via Google Forms. The findings showed that the overall level of organizational justice practiced by deans was high, with interactional justice ranked first, followed by procedural justice, whereas distributive justice ranked last and was reported at a moderate level. Faculty members also reported a high level of satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis further revealed that distributive justice was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction, followed by procedural justice, while interactional justice did not make any significant contribution to the final regression model. Distributive and procedural justice together accounted for over 30% of the variance in faculty members' job satisfaction. These findings indicate that organizational justice plays an important role in enhancing faculty job satisfaction. The study recommends strengthening organizational justice practices in Jordanian universities by ensuring the equitable distribution of rewards and incentives, enhancing transparency in administrative procedures, and improving communications between academic leaders and faculty members to foster a positive and supportive university work environment.

Keywords: organizational justice, job satisfaction, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, Jordanian universities.

*Author info: Correspondence should be sent to: Ziad L. AlTahayneh,
Email: tahayneh@anu.edu.jo*

*North American Journal of Psychology, 2026, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1975-1997
© NAJP <https://doi.org/10.65696/001c.168913>*

INTRODUCTION

Higher education is widely recognized as a key driver of national development of human capital and preparation of qualified professionals capable of meeting the societal and labor market demands. Colleges and universities accomplish their missions of teaching, research, and community service through the collective efforts of academic and administrative staff, whose success and effectiveness depend largely on effective leadership that promotes employees' engagement, excellence, and institutional performance. Central to this success is the adoption of fair administrative practices, particularly the equitable treatment of employees (Dahleez & Aboramadan, 2025). Fairness and equality are fundamental principles of effective organizational management and have been emphasized in administrative and educational literature through the concept of "organizational justice" (Al-Saud & Sultan, 2009; Sultan & Al-Saud, 2006). Recent research confirms this centrality within higher education, demonstrating that faculty perceptions of fairness are closely associated with trust, motivation, satisfaction, and performance (Assefa et al., 2026), and that organizational justice remains a significant predictor of employees' job satisfaction and other related organizational outcomes in academic institutions (Dahleez & Aboramadan, 2025).

The concept of organizational justice traces its roots to the theory of justice (Equity Theory) advocated by Adams (1963, 1965), which is based on the basic assumption that individuals tend to judge justice by comparing their inputs to the outputs they receive, and also by comparing this input-output ratio to that of their colleagues and peers at work. According to the theory, perceptions of equity emerge when these ratios are viewed as balanced, whereas perceived inequity generates feelings of injustice that may result in adverse attitudinal and behavioral responses affecting commitment, engagement, and other organizational outcomes (Ho, 2025; Rbiaa & Dextras-Gauthier, 2025).

Building on Adams' original framework, Hou (2007) further clarified the components of the equity evaluation process by categorizing employees' inputs as personal and professional qualities, including intelligence, experience, training and skills, age, gender, marital status, education, and work efforts. Outputs, on the other hand, include the rewards and benefits received from the organization such as salary, rewards, supervision, promotion, seniority benefits, and authority.

Organizational justice has attracted considerable scholarly attention since the 1990s due to its significant effect on both employees' performance and overall organizational effectiveness (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013; Suifan et al., 2017). Despite its well-established theoretical foundations and application in organizational research, organizational justice - like many administrative and educational concepts - lacks a universally accepted definition. The literature suggests that it is a

multidimensional and subjective concept influenced by differing philosophical perspectives and employees' perceptions regarding the fairness, integrity, and objectivity of organizational procedures and outcomes. As a result, the same organizational practices may be perceived as fair by some employees while being viewed as unfair or biased by others, depending on their expectations, experiences, and personal values (Zayed, 1995).

Although organizational justice may be viewed as a broad administrative concept that applies to all organizations, the majority of literature conceptualize it as multidimensional, comprising three primary dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Hou, 2007; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 1990; Clay-Warner, et al., 2005; Colquitt, et al., 2001; Rbiaa & Dextras-Gauthier, 2025). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of outcomes employees receive, including salaries, promotions and other organizational rewards (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Al-Atwi, 2007). Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the procedures and processes used to decide how outcomes are distributed and to the outcomes are offered (Mengstie, 2020). It reflects employees' perceptions of the extent to which individuals feel that the formal procedures and policies followed in decision-making in the workplace, and in determining and distributing rewards, are fair (Al-Atwi, 2007). Interactional justice reflects employees' perceptions of the level of respect, courtesy, and honesty they experience in their interactions with their managers and colleagues, including how they are treated during decision making process, communication styles, and the transparency of information processes (Demiray & Tokmak, 2026).

Collectively, these three dimensions indicate that organizational justice is not simply an administrative procedure, but a moral principle that carries significant implications for organizational functioning. As a multidimensional construct, organizational justice significantly affects employees' perceptions of fairness regarding both managerial practices and interpersonal relationships within the workplace, thereby affecting their attitudes, behaviors, commitment, trust, and overall organizational effectiveness (Ho, 2025, Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022).

Organizational justice scholars and researchers have devoted considerable attention to study the organizational outcomes associated with organizational justice, among which job satisfaction has emerged as one of the most extensively studied (e.g. Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Clay-Warner et al., 2005; Hao et al., 2016; Yalçın & Yalçın, 2022).

Job satisfaction, defined as individuals' feelings and attitudes toward their work (Spector, 1997), is considered an important determinant of employees' well-being and organizational effectiveness, particularly in

higher education institutions, where faculty members play a central role in achieving institutional objectives. Faculty members who experience high levels of job satisfaction are more likely to demonstrate greater motivation, stronger organizational commitment, and enhanced teaching and research performance (Judge et al., 2001; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

Numerous studies conducted in diverse organizational and cultural contexts have examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, consistently demonstrating that employees' perceptions of fairness contribute significantly to higher levels of job satisfaction. Cohen-Charatsh and Spector (2001) in their meta-analysis study concluded that different dimensions of organizational justice were positively correlated with job satisfaction and other desirable outcomes. Likewise, Clay-Warner et al., (2005) demonstrated that distributive justice and procedural justice were among the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. More recently, Yalçın and Yalçın (2022) through a meta-analysis, confirmed a strong positive correlation between organizational justice and employees' job satisfaction, providing further evidence that perceptions of fairness constitute an important determinant of positive work attitudes.

Subsequent empirical studies have continued to support these findings. Sarwari (2022) and Lambert et al., (2020) found that organizational justice had a significant effect on employees' job satisfaction. Gomes and Marques (2025) further demonstrated that organizational justice had significant direct effects of work engagement, commitment, and job satisfaction. In addition, (Rbiaa and Dexras-Gauthier 2025), based on a meta analytic evidence, confirmed the positive association between organizational justice and favorable organizational outcomes particularly innovative work behavior. Kim (2025) likewise, reported that distributive and procedural justice significantly enhanced job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Evidence from educational settings has further demonstrated and confirmed the importance of organizational justice in promoting faculty job satisfaction. Mohamed and Moussa (2022) and Al-Kaabi (2023) examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among faculty members and administrative staff in public and private colleges. Their results indicated a statistically significant positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, emphasizing the importance of fair organizational practices in educational institutions. Similarly, Mayouf (2025) explored the effects of organizational justice practices on job satisfaction among faculty members at Khamis Miliana University. They found that organizational justice contributes significantly to the improvement of faculty job satisfaction.

More recent evidence from higher education has further strengthened these findings. Assefa et al., (2026) conducted a qualitative case study involving 48 faculty members to explore their perceptions and experiences of distributive procedural and interactional justice. The findings revealed concerns regarding inequities in resource allocation and access to professional development opportunities, limited transparency and faculty participation in decision making, and experiences of disrespectful treatment by academic leaders. The study emphasized the importance of transparent participatory and equitable administrative practices in promoting positive faculty work experiences. Likewise, Sultan et al. (2026), in a study of employees in the colleges of Salahaddin University, reported a significant positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction at Salahaddin University.

Overall, the reviewed literature consistently demonstrates that organizational justice is positively associated with employees' job satisfaction across diverse organizational, cultural, and educational contexts. The evidence further suggests that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice contribute to job satisfaction through different but complementary mechanisms related to fair outcomes, respectful treatment, and transparent decision making. Consequently, fair transparent and participatory organizational practices play an important role in enhancing job satisfaction and fostering positive work attitudes. These findings are particularly important for higher education institutions where faculty members' perceptions of fairness can significantly affect their performance and contribution to institutional effectiveness.

Statement of Problem

Faculty members play a central role in the success and effectiveness of higher education institutions through their contributions to teaching, research, and community service. Consequently, their job satisfaction is considered a key factor of a productive academic environment and enhancing faculty motivation and performance. Among the organizational factors that influence job satisfaction, organizational justice is widely recognized as particularly important, as faculty members continuously evaluate the fairness of workload, resource allocation, promotion opportunities, decision making procedures, and the quality of interpersonal treatment they receive from their academic leaders.

Although the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction has been widely examined in different organizational settings, the existing literature indicates that relatively few studies have examined this relationship within higher education institutions in Arab countries, and particularly in the Jordanian context. This gap is especially pressing given that Jordanian universities operate under administrative structures, employment systems, and cultural characteristics that differ from those

examined in previous international research, limiting the applicability of existing results to the Jordanian context.

Within this structure, college deans hold considerable authority over workload distribution, participation in decision making, promotion opportunities, and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, perceptions of faculty members about deans practice of organizational justice are likely to have important implications for their job satisfaction and overall attitudes toward their institution. Nevertheless, the influence of organizational justice practiced by college deans on faculty members' job satisfaction remains insufficiently examined within the context of Jordanian universities. Recent research continues to emphasize the positive relationship between organizational justice and faculty job satisfaction (Assefa et al., 2026; Sultan et al., 2026), underscoring the need for empirical research in Jordanian universities rather than relying on findings derived from other contexts that may differ in their organizational structures and cultural characteristics.

Given the importance of faculty members to the success of higher education institutions and the limited empirical evidence concerning this relationship within Jordanian universities specifically, there is a need to explore how organizational justice practiced by college deans affect faculty members job satisfaction in this context.

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the existing literature and to provide university leaders and policy makers with evidence that may help promote fair administrative practices and enhance faculty members' job satisfaction. Therefore, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What is the level of organizational justice practiced by college deans from the perspective of faculty members in Jordanian universities?
- 2) What is the level of job satisfaction among faculty members in Jordanian universities?
- 3) What is the impact of organizational justice practiced by college deans on the job satisfaction of faculty members in Jordanian universities?

METHODOLOGY

Study Sample

This study employed a descriptive correlational research design. Data were collected from the entire study population, which comprised 140 faculty members working at a private university in Jordan. Given the manageable size of the population, a census approach was adopted, whereby an electronic questionnaire developed by the researchers was distributed to all faculty members through institutional communication channels using Google Forms. Out of the 140 questionnaires distributed,

123 completed questionnaires were returned and deemed valid for analysis, yielding a response rate of 87.9%.

Prior to participation, the participants were informed about the purpose and nature of the study, and were assured that participation was voluntary. They were also informed that all information provided would be treated with strict confidentiality, and would be used for scientific research purposes only. In addition, they were informed of their right to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences.

Instruments

Organizational Justice Scale: organizational justice was measured using the scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and translated into Arabic by Sultan and Al-Saud (2006). The scale comprises (20) items distributed over three dimensions of organizational justice: distributive justice (5 items), procedural justice (6 items), and interactional justice (9 items). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5(always) to 1(never). Scores for items within each dimension were summed separately, with higher scores indicating higher perceived levels of organizational justice

Job Satisfaction Scale: Job satisfaction was measured using the general job satisfaction scale developed by Ironson et al. (1989). The scale comprises (18) items designed to measure overall job satisfaction. It contains positive and negative worded items, with the negative worded items reverse-coded before data analysis. Responses were obtained using a 3-point Likert scale: Yes (3 points), indicating that the statement accurately describe the job; Not sure (1 point) indicating uncertainty or inability to express the opinion; and No (0 points) indicating that the statement doesn't describe the job.

The total job satisfaction score was calculated by summing responses to all items, resulting in a possible score range from 0-54, with higher total score indicating higher level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction levels are determined as high, moderate, or low, according to the following criteria: (0 – 18) indicate low level of satisfaction, (19 – 36) indicate moderate level of satisfaction, and (37 – 54) indicate high levels of job satisfaction.

Validity and Reliability

The validity of study instruments was established through a panel of (8) experts in educational sciences. They were asked to assess the clarity, and relevance of the items, and based on the expert comments and recommendations, the necessary revisions were made.

The reliability of study instruments was also verified using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The results revealed satisfactory reliability for all

dimensions of the scales, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70 recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Table (1) shows Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the study variables.

Table (1). The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the study variables

The scale	Dimension	Number of items	Reliability coefficient (α)
Organizational Justice Scale	Distributive justice	5	0.878
	Procedural justice	6	0.920
	Interactional justice	9	0.938
	Total	20	0.956
General job satisfaction scale	Job satisfaction	18	0.946

Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The statistical analysis includes: the means, standard deviations, percentages, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and stepwise multiple regression.

RESULTS

To answer the first question "What is the level of organizational justice practiced by college deans from the perspective of faculty members in Jordanian universities?" means and standard deviations were calculated for the three dimensions of organizational justice and for the overall organizational justice scale. The results are presented Table (2).

Table (2). Means and standard deviations of faculty members' perceptions of organizational justice

Dimension	Mean	Standard deviation	Level
Interactional justice	3.72	.848	High
Procedural justice	3.70	.781	High
Distributive justice	3.61	.773	Moderate
Total	3.68	.704	High

Table (2) shows that the overall level of organizational justice was perceived by faculty members to be high, with overall mean 3.68 (SD = 0.704). Interactional justice was rated highest with mean score (M = 3.72, SD = 0.848), followed by procedural justice (M = 3.70, SD = 0.781), whereas distributive justice received the lowest rating with a mean score (M = 3.61, SD = 0.773), though it remained at acceptable level.

In order to provide a more detailed analysis of faculty members' perceptions, means and standard deviations were calculated for each item of the three dimensions of organizational justice. The results for each dimension are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

A) Distributive justice

Table (3). Means and standard deviations of faculty members' responses to distributive justice items

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
– The distribution of my working hours is fair and appropriate.	3.89	.913	High
– I feel that my job burdens and duties are very appropriate.	3.67	.864	High
– I consider my workload to be very fair.	3.64	.968	Moderate
– I think my monthly salary is appropriate.	3.45	.934	Moderate
– In general, the financial incentives I receive are very appropriate.	3.39	1.029	Moderate
– Total	3.61	.773	Moderate

The results in Table (3) show that the overall mean of the distributive justice was (3.61) and (SD = 0.773 indicating a moderate level of perceived distributive justice among faculty members. The highest rated item was "The distribution of my working hours is fair and appropriate" (M = 3.89, SD = 0.913) followed by "I feel that my job burdens and duties are very appropriate" (M = 3.67, SD = 0.864). Conversely, the lowest rated item was "In general, the financial incentives I receive are very appropriate" (M = 3.39, SD = 1.029). Overall, the results indicate that faculty members perceived greater fairness in the distribution of workload and working hours than in allocation of salaries and financial incentives.

B) Procedural justice

Table (4). Means and standard deviations of faculty members' responses to procedural justice items

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
– The manager collects accurate and complete information before making work decisions.	3.80	.905	High
– The manager explains the decisions and provides employees with additional details when they inquire about those decisions.	3.72	1.058	High
– The manager makes job decisions in a fair and unbiased manner.	3.72	.854	High
– All administrative decisions are applied to all employees without exception.	3.72	.883	High
– The manager ensure that each employee has the opportunity to express his or her opinion before making work related decisions.	3.69	.897	High
– The manager allows employees to object or appeal the decisions he makes.	3.53	.935	Moderate
– Total	3.70	.781	High

The results in Table (4) show that the overall mean of the procedural justice was (3.70) and (SD = 0.781), indicating a high level of perceived procedural justice. The highest rated item was "The manager collects accurate and complete information before making work decisions" (M = 3.80, SD = 0.905). Three items came in second place with an equal mean of (3.72): "The manager explains the decisions and provides employees with additional details when they inquire about those decisions" (SD = 1.058), "The manager makes job decisions in a fair and unbiased manner" (SD = 0.854), and "All administrative decisions are applied to all employees without exception" (SD = 0.883). The lowest rated item was "The manager opens the way for employees to object or appeal the decisions he makes" (M = 3.53) and (SD = 0.935). In general, the results indicate that faculty members perceive decision making procedures as fair and unbiased and transparent, while opportunities to appeal managerial decisions were perceived less favorably.

C) Interactional justice

Table (5). Means and standard deviations of faculty members' responses to interactional justice items

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
– When a manager makes a decision about my work, he treats me with respect and dignity.	4.02	.941	High
– When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he treats me with all care and friendliness.	3.88	.972	High
– When a manager makes a decision about my work, he shows concern for my rights as an employee.	3.79	.977	High
– When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he discusses it with me very frankly.	3.78	.963	High
– The manager explains to me very clearly any decision made regarding my business.	3.67	.929	High
– The manager discusses with me the consequences of decisions that could affect my work.	3.63	.978	Moderate
– The manager explains to me the justifications for the decisions made regarding my work.	3.62	1.028	Moderate
– When a manager makes a decision related to my business, he explains the logical reasons that prompted the decision.	3.58	1.016	Moderate
– When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he takes my personal needs into consideration.	3.53	1.027	Moderate
– Total	3.72	.848	High

The results in Table (5) show that the overall mean of the interactional justice was (3.72) and the standard deviation was (0.848), indicating a high level of interactional justice.

The item “When a manager makes a decision about my work, he treats me with respect and dignity” came in first place with a mean score of ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.941$). The item “When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he treats me with all care and friendliness” ranked second ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.972$). This was followed by item “When a manager makes a decision about my work, he shows concern for my rights as an employee”

($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.977$), and “when a manager makes a decision related to my work, he discusses it with me very frankly” ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.963$).

Four items came at moderate level. The item “The manager discusses with me the consequences of decisions that could affect my work” with a mean of ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.978$), followed by “The manager explains to me the justifications for the decisions made regarding my work” ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.028$), and the item “When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he explains the logical reasons that prompted the decision, ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.016$). The item “When a manager makes a decision related to my work, he takes my personal needs into consideration” ranked last with a mean of (3.53) and a standard deviation of (1.027) indicating moderate level.

In general, the results showed favorable perception of interactional justice among faculty members. Interpersonal respect and courteous treatment by college deans received the highest ratings, while lower ratings were associated with the extent to which managerial decisions were explained and with attention to faculty personal needs.

To answer the second research question, “What is the level of job satisfaction among faculty members in Jordanian universities?” frequencies, percentages, mean score, and standard deviation were computed to determine the level of job satisfaction among faculty members. The results are shown in Table (6).

Table (6). Levels of job satisfaction among faculty members

Level of job satisfaction	Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Low	0 – 18	17	%13.8
Average	19 – 36	15	%12.2
High	37 - 54	91	%74.0
Total	-	123	%100
The overall mean score of the participants = (41.41)			
Standard deviation = (14.26)			

Table (6) shows that the majority of the study participants (74%) reported a high level of job satisfaction. Whereas (12.2%) reported moderate level of job satisfaction, while (13.8%) reported low level. The overall mean score for job satisfaction ($M = 41.41$, $SD = 14.26$) and the high proportion of respondents (74%) indicate that faculty members experienced high levels of job satisfaction.

To answer the third research question, “What is the impact of organizational justice practiced by the college dean on the job satisfaction of faculty members in Jordanian universities?”, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between

organizational justice and job satisfaction. The results are shown in Table (7).

Table (7). Pearson correlation coefficient between organizational justice and job satisfaction (N = 123)

Scale	Dimension	Job satisfaction	Significance
Organizational Justice	Distributive justice	.512	.000
	Procedural justice	.466	.000
	Interactional justice	.343	.000
	Total	.481	.000

Table (7) shows that all dimensions of organizational justice were positively and significantly correlated with job satisfaction. ($r = 0.481$, $p < .001$). At the dimensional level, the distributive justice showed the strongest correlation with job satisfaction ($r = 0.512$) followed by procedural justice with a correlation coefficient of ($r = 0.466$), then interactional justice with a correlation coefficient ($r = 0.343$).

To further investigate the predictive effect of organizational justice on faculty job satisfaction, a multiple regression analysis was conducted using the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) as predictor variables and job satisfaction as dependent variable. Table 8 shows the results.

As shown in Table (8), the overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(3,119) = 17.086$, $p < .001$, explaining 30.1% of the variance in faculty satisfaction ($R^2 = .301$, adjusted $R^2 = .283$). Among the predictor variables, distributive justice was the strongest significant predictor of faculty job satisfaction ($\beta = .364$, $t = 3.784$, $p < .001$), as was procedural justice ($\beta = .268$, $t = 2.100$, $p < .038$). In contrast, interactional justice was not a significant predictor of faculty satisfaction ($\beta = -.029$, $t = -.248$, $p = .805$).

The multicollinearity diagnostics presented in table (8) indicated no concern regarding collinearity among the predicted variables. All tolerance values exceed the recommended threshold of 0.2 (ranging from .361 to .635) and all VIF values were below 5 (ranging from 1.574 to 2.766).

Table (8) Multiple Regression Analysis of the Effects of Organizational Justice Dimensions on Job Satisfaction

Variable	B	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Collinearity statistics	
						LL	UL	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	.924	5.982		.154	.877	-	12.768		
						10.920			
Distributive justice	6.709	1.773	.364	3.784	< .001	3.198	10.220	.635	1.574
Procedural justice	4.884	2.326	.268	2.100	.038	.279	9.489	.361	2.766
Interactional justice	-.480	1.937	-	-.248	.805	-4.314	3.355	.442	2.263
			.029						

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. Model summary: $R = .549$, $R^2 = .301$, adjusted $R^2 = .283$, $F(3, 119) = 17.086$, $p < .001$.

DISCUSSION

The results pertaining to the first research question indicated that the level of organizational justice practiced by the deans as perceived by faulty members was high, with an overall mean score of 3.68. This result reflects faculty members' recognition of a satisfactory level of justice in administrative practices within the colleges, including the manners in which the deans interact with faculty members, the procedures used in decision-making, and the distribution of rights and responsibilities. Such an outcome may be attributed to the nature of university work itself, which is governed by formal regulations and instructions that define decision-making processes and the allocation of responsibilities. Such structures limit the scope of personal discretion and foster a stronger sense of fairness among faculty members.

This finding may also be explained and understood in light of the recent developments in Jordanian universities in recent years in the areas of governance, transparency, and academic accreditation. Academic leaders have increasingly become committed to implementing formal regulations and involving faculty members in academic and administrative decision making, thereby enhancing perceptions of organizational justice.

This result is in line with Al-Saud and Sultan (2009) who reported a high level of organizational justice among heads of academic departments in public Jordanian universities. It is also consistent with Sultan et al., (2026) who reported a good level of organizational justice in the faculties of Salah Al-Din University, and with Al-Kaabi (2023) who found a good level of organizational justice among employees in public and private colleges.

At the dimensional level, interactional justice emerged as the most important dimension, followed by procedural justice and distributive justice. The importance of interactional justice may be attributed to the direct and frequent interactions between faculty members and their deans.

These interactions are characterized by respectful treatment, honesty, courtesy, and transparent communication. Faculty members are also provided with adequate explanations regarding organizational decisions and procedures. According to Colquitt et al., (2001) interactional justice comprises interpersonal justice (respect, dignity, and politeness) and informational justice (truthful, adequate, and timely explanations) both of which shape employees' perceptions of fairness.

The results also showed that procedural justice was perceived at a high level, indicating that faculty members viewed decision-making processes and procedures as objective and consent. This perception may be explained by the fact that university decisions are typically governed by clear regulations and instructions and through academic committees and councils. This result aligns with Al-Zu'bi (2010), Mulgund (2022), and Wan et al., (2023), all of whom reported that employees hold positive attitudes toward the fairness of organizational procedures. When employees perceive that their workplace decision-making is free of bias and discrimination, they tend to approach their work with greater enthusiasm and effort, which in turn contributes to positive outcomes (Mulgund, 2022).

Distributive justice, in contrast, ranked last and was perceived at a moderate level, indicating that faculty members were less satisfied with the fairness of organizational outcomes. The researchers noted that the items with the lowest mean scores were those related to salaries and financial incentives, suggesting a perception among faculty members that rewards and incentives are not always equal to the effort exerted or the academic responsibilities assumed. This is consistent with Ismail et al. (2008) and Malmrud et al. (2020) who found that employees experience greater dissatisfaction with pay when they perceive imbalance between their inputs (e.g. efforts, contributions) and the outcomes (e.g. pay, rewards) they receive relative to others.

The results related to the second research question indicate a high level of job satisfaction among faculty members. Specifically, 74% of participants reported high satisfaction, 12.2% reported moderate satisfaction, and 13.8% reported low satisfaction. These results suggest that most faculty members hold positive attitudes toward their work and are generally satisfied with the university environment.

This high level of satisfaction among faculty members may be attributed to several factors inherent in the academic profession. Faculty members often enjoy a substantial degree professional autonomy and academic freedom in teaching, research, and community service. In addition, opportunities for academic promotion, participation in situational decision-making, and engagement in scholarly activities may strengthen

their commitment and satisfaction with their institutions. This interpretation is consistent with the findings of Chen (2023), who indicated that a positive university work environment and the nature of academic work are among the strongest predictors of professors' job satisfaction.

Furthermore, the high level of satisfaction may be explained by the autonomy faculty members experience in managing their teaching and research responsibilities. Greater autonomy allows academics to select the appropriate teaching methods pursue research interests, and contribute to their disciplines. This explanation is supported by Dara (2023) who reported a significant positive relationship between job autonomy and satisfaction. Another possible explanation could be attributed to faculty perceptions of organizational justice. Employees tend to report greater satisfaction when they feel they are treated with respect and when decisions affecting their work follow fair and transparent procedures.

The findings of the present study are in line with those of Igrirah and Alafaid (2021), Al-Kaabi (2023), and Hussein (2023), all of which reported good to high levels of job satisfaction among faculty members attributing these outcomes to supportive institutional environments, professional support, and organizational justice. The results further align to some extent with evidence from the Jordanian higher education context. Ghidan (2019) and Abu-Khdair (2018) reported moderate levels of faculty job satisfaction. Although the level of satisfaction perceived in this study was relatively higher, these studies affirm the role of favorable institutional conditions in promoting faculty wellbeing and performance. By contrast, the results differ from those found by Al-Ati and Eshmaila (2023) who reported low job satisfaction.

The results related to the third question showed a statistically significant influence of organizational justice, as practiced by college deans, on faculty members' job satisfaction in Jordanian universities. The correlation and the regression analysis confirmed this positive relationship between the two variables, indicating that faculty members who perceive higher levels of fairness within their institutions tend to report higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs. The regression analysis further demonstrated that distributive justice and procedural justice significantly predicted faculty job satisfaction. This finding indicates that faculty job satisfaction is influenced both by the fairness of outcomes they receive and the fairness of the procedures used to determine them.

Distributive justice emerged as the strongest predictor of job satisfaction among the three dimensions of organizational justice. This is possibly not surprising given how directly it touches on matters central to

faculty professional and personal wellbeing, such as workload distribution, promotion opportunities, financial incentives, rewards, and professional development. When these resources are distributed fairly, faculty members are more likely to feel that their contributions and efforts are valued, which in turn enhances their satisfaction.

Procedural justice also contributed significantly to predicting job satisfaction. This result may be explained by the fact that faculty members tend to place greater trust in their institutions when administrative decisions follow clear, transparent, and consistently applied procedures. Fair procedures give the employees a sense of security and confidence that decisions are not influenced by favoritism or personal interests. As a result, faculty may be more willing to accept organizational decisions and remain satisfied with their work even when specific outcomes don't meet their expectations. This aligns with Ho (2025), who found that procedural justice and distributive justice promote positive work attitudes by strengthening employees' sense of organizational identification and trust in their institutions.

Another possible explanation may relate to the nature of the academic profession itself. Faculty members usually possess a high level of professional autonomy and awareness of institutional policies, making them attuned to issues of fairness and equal opportunities. Consequently, they evaluate their institutions not only according to interpersonal relationships but also according to the extent to which organizational practices reflect equity and accountability. This helps explain why distributive justice and procedural justice stand out as central factors of positive work attitudes and their overall job satisfaction. This is consistent with Dara's (2023) study, which found that academic staff place considerable importance on autonomy, participation in decision making, and fair institutional practices as contributors to their job satisfaction and professional commitment.

These findings are in line with a growing body of research that emphasizes the positive influence of organizational justice on job satisfaction. Previous research studies have reported that employees who perceive higher levels of fairness in organizational practices tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction. For example, Sarwari (2022) and Gomes and Marques (2025) found that organizational justice has a significant effect on job satisfaction. Similar results have been reported in higher education settings. Mohamed and Mousa (2022) and Al-Kaabi (2023) found significant positive relationships between organizational justice and job satisfaction among faculty members and administrative employees. Likewise, Mayouf (2025) and Sultan et al., (2026) concluded that organizational justice is a significant predictor of job satisfaction among university faculty members. Collectively, these results support the results of this study and suggest that faculty members are more likely to

experience higher levels of job satisfaction when university policies and practices are perceived as fair, transparent, and equitable.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The college deans in Jordanian universities practice organizational justice at high levels, as perceived by the faculty members, indicating that university administrative practices are generally characterized by fairness and equity. Among the dimensions of organizational justice, interactional justice ranked highest followed by procedural justice, while distributive justice ranked lowest despite remaining within an acceptable range. This suggests the need to improve fairness in the distribution of rewards, incentives, and workload.
2. Faculty members at Jordanian universities reported a high level of job satisfaction, which reflects a positive and supportive academic work environment within Jordanian universities.
3. The findings of the study revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction, indicating that higher awareness of organizational justice practices is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction.
4. Organizational justice was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction, with distributive justice and procedural justice contributed significantly to the explained variance. The two dimensions accounted for over 30% of the total variance in faculty members' satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the study, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Jordanian universities should strengthen organizational practices, particularly in aspects related to fair distribution of teaching load, incentives and rewards, and the opportunities for promotion and professional development.
2. Develop clear and fair policies for distributing rewards, incentives, and benefits according to objective, stated criteria based on performance, efficiency, and achievement.
3. University leaders should adopt clear and fair decision making practices and to actively engage faculty members in decisions that influence their academic and professional responsibilities. Such practices can help build mutual trust, strengthen positive relationships within the university community and foster a more supportive work environment.

4. Future studies should examine additional factors that may influence faculty job satisfaction including organizational support, leadership styles, work environment and opportunities, professional development, given that organizational justice explained only part of the variance in job satisfaction.
5. Future research is recommended to investigate the impact of organizational justice on other organizational variables, such as organizational commitment, organizational loyalty, and academic performance. Comparative studies involving different university sectors and educational contexts are also encouraged to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Khdair, B. M. (2018). The level of job satisfaction among academic staff in public and private universities located in the northern governorates of Jordan: A field study. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 19(2), 569-605. <https://doi.org/10.12785/JEPS/190219>
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422-436. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040968>
- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Al-Ati, T.A. & Eshmaila, M. H. (2023). Job satisfaction of high technical institutes' teaching staff and its effect on the job performance. *African Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 178-197. <https://doi.org/10.65418/ajashss.v2i3.428>
- Al-Atwi, A. A. (2007). The impact of organizational justice on contextual performance: An analytical study of the views of the teaching staff at the College of Administration and Economics, University of Al-Qadisiyah. *Al-Qadisiyah Journal for Administrative and Economic Sciences*, University of Al-Qadisiyah, 10(1), 146-170.
- Al-Kaabi, M. H. (2023). Organizational justice and its impact on job satisfaction: A case study of some public and private colleges in Baghdad. *Damascus University Journal for Economic and Political Sciences*, 39(1), 153-171.
- Al-Saud, R., & Sultan, S. (2009). The degree of organizational justice among academic department heads in official Jordanian universities and its relationship to the organizational commitment of their faculty members. *Damascus University Journal*, 25(1+2), 191-231.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
- Assefa, Y., Tilwani, S. A., Alhur, A. A., Spahiu, I., Abera, W. G., & Majeed, H. (2026). Organizational justice in higher education: A qualitative inquiry into faculty perspectives on issues of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Sage Open*, 16(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251415068>
- Chen, C. Y. (2023). Are professors satisfied with their jobs? The factors that influence professors' job satisfaction. *SAGE Open*, 13(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181515>
- Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J., & Roman, P. (2005). Organizational justice and job satisfaction: A test of three competing models. *Social Justice Research*, 18(4), 391-409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-005-8567-5>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Dahleez, K. & Aboramadan, M. (2025). Servant leadership and job satisfaction in higher education: The mediating roles of organizational justice and organizational trust. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(4), 853–874. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2052753>
- Dara, D. (2023). An investigation of faculty members' job autonomy, work satisfaction, and innovative work behavior indicators. *International Journal of Academic Research in Psychology*, 13(12), 5194–5211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i12/19852>
- Demiray, T., & Tokmak, C. (2026). The impact of organizational justice on intention to leave and organizational health: An application in five-star hotel businesses in Istanbul. *Journal of Management and Economic Studies*, 8(1), 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.26677/TR1010.2026.1637>
- Ghidan, M. W. A. (2019). *The degree of job satisfaction among faculty members in private universities in Jordan and its relationship to the quality of their academic performance* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Jordan). Retrieved from <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1411437>
- Gomes, J. F., & Marques, T. M. (2025). The influence of organisational justice on work engagement, organisational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comprehensive study. *Journal of General Management*, 50(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03063070221140726>
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- Hao, Y., Hao, J., & Wang, X. (2016). The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction: Evidence from China. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 7(2), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHRM-07-2016-0012>
- Ho, H. C. (2025). A one-year prospective study of organizational justice and work attitudes: An extended job demands-resources model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 40(1), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2024-0113>
- Hou, H. (2007). The impact of faculty members' perceptions of institutional policies on their performance in Taiwan's context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, USA.
- Hussein, S. A. (2023). Improving the Level of Job Satisfaction among Employees of the Faculty of Education at Benha University: A Field Study. *Benha University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 34(135), 245–284. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jfeb.2023.245293.1779>
- Igrirah, A. & Alafaid, E. (2021). Factors influencing staff members' job satisfaction at Sebha University. *Sebha University Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 20(1), 144–152. <https://doi.org/10.51984/jopas.v20i1.1206>

- Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.193>
- Ismail, A., Leng, O. G., Marzuki, E. B., & Cheekiong, T. (2008). Adequacy of benefits, distributive justice and individual attitudes and behaviors: A case of public community colleges staff. *Intangible Capital*, 4(4), 212–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3926/ic.2008.v4n4.p212-236>
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Kim, J.-H. (2025). Organizational justice and performance in distribution perspectives: Job satisfaction, commitment, and empowerment among millennials and Gen Z. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 23(11), 139–148. <http://doi.org/10.15722/jds.23.11.202511.139>
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237>
- Lambert, E. G., Keena, L. D., Leone, M., May, D., & Haynes, S. H. (2020). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of correctional staff. *The Social Science Journal*, 57(4), 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2019.02.002>
- Malmrud, S., Falkenberg, H., Eib, C., Hellgren, J., & Sverke, M. (2020). Just what I see? Implications of congruence between supervisors' and employees' perceptions of pay justice for employees' work-related attitudes and behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 2069. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02069>
- Mayouf, K. (2025). The impact of organizational justice practices on job satisfaction among faculty members at of Khemis Miliana University. *Economic Integration Journal*, 13(3), 413–433.
- Mengstie, M. M. (2020). Perceived organizational justice and turnover intention among hospital healthcare workers. *BMC Psychology*, 8(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-0387-8>
- Mohamed, H. O. & Moussa, B. E. (2022). The impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction: Applied to faculty members and staff at Omdurman Islam The impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction: Applied to faculty members and employees in Omdurman Islamic university. *Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 1(11), 1–35.
- Mulgund, S. (2022). Importance of distributive justice, procedural justice and fairness in workplace. *International Journal of Management and Humanities*, 8(6), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijmh.F1419.018622>
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527–556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>

- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill
- Rbiaa, O. & Dextras-Gauthier, J. (2025). Unpacking the link between organizational justice and innovative behavior: A meta-analytic review across sectors. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2546560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2546560>
- Sarwari, K. (2022). The effect of organizational justice on employees' job satisfaction. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 191-217. <https://doi.org/10.62810/jss.v4i3.196>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006>
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Suifan, T. S., Diab, H., & Abdallah, A. B. (2017). Does organizational justice affect turnover-intention in a developing country? The mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(9), 1137–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2017-0048>
- Suliman, A., & Kathairi, M. A. (2013). Organizational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451311279438>
- Sultan, K. H., Rashed, J. S., & Ibrahim, H. R. (2026). The role of organizational justice in achieving job satisfaction among employees: An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of employees from the colleges of Salahaddin University – Erbil. *Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies*, 16(5), 873-910. <https://doi.org/10.66026/8vbtjb04>
- Sultan, S. A., & Al-Saud, R. (2006). Organizational justice among academic department heads in official Jordanian universities and its relationship to the job satisfaction of their faculty members. *Mu'tah Journal for Research and Studies*, 21(4), 127-158.
- Wan, J., Qin, M., Zhou, W., Zhou, H., & Li, P. (2023). Procedural justice, relative deprivation, and intra-team knowledge sharing: The moderating role of group identification. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 994020. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.994020>
- Wiseman, J., & Stillwell, A. (2022). Organizational justice: Typology, antecedents and consequences. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1287-1295. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia2030086>
- Yalçın, H., & Yalçın, Y. (2022). A meta analysis of the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction: The case of Turkey. *Istanbul Business Research*, 51(2), 417–432. <https://doi.org/10.26650/ibr.2022.51.894298>
- Zayed, A. M. (1995). Analyzing the relationship between job performance monitoring methods and employees' sense of organizational justice. *Arab Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 2(2), 269-298.