

e-mentor

DWUMIESIĘCZNIK SZKOŁY GŁÓWNEJ HANDLOWEJ W WARSZAWIE
WSPÓŁWYDAWCA: FUNDACJA PROMOCJI I AKREDYTACJI KIERUNKÓW EKONOMICZNYCH

2021, nr 3 (90)



Wojciechowska-Dzięcielak, P. i Szumowski, W. (2021). Transactional and transformational leadership in the context of perceived organizational justice and its dimensions. Identification of the interdependencies. *e-mentor*, 3(90), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.15219/em90.1521>



Paulina
Wojciechowska-
-Dzięcielak



Witold
Szumowski

Transactional and transformational leadership in the context of perceived organizational justice and its dimensions. Identification of the interdependencies

Abstract

The authors of this article analyzed the phenomenon of the interdependence between transactional/transformational leadership style and perceived organizational justice (and its dimensions). In the first part of the article, the necessity to conduct detailed research on aforementioned subject is presented. Next, a literature review was carried out in order to examine the possibly toothcombing links between organizational justice and transactional/transformational leadership (taking into consideration the multidimensionality of those subjects). Leadership style and perceived organizational justice are linked to many organizational aspects such as organizational citizenship behaviors, work commitment, job satisfaction, knowledge-sharing, willingness to share knowledge, and burnout. The authors of this publication attempted to present research scope as having growth potential for future studies.

Keywords: interdependencies, leadership, perceived organizational justice, transformational leader, transactional leader

Introduction

For several decades, the phenomenon of perceived organizational justice has been of interest to a significant number of organizational behavior researchers working on aspects of organizational culture (De Cremer & Blader, 2006; Greenberg, 1993; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). This problem has been raised many times recently. The issue of justice is closely related to the social exchange theory introduced by Peter Blau (1964) and Georg Homans (1958) who mentions the concept of *quid pro quo* (from Latin: *something for something*).

Blau's considerations introduced the notion of a norm of fair exchange. The imbalance between the amount of work and the gratification received, the same as the disproportion between the costs and profits, may cause negative emotions that may lead to the disturbance of the relationship between employees and superiors. The same, such inequities may cause counterproductive (negative, purposeful) work behaviors directed toward coworkers, employer and/or the organization as a whole (Blau, 1964).

Perceived justice has a huge impact on the functioning of various institutions (Rawls, 1958). It is one of the most significant and crucial elements of an organizational culture that shapes people's attitudes and behaviors. James Clawson (1999) recognized it as one of the virtues of an ideal leader, which is no less important than his/her truthfulness and trust. Both a reliable leader and an atmosphere of justice constitute the rock-solid foundation of contemporary organizations.

Paulina Wojciechowska-Dzięcielak, Wrocław University of Economics and Business, Poland,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1678-6194>

Witold Szumowski, Wrocław University of Economics and Business, Poland,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0709-2978>

A superordinate plays an important role in motivating employees (Bass & Riggio, 2006) enhancing their efforts and reducing the level of staff turnover (Olkonen & Lipponen, 2006). A strong leader enhances (positive, purposeful) organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Ehrhart, 2004; Podsakoff et al., 2000) and reduces the level of occupational burnout (Oklay & Uslu, 2015; Shanafelt et al., 2015). The leader's approach and inspiring leadership style influence the attitudes of employees toward the organization, which corresponds to their efficiency and workplace commitment (Reb et al., 2019; Tziner & Shkoler, 2018).

Smart leadership practices effectively support and strengthen the perception of positive emotions in the workplace, which contributes to the development of the organization and increases its income (Ozcelik et al., 2008).

Strength and direction constitute a critical element of managerial problems. This is one of the reasons why the relationship between perceived organizational justice and leadership style may be a potentially absorbing topic worthy of further analysis.

The employees' work attitudes also constitutes a significant factor shaping the final organizational success. This is why this problem should be raised by top management members and insightfully discussed during board meetings.

