

Exploring The Educational Leaders' Perception of Organizational Justice and Its Components

Jafni Ghazali^{1*} , Samsudin Wahab² , Nor Aminin Khalid³ 
Nurul Huda Jafni⁴ , Shahrizal Mohd Saderi⁵

¹Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA(UiTM), 13500 Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
Email: cikgujafni@gmail.com

²Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA(UiTM), 13500 Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
Email: samsudinw@uitm.edu.my

³Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA(UiTM), 13500 Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
Email: noraminin@uitm.edu.my

⁴Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA(UiTM), 13500 Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
Email: noraminin@uitm.edu.my

⁵Bahagian Pendidikan Menengah MARA, 21, Jalan MARA 50609 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Email: smreezal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explores how Maktab Rendah Sains MARA (MRSM) leaders perceive organizational justice and its components. Leaders are essential in influencing perceptions of fairness, especially when dealing with equitable rights and balanced workloads. It is crucial to address these matters to ensure the organization's effectiveness. To eliminate inequalities, leaders need to show a strong commitment and capabilities that go beyond their official job responsibilities. A quantitative approach was employed, involving the distribution of an online survey to 463 MRSM leaders from 57 MRSMs. Stratified random sampling was utilized to achieve diverse representation from different roles, such as principals, vice principals, and heads of departments, resulting in 210 responses as a research sample. The findings emphasize the importance of organizational justice and its components in improving organizational performance at MRSM, highlighting the need for systematic leadership practices that promote fairness. For MRSM leaders, organizational justice plays a crucial role. It suggests that leaders must approach leadership by rewarding individuals and making decisions that prioritize the well-being and development of the organization. Additionally, it fosters an environment of justice that encompasses procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice.

CORRESPONDING

AUTHOR (*):

Jafni Ghazali
(cikgujafni@gmail.com)

KEYWORDS:

Organizational Justice
Leadership
Leaders

CITATION:

Jafni Ghazali, Samsudin Wahab, Nor Aminin Khalid, Nurul Huda Jafni, & Shahrizal Mohd Saderi. (2025). Exploring The Educational Leaders' Perception of Organizational Justice and Its Components. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 10(5), e003250.
<https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v10i5.3250>

Contribution/Originality: This study contributes to the existing literature by examining organizational justice from the perspective of MRSM leaders, a viewpoint explored in Malaysian educational research. It is one of the studies using a dimensional justice framework to investigate how justice perceptions influence leadership behavior in MRSM.

1. Introduction

Maktab Rendah Sains MARA (MRSM) operates under the purview of the MARA Secondary Education Division and functions as a premier educational institution within the broader framework of Majlis Amanah Rakyat (MARA). Initially established to provide an alternative, science- and technology-oriented secondary education for intellectually gifted Bumiputras, particularly those from low-income and rural backgrounds. MRSM plays a strategic role in Malaysia's educational landscape ([Majlis Amanah Rakyat MARA, 2021](#); [Johari et al., 2023](#)).

National policy documents such as the Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013–2025 and the MARA Gateway to Holistic Education 2021–2025 emphasize the central role of leadership in driving institutional excellence and sustainability ([Majlis Amanah Rakyat MARA, 2021](#)). These blueprints underscore the need for educational leaders who are not only competent in managerial and administrative tasks but also demonstrate a high level of commitment and the ability to surpass routine job expectations ([Aziz et al., 2022](#); [Darus et al., 2021](#); [Razali et al., 2024](#)). In MRSM, leadership is not merely administrative but a catalyst for institutional performance and educational quality ([Tahir et al., 2023](#)).

However, leadership also entails the potential for error and misconduct. In high-stakes environments like MRSM, leadership missteps include unethical conduct, excessive pressure on subordinates, egocentric decision-making, and discriminatory practices that undermine fairness and transparency ([Alvesson, 2020](#); [Almeida et al., 2022](#); [Smollan, 2024](#)). These behaviors have been shown to erode morale, damage organizational reputation, and impair overall performance ([Khan et al., 2023](#)).

A key consequence of such leadership failures is the perception of injustice among staff, particularly regarding unequal workload distribution and inequitable treatment ([Sherf et al., 2019](#); [Tinay et al., 2024](#); [Muniandy & Kutty, 2019](#)). These perceptions are often exacerbated by weak transparency practices and a lack of organizational accountability ([Liang et al., 2022](#)). If left unaddressed, these challenges jeopardize not only operational efficiency but also institutional integrity ([Smollan, 2024](#); [Khan et al., 2023](#)).

Leaders, therefore, cannot afford to overlook the principles of justice and fairness. Effective leadership requires confronting and rectifying judgment and policy implementation errors, particularly when such errors compromise ethical governance ([Hasyim & Bakri, 2024](#); [Seijts & Milani, 2022](#)). Sustaining quality standards in education hinges on leaders' capacity to uphold fairness, demonstrate empathy, and exhibit resilience through continuous professional development ([Sherf et al., 2019](#); [Liang et al., 2022](#)). Learning from past mistakes is not merely a defensive mechanism. It is essential for fostering innovation, cultivating trust, and enhancing organizational performance. By acknowledging and addressing their shortcomings, educational leaders can rebuild confidence, improve their leadership competencies, and contribute meaningfully to institutional success.

Against this backdrop, the present study explores how educational leaders within MRSM perceive organizational justice, respond to fairness challenges, and adopt leadership styles that shape their commitment to institutional goals. This inquiry further identifies the key constructs, underlying theories, and practical frameworks needed to address these leadership dilemmas and enhance justice-driven governance in MRSM.

1.1. Problem Statement

For over five decades, Maktab Rendah Sains MARA (MRSM) has served as a cornerstone of Malaysia's alternative secondary education system, particularly in promoting science and technology among Bumiputras. Despite its long-standing success, persistent leadership challenges continue to arise within MRSM institutions. This raises a critical question: Why do leadership issues endure in an educational system that has achieved so much? One plausible explanation lies in the absence of a unified, context-specific leadership model to guide the development and succession of future MRSM leaders.

Among the most pressing concerns are task distribution inequities and perceived imbalances in workload management. These leadership shortcomings are not isolated incidents but recurring themes voiced by MRSM administrators who report dissatisfaction over fairness in job delegation and resource allocation (Omar et al., 2021; Shaari et al., 2022). The ongoing demand for "equal rights" and "equal balance" in institutional responsibilities underscores the growing urgency to establish equitable and just leadership practices.

In response to these concerns, the MARA Secondary Education Division has highlighted the need for equitable task allocation across leadership ranks, underscoring the relevance of both distributive and procedural justice in sustaining trust, engagement, and morale (Muniandy & Kutty, 2019). These calls reflect the operational need for fairness and the broader ethical imperative for leadership grounded in transparency, accountability, and respect. Without such foundational elements, organizational trust may erode, and institutional credibility may be compromised. Therefore, MRSM's leadership landscape warrants critical examination through the lens of organizational justice. Fairness, transparency, and ethical responsibility must be addressed systematically to prevent further erosion of leadership quality.

1.2. Research Objectives

- i. To examine MRSM educational leaders' perceptions of organizational justice based on its four components, procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice.
- ii. 2. To analyze how leadership practices within MRSM influence those perceptions of fairness and justice.

1.3. Research Questions

- i. How do MRSM educational leaders perceive the four components of organizational justice?
- ii. In what ways do leadership practices within MRSM influence leaders' perceptions of organizational justice?

2. Literature Review

The concept of organizational justice was introduced, and its impact on organizations (Adams, 1963; Northouse, 2021). Before discussing the organizational justice model, it is essential to mention equity theory. This theory posits that employees must perceive fairness in their treatment to maintain a positive work attitude. When they detect an imbalance between their efforts and rewards, it can lead to feelings of injustice (Liang et

al., 2022). Such perceptions can drive them to adjust their efforts or even consider leaving the organization (Greenberg, 1990; Colquitt, 2001).

Therefore, fairness is an important aspect. Individuals who perceive that they have been mistreated may seek new career opportunities to regain a sense of fairness. People who feel wronged are often inclined to look for alternative employment. Grasping the concept of fairness can trigger emotional reactions that improve organizational performance, resulting in increased satisfaction and effectiveness (John-Eke & Akintokunbo, 2020; Darus et al., 2021).

As a result, Colquitt (2001) introduces the four components of organizational justice: procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice, all of which impact perceptions of fairness. Recognizing justice in organizations predicts outcomes for individuals and the organization, as it fosters peace, respect, and collaboration (Kumasey et al., 2021). While organizations pursue shared goals, individual rights and perspectives on the system might be different.

2.1. Organizational Justice

Adams (1965) introduced the concept of organizational justice in 1965 and explored how it influences organizational outcomes (Wistiany et al., 2024). Before examining the organizational justice model (Greenberg, 1990; Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005; Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2023), it is essential to introduce a foundational concept within this model known as equity theory.

Adams's (1965) equity theory suggests that for an organization to maintain a positive attitude toward leaders' responsibilities, team members must perceive that they are "*Being treated fairly.*" The fundamental assumption is the comparison of inputs, such as effort and commitment, with outputs, such as pay, recognition, and benefits.

However, when members of organizations feel a disparity between what they contribute and receive and what others receive, they perceive this as unfair. For this reason, leaders in organizations assess their input and output ratio and compare it to others. Therefore, they can modify the input ratio, recognize possible biases, and determine whether the situation is fair or unfair (Liang et al., 2022).

It is important to note that inequality can lead to jobs leaving. Leaders must remember that fair treatment at work can lead to a lack of commitment, while unfairness can result in dissatisfaction and starting against a leader. Leaders who mistreat others (Seijts & Milani, 2022) will create others looking for new working opportunities to restore their sense of fairness. In the same way, fairness is due to the positive results it is linked with, such as trust and performance (Novitasari et al., 2020). However, despite the attention to the idea, there is still some uncertainty about its definition. Organizational justice consists of four components, emphasizing the impact of procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice on fairness (Colquitt, 2001).

Eventually, organizational justice is a comprehensive framework that explains how fairness is perceived and implemented in organizations. It integrates components, including procedural justice, emphasizing fair and consistent decision-making processes. Next is distributive justice, which focuses on the equitable allocation of rewards.

Interpersonal justice addresses the quality of treatment during interactions, and informational justice involves transparency and clarity in communication.

The concept of organizational justice draws on theories (Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1990; Colquitt, 2001) and it underscores that fairness is important for building trust, engagement, and commitment and improving the organization's long-term success.

2.2. Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to fairness in decision-making (Colquitt, 2001). It requires that procedures be applied equally to everyone and that decisions remain objective to avoid bias by leaders (Colquitt, 2001; Lambert et al., 2020). Decisions should rely on accurate information, and people should have the opportunity to challenge them when needed. Lastly, all procedures must follow ethical standards to ensure integrity in decision-making.

Consistency in procedural justice requires that organizational procedures and processes are applied equally and in relevant situations (Lambert et al., 2020). This ensures that everyone in the organization is subject to the same standards of rules (Joseph & Alhassan, 2023; Newman et al., 2020). It also helps build a culture of fairness and equality (Newman et al., 2020).

The effects of procedural justice strengthen the dedication of individuals in organizations (Lambert et al., 2020). When leaders believe decisions are made in the organization's best interest, they form a strong connection to it. Fair processes enhance commitment, encouraging people to excel, collaborate, and feel valued and respected (Hasyim & Bakri, 2024).

Procedural justice is a valuable framework for understanding how fair decision-making works in organizations. It highlights the importance of consistency, reduces bias, and improves accuracy. While this theory is widely accepted, it has faced criticism (Pina-Sánchez & Brunton-Smith, 2021) that believes a complete understanding of fairness in organizations must include both procedural and distributive elements.

2.3. Distributive Justice

Distributive justice is the role of leaders in ensuring a fair allocation of resources and outcomes among team members (Colquitt, 2001; Lambert et al., 2020). When individuals perceive that resources are allocated fairly (Lambert et al., 2020; Hasyim & Bakri, 2024), they are more likely to feel valued in the organization. Conversely, unfairness can lead to dissatisfaction and disengagement, harming team cohesion and overall performance (Hasyim & Bakri, 2024).

Leaders must prioritize equality and follow guidelines for effective distributive justice. This means rewarding individuals based on their contributions and performance (Lambert et al., 2020). On the other hand, the principle of equality advocates for the equal distribution of resources and the encouragement of a sense of community (Hasyim & Bakri, 2024; Irwan et al., 2024).

Ensuring fairness in sharing rewards and costs among team members (Colquitt, 2021). When leaders overlook their organization's members, it creates feelings of unfairness

(Hasyim & Bakri, 2024). So, it is important to provide consistent rewards that match commitment and teamwork (Irwan et al., 2024). Discrepancies can cause conflicts, so transparent allocation practices are essential for resolving interests and ensuring fairness. Ensuring that distribution decision processes are handled respectfully, transparently, and understandably strengthens relationships in the organization (Pigola et al., 2024).

2.4. Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal justice focuses on how leaders interact with their team members, emphasizing the importance of respect and dignity (Rahaman et al., 2022; Leineweber et al., 2020). It deals with the fairness individuals perceive in how leaders communicate during discussions (Colquitt et al., 2023).

How people are treated, and organizations' decisions directly influence fairness, mainly when outcomes differ from expectations. Leaders must communicate with care, respect, empathy, and dignity to avoid being perceived as rude or dismissive. This approach fosters fairness. They should also communicate transparently, honestly, and timely to build trust and make people feel valued.

Therefore, effective leadership relies on interpersonal justice principles to improve individual and organizational outcomes. Leaders reinforce respectful and fair treatment, essential for building strong bonds within the organization (Purwanto et al., 2021).

To achieve this, they must respect others, encourage collaboration, and reduce conflicts (Kim & Beehr, 2020; Leineweber et al., 2020; Pigola et al., 2024; Rahaman et al., 2022). On another note, looked into how different cultures view interpersonal justice and found that cultural norms and values matter.

Leaders must prioritize interpersonal justice in decision-making to create a more human approach. This involves addressing emotional and social needs and ensuring people feel valued and respected, even in resource-limited situations (Kim & Beehr, 2020; Khan et al., 2022).

Direct communication that respects others' viewpoints, demonstrates empathy for their feelings, and remains honest can reduce the harmful effects of difficult situations. Listening carefully and acknowledging emotions creates a supportive environment that raises understanding and encourages open dialogue for better problem-solving and stronger relationships (Agina et al., 2023).

2.5. Informational Justice

Informal justice refers to how fair the information is communicated (Colquitt, 2001). This aspect of justice emphasizes the importance of leaders sharing the rationale, criteria, and procedures that inform their decisions. Essentially, informational justice focuses on transparency, honesty, and timeliness of communication to ensure the necessary information is comprehended and acceptable.

Transparency is a fundamental aspect of informational justice because it builds trust and reduces uncertainty in decision-making (Pigola et al., 2024). Prioritizing transparency ensures that everyone feels respected and valued. Sharing accurate information about decisions and rules creates trust and honesty.

Thus, honest and transparent information about decisions and policies is needed to develop confidence and openness. This can lead to distrust and dissatisfaction, regardless of the actual fairness of the decisions made. Transparent communication is vital in maintaining a sense of justice within the workplace.

However, when leaders fail to provide important information, give inconsistent explanations, or neglect prompt communication, they risk unfairness. This can lead to confusion and distrust among team members. Clear and consistent communication helps to ensure that everyone feels informed and valued.

Additionally, timely communication ensures that the information is received when needed, which avoids confusion and allows them to process and adapt to decisions more effectively. The timing of information distribution provides timely information, is kept informed, and can respond appropriately, leading to a greater sense of trust and value. Recent studies have expanded the understanding of informational justice and its implications by [Lee and Park \(2020\)](#) and [Siswanto et al. \(2020\)](#). These studies have explored how informational justice affects members' well-being and cultural differences ([Lee & Park, 2020](#)) in informational justice perceptions and crisis management.

Grasping and applying the tenets of informational justice theory can result in a more favorable work atmosphere ([Siswanto et al., 2020](#)), enhanced well-being among members ([Pigola et al., 2024](#)), and greater organizational effectiveness ([Schumacher et al., 2020](#)). Informational justice plays a role in enhancing perceptions of fairness in organizations. Organizations can better align leaders' expectations with their decision-making processes by prioritizing clear, honest, and transparent communication. This strategy helps to minimize conflicts and cultivate trust in the workplace.

Fairness, whether perceived as fair or unfair, is often attributed to leaders' actions and decisions and is closely tied to how others perceive their power. It is essential to delve deeper into its dynamics and implications to grasp this concept of leadership power. Additionally, referent power comes from a leader's interpersonal skills and ability to inspire those around them. Each type of power plays a crucial role in shaping effective leadership and fostering positive relationships within a team.

Expert power derives from a leader's unique skills, while reward power stems from the ability to offer incentives. Moral power is linked to a leader's ability to inspire, based on informational power that comes from specialized knowledge ([Northouse, 2021](#)). This dynamic raises questions about consensus and dissent, especially when loyalty is expected, but fairness is in question.

3. Research Method

This study employed a quantitative research design to examine the organizational justice among MRSM leaders. A quantitative approach objectively measures constructs and generalizable findings across a broad leadership population ([Creswell, 1999](#); [Chua, 2011](#); [Hussin et al., 2014](#); [Pallant, 2020](#)).

3.1. Research Population

The research was conducted across 57 MRSM institutions nationwide. These MRSMs, administered under the MARA Secondary Education Division, represent a diverse yet

standardized context for examining leadership practices, justice perceptions, and commitment within elite residential educational institutions in Malaysia.

The target population consisted of 463 academic leaders from the 57 MRSMs. These included principals, vice principals, and heads of departments who are directly responsible for implementing policies, leading teams, and sustaining school operations.

3.2 Research Sample

Four hundred sixty-three leaders participated in the study. The [Krejcie and Morgan \(1970\)](#) table determined that 210 leaders are the sample size suitable for ensuring statistical power within a finite population. Stratified random sampling was adopted to ensure equitable representation of leadership roles across all MRSMs ([Creswell, 1999](#); [Chua, 2011](#); [Hussin et al., 2014](#); [Pallant, 2020](#)). Stratified random sampling was selected to ensure that all leadership categories, principals, vice principals, and heads of department were proportionally represented. This method enhances internal validity and reduces sampling bias by considering subgroup characteristics within the leadership structure.

3.3. Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaire was designed to capture demographic information and assess organizational justice using the established scale developed by [Colquitt \(2001\)](#), covering procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice. The selected instrument ensured construct validity and measurement reliability appropriate to the MRSM context.

The online questionnaire was distributed to MRSM leaders using Google Forms, with formal permission from the MARA Secondary Education Division Director. Survey links were sent through official email communication, and the data collection was conducted over two weeks. Upon the deadline, the survey was closed to maintain data integrity. This method provided a cost-effective and efficient strategy for reaching respondents across geographically dispersed MRSMs. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondent demographics, construct distributions, and perform inferential analyses.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM). Participants were informed of the study's voluntary nature, and informed consent was obtained electronically before completing the questionnaire. All data were anonymized to ensure confidentiality and used solely for academic purposes.

4. Results

The sample comprised 210 respondents, 126 males (60.0%) and 84 females (40.0%). In terms of job titles, there were 26 principals (12.4%), 78 vice principals (37.1%), and 106 heads of departments (50.5%). Regarding administrative experience, 134 respondents (63.8%) had ten years or less, 74 (35.2%) had 11 to 20 years, and only two (1.0%) had over 21 years. These demographic details provide a clear overview of the sample's composition.

The distribution of responses in [Table 1](#) reflects the respondents' perceptions of organizational justice. The mean scores for most items are relatively high, indicating that respondents generally perceive fairness in organizational procedures and treatment. The highest relative index (RI) was observed for the item "I treat members of the organization with respect." 96.26%, suggesting that respect within the organization is highly emphasized. In contrast, the lowest RI (78.23%) was reported for "I seemed to tailor my communications to individual members of the organization for specific needs," indicating room for improvement in addressing individualized communication needs.

Table 1: Responses Perceiving Organizational Justice

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	RI (%)
1. I communicate my viewpoints and perspectives to members of my organization concerning the allocation of procedures.	6.24	0.797	89.18
2. I have been able to influence the procedures determined by the organization.	5.83	0.910	83.33
3. I have applied procedures consistently to members of my organization.	6.18	0.761	88.30
4. The procedures have been free of bias toward members of my organization.	6.20	0.842	88.64
5. Procedures are based on accurate information to my organization.	6.35	0.750	90.68
6. I can accept an appeal from my organization members on a task given.	5.67	1.155	80.95
7. Procedures sustained ethical and moral standards to members of the organization.	6.52	0.658	93.20
8. Task distribution to members of the organization reflects my effort.	5.94	1.047	84.90
9. Tasks for members of the organization were appropriately distributed.	6.32	0.764	90.34
10. Task distribution to members of the organization reflects my contribution.	5.77	1.157	82.38
11. Task distribution to members of the organization is justified.	5.98	0.985	85.37
12. I politely treat members of the organization.	6.56	0.602	93.74
13. I treat members of the organization with dignity.	6.55	0.684	93.61
14. I treat members of the organization with respect.	6.74	0.492	96.26
15. I refrain members of the organization from improper remarks or comments.	6.25	0.885	89.32
16. I am honest in communications with members of the organization.	6.38	0.743	91.16
17. I explain the procedures thoroughly to members of the organization.	6.42	0.682	91.70
18. My explanations to members of the organization regarding the procedures are reasonable.	6.48	0.620	92.59
19. I communicate in detail to members of the organization promptly.	6.23	0.769	89.05
20. I seemed to tailor my communications to individual members of the organization for specific needs.	5.48	1.519	78.23

The data in [Table 2](#) indicate that respondents perceive a high level of organizational justice across various components. The highest RI was 93.2% for the item "Procedures sustained ethical and moral standards to members of the organization," suggesting that

respondents strongly believe that ethical standards are maintained in organizational procedures.

Table 2: Responses Perceiving Procedural Justice

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	RI (%)
1. I communicate my viewpoints and perspectives to members of my organization concerning the allocation of procedures.	6.24	0.797	89.18
2. I have been able to influence the procedures determined by the organization.	5.83	0.910	83.33
3. I have applied procedures consistently to members of my organization	6.18	0.761	88.30
4. The procedures have been free of bias toward members of my organization.	6.20	0.842	88.64
5. Procedures are based on accurate information to my organization.	6.35	0.750	90.68
6. I can accept an appeal from my organization members on a task given.	5.67	1.155	80.95
7. Procedures sustained ethical and moral standards to members of the organization.	6.52	0.658	93.20

Additionally, the mean scores consistently range between 5.67 and 6.52, reflecting a generally positive perception of procedural fairness, bias-free practices, and transparency in decision-making processes. On the other hand, the item "I can accept an appeal from my organization members on a task given" showed the lowest RI (80.95%), indicating some variability in perceptions related to task appeal processes.

The responses in [Table 3](#) generally indicate positive perceptions regarding the fairness and appropriateness of task distribution within the organization. The highest RI (90.34%), mean (6.32) was recorded for the item "Task to members of the organization was appropriately distributed," suggesting strong agreement among respondents that tasks are allocated fairly and appropriately. Conversely, the item "Task distribution to members of the organization reflects my contribution" had the lowest RI (82.38%), mean (5.77), indicating a slightly lower perception of the extent to which task distribution reflects individual contributions.

Table 3: Responses Perceiving Distributive Justice

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	RI (%)
8. Task distribution to members of the organization reflects my effort.	5.94	1.047	84.90
9. Tasks for members of the organization were appropriately distributed.	6.32	0.764	90.34
10. Task distribution to members of the organization reflects my contribution.	5.77	1.157	82.38
11. Task distribution to members of the organization is justified.	5.98	0.985	85.37

The responses in [Table 4](#) strongly emphasize respectful and dignified treatment within the organization. The item "I treat members of the organization with respect" received

the highest relative index (96.26%) and mean (6.74), indicating that respondents perceive respect as a cornerstone of their interpersonal interactions. Similarly, high scores of RI (93.74%) were reported for treating members with politeness. The item "I refrain from improper remarks or comments towards members of the organization" had a lower RI of 89.32%. However, it still reflects a generally positive perception of respectful communication.

Table 4: Responses Perceiving Interpersonal Justice

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	RI (%)
12. I politely treat members of the organization.	6.56	0.602	93.74
13. I treat members of the organization with dignity.	6.55	0.684	93.61
14. I treat members of the organization with respect.	6.74	0.492	96.26
15. I refrain members of the organization from improper remarks or comments.	6.25	0.885	89.32

The data indicate that respondents in [Table 5](#) generally perceive communication within the organization as transparent, thorough, and timely. The highest RI (92.59%) and mean (6.48) are attributed to the item "My explanations to members of the organization regarding the procedures are reasonable," suggesting that respondents believe their explanations of procedures are clear and logical.

Table 5: Responses Perceiving Informational Justice

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	RI (%)
16. I am honest in communications with members of the organization.	6.38	0.743	91.16
17. I explain the procedures thoroughly to members of the organization.	6.42	0.682	91.70
18. My explanations to members of the organization regarding the procedures are reasonable.	6.48	0.620	92.59
19. I communicate in detail to members of the organization promptly.	6.23	0.769	89.05
20. I seemed to tailor my communications to individual members of the organization for specific needs.	5.48	1.519	78.23

Thoroughness in explaining procedures, RI (91.70%), and mean (6.42) also received high scores, reflecting positive organizational communication practices. However, the item "I seemed to tailor my communications to individual members of the organization for specific needs" had a lower relative index of 78.23% and mean (5.48), indicating that individualized communication may be an area for improvement.

5. Discussions, Implications, and Recommendations

5.1. Discussions

The findings from this study provide a nuanced understanding of how MRSM leaders perceive organizational justice across its four dimensions. It is a procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational, as conceptualized by [Colquitt \(2001\)](#). The high mean scores across most items suggest that MRSM leaders generally perceive their organizational environment as fair, respectful, and grounded in ethical standards.

Empowerment guarantees that organizational justice is experienced through fairness and transparency (Shafiee et al., 2021), strengthening organizational commitment (Murray & Holmes, 2021; Agina et al., 2023). These insights are particularly relevant for MRSM leaders, including principals, vice principals, and heads of departments, who are directly involved in decision-making and team leadership.

Procedural justice emerged as one of the strongest dimensions. Leaders reported that procedures were implemented consistently and based on accurate information, with the highest rating observed for ethical standards (RI 93.20 percent). This aligns with the findings of Kim and Beehr (2020), Malla and Malla (2023), and Kilag et al. (2023), who argued that positive perceptions of procedural justice promote ethical engagement and sustained leadership commitment.

However, a lower relative index (RI 80.95 percent) in accepting appeals suggests a limitation in participatory feedback loops, pointing to the need for more inclusive decision-making practices (Outlaw et al., 2019). Leaders are encouraged to enhance impartiality, ensure transparency, and demonstrate openness to feedback (Liu et al., 2022), as these behaviors reinforce justice perceptions and strengthen long-term organizational trust.

Distributive justice was viewed positively, particularly regarding fair and appropriate task allocation. However, the slightly lower rating on whether task distribution reflects individual contributions (RI 82.38 percent) reveals concerns over recognition and merit-based workload distribution.

A leader's perception of distributive justice reflects their belief that fairness in resource allocation enhances job satisfaction and loyalty. Regular performance evaluation and transparent criteria reinforce this belief (Lambert et al., 2023). These findings are supported by earlier studies identifying imbalances in task delegation within MRSM institutions (Omar et al., 2021; Shaari et al., 2022).

Interpersonal justice recorded the highest relative indices, with "I treat members of the organization with respect" achieving 96.26 percent. This suggests that MRSM leadership upholds a strong culture of respect and dignity, echoing previous findings that emphasized interpersonal fairness as essential to team cohesion and leader credibility (Outlaw et al., 2019). Respectful leadership fosters empathy, trust, and motivation, creating a more supportive and ethical work atmosphere.

Informational justice also received favorable evaluations, with high scores for honesty and thoroughness in procedural communication. However, the lowest rating in the entire data set, 78.23 percent, was observed for the item related to tailoring communication to individual needs. This indicates a gap in personalized engagement, essential for mentoring, coaching, and inclusivity.

Leaders must practice active listening, recognize diverse contributions, and tailor communication to address varied developmental needs (Lambert et al., 2023; Qing et al., 2020; Bakker et al., 2023). By doing so, they can build trust, enhance strategic thinking, and cultivate a culture of shared ownership and accountability (Smith & Benavot, 2019). Leadership practices have the potential to ensure that organizational members view decision-making, resource distribution, and performance assessments as fair (Rahman et al., 2019; Aziz et al., 2022). Such perceptions significantly contribute to organizational

commitment (Ibrahim & Wahab, 2021). Justice perceptions are further enhanced when leaders demonstrate proactive involvement, ethical behavior, and fairness in role modeling (Daouk et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2024). These attributes reaffirm the importance of structure, fairness, and reward systems in educational leadership (Northouse, 2021; Donkor et al., 2021; Borde et al., 2024).

Finally, MRSB leaders who prioritize fair treatment, transparent communication, and empowerment practices foster an environment of emotional connection and loyalty (Gong & Subramaniam, 2020; Modise, 2023; Burhan & Khan, 2024). They create an atmosphere where all members feel valued, motivated, and committed to achieving the institution's goals. While MRSB leadership demonstrates visionary qualities and ethical decision-making (Newman et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022), there remains a need to further enhance individualized support through coaching and mentoring practices, which could elevate satisfaction and commitment.

5.2. Implications

This study offers several theoretical, practical, and policy implications for educational leadership, particularly within elite Malaysian institutions such as MRSB. The research affirms the relevance of Colquitt's (2001) multidimensional model of organizational justice in an educational leadership context. The findings also support the integration of transformational and transactional leadership theories in understanding how justice perceptions shape leader behavior and commitment.

The study highlights the importance of fairness in distributing tasks, maintaining transparent communication, and showing interpersonal respect, as educational leaders understand. These aspects are not only ethical obligations but also operational requirements that affect morale, trust, and the institution's overall performance. The high procedural and interpersonal justice ratings indicate that MRSB has established a solid basis in ethical governance and respectful interactions. Nevertheless, the results identify critical areas that require focus, including addressing individual communication preferences and implementing recognition-based task distribution.

From a policy perspective, the results call for the MARA Secondary Education Division to prioritize justice-based leadership development. Empowerment strategies, fair performance appraisal systems, and feedback mechanisms must be institutionalized to strengthen organizational commitment and mitigate leadership deficiencies. Justice is not an abstract principle, but it is a measurable and actionable framework that must guide every level of institutional practice.

5.3. Recommendations

Craft structured training modules that integrate the principles of organizational justice and its components, which include procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational elements, into MRSB leadership development initiatives. These modules should address typical challenges, such as ensuring transparency in task allocation and promoting ethical decision-making.

Create systems that guarantee task distribution and resource allocation, taking into account individual contributions, performance, and effort. This approach would reinforce

perceptions of distributive justice and improve overall job satisfaction and loyalty (Lambert et al., 2023).

Implement mentoring and coaching techniques to help leaders customize their communication based on the specific needs of individual staff members. Incorporating consistent feedback mechanisms and reflective conversations into leadership practices is essential to promoting fairness in information sharing and tackling developmental challenges (Qing et al., 2020; Bakker et al., 2023).

Foster a leadership environment in which individuals are empowered to ask questions, challenge decisions, or participate in decision-making. This method can enhance views on fairness, increase accountability, and cultivate a feeling of collective ownership (Outlaw et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2022).

Carry out yearly evaluations of leadership practices and perceptions of justice throughout MRSMs. These evaluations should involve surveys, interviews, and institutional assessments to guarantee that justice continues to be a fundamental aspect of the school governance framework and is in line with changing organizational values and reforms in educational policy.

6. Conclusion

This study concludes that organizational justice is crucial for maintaining effective leadership, fostering institutional commitment, and ensuring ethical governance within MRSM. The findings indicate that MRSM leaders recognize high levels of justice, especially in procedural, interpersonal, and informational aspects, highlighting the importance of respectful treatment, ethical choices, and clear communication. These perceptions confirm that MRSM has made considerable strides in embedding fairness within its leadership culture.

Nonetheless, the study points out specific areas that need improvement. The lower ratings in individualized communication and alignment of task contributions indicate persistent issues in distributive justice and personal engagement. These insights imply that even in well-established organizations, perceptions of justice can differ based on a leader's experience, administrative position, and the recognition of individual contributions.

Leadership practices focused on justice are vital for enhancing institutional performance and building trust, engagement, and cohesion within the organization. Equipping leaders to consistently apply fairness, communicate effectively, and acknowledge individual efforts is essential for the long-term success of MRSM's mission. Additionally, merging transformational and transactional leadership styles strengthens the important role of leadership in converting justice into commitment and performance results.

To maintain and improve its reputation as a top educational institution, MRSM should enhance its leadership capabilities through organized training, feedback systems, and performance evaluations. Future research should investigate the long-term impacts of justice perceptions on leader retention, satisfaction, and institutional resilience and conduct comparative studies with other elite educational systems. Ultimately, fostering a culture of fairness, transparency, and ethical leadership will position MRSM as a standout example of educational governance excellence in Malaysia and beyond.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM). Participants were informed of the study's voluntary nature, and informed consent was obtained electronically before completing the questionnaire. All data were anonymized to ensure confidentiality and used solely for academic purposes.

Acknowledgment

All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

Funding

This study received no funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors reported no conflicts of interest in this work and declared no potential conflict concerning this article's research, authorship, or publication.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 67(5), 422.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic press.
- Agina, M. F., Khairy, H. A., Abdel Fatah, M. A., Manaa, Y. H., Abdallah, R. M., Aliane, N., ... & Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2023). Distributive injustice and work disengagement in the tourism and hospitality industry: mediating roles of the workplace negative gossip and organizational cynicism. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 15011.
- Almeida, J. G., Hartog, D. N. D., De Hoogh, A. H., Franco, V. R., & Porto, J. B. (2022). Harmful leader behaviors: Toward an increased understanding of how different forms of unethical leader behavior can harm subordinates. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(1), 215-244.
- Alvesson, M. (2020). Upbeat leadership: A recipe for—or against—“successful” leadership studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(6), 101439.
- Aziz, N. A. A., Asimiran, S., & Hassan, A. (2022). Mediating role of readiness for change in the relationship between principal instructional leadership and commitment to change. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 16(4), 407-437.
- Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2023). Daily transformational leadership: A source of inspiration for follower performance? *European Management Journal*, 41(5), 700-708.
- Borde, P. S., Arora, R., & Kakoty, S. (2024). Linkages of organizational commitment and leadership styles: a systematic review. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 48(1/2), 41-66.
- Burhan, Q. U. A., & Khan, M. A. (2024). Empowering leadership ripple effect: improving employee engagement, performance and knowledge sharing through relational energy and autonomy. *European Business Review*, 36(3), 392-409.
- Chua, Y. P. (2011). *Kaedah penyelidikan edisi kedua*. Malaysia: McGraw-Hill.

- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2021). My Journey with Justice. A Journey Toward Influential Scholarship. *Insights from Leading Management Scholars, 124*.
- Colquitt, J. A., Edwyna T. Hill, & David De Cremer. (2023). Forever focused on fairness: 75 years of organizational justice in Personnel Psychology. *Personnel Psychology, 76*(2) 413–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12556>
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). *Mixed-method research: Introduction and application*. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455-472). Academic press.
- Daouk, A., Farmanesh, P., & Zargar, P. (2021). The Relationship Between Transactional Leadership and OCB: A Conditional Analysis of Organizational Justice Perception and Psychological Contract Fulfillment. *Sage Open, 11*(4), 21582440211061563.
- Darus, F., Khairuddin, M., & Abdullah, J. (2021). Amalan Kepimpinan Multidimensi Pengetua dan Norma-Norma Budaya di MRSM. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), 6*(6), 147-156.
- Donkor, F., Dongmei, Z., & Sekyere, I. (2021). The mediating effects of organizational commitment on leadership styles and employee performance in SOEs in Ghana: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Sage Open, 11*(2), 21582440211008894.
- Gong, M. Z., & Subramaniam, N. (2020). Principal leadership style and school performance: mediating roles of risk management culture and management control systems use in Australian schools. *Accounting & Finance, 60*(3), 2427-2466.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*(2), 399–432.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hasyim, H., & Bakri, M. (2024). A study of Task Mismatch and its effect on Work Motivation and employee performance. *Paradoks: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, 7*(4), 355-370.
- Hussin, F. B., Ali, J., & Noor, M. S. Z. (2014). *Kaedah Penyelidikan & Analisis Data SPSS*. UUM Press.
- Ibrahim, N. H., & Wahab, J. A. (2021). Kepimpinan transformasional penolong kanan kokurikulum dan hubungannya dengan efikasi guru. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), 6*(2), 181-196.
- Irwan, I., Idris, R., Fajriah, Y., & Wahyuningsih, S. (2024). The Influence of Organizational Culture and Leadership Style on Employee Performance Mediated by Employee Competence at PT. East Makassar. *Gema Wiralodra, 15*(3), 978-986
- Johari, Z. A. A., Jali, M. N. J., Zaini, A. F. A., & Ibrahim, N. Z. M. (2023). The Impact of Leadership Style on MRSM Performance moderated by Tacit Knowledge. *Jurnal Evolusi, 4*(1).
- John-Eke, E. C., & Akintokunbo, O. O. (2020). Conflict management as a tool for increasing organizational effectiveness: A literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10*(5), 299-311.
- Joseph, S., & Alhassan, I. (2023). Favouritism in higher Education institutions: Exploring the drivers, consequences and policy implications. *European Journal of Human Resource, 7*(1), 31-45.
- Khan, I. U., Gan, G. G. G., Khan, M. T. I., & Saif, N. (2023). Role of organizational justice in linking leadership styles and academics' performance in higher education. *Administrative Sciences, 13*(4), 101.
- Kilag, O. K., Tokong, C., Enriquez, B., Deiparine, J., Purisima, R., & Zamora, M. (2023). School Leaders: The Extent of Management Empowerment and Its Impact on Teacher and School Effectiveness. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994–9521), 1*(1), 127–140.

- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2020). Empowering leadership: leading people to be present through affective organizational commitment? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(16), 2017-2044.
- Kumasey, A. S., Delle, E., & Hossain, F. (2021). Not all justices are equal: the unique effects of organizational justice on the behaviour and attitude of government workers in Ghana. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 87(1), 78-96.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- 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.
- Lambert, E. G., Lanterman, J. L., Leone, M., Keena, L. D., Haynes, S. H., & May, D. (2023). Improving correctional staff perceptions of organizational justice. *Corrections*, 8(2), 97-118.
- Lee, D., & Park, S. (2020). Civil servants' perceptions of agency heads' leadership styles: the role of gender in public sector organizations. *Public Management Review*, 23(8), 1160-1183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1730941>
- Liang, L. H., Nishioka, M., Evans, R., Brown, D. J., Shen, W., & Lian, H. (2022). Unbalanced, unfair, unhappy, or unable? Theoretical integration of multiple processes underlying the leader mistreatment-employee CWB relationship with meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(1), 33-72.
- Leineweber, C., Peristera, P., Bernhard-Oettel, C., & Eib, C. (2020). Is interpersonal justice related to group and organizational turnover? Results from a Swedish panel study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 265, 113526.
- Liu, B. F., Shi, D., Lim, J. R., Islam, K., Edwards, A. L., & Seeger, M. (2022). When crises hit home: How US higher education leaders navigate values during uncertain times. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 179(2), 353-368.
- Majlis Amanah Rakyat Mara. (2021). *Gateway To Holistic Education 2021-2025*. Retrieved [2024] from Majlis Amanah Rakyat Mara. <https://www.mara.gov.my/en/index/>.
- Malla, S. S., & Malla, S. (2023). Does the perception of organizational justice determine employees' affective commitment? The mediating role of organizational trust. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30(2), 603-627.
- Modise, J. M. (2023). Leadership Philosophies and How They Relate to the Composition, Demographics, Character, Effectiveness, and Efficiency in an Organisation: The Literature Review. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(7), 3413-3434.
- Muniandy, M., & Kutty, F. M. (2019). Impak beban tugas terhadap prestasi kerja guru di Maktab Rendah Sains Mara. *Jurnal Dunia Pendidikan*, 1(1), 9-17.
- Murray, W. C., & Holmes, M. R. (2021). Impacts of employee empowerment and organizational commitment on workforce sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3163.
- Newman, S. A., Ford, R. C., & Marshall, G. W. (2020). Virtual team leader communication: Employee perception and organizational reality. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 57(4), 452-473.
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage publications. 9th Edition.
- Novitasari, D., Asbari, M., Wijaya, M. R., & Yuwono, T. (2020). Effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment: mediating role of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 3(3), 96-112. ijsmsjournal.org
- Omar, N. H. C., Hamid, A. H. A., & Othman, N. (2021). Korelasi antara amalan kepimpinan distributif pengetua dengan amalan kepimpinan guru sekolah menengah di

- Muadzam Shah, Pahang. *International Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(4), 142-161.
- Outlaw, R., Colquitt, J. A., Baer, M. D., & Sessions, H. (2019). How fair versus how long: An integrative theory-based examination of procedural justice and procedural timeliness. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(3), 361-391.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.
- Pigola, A., Rezende da Costa, P., Marcondes de Moraes, G. H. S., de Souza Meirelles, F., & Anholon, R. (2025). Exploring digital solutions for sustainable production: academic insights and practical applications. *International Journal of Sustainable Engineering*, 18(1), 2453938.
- Pina-Sánchez, J., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2021). Are we all equally persuaded by procedural justice? Re-examining the invariance thesis using longitudinal data and random effects. *Journal of developmental and life-course criminology*, 7(3), 449-480.
- Purwanto, A., Asbari, M., Hartuti, H., Setiana, Y. N., & Fahmi, K. (2021). Effect of psychological capital and authentic leadership on innovation work behavior. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Qing, M., Asif, M., Hussain, A., & Jameel, A. (2020). Exploring the impact of ethical leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in public sector organizations: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Review of Managerial Science*, 14(6), 1405-1432.
- Rahaman, H. S., Stouten, J., Decoster, S., & Camps, J. (2022). Antecedents of employee thriving at work: The roles of formalization, ethical leadership, and interpersonal justice. *Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 3-26.
- Razali, M. N. M., Hamid, A. H. A., Alias, B. S., & Mansor, A. N. (2024). Towards a Conceptual Framework of Culturally Responsive Leadership, Professional Learning Community on Teacher Competency: An Overview of the Conceptual and Theoretical Literature. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*, 14(6), 788-798.
- Schumacher, D., Schreurs, B., De Cuyper, N., & Grosemans, I. (2021). The ups and downs of felt job insecurity and job performance: The moderating role of informational justice. *Work & Stress*, 35(2), 171-192.
- Seijts, G. H., & Milani, K. Y. (2022). The application of leader character to building cultures of equity, diversity, and inclusion. *Business Horizons*, 65(5), 573-590.
- Shaari, R., Kamarudin, D., Yew, J. S., & Zakaria, H. (2022). Effects Of Leadership Types on Job Satisfaction Among Malaysian Higher Education Institutions. *Asian Journal of Instruction (E-AJI)*, 10(1), 54-70.
- Shafiee, N. S., Ghani, M. A., & Mahamood, Y. (2021). Perbezaan Tahap Kepimpinan Instruksional Pengetua di Sekolah Berasrama Penuh, Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan dan Maktab Rendah Sains MARA yang Melaksanakan International Baccalaureate-Middle Years Programme (IBMYP). *Jurnal Dunia Pendidikan*, 3(2), 423-432.
- Sherf, E. N., Venkataramani, V., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). Too busy to be fair? The effect of workload and rewards on managers' justice rule adherence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(2), 469-502.
- Singh, P., Mishra, M. K., Kumar, S., & Sharma, N. (2024). The mediating and moderating effect of organizational justice and transformational leadership on employee mindfulness and employee wellbeing. *International journal of work innovation*, 5(1), 37-57.

- Siswanto, S., Masyhuri, M., Maksum, I., & Murdiansyah, I. (2020). The role of job satisfaction as a mediating variable on leadership styles to employee performance. *Jurnal Ekonomi Modernisasi*, 16(1), 54-65.
- Rahman, S. N. H. A., Ajmain, M. T., & Mohamad, A. M. (2019). Management and Supervision of Education in Schools from Islamic Education Perspective. *BITARA International Journal of Civilizational Studies and Human Sciences*, 2(4), 147-161.
- Smith, W. C., & Benavot, A. (2019). Improving accountability in education: the importance of structured democratic voice. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20, 193-205.
- Smollan, R. K., & Mooney, S. K. (2024). The bright side and dark side of performance expectations: the role of organizational culture and the impact on employee performance and wellbeing. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 54(3), 218-237.
- Tahir, L. M., Anis, S. N. M., & Ali, M. F. (2023). Authentic and Moral Leadership Practices in Schools. In *Educational Leadership: Contemporary Theories, Principles, and Practices* (pp. 57-70). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Tinay, D. T., Ayaz, Ö., & Özbilgin, M. (2024). Transforming leadership emergence through equality, diversity and inclusion. In *Research Handbook on Inequalities and Work* (pp. 228-241). Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800886605.00026>
- Wistiany, R., Arafat, Y., & Rahman, A. (2024). The Effect of Principal's Leadership and Organizational Justice on Elementary School Teacher's Performance. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education*, 5(1), 172-181.