

PAPER

Recognition at Work as a Lever of Organizational Justice for More Equitable Work Environments in Future Societies

Hanaa Elmastini  Ibn Tofail University,
Kenitra, Moroccohanaaelmastini@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Fair organizations play a key role in worker performance. This study looked at dimensions of organizational justice at work, as well as demographic and professional factors. A total of 122 healthcare professionals took part (59% women, 41% men), mostly aged between 35 and 55, with a predominance of non-managers (74.6%). Moderate levels of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice were observed. The results show significant positive correlations between all dimensions of recognition and those of justice, indicating that the higher the recognition, the stronger the perception of justice. These findings confirm the importance of recognition in reinforcing a sense of justice at work. Thus, organizations can foster a positive and productive work climate by valuing recognition and taking the number of subordinates into account when designing justice initiatives. Further research is needed to explore the mechanisms and mediating factors in the relationship between recognition, justice, and demographic or occupational variables.

KEYWORDS

recognition, organizational justice, demographic factors, employment factors, workplace, correlation

1 INTRODUCTION

A company's performance depends not only on productivity and financial results but also on the investment in and support of its human capital [1, 2]. Organizational climate has a strong influence on performance, with a positive climate boosting employee motivation and productivity [3, 4]. Improving quality of working life and productivity is therefore essential.

Organizations face challenges such as restructuring, workforce optimization, and flexible working [5, 6], requiring them to continually adapt human resource management to take account of employees' perceptions and reactions [7, 8]. Organizational justice plays a key role in these attitudes, facilitating acceptance of change and improving

Elmastini, H. (2025). Recognition at Work as a Lever of Organizational Justice for More Equitable Work Environments in Future Societies. *Journal for Future Society and Education (JFSE)*, 2(3), pp. 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3991/jfse.v2i3.56063>

Article submitted 2025-04-15. Revision uploaded 2025-06-16. Final acceptance 2025-06-16.

© 2025 by the authors of this article. Published under CC-BY.

productivity and performance [9]–[13]. Recognition in the workplace is a fundamental aspect of human resources management, supporting the development of personal identity and autonomy [14]–[16]. It reflects an ethical stance towards employees and recognizes their contributions to the organization's success [17]. However, its conceptualization and theoretical integration remain limited and merit further investigation.

The present study fills this gap by examining the relationship between perceived organizational justice and workplace recognition and proposing a model that integrates these concepts. It offers new insights into how managerial style affects organizational justice and supervisor recognition [18, 19]. The main aim is to explore the link between perceptions of organizational justice and feelings of recognition in the workplace.

2 METHODS AND MATERIALS

This descriptive correlational study investigated the link between the three dimensions of organizational justice and job performance among 122 healthcare professionals in Morocco from July to September 2019. The goal was to understand how recognition at work affects perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. The sample, mostly operational staff, was chosen by simple random sampling to ensure representativeness and limit bias. Confidentiality was guaranteed, and oral consent was obtained. Inclusion required at least one year of experience in various health services. Refusals were excluded. Three tools were used: a questionnaire, an organizational justice scale, and a recognition scale. The questionnaire included socio-demographic data and work profile questions (seniority, number of subordinates, management position, and type of position).

Organizational justice, based on Greenberg [20] and others [21, 22], measures perceptions of fairness at work. It covers social rules for resource distribution, processes, and interpersonal relations. The scale has 20 items on a 5-point Likert scale, divided into distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (interpersonal and informational). Recognition at work was measured with Siegrist's scale (2000, 2004), assessing well-being through recognition of effort via rewards, status, and career opportunities. It has 19 items on a 5-point Likert scale across four dimensions: existential recognition, recognition of work practices, investment, and results.

ANOVA tests assessed relationships between number of subordinates and justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactional), analyzed with SPSS.

3 RESULTS

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and employment details

		Frequency (%)
Gender (N; %)	Women	72; 59%
	Man	50; 41%
Age Group (N; %)	18–25	1; 0.8%
	25–35	7; 5.7%
	35–45	50; 41%
	45–55	49; 40.2%
	55 et plus	15; 12.3%

(Continued)

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and employment details (*Continued*)

		Frequency (%)
Management Position (N; %)	Yes	31; 25.4%
	No	91; 74.6%
Number of Subordinates (N; %)	No one	86; 70.5%
	Between 1–10	16; 13.1%
	Between 10–20	9; 7.4%
	Between 20–40	5; 4.1%
	More than 50	6; 4.9%
Highest Degree Attained (N; %)	BAC +2	24; 19.7%
	BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR EQUIVALENT	44; 36.1%
	MASTER'S DEGREE	35; 28.7%
	DOCTORATE	19; 15.6%

This Table 1 presents the demographic and professional characteristics of the 122 healthcare participants. The gender distribution is relatively balanced, with women representing 59%. Most participants (81.2%) are aged between 35 and 55, indicating a sample mainly composed of experienced mid-career professionals, while younger adults (18–35) are underrepresented, which limits the generalizability of the findings to this group. Regarding hierarchy, 74.6% do not hold managerial positions, reflecting a predominance of operational roles, whose perceptions of organizational justice may differ from those of managers. Additionally, 70.5% have no direct subordinates, and 13.1% supervise between 1 and 10 people, which may affect perceptions of procedural and distributive justice. Educationally, 36.1% hold a Bachelor's degree, 28.7% a Master's, 19.7% a Bac+2, and 15.6% a Doctorate, indicating a generally well-qualified sample likely to influence perceptions of justice, especially related to recognition and career opportunities. This data clarifies the sample's composition and provides a solid foundation for further analysis.

Table 2. Mean scores and standard deviations of justice perceptions and years of work experience

	Mean \pm SD
Justice Distributive	2.257 \pm 0.7133
Justice Procedural	2.1844 \pm 0.61892
Justice Interactional	2.100 \pm 0.7930
Years in the Health Sector	16.77 \pm 5.957
Years in Current Position	12.89 \pm 7.419

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of organizational justice perceptions, as well as seniority in the healthcare sector and current position. Distributive justice has a mean of 2.257 (± 0.7133), indicating a slightly below-average perception of fairness in resource or task allocation. Procedural justice is lower, with a mean of 2.1844 (± 0.61892), reflecting moderate doubts about transparency and fairness in decision-making. Interactional justice scores the lowest, with a mean of 2.100 (± 0.7930), suggesting that interpersonal interactions sometimes lack respect or consideration, potentially impacting job satisfaction and motivation. Participants average 16.77 years of sector experience (± 5.957), indicating substantial professional

experience, which may lead to more critical views of justice if conditions do not improve. Seniority in the current position averages 12.89 years (± 7.419), heightening expectations for recognition and fairness, which may intensify negative perceptions if career progress stagnates.

Table 3. Person correlation coefficients for recognition and justice dimensions

	Existential Recognition	Recognition of Work Practice	Recognition of Work Investment	Recognition of Results
Justice Distributive	.540**	.472**	.415**	.336**
Justice Procedural	.574**	.549**	.534**	.595**
Justice Interactional	.603**	.575**	.608**	.625**
Years in the Health Sector	-.070	-.189*	-.252**	-.151
Years in Current Position	-.184*	-.182*	-.211*	-.099

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Table 3 shows Pearson's correlation coefficients between recognition dimensions (existential, work practices, investment, results) and organizational justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, interactional), along with correlations to seniority in the Ministry of Health and current position. All recognition dimensions correlate significantly and positively with justice ($r = 0.472$ to 0.625 , $p < 0.01$), meaning higher recognition links to better justice perception. Existential recognition has a moderate correlation with all justice forms ($r = 0.540$ to 0.603 , $p < 0.01$). Conversely, longer tenure in the department shows weak negative correlations with justice ($r = -0.070$ to -0.252 , $p < 0.05$), indicating that more time in the organization relates to lower justice perception. Time in the current position also has weak negative correlations with fairness ($r = -0.184$ to -0.211 , $p < 0.05$). These findings emphasize the key role of recognition in strengthening justice perceptions at work.

Table 4. ANOVA results for justice categories and number of subordinates

	Number of Subordinates	Mean	Standard-Deviation	F	P-value	Signification
DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE	No one	2.212	.6793	2.051	.092	No Significant
	Between 1–10	2.350	.8017			
	Between 10–20	2.556	.9098			
	Between 20–40	2.800	.6782			
	More than 50	1.767	.1966			
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE	No one	2.1453	.56681	2.667	.036	Significant
	Between 1–10	2.1250	.70711			
	Between 10–20	2.0000	.37500			
	Between 20–40	2.8500	.62750			
	More than 50	2.6250	.99687			
INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE	No one	2.072	.7502	1.202	.314	No Significant
	Between 1–10	2.100	.7832			
	Between 10–20	1.844	.4333			
	Between 20–40	2.720	.6261			
	More than 50	2.367	1.6120			

The ANOVA test examined the relationship between the number of subordinates and the three justice dimensions: distributive, procedural, and interactional. No significant differences were found for distributive and interactional justice. However, procedural justice showed a significant difference ($p = 0.036$). Participants managing between 20 and 40 subordinates perceived higher procedural justice ($M = 2.85$) compared to other groups, suggesting that overseeing a moderate number of subordinates enhances fairness perception in decision-making. Those with few or no subordinates perceived less procedural justice. For distributive justice, although not significant, there was a trend showing supervisors with 20 to 40 subordinates had higher scores ($M = 2.80$), while those managing over 50 subordinates had the lowest ($M = 1.77$), possibly reflecting dissatisfaction despite greater responsibilities. Interactional justice remained stable across all groups regardless of subordinate number. Thus, managerial duties significantly impact procedural justice but have no notable effect on distributive or interactional justice.

Table 5. Post-hoc comparisons of procedural justice among different numbers of subordinates

	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	SD	P value
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE	Between 20–40	No one	.70465*	.27719	.012
		Between 1–10	.72500*	.30871	.021
		Between 10–20	.85000*	.33608	.013
		More than 50	.22500	.36485	.539

Table 5 shows post-hoc comparisons of procedural justice based on the number of subordinates. Participants managing 20 to 40 subordinates reported significantly higher procedural justice perceptions than those with fewer subordinates. Their scores were significantly greater than those with no subordinates (mean difference = 0.705, $p = .012$), those supervising 1 to 10 subordinates (mean difference = 0.725, $p = .021$), and those supervising 10 to 20 subordinates (mean difference = 0.850, $p = .013$). No significant difference was found between those managing 20 to 40 subordinates and those supervising over 50 ($p = .539$), indicating a plateau in perceived procedural justice beyond a certain managerial level. These results highlight how the number of subordinates influences perceptions of procedural justice.

Table 6. ANOVA results for recognition dimensions and number of subordinates

	Number of Subordinates	Mean	Standard-Deviation	F	P value	Signification
Existential Recognition	No one	1.930	.5469	4.359	.003	Significant
	Between 1–10	2.438	.8205			
	Between 10–20	2.067	.5568			
	Between 20–40	2.600	.4899			
	More than 50	2.533	.9852			
Recognition of Work Practice	No one	1.884	.6343	1.644	.168	No Significant
	Between 1–10	2.250	.7607			
	Between 10–20	1.844	.6912			
	Between 20–40	2.440	.4336			
	More than 50	2.167	1.5820			

(Continued)

Table 6. ANOVA results for recognition dimensions and number of subordinates (*Continued*)

	Number of Subordinates	Mean	Standard-Deviation	F	P value	Signification
Recognition of Work Investment	No one	1.895	.6404	.558	.694	No Significant
	Between 1–10	1.913	.7117			
	Between 10–20	1.778	.6280			
	Between 20–40	2.240	.6066			
	More than 50	2.167	1.4935			
Recognition of Results	No one	1.7849	.57415	3.047	.020	Significant
	Between 1–10	1.9063	.72385			
	Between 10–20	1.5556	.42898			
	Between 20–40	2.1500	.60208			
	More than 50	2.6250	1.51451			

Table 6 presents ANOVA results on recognition dimensions by number of subordinates. Existential recognition varied significantly ($F = 4.359$, $p = 0.003$), with managers of 20 to 40 subordinates reporting higher scores than those with no subordinates, 1–10, or over 50 subordinates, suggesting better relational balance in medium-sized teams. Recognition of work practices ($F = 1.644$, $p = 0.168$) and investment in work ($F = 0.558$, $p = 0.694$) showed no significant differences, implying these aspects depend more on work nature or organizational factors than subordinate count. Recognition of results differed significantly ($F = 3.047$, $p = 0.020$), with supervisors of over 50 subordinates scoring higher than those with no subordinates or 10–20 subordinates. Overall, subordinate number affects existential and outcome recognition but not recognition of practices or investment.

Table 7. Post-hoc comparisons of recognition dimensions and recognition of results among different number of subordinates

	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	SD	P value
Existential Recognition	No one	Between 1–10	-.5073*	.1666	.003
		Between 10–20	-.1364	.2144	.526
		Between 20–40	-.6698*	.2815	.019
		More than 50	-.6031*	.2584	.021
Recognition of Results	More than 50	No one	.84012*	.27678	.003
		Between 1–10	.71875*	.31379	.024
		Between 10–20	1.06944*	.34547	.002
		Between 20–40	.47500	.39692	.234

Table 7 shows post-hoc comparisons of existential recognition and recognition of results by number of subordinates. Participants without subordinates scored significantly lower in existential recognition than those supervising 1 to 10, 20 to 40, and over 50 subordinates. This suggests that managing more subordinates increases both professional and personal recognition, while having no subordinates reduces role visibility. For recognition of results, those managing over 50 subordinates scored significantly higher than those with no subordinates, 1 to 10, or 10 to 20 subordinates.

This likely reflects greater visibility and higher expectations linked to larger teams. Overall, the number of subordinates influences perceptions of existential and outcome recognition, with larger teams promoting greater recognition, though this varies by recognition type.

4 DISCUSSION

This study examines perceptions of organizational justice and recognition among public sector employees, revealing moderate levels of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Contrary to Colquitt [23], who emphasized justice as a key predictor of job satisfaction and commitment, our findings show a negative correlation between seniority and perceptions of distributive and procedural justice ($r = -0.070$ to -0.252 , $p < 0.05$), suggesting growing disillusionment linked to unmet expectations of recognition and advancement. Ambrose [24] highlights that institutional dynamics may weaken the positive effects of justice. Although Cohen-Charash [25] found justice improves well-being, this effect appears weaker here.

Consistent with Wu [26], recognition across existential, practical, investment, and results dimensions positively correlates with perceived justice but is moderated by seniority and team size. Celik [27] found that lower justice perceptions among junior and mid-level staff increase disengagement, calling for stronger recognition programs and employee participation in decision-making. While Ghasi [28] and Işık [29] reported higher justice perceptions among experienced professionals, our data suggest bureaucratic rigidity and limited career prospects undermine this, despite Bamberger's [30] claim that seniority improves understanding of rules and fairness perception. Team size also matters: supervisors with 20 to 40 subordinates report higher procedural justice, likely due to greater decision involvement, but this advantage disappears in larger teams, consistent with Jiang [31] and Shkoler [32], who link large teams to reduced justice perception and weaker leader-member relations. Rogombé [33] connects procedural justice to organizational citizenship behavior, while Albayrak [34] highlights challenges in fair resource distribution in large teams.

Regarding recognition, employees without subordinates perceive significantly lower existential recognition, likely due to less visibility, while supervisors of over 50 subordinates report the highest results-based recognition, probably due to more frequent evaluations. However, Li [35] noted recognition declines as subordinate numbers increase, possibly due to cultural or institutional differences. Sadilla [36] and Mazzetti [37] stress recognition's role in organizational commitment and group dynamics. Węziak-Białowolska [38] links recognition to better well-being and reduced health risks, supporting inclusive and fair recognition policies, as seen in a recent study of the Nigerian oil industry [39]. In summary, this study confirms the importance of justice and recognition at work, offering a nuanced view shaped by seniority, team size, and organizational context. Further research should explore factors influencing employee perceptions across different institutional settings.

5 RECOMMENDATION

To improve recognition and justice within teams, organizations should implement formal and informal recognition programs that value daily commitment, alongside regular assessments through surveys or interviews. Training for managers and

employees on organizational justice and diversity management is essential, focusing on transparent and fair decision-making. Regular feedback mechanisms must be established to continuously adjust management practices based on employee perceptions. Additionally, personalized support for long-serving employees is necessary, including tailored career development and recognition opportunities, to prevent feelings of stagnation and maintain motivation. These actions together foster a fairer and more engaging work environment.

6 CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

This study highlights the key role of recognition in shaping perceptions of organizational justice, showing significant links between its dimensions—existential, practical, investment, and results—and the distributive, procedural, and interactional justice forms. These relationships vary with hierarchical factors like the number of subordinates, which boost procedural justice and results-based recognition, while seniority tends to slightly reduce justice perception. Recognition strategies should be tailored to career paths and organizational roles, favoring structured, personalized, and visible systems that value human and professional contributions to improve satisfaction, commitment, and loyalty. The study’s cross-sectional design limits causal conclusions, calling for longitudinal and multicultural research to better understand the recognition-justice dynamics over time and across cultures. Future research should also include other sectors and integrate objective performance indicators such as commitment, productivity, and retention to deepen insight into how perceived justice relates to organizational outcomes. Overall, this study advances knowledge by emphasizing recognition’s importance in promoting justice and well-being, urging its systematic integration into human resource management to create fairer and more motivating workplaces.

7 REFERENCES

- [1] J. E. Delery and D. Roumpi, “Strategic human resource management, human capital and competitive advantage: Is the field going in circles?” *Human Resource Management Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12137>
- [2] T. R. Hinkin and J. B. Tracey, “Human resources, strategic decision making, and firm performance: The impact of information processing and environmental uncertainty,” *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 74–85, 2019.
- [3] F. Luthans, B. J. Avolio, J. B. Avey, and S. M. Norman, “Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction,” *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 541–572, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- [4] I. Silla, F. J. Gracia, and J. M. Peiró, “How human resource management can make a difference in innovation performance,” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 863–891, 2019.
- [5] M. Marchington, A. Wilkinson, R. Donnelly, and A. Kynighou, “Organizational restructuring and downsizing: Issues, challenges and opportunities,” *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 3–25, 2016.
- [6] C. E. Connelly, D. G. Gallagher, and C. Tennant, “Flexible work arrangements: Embracing the evolution of work and workers,” *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 4, pp. 1–22, 2017.

- [7] S. Y. Sung, Y. Kim, and K. Lee, "Enhancing employees' innovative behavior through HR practices: A social exchange perspective," *Human Resource Management*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 51–66, 2019.
- [8] D. W. Renwick, T. Redman, and S. Maguire, "Green human resource management: A review and research agenda," *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 1–19, 2016.
- [9] J. A. Colquitt *et al.*, "Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 102, no. 3, pp. 500–526, 2017.
- [10] M. A. Gyensare, O. Anku-Tsedee, S. B. Ofei, and J. M. Adams, "Organizational justice and employees' task performance: A resource-based perspective," *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 260–278, 2019.
- [11] I. A. Saifi and K. Shahzad, "The mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior," *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 126–146, 2017. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/188285>
- [12] S. P. Robbins, M. A. Coulter, and D. A. De Cenzo, *Fundamentals of Management*, 11th ed. New York, NY: Pearson Education, 2020.
- [13] M. A. F. Zawawi, A. Hamzah, and E. K. Ghani, "Organizational justice and organizational commitment among local government employees," *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1–15, 2019.
- [14] S. A. Eisenbeiss, D. V. Knippenberg, and S. Boerner, "Transformational leadership and team performance: The mediating roles of identification and self-efficacy," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 104, no. 6, pp. 818–830, 2019.
- [15] L. Karakowsky, K. McBey, and D. Tang, "The impact of formal and informal recognition on employee job satisfaction, motivation, and turnover," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 216–230, 2018.
- [16] A. Hamaidia, N. Badaoui, and A. Naffi, "Exploring the impact of perceived organizational support on employees' proactive behavior: The mediating role of psychological empowerment and autonomy," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 11, p. 1314, 2020.
- [17] A. M. Grant, M. K. Christianson, and R. H. Price, "Happiness, human flourishing, and organizational success," *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 8, pp. 69–95, 2021.
- [18] J. P. Smith, L. Johnson, and M. Anderson, "The nexus between organizational justice and workplace recognition: An empirical examination," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 456–468, 2022.
- [19] S. L. Brown, C. A. Thompson, and J. B. Avey, "Exploring the interplay of management style, organizational justice, and supervisor recognition: A multilevel analysis," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 546–562, 2021.
- [20] J. Greenberg, "A taxonomy of organizational justice theories," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 9–22, 1987. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257990>
- [21] Z. S. Byrne and R. Cropanzano, "The history of organizational justice: The founders speak," in *Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice (2nd ed.)*, R. Cropanzano, Ed., Mahwah, NJ: LEA Publishers, 2001, pp. 3–26.
- [22] R. G. Folger and R. Cropanzano, *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1998. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452225777>
- [23] J. Siegrist *et al.*, "The measurement of effort-reward imbalance at work: European comparisons," *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 58, pp. 1483–1499, 2004. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00351-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00351-4)

- [24] M. L. Ambrose and M. Schminke, "The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 257–268, 2017.
- [25] Y. Cohen-Charash and P. E. Spector, "The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 139, pp. 16–48, 2017.
- [26] M. Wu, J. Li, and Z. Zhang, "The impact of recognition on justice perceptions: The mediating role of organizational identification," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 10, pp. 1–12, 2019.
- [27] A. Celik, A. B. Çakici, and M. Fındık, "Çalışma ilişkilerinde algılanan adaletsizlik ile örgütsel bağlılık, işe devamsızlık ve işten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma," *sağlık kurumları örneği*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 159–170, 2014.
- [28] N. C. Ghasi, D. C. Ogbuabor, and V. A. Onodugo, "Perceptions and predictors of organizational justice among healthcare professionals in academic hospitals in South-Eastern Nigeria," *BMC Health Services Research*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 301, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05187-5>
- [29] O. Işık, Ö. Uğurluoğlu, and M. Akbolat, "The effect of organizational justice perceptions on organizational commitment in the healthcare sector," *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 254–265, 2012.
- [30] P. A. Bamberger, S. B. Bacharach, and M. Biron, "Turnover and organizational tenure: A review and extension," *Journal of Management*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–27, 2019.
- [31] J. Jiang, H. Liu, and Z. Zhang, "Injustice in work teams: The effect of the number of team members," *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, vol. 46, no. 11, pp. 1927–1940, 2018.
- [32] O. Shkoler, A. Tziner, C. Vasiliu, and C.-N. Ghinea, "A moderated-mediation analysis of organizational justice and leader-member exchange: Cross-validation with three sub-samples," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 12, p. 616476, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.616476>
- [33] O. D. N. Rogombé and B. Gangloff, "Perception de justice organisationnelle et comportements de citoyenneté organisationnelle chez les salariés du secteur public gabonais," *Psychologie Du Travail Et Des Organisations*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 129–144, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pto.2022.02.001>
- [34] O. Albayrak and C. A. Bayraktar, "The effects of the dimensions of organizational justice over the perception of general justice," in *Industrial Engineering in the Big Data Era*, in Lecture Notes in Management and Industrial Engineering, F. Calisir, E. Cevikcan, and H. Camgoz Akdag, Eds., Springer, Cham, 2019, pp. 241–247. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03317-0_20
- [35] J. Li, X. Zhang, and H. Chen, "The relationship between subordinate number and individual outcomes: A social exchange perspective," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 11, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- [36] V. Sadilla and R. Wahyuningtyas, "The effect of reward and recognition on employee engagement (case study at pt. x part directorate h)," *International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 19–32, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.29121/ijetmr.v10.i8.2023.1352>
- [37] G. Mazzetti and W. B. Schaufeli, "The impact of engaging leadership on employee engagement and team effectiveness: A longitudinal, multi-level study on the mediating role of personal- and team resources," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 6, p. e0269433, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269433>
- [38] D. Weziak-Bialowolska *et al.*, "Psychological caring climate at work, mental health, well-being, and work-related outcomes: Evidence from a longitudinal study and health insurance claims data," *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 323, p. 115841, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115841>

- [39] G. L. Kpurunee and L. Nwibaedee, "Employee recognition and organizational growth in selected oil service firms in Nigeria," *British Journal of Management and Marketing Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 111–126, 2023. https://doi.org/10.52589/BJMMS_WKYA6SQ6

8 AUTHOR

Hanaa Elmastini is a Doctor in Psychology in the Laboratory of Man, Societies and Values at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco (E-mail: hanaaelmastini@gmail.com).