The authors of this paper undertook a bibliometric analysis using the SCOPUS database due to its high credibility in the field of social sciences and management as it contains articles from reliable peer-reviewed journals.

A search process was conducted using the words "transactional/transformational leadership" and "organizational* justice" in the article title, abstract and keywords. It was limited to the scientific documents published in the field of social sciences and business, management and accounting, written in English, and resulted in 75 articles published in the period of 1999–2021. Most of them (52 articles) were written in 2013–2021. This shows that the mentioned problem has been taken up relatively often in the subject literature, but has not been excessively exploited, and its popularity is still growing over time.

After reviewing the abstracts and contents, the authors of this article narrowed their search to 19 publications clearly pointing out the relation between organizational justice (and its dimensions) and transactional/transformational leadership. In most of them, quantitative research was conducted. The authors mainly used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), multiple regression, path analysis and/or structural equation modeling (SEM). Organizational justice (as well as its dimensions) and leadership styles were treated as mutually interrelated variables (Ehrhart, 2004; Gumusluoglu et al., 2013).

Many authors (Alamir et al., 2019; Deschamps et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2014) noticed and analyzed the correlation between the assessment of leadership style, the dimensions of organizational justice

and other variables such as, for instance, motivation, innovation, attachment to the organization, and challenge stressors.

Taking the above into consideration, the authors of this paper adopted a method based on a critical analysis of the subject literature. The research was undertaken in order to determine the fundamental relations between the type of justice perceived by an employee (i.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice), and a leadership style. Although various leadership styles are discussed in the scientific articles, transformational and transactional approaches, announced by Burns (1978), seem to be deeply embedded in managerial practices and commonly known. Thus, particular emphasis was placed on the transactional and transformational styles (Alamir et al., 2019; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1978; Tichy & Ulrich, 1984; Tziner & Shkoler, 2018).

Considering this potentially promising and scientifically useful directorial trend, the authors of this article have attempted to indicate further research directions in the field of relations between the perceived organizational justice and the type of organizational leadership. For this purpose, the aforementioned literature review was conducted.

Characterization of perceived organizational justice

Nowadays, perceived organizational justice constitutes a significant part of organizational behavior studies. Over the years, the aforementioned concept has been brought up relatively often in the works of researchers, such as John Rawls, John Thibaut, Laurence Walker, Russel Cropanzano, Jerald Greenberg, Robert Folger, Jason Colquitt, Brian Niehoff, Robert Moorman, Daniel Skarlicki, and many others. *The theory of justice* by John Rawls (1999) is often perceived as the basis of distributive justice. Rawls raised the subject of the *greatest equal liberty principle*, followed by the *equal opportunity principle* and the *difference principle*. He brought up an important psychological aspect of perceived organizational justice based on the socially just goods distribution (Rupp et al., 2014). The aforementioned theory of justice signaled the need to examine the balance between the contribution of the individual (how much an employee contributed to the organization) and the result obtained (the actual profit of the individual) (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

John Thibaut and Laurence Walker (1975) defined the procedural justice system, suggesting a focus on the distribution process rather than on the final result itself (Greenberg & Folger, 1983). Employees sometimes tend to accept the unfavorable results of the distribution of funds. This is because they attach greater importance to the process itself, leading to the allocation of these resources. In line with the fair process effect (Folger et al., 1979), people often focus primarily on the decision-making process and its correctness, rather than on the further

result. Gerald Leventhal (1980) introduced six main principles relating to procedural justice. These rules concern: *representativeness* (respecting the interests of all involved parties), *consistency* (process equivalence across persons and time), *bias suppression* (excluding any decision-maker's private interests), *accuracy* (acting on possibly the most reliable way), *correctability* (allowing for the possibility of decision correction), and *ethicality* (respecting moral principles) (Cropanzano et al., 2001; Leventhal, 1980). Peculiarly, Thibaut and Walker perceived procedural and distributive justice as a separate context, meanwhile Leventhal considered procedural justice as the base of goods allocation (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005).

Robert Bies and Joseph Moag (1986) introduced another important level of perceived organizational justice: the interactional dimension that can be seen as the human aspect of the decision-making process. It reflects the relationship between the decision-maker and his/her subordinates who are the subject of the decision (Bies, 1987). Jerald Greenberg (1993), examining the subject of interactive justice, suggested separating interpersonal and informational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). Interpersonal justice is directly related to the way the decision-maker treats the employees. It is important that the employee is respected and treated with human dignity (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Research on organizational behavior has proved that interactional justice is a reliable antecedent of employees' attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001). Moreover, informational fairness reflects the correctness of informing employees about the applicable procedures.

Appropriate time is also extremely important, in which the employer honestly informs subordinates about obligatory procedures and employees' rights (Bakhshi et al., 2009). The spirit of interactional justice is one of the most important elements of organizational law and order. Namely, a decreased sense of interactional justice may cause violent behaviors in the workplace. It is a predictor of verbal aggression directed toward colleagues and superordinates, acts of sabotage as well as a decline in organizational engagement. It is also a source of counterproductive work behaviors, which are very harmful for every organization (Brimecombe et al., 2014; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

The belief of fair treatment generates enhanced work engagement and confidence in one's supervisor, which may ultimately result in greater employee productivity (Masterson et al., 2000; Tyler, 2010).

An unfavorable atmosphere may lead to employees' depression, sadness, distrust, insecurity, lack of motivation, or anxiety (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Fox et al., 2001). Similarly, employees who are worried about being uninformed while working, may provoke detrimental behaviors (e.g. excessive absences and/or chronic lateness and/or sloppiness/neglect). Those beliefs are consistent with the cognitive theory of emotions (Bandura, 1977; Hlupic et al., 2002).

Significance of leadership

Leadership is one of the most discussed subjects in the field of resource management (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008; Karam et al., 2019). Its common definitions are often contradictory or inconsistent (Avery, 2004). One of the most widespread and universal approaches suggests that leadership refers to the personal ambitions and motivations of subordinates to achieve the long-term goals of their organization (Prentice, 2004).

Leadership is usually considered in the context of the group relations, and leaders are perceived as people who influence the behavior of other group members. The leader is a person stimulating workers to undertake common and effective actions in the business scope of the enterprise they belong to. Thus, leadership can be described as a process in which an entity may motivate the group and encourage its members to achieve organizational goals and obligations (Avery, 2004).

The quality of the leader-follower relation shapes employees' work experiences and behaviors (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Moreover, a clever leader thinks about the firm's goals, but also takes care of subordinates' needs and requirements. The leader encourages subordinates to participate actively in the decision-making process and carefully listens to their remarks and comments (Yukl, 2010). Such a responsible and friendly behavior is a good sign of organizational justice, particularly the interpersonal and informational one.

Each leader possesses a unique and personalized leadership style. However, one of the classifications includes style-oriented behavior (Blake & Mouton, 1981). The aforementioned behavioral style is characterized by either task- or relationship-orientation. The American management theorists Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1981) introduced a managerial grid model that became popular and useful in management science. The concept of those researchers is related to the phrase: *The power to change*. The model is based on two dimensions related to the leader's behavior: concern for people (a friendly, flexible leader devoted to his/her employees), and concern for production (keeping strict formal rules). Both dimensions may be presented on the grid with various intensity, which creates multiple leadership styles.

Another popular approach deeply discussed in the literature is the situational approach. It demands a flexible and responsive leader, followed by a conscious follower. Both the leader's and subordinate's behavior must be well accommodated to the current situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Many styles of leadership have been considered in the subject literature (Blake & Mouton, 1981; Clawson, 1999; Den Hartog et al., 1999). However, the most widespread styles are the transactional and transformational ones (Sfantou et al., 2017).

According to Bass (1985) the transactional leader operates within the present system or culture, avoids risk, skillfully manages the time and efficiency, and

monitors the procedures to maintain the control. Such a leader prefers stable, predictable environments where progress control constitutes a successful strategy. In this approach, the tasks must be well-defined, and an employee should be aware of the given obligations and possible rewards (Evans, 1996). The approach presents two possible paths: reward and punishment. The roles of every employee should be well-defined to verify the subordinate's scrupulousness, and to discipline them if needed. It is an instrumental act that provides clear rules and responsibilities. It avowedly presents possible penalties for ones' insubordination. According to Bass and Avolio (1990), transactional leadership constitutes rather a starting point for effective leadership. Transactional leadership does not consider raising employees' potential and motivation. A raw transactional approach concerns merely requirements and tasks.

Although the transformational leader may be considered as distinct from the transactional leader (Burns, 1978), both leadership approaches are somewhat overlapping (Bass, 1990). Another significant approach is the transformational leadership style. Those styles may be perceived either as supplementary or disparate.

The transformational leader highly appreciates the human factor and articulates a vision of the future (Burns, 1978), presents charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass, 1990). He/she should be concentrated on employees' needs and values. His/her followers are usually motivated and engaged in collaboration by a friendly and respectful organizational atmosphere. Employers tend to spread the values and visions among people and encourage them to be creative and devoted to their work. Such a leader has to present a respectful and moral attitude to the organization. His/her actions are inspiring and really motivating and he/she must be fully responsible for the determined goals (Avolio & Bass, 1990; Cho & Dansereau, 2010). The leader efficiently directs his/her employees to the determined goal by showing the correct path and carefully supporting their actions. Inspiring leaders stimulate employee satisfaction, and self-reported effort and job performance (Bryman, 1992; Podsakoff et al., 1996).

There are no perfect leadership styles. However, the reasonable and clever superordinate should use both (or more) of them to accommodate to certain conditions. A smart leader should present both the transactional, as well as transformational approach (Bass, 1999).

Organizational justice and its dimensions in relation to transactional/ /transformational leadership

The authors of this paper took the effort to analyze the relations between the perceived organizational justice and leadership style presented in an organization. The literature review and opinions gathered in the analysis suggest a significant relation between

these aspects. There are manifold researches in the field of organizational behavior concerning human factors. The aspects of common relations, interpersonal treatment, quality of relations, personal behavior, and common attitudes are often mentioned in the literature (Furman, 2012; Reb et al., 2019; Zeffane, 1994). The specific type of intraorganizational relations are leader-member links and issues. Although various leadership styles have been distinguished, mainly the transactional and transformational approaches are examined. A great variety of leadership styles suggests the need for further and more complex research, including less popular styles, e.g. the Fiedler model, and the situational approach by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) and Blake and Mouton (1981).

The authors of this paper conducted an analysis of the most accurate researches considered in the mentioned publications. The results are presented in the Table 1, arranged alphabetically by the author's name.

Analysis of the data gathered among Turkish teachers pointed out the significant positive relationships between transformational leadership, organizational justice, organizational support, and quality of work life perceptions. Further path analysis revealed that teachers' perceptions about the presence of transformational leadership behavior among school administrators had a significant, indirect and positive effect on teachers' perceptions of organizational justice (Akar & Ustuner, 2019).

Research undertaken among Syrian higher education employees proved that transformational leadership has both a direct and indirect impact on work engagement (mediated by interactional fairness), while transactional leadership has an impact on work engagement (through distributive fairness) (Alamir et al., 2019).

Carter et al. (2009) analyzed about 240 subordinate-supervisor dyads. They noticed the relation between in-role task performance and extra-role organizational citizenship behavior through the reciprocal relationship between subordinate and supervisor and interactional justice.

In addition, research among Korean banking sector workers showed the impact of perceived organizational justice on both the individual and group levels on the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB (Cho & Dansereau, 2010).

Dai et al. (2013) undertook an analysis of 358 valid responses from Taiwanese hotel workers. The gathered data showed that the transactional and transformational leadership styles affect procedural and distributive justice significantly and positively. Transformational leadership positively affects organizational commitment through distributive justice and trust, while transactional leadership enhances organizational commitment through distributive justice.

Research among 253 Canadian healthcare managers showed the positive impact of transformational leadership on motivation. The relation is mediated by some dimensions of organizational justice. The

Transactional and transformational leadership...

Table 1

Presentation of the research results described in the chosen publications

	Author	Influence of	Characteristic of the relation	Influence on	Mediating factor	Method	Examined group	Country
1.	Akar & Ustuner, 2019	transformational leadership behavior	significant, indirect and positive effect	perceptions of organizational justice		SEM	658 Teachers, school administrators	Turkey
2.	Alamir et al., 2019	transformational leadership and transactional leadership	direct and indirect impact	work engagement	interactional fairness and distributive fairness	SEM	502 higher education employees	Syria
3.	Carter et al., 2009	transformational leadership	positive	followers' job performance	interactional justice	CFA	243 subordinate and 237 supervisor	USA
4.	Cho & Dansereau, 2010	transformational leadership behaviors	significant	OCB	individual and group level justice perceptions	mediated regression, SEM	159 banking sector workers	Korea
5.	Dai et al., 2013	transformational and transactional leadership	significantly and positively	procedural and distributive justice		CFA	700 employees of international tourist hotels	Taiwan
6.	Deschamps et al., 2016	transformational leadership	positive	employee motivation	organizational justice	multiple regression and path analysis, SEM	253 healthcare managers	Canada
7.	Gumusluoglu et al., 2013	transformational leadership	positive	organizational commitment	procedural justice	CFA	445 R&D employees	Turkey
8.	Katou, 2015	transformational leadership	positive	organizational growth	procedural justice	SEM	1250 employees	Greece
9.	Khaola & Rambe, 2020	transformational leadership	partially mediated	affective commitment	organizational justice	SEM and process macro techniques	300 university employees and 122 employees from public and private sector organizations	Lesotho
10.	Kim & Kim, 2015	transformational leadership	positive	affective organizational commitment	procedural leadership	CFA	1200 full-time employees of local governments	Korea
11.	Kirkman et al., 2009	transformational leadership	positive	procedural justice		CFA	560 followers and 174 leaders	China, USA
12.	Le & Lei, 2017	transformational leadership	positive	Knowledge-sharing behavior	distributive justice, procedural justice, trust in leadership	SEM	353 employees of manufacturing/ service companies	China
13.	Pillai et al., 1999	transformational leadership	indirect effect	OCB	procedural justice and trust	EFA	192 leaders and 155 subordinates	USA
14.	Pillai et al., 2011	transformational leadership	positive	procedural justice		CFA	476 employees	China, Singapore, Taiwan

Table 1, continue

	Author	Influence of	Characteristic of the relation	Influence on	Mediating factor	Method	Examined group	Country
15.	Sánchez et al., 2020	transformational leadership	negative	work-family conflict	interactional justice	CFA	466 employees	Colombia
16.	Song et al., 2012	procedural justice	positive	OCB	transformational leadership	SEM	182 employees	Korea
17.	Strom et al., 2014	distributive and procedural justice	positive	employee engagement	transactional leadership	hierarchical regression analyses	356 employees	USA
18.	Tziner & Shkoler, 2018	transformational leadership	positive	commitment	organizational justice	SEM	260 employees	Israel
19.	Zhang et al., 2014	challenge stressors	reduce the negative effect of hindrance stressors on job performance/ /foster a positive link between challenge stressors and perceived justice	job performance	transactional/transformational leaders	CFA	339 employees and their supervisors	China

Note. The table contains the nineteen most relevant interdependencies selected by the authors of this paper.

Source: authors' own work.

results indicate that while transformational leaders influence each type of organizational justice, followers' motivation is enhanced mostly by procedural and interpersonal justice and little by distributive justice (Deschamps et al., 2016).

Research done among Turkish R&D workers outlined the significant impact of transactional leadership on work engagement through interactional fairness. The researchers showed that transformational leaders enhance perceived procedural fairness in the case of a narrow span of control, and in the case of a wide span control, transformational leadership has a significant positive effect on supervisor engagement, but has no significant impact on employee engagement (Gumusluoglu et al., 2013).

A survey among 1250 Greek employees at three hierarchical positions shed light on transformational leadership having a positive influence on organizational growth. The impact is mediated by procedural justice, trust, and organizational commitment (Katou, 2015).

A random survey of employees from Lesotho was used to examine the serial mediating roles of organizational justice and affective commitment in transformational leadership – OCB relationship. A significant relation between transformational leadership and organizational justice was observed. Perceived organizational justice and affective commitment appeared to be serial mediators between transformational leadership and OCB (Khaola & Rambe, 2020).

A Korean cross-level study showed the partial mediation of procedural justice on the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment (Kim & Kim, 2015). The results appeared to be consistent with previous studies (cf. Avolio et al., 2004; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003).

A cross-level, cross-cultural examination undertaken in the USA and China showed that procedural justice mediated the link between transformational leadership and power distance orientation with followers' organizational citizenship behavior. Although there was no significant difference between the American and Chinese interviewees, there was a suggestion to repeat the research on larger and more diverse sample (Kirkman et al., 2009).

In turn, Le and Lei (2017) noticed the problem of knowledge-sharing behavior. Their research proved that distributive justice, procedural justice and trust mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and knowledge-sharing behavior. Moreover, transformational leadership and procedural justice have more significant effects on knowledge collecting, but trust and distributive justice have more significant effects on knowledge donating.

Pillai et al. (1999) examined MBA students, members of the Chamber of Commerce in the USA and employees of Australian companies. They shed light on the problem of the influence of perceived organizational justice, job satisfaction, and the leader-fol-

Transactional and transformational leadership...

lower relation in shaping the sense of procedural and distributive fairness.

The research conducted in the Confucian Asian Cluster showed that procedural and distributive justice support the trust in the transformational leader. Taiwanese transformational leaders develop the sense of procedural justice, commitment and trust (Pillai et al., 2011).

Sánchez et al. (2020) involved the problem of work-family conflict. They showed the positive influence of transformational leadership on the work-family balance, as long as the leader promotes organizational justice.

The Korean research discusses the influence of procedural justice on transformational leadership and OCB. Moreover, transformational leadership positively affects OCB. The results suggest that transformational leadership partially mediates the relationship between organizational procedural justice and OCB (Song et al., 2012).

Distributive and procedural justice enhancing engagement would be more pronounced among workers encountering low transactional leadership than in the case of high transactional leadership. Researchers suggest that a low transactional leadership style elicits uncertainty about one's social self in the workplace. Uncertain employees tend to leave their job to find one where there is the atmosphere of justice (Strom et al., 2014).

A survey administered to young-to-adult Israeli workers showed that both transformational and transactional leadership associate positively with organizational justice. In the case of older workers, transformational leadership associates positively with organizational justice; but transactional leadership is linked to it negatively (Tziner & Shkoler, 2018).

Research conducted on follower-leader dyads tested the influence of leadership and justice in the stressor-job performance relationships. Transactional leaders reduce the negative effect of hindrance stressors on job performance. In turn, the transformational approach develops the positive effect of challenge stressors on job performance as they stimulate a positive link between challenge stressors and perceived justice (Zhang et al., 2014).

A further review of the analyzed articles points out the possible direction of the examined issues. Namely, especially transformational leadership is presented as a trigger of organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and work motivation. The aforementioned factors are catalyzed by organizational fairness in the general context. Especially, interpersonal and interactional justice enhances positive employee behaviors toward an organization.

Distributive justice is also considered as a stimulating factor in the relation between leadership style and employees' attitudes toward their organization. Other important catalysts influencing the relation between leadership style and employee commitment are: commitment to the supervisor, self-efficacy, and an atmosphere or procedural justice. Further, a col-

lective identity shapes the employees' approach to an organization. In addition, it is worth mentioning the employees' behavior-forming role of the perceptions of justice both at the individual, as well as at the group level (Cho & Dansereau, 2010), which may constitute a future research direction.

Conclusions

The authors of this paper attempted to outline the complex and elaborate problem of the interrelation between leadership style and perceived organizational justice. The literature review was undertaken in order to close the gap on the link existing between the abovementioned issues. Moreover, these aspects may play a mediating role in the relationship involving OCB, work commitment, sense of job satisfaction, knowledge sharing, willingness to share knowledge, and intention to quit the job. What is more, both perceived justice and leadership shape the employee's motivation, innovation, readiness to work, and creativity. These issues play an important role in the whole management process, which results in the improvement (or the falloff) in organizational performance.

The relationship between leadership style and organizational equity has been analyzed many times in the subject literature, however, this topic has not been fully exploited yet. This is why these problems should be further examined. These issues should be insightfully analyzed, as they are multidimensional and multi-faceted, and they differ over time. Owing to the fact that both organizational justice as well as leadership styles are not unambiguous and include various subtypes, further examinations should be conducted.

The analyzed phenomena refer to the empirical research conducted among medical personnel, bank employees, and academic staff. It may be useful and interesting to test the employees working in other types of organizations. Leaders involved in every single organization should be aware of the significance of their attitude toward their employees. Namely, through a more accurate approach and proper work style and support, leaders may influence employees' work effectiveness and organizational performance.

Each specific dimension of perceived organizational justice may support the leader's ability to guide his/her subordinates' actions. Advanced research on leadership effectiveness may shed some light on justice dimensions, as factors enhancing the relations between leadership effectiveness and other factors, i.e. employees' motivation, job satisfaction, and knowledge sharing intention, etc. It brings out the moderating attribute of perceived organizational justice types.

The literature review undertaken by the authors of this paper may constitute a theoretical foundation to prepare and conduct future empirical research concerning the interrelations between perceived organizational justice and leadership style. Undoubtedly, the current state of knowledge demands further

insightful analysis and discussions on the points which may be raised in such research. Further testing of the relations may point to their potential direction and intensity, taking into consideration various economic sectors and cultural contexts.

References

- Akar, H., & Ustuner, M. (2019). The relationships between perceptions of teachers' transformational leadership, organizational justice, organizational support and quality of work life. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 5(1), 309–322.
- Alamir, I., Ayoubi, R. M., Massoud, H., & Hallak, L. A. (2019). Transformational leadership, organizational justice and organizational outcomes: A study from the higher education sector in Syria. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 40(7), 749–763. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2019-0033>
- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491–500. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013203>
- Avery, G. C. (2004). *Understanding leadership: Paradigms and cases*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446215487>
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951–968. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.283>
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n9p145>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. The Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930250310>
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090599010135122>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
- Bies, R. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 9, 289–319. JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43–55), vol. 1. JAI Press.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1981). Management by Grid® principles or situationalism: which? *Group & Organization Management*, 6(4), 439–455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118100600404>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x>
- Brimecombe, M., Magnusen, M. J., & Bunds, K. (2014). Navigating the storm: A counterproductive work behavior and leadership case study in a Division I FBS School. *Sport Management Review*, 17(2), 219–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2013.03.001>
- Bryman A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. Sage Publications.
- Burns, J. M. G. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row.
- Carter, M. Z., Jones-Farmer, A., Armenakis, A. A., Field, H. S., & Svyantek, D. J. (2009). Transformational leadership and followers' performance: Joint mediating effects of leader-member exchange and interactional justice. *Academy of Management 2009 Annual Meeting: Green Management Matters, AOM 2009*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2009.44265098>
- Cho, J., & Dansereau, F. (2010). Are transformational leaders fair? A multi-level study of transformational leadership, justice perceptions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 409–421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.006>
- Clawson, J. (1999). *Level three leadership: Getting below the surface* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/OBHD.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 113–152). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338>
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three roads to organizational justice. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 20 (pp. 1–113). JAI Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301\(01\)20001-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301(01)20001-2)
- Dai, Y.-D., Dai, Y.-Y., Chen, K.-Y., & Wu, H.-C. (2013). Transformational vs transactional leadership: which is better?: A study on employees of international tourist hotels in Taipei City. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(5), 760–778. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-Dec-2011-0223>
- De Cremer, D., & Blader, S. L. (2006). Why do people care about procedural fairness? The importance of belongingness in responding and attending to procedures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(2), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.290>
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Abdalla, I. A., Adetoun, B. S., Aditya, R. N., Agourram, H., Akande, A., Akande, B. E., Akerblom, S., Altschul, C., Alvarez-Backus, E., Andrews, J.,

- Arias, M. E., Arif, M. S., Ashkanasy, N. M., Asllani, A., ... Zhou, J. (1999). Culture specific and crossculturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219–256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00018-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00018-1)
- Deschamps, C., Rinfret, N., Lagacé, M. C., & Privé, C. (2016). Transformational leadership and change: How leaders influence their followers' motivation through organizational justice. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 61(3), 194–213. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00115514-201605000-00007>
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x>
- Evans, M. G. (1996). R. J. House's "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 305–309. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90021-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90021-1)
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkran, L. (1979). Effects of "voice" and peer opinions on responses to inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(12), 2253–2261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.12.2253>
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803>
- Furman, G. (2012). *School as community: From promise to practice*. State University of New York Press. https://books.google.pl/books?id=iwW_P4Dj12AC
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The intellectual adolescence of organizational justice: You've come a long way, maybe. *Social Justice Research*, 6, 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048736>
- Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic group processes* (pp. 235–256). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5578-9_10
- Gumusluoglu, L., Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z., & Hirst, G. (2013). Transformational leadership and R&D workers' multiple commitments: Do justice and span of control matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 66(11), 2269–2278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.039>
- Hart, D. K. (1986). Distributive justice: a social-psychological perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 46(4), 365–366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976312>
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behaviour: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.) (pp. 169–201). Prentice Hall.
- Hlupic, V., Pouloudi, A., & Rzevski, G. (2002). Towards an integrated approach to knowledge management: 'hard', 'soft' and 'abstract' issues. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 9(2), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.134>
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6). <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Karam, E. P., Hu, J., Davison, R. B., Juravich, M., Nahrgang, J. D., Humphrey, S. E., & Scott DeRue, D. (2019). Illuminating the 'face' of justice: a meta-analytic examination of leadership and organizational justice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(1), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12402>
- Katou, A. A. (2015). Transformational leadership and organisational performance: Three serially mediating mechanisms. *Employee Relations*, 37(3), 329–353. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-05-2014-0056>
- Khaola, P., & Rambe, P. (2020). The effects of transformational leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour: the role of organisational justice and affective commitment. *Management Research Review*, 44(3), 381–398. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-07-2019-0323>
- Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2015). A cross-level study of transformational leadership and organizational affective commitment in the Korean Local Governments: Mediating role of procedural justice and moderating role of culture types based on competing values framework. *Leadership*, 11(2), 158–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013514880>
- Kirkman, B., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744–764. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669971>
- Le, P. B., & Lei, H. (2017). How transformational leadership supports knowledge sharing: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing and service firms. *Chinese Management Studies*, 11(3), 479–497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-02-2017-0039>
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis. (Eds.), *Social exchange* (pp. 27–55). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5_2
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738–748. <https://doi.org/10.5465/1556364>
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Roberts, K. H. (1978). Supervisor influence and subordinate mobility aspirations as moderators of consideration and initiating structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(1), 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.1.96>
- Oklay, E., & Uslu, F. (2015). The effect of leadership on organizational burnout. In E. Karadağ (Ed.), *Leadership and organizational outcomes* (pp. 185–198). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14908-0_11
- Olkkonen, M. E., