



sciendo

BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW & POLITICS

A Journal of Vytutas Magnus University

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 3 (2023)

ISSN 2029-0454

Cit.: *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 16:3 (2023):2526-2532

DOI: 10.2478/bjlp-2023-00000192

Distributive, Procedural And Interactional Justice On Employee Job Satisfaction

Petronela Sahetapy^{1*}
Tehubijuluw Zacharias²

^{1*}Universitas Pattimura Ambon, Indonesia. Email: Petronelasahetapy@gmail.com

²Universitas Kristen Indonesia Maluku, Indonesia. Email: tehubijuluwzacharias@yahoo.com

***Corresponding Author:** Petronela Sahetapy

*Universitas Pattimura Ambon, Indonesia. Email: Petronelasahetapy@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of distributive, procedural and interactional justice on employee job satisfaction at Ambon State Madrasah Aliyah. This study used an approach. The research approach used was quantitative, associative, survey and cross section. The population used in this study were all Social Service of Ambon City employees as many as 39 people. The sample is full sampling. Data @ analyzed using multiple linear regression with the help of SPSS 25.00. The results of the study concluded that (1) distributive justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Social Service of Ambon City employees; (2) Procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Social Service of Ambon City employees; (3) Interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Social Service of Ambon City employees, (4) Distributive, procedural and interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Social Service of Ambon City employees.

Keywords: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is one of the employee attitudes that has become a lot of research material related to organizational justice. The biggest challenge faced by organizations is how to retain competent employees. Job satisfaction is needed to produce functional employee behavior in the organization. For organizations, employee job satisfaction means they are motivated and committed to achieving high performance. Job satisfaction is an evaluation that describes a person's feelings of pleasure or displeasure, satisfaction or dissatisfaction at work. Organizational effectiveness and productivity are strongly influenced by job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction will lead to a decrease in morale and enthusiasm for work.

Employee work behavior has become a research subject that has attracted the interest of researchers and academics. Researches in this field are mainly carried out to find useful conceptions to be used as inputs in making decisions and policies in the field of human resource management, as well as in the framework of knowledge development. One of the conceptualizations of employee work behavior that has received much attention from researchers is the perception of justice.

Justice researchers have consistently identified three types of perceptions of justice, namely: distributive, procedural, and interactional. Perceptions of distributive justice refer to judgments about the fairness of outcomes received by individuals. Research findings explain that distributive justice is related to individual perceptions of their relationship with other individuals who have resources. Social justice examines perceptions about organizational decisions. The method used to research it and examine the attitudes of those who are influenced through the three theories expressed by Folger and Cropanzano. The first theory relates to workers' perceptions of outcomes called distributive justice. The second theory is procedural justice which focuses on workers'

perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to make decisions, and the third theory is interactional justice which emphasizes perceptions of the fairness of interpersonal treatment received by workers.

Luthfi & Sudarma (2016) stated that organizational justice is a key factor in understanding the attitudes and behavior of employees in organizations. Job satisfaction is one of the most frequently used variables in organizational behavior (Hwei & Santosa, 2012). Several studies have found that organizational justice affects job satisfaction.

Organizational justice refers to the extent to which employees understand the rules of the workplace, interactions, and actual work results. In this perception there will be positive or negative actions that affect the performance and success of the organization. Justice is said to have significant potential in growing benefits for employees and organizations, which include: trust, commitment, increased performance, and job satisfaction (Sutrisna & Rahyuda, 2014).

Someone will feel satisfied or dissatisfied, depending on whether he feels the existence of justice (equity). Feelings of equity and inequity for a situation are obtained by someone by comparing himself with other people in the same class, office and government. This means that justice is one of the factors that influence job satisfaction. The justice referred to includes distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice and spatial justice (Tjahyanti & Puspasari, 2017).

Research (Ravangard, Ansarizade, & Sajjadnia, 2013) and (Crow, Lee, & Joo, 2012) shows that the three types of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. The results of previous research say that there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and procedural justice on employee job satisfaction (Durrani, Cheema, & Khokhar, 2015). Other research says that there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and interactional justice on job satisfaction and there is a negative relationship between procedural justice on job satisfaction (Iqbal, 2013), Krisnayanti & Riana (2015), Tjahyanti & Puspasari (2017), Yudhian et al. (2020), Dewi & Sudibya (2016) and Heavyantoro (2016).

Based on the observations of researchers, employees at the Ambon City Social Service experience several problems related to employee performance, job satisfaction, distributive justice and procedural justice. First, there is a decrease in employee performance, as seen from the presence of some employees who arrive late, leave before their time, are slow to complete work and so on. Second, the lack of job satisfaction felt by employees can be observed from the low employee enthusiasm for work, this can be seen from the lack of employee desire to develop, employees do not like work, do not enjoy work, consider compensation to be insufficient, and so on. The third distributive justice that often appears is the inconsistency in the timing of the delivery of compensation to employees. Fourth, procedural justice often arises, for example, there is a placement of workers who are not in accordance with their fields. In addition, there are several work mechanisms that are not in accordance with the organization's standard operating procedures (SOP). Things like that often make employees feel less enthusiastic at work, and as a result will reduce performance.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive-quantitative approach with a causal correlation type, meaning that the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is a causal relationship. The population used in this study were all employees of the Ambon City Social Service as many as 39 people. The method of determining the sample is full sampling. Data analysis techniques in this study, using descriptive analysis and multiple linear regression analysis with the following equation:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e$$

Where:

- Y = Employee Job Satisfaction
- X1 = Distributive justice
- X2 = Procedural justice
- X3 = interactional justice
- bo, b1,b2,b3 = Regression coefficient
- e = error term (error term)

The effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable was tested with a confidence interval of 95% or alpha = 0.05. This can be known by conducting simultaneous tests and partial tests.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The influence of the independent variables of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on the dependent variable, namely job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees (Y) is known through multiple linear regression calculations. Based on the results of data processing using the SPSS 23.00 program, the following table is obtained:

Table 1. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

| Variable | Regression Coefficient | T count | T table Df=35 | Sig. | r ² Partial |
|---|------------------------|---------|---------------|--------|------------------------|
| distributive justice (X ₁) | 0,211 | 2,282 | 2,131 | 0,704 | 0,540 |
| procedural justice (X ₂) | 0,201 | 2,422 | 2,131 | 0,161 | 0,497 |
| interactional justice (X ₃) | 0,790 | 3,201 | 2,131 | 0,000 | 0,932 |
| Constanta : | 0,219 | | F. Ratio : | 67,752 | |
| R square : | 0,932 | | Prob. : | 0,000 | |
| Multiple R : | 0,928 | | n : | 39 | |

Based on the table above, a mathematical equation model can be arranged as follows:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e$$

$$Y = 0,219 + 0,211 X_1 + 0,201 X_2 + 0,790 X_3 + 0,112$$

The explanation of the mathematical model above is:

1. The value of b0 indicates the magnitude of the prediction of job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees of 0.210 which is not influenced by the variables of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.
2. The value of b1 indicates the distributive justice variable (X1) is positive, this means that if distributive justice increases it will result in increased job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.211, meaning that every one unit increase in the distributive justice variable will result in an increase of 0.211 units in the job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees, if other variables are constant.
3. The value of b2 indicates the procedural justice variable (X2) is positive, this means that if procedural justice increases it will result in increased job satisfaction of the Ambon City Social Service employees. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.201, meaning that every one unit increase in the procedural justice variable will result in an increase of 0.201 units in the job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees, if other variables are constant.
4. The b3 value indicates the interactional justice variable (X3) is positive, this means that if there is an increase in interactional justice it will result in increased job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.790, meaning that every one unit increase in the interactional justice variable will result in an increase of 0.790 units in the job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees, if other variables are constant.

First, Second, and Third Hypothesis Testing

- 1) The first hypothesis states that the variables of distributive justice (X1), procedural justice (X2) and interactional justice (X3) have a significant effect on the related variable, namely job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees (Y) partially. The test is carried out by confirming the calculated t value with the t table value in degrees of freedom ($df = 35$).
- 2) The calculated t value for the distributive justice variable is $2.282 >$ the t table value ($df=35$) is 2.131 , so it is concluded that H_0 is rejected, H_a is accepted which means that distributive justice partially influences job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees. (Hypothesis 1 accepted)
- 3) The calculated t value for procedural justice variable is $2.422 >$ t table value ($df = 35$) of 2.131 , so it is concluded that H_0 is rejected, H_a is accepted which means that procedural justice has a partial effect on job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees. (Hypothesis 2 is accepted)
- 4) The t value for the interactional justice variable is $3.201 >$ the t table value ($df = 35$) is 2.131 , so it is concluded that H_0 is rejected, H_a is accepted which means that interactional justice partially influences job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees. (Hypothesis 3 is accepted)

Fourth Hypothesis Testing

The fourth hypothesis which states that distributive justice (X1), procedural justice (X2) and interactional justice (X3) have a significant effect on the related variables, namely job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees (Y) simultaneously. The test is carried out by confirming the calculated F value with the table F value on $df_{(3)(35)}$. The table above shows the calculated F value of $67.752 >$ F table on $df_{(3)(35)}$ of 8.70 ; so it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means that the variables of distributive justice (X1), procedural justice (X2) and interactional justice (X3) have a significant effect on the related variable, namely job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees (Y) simultaneously. The magnitude of the influence of these three variables is 0.932 or 93.2% , the variable job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees is influenced by distributive justice (X1), procedural justice (X2) and interactional justice (X3) and the remaining 6.8% ($100\% - 93.2\%$) is influenced by other variables that are not included in the research model. Table 1 shows the results of multiple linear regression analysis, where it can be seen that the largest regression coefficient value is the variable of interactional justice, as well as the calculated t value and the partial r^2 value, which shows that the greatest influence comes from the interactional justice variable with an effect size of 79.1% , because it has the largest correlation coefficient value between the two other variables. The regression coefficient shows the influence of each independent variable (X1, X2, X3) on the dependent variable (Y) if the size of the other independent variables in the model remains the same.

Discussion

1. The Effect of Distributive Justice on Job Satisfaction

The distributive justice variable (X1) is positive, this means that if the employee's assessment of the fairness of the results (outcomes) received by employees from the organization increases, it will result in increased employee job satisfaction. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.211 , meaning that each increase of one unit of the distributive variable will result in an increase of 0.211 units of employee job satisfaction, if other variables are constant.

The results of this study are in line with research (Budiarto & Wardani, 2005) which states that organizational distributive justice can lead to job satisfaction among employees. With the same job, the same reward (salary) between two people in the same organization, job satisfaction is achieved. In addition to rewards that are in accordance with sacrifices, there are also policies that can affect their work and career, fair compensation, a cooperative work environment, and good welfare guarantees. These expectations then develop into demands that employees submit to the organization as something that must be met. With the increasing demands on the organization, the more important the role of employee commitment to the organization. This affects his decision to stay with and advance the organization, or choose a more promising workplace. Likewise (Dewi & Sudibya, 2016) which states that more studies claim that distributive justice has a stronger influence on job satisfaction than procedural justice.

Distributive justice is a dimension of organizational justice which is considered very important because this dimension is directly related to the contribution or participation of employees directly to the organization. Distributive justice is related to the existence of a relationship with employee satisfaction with salary, promotion, performance appraisal, and organizational commitment. If an employee who has made the best contribution to the organization is not given fair rewards or awards in accordance with the input provided, it is likely that the worker will leave the organization (Krisnayanti & Riana, 2015).

2. The Effect of Procedural Justice on Job Satisfaction

The procedural justice variable (X2) is positive, this means that if organizational justice related to decision-making procedures by the organization aimed at its members increases it will result in increased employee job satisfaction. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.201, meaning that every one unit increase in the procedural justice variable will result in an increase of 0.201 units of employee job satisfaction, if the other variables are constant.

The results of this study are in line with Crow et al. (2012) who added findings that perceptions of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice in police officers can have an indirect effect on commitment through job satisfaction.

Likewise, procedural justice is a concept of justice that focuses on the methods used to determine the rewards received. Procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction (Dewi & Sudibya, 2016). Procedural justice has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction (Krisnayanti & Riana, 2015)

3. The Effect of Interactional Justice on Job Satisfaction

The interactional justice variable (X3) is positive, this means that if there is an increase in justice received for respectful and dignified treatment it will result in increased employee job satisfaction. Furthermore, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is 0.790, meaning that every one unit increase in the interactional justice variable will result in an increase of 0.790 units of employee job satisfaction, if the other variables are constant.

The results of this study are in line with previous research conducted by Dewi & Sudibya (2016) showing that interactional justice has a significant effect on job satisfaction. Likewise the results of research conducted by Usmani & Jamal (2013) who obtained the result that interactional justice had a positive and significant relationship to job satisfaction. Interactional justice has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction (Krisnayanti & Riana, 2015) and (Afuan, 2021) which concludes that the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the execution of procedures and these assessments will influence individual attitudes and behavior.

4. The Effect of Distributive Justice (X1), Procedural Justice (X2) and Interactional Justice (X3) Variables on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) Simultaneously

The results of this study indicate that the three variables namely distributive justice (X1), procedural justice (X2) and interactional justice (X3), if they interact with each other, will significantly increase employee job satisfaction. In the sense that, the justice for the results (outcomes) received by employees from the organization is very high, supported by organizational justice related to decision-making procedures by the organization aimed at its members and justice received for respectful and dignified treatment, then job satisfaction will increase will increase, and vice versa. This is in line with Dewi & Sudibya (2016) with the research title "The Influence of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice on Employee Job Satisfaction" which shows that on employee job satisfaction, procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction, as well as fairness. Interactional positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. Likewise Heavyantoro (2016) with the research title "The Influence of Distributive and Procedural Justice on Job Satisfaction of Non-Civil Servants (Non PNS) Education Workers at Brawijaya University" which shows that distributive and procedural justice has a significant direct effect on perceptions of organizational support and has no effect directly significant to job satisfaction. In general, to be satisfied, employees are not sufficiently treated fairly, but they must first feel supported by the organization..

5. The Dominant Effect of Interactional Justice on Employee Job Satisfaction

The largest regression coefficient value is the interactional justice variable as well as the calculated t value and partial r² value, which indicates that the greatest influence comes from the interactional justice variable with a large influence of 79.1%, because it has the largest correlation coefficient value among the other two variables. The regression coefficient shows the influence of each independent variable (X₁, X₂, X₃) on the dependent variable (Y) if the size of the other independent variables in the model remains the same.

The dominant influence of interactional justice on the job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees, is because Ambon City Social Service employees feel treated with respect, kindness, and dignity in interpersonal interactions with colleagues, superiors, and customers. Interactional justice is justice that is received for respectful and dignified treatment. Interactional justice is how to treat employees with dignity and respect for them.

Interactional justice (interactional justice) refers to the extent to which an authority given to employees is able to be communicated properly. In general, interactional justice displays a condition of activity that does not intersect with work, but rather on aspects of interaction both informationally and interpersonally. According to Afuan (2021), there are at least two indicators of interactional justice: 1. Interpersonal Justice, treating employees with dignity, courtesy and respect and 2. Informational Justice, sharing relevant information. Both between supervisors and employees or employees with fellow employees.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions are obtained:

1. Distributive justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees.
2. Procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees.
3. Interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees.
4. Distributive, procedural and interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction of Ambon City Social Service employees.

REFERENCES

- Afuan, M. (2021). Determinasi Kepuasan Kerja Dan Komitmen Organisasi: Keadilan Distributif Dan Keadilan Interaksional (Suatu Kajian Studi Literatur Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(1), 331–346.
- Akhmal, A., Laila, F., & Sari, R. A. (2018). Pengaruh Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Bisnis Internasional*, 07, 20–24.
- Budiarto, Y., & Wardani, R. P. (2005). Peran Keadilan Distributif, Keadilan Prosedural Dan Keadilan Interaksional Organisasi Terhadap Komitmen Pegawai Pada Organisasi (Studi Pada Organisasi X). *Jurnal Psikologi*, 3(2), 109–126.
- Cahyana Sudhana I Gede, I. ketut J. (2017). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Stres Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*, 2017(1), 1314–1342.
- Crow, M. M., Lee, C. B., & Joo, J. J. (2012). Organizational justice and organizational commitment among South Korean police officers: An investigation of job satisfaction as a mediator. *Policing*, 35(2), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511211230156>
- Dewi, I., & Sudibya, I. (2016). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif, Keadilan Prosedural, Dan Keadilan Interaksional Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 5(6), 254766.
- Durrani, B. A., Cheema, S., & Khokhar, M. F. (2015). Exploring The Relationship of Organizational Justice With Employee Satisfaction and Employee's Commitment. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 24(6), 156–167. Retrieved from <http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>
- Evanda, R. B. (2017). Pengaruh Motivasi, Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dan Kinerja Perawat Di Rumah Sakit dr. Soebandi Jember. *Bisma*, 11(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.19184/bisma.v11i1.6207>
- Heavyantoro, O. I. (2016). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif dan Prosedural terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Tenaga Kependidikan Non Pegawai Negeri Sipil (Non PNS) di Universitas Brawijaya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik (JIAP)*, 2(1), 58–67.
- Hidayah, S., & Haryani. (2013). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif Dan Keadilan Prosedural Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Bmt Hudatama Semarang. *Jurnal Ekonomi-Manajemen-Akuntansi*, 20(35), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1190/segam2013-0137.1>

- Hidayat, C., & Ferdiansyah, F. (2011). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Binus Business Review*, 2(1), 379. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v2i1.1144>
- Hwei, S., & Santosa, T. E. C. (2012). Pengaruh Keadilan Prosedural dan Keadilan Distributif terhadap Komitmen Organisasi. *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 9(2), 37–52.
- Iqbal, K. (2013). Determinants of Organizational Justice and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 48–56. Retrieved from <http://www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/1362052480.pdf>
- Krisnayanti, G., & Riana, I. (2015). Pengaruh Keadilan Organisasional Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai (Studi Kasus Pada BPR Lestari). *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 4(9), 253710.
- Lisdiani, V. (2017). Pengaruh Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Melalui Motivasi Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus Pada Hotel Grasia Semarang). *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis S1 Undip*, 6(4), 105–112.
- Luthfi, I., & Sudarma, K. (2016). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif Dan Keadilan Prosedural Pada Komitmen Afektif Melalui Kepuasan Kerja. *Management Analysis Journal*, 5(2), 149–155. Retrieved from <http://maj.unnes.ac.id>
- Manoppo, R. (2015). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi Kerja dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pada TVRI Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 3(3), 1220–1231.
- Mardhatillah, F. (2021). Keadilan Distributif, Keadilan Prosedural Dan Keadilan Interaksional Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Tenaga Pendidik. *JCOMENT (Journal of Community Empowerment)*, 3(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.55314/jcoment.v3i1.176>
- Margaretha, M., & Santosa, T. (2012). Keadilan Prosedural Dan Keadilan Distributif Sebagai Prediktor Employee Engagement. *Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha*, 12(1), 113141.
- Ravangard, R., Ansarizade, N., & Sajjadnia, Z. (2013). Study of the effects of perceived organizational justice and its components on organizational commitment of administrative and financial employees of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences general hospitals in 2012. *Archives of Pharmacy Practice*, 4(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2045-080x.111580>
- Rosmaini, R., & Tanjung, H. (2019). Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3366>
- Suharyoko. (2016). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif dan Prosedural Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi pada Pegawai Palang Merah Indonesia Eks Karesidenan Surakarta). *Widya Ganeswara*, 26(31), 190–199.
- Sutrisna, I., & Rahyuda, A. (2014). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif, Prosedural, Dan Interaksional Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dan Komitmen Organisasi Pada Paramedis Di Rumah Sakit Tk Ii Udayana Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 3(9), 255099.
- Tjahyanti, S., & Puspasari, P. A. (2017). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif, Keadilan Prosedural, Keadilan Interaksional, Keadilan Temporal dan Keadilan Spasial Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja pada Unit Kerja Access dan Service Operation PT. XYZ. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 4(3), 395–408. <https://doi.org/10.31843/jmbi.v4i3.132>
- Ulupui, I. G. K. (2017). Pengaruh Partisipasi Anggaran, Persepsi Keadilan Distributif, Keadilan Prosedural, Dan Goal Commitment Terhadap Kinerja Dinas. *Kinerja*, 9(2), 98–112. <https://doi.org/10.24002/kinerja.v9i2.908>
- Usmani, S., & Jamal, S. (2013). Impact of Distributive Justice , Procedural Justice , Interactional Justice, Temporal Justice, Spatial Justice on Job Satisfaction of Banking Employees. *Review of Intehrative Business and Economics Research*, 2(1), 351–383. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/docview/1514370924/5E5DFCCC78A5411APQ/4?accountid=12219#>
- Wahyudi, W. D., & Tupti, Z. (2019). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Motivasi dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3363>
- Widiastuti, R. K., & Aisyah, M. N. (2016). Pengaruh Keadilan Prosedural Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Tingkat Kepuasan Pegawai Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Nominal, Barometer Riset Akuntansi Dan Manajemen*, 5(1), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.21831/nominal.v5i1.11478>
- Wijaya, M. (2017). Pengaruh Sistem Rekrutmen Dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Pada PT. Kimia Farma Plant Medan. *Jurnal Konsep Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Yudhian, E. F., Wibowo, S. D., & Indiyastuti, D. L. (2020). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif dan Keadilan Prosedural terhadap Turnover Intention dengan Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Ekonomi*, 27(2), 123–134. Retrieved from <https://www.unisbank.ac.id/ojs/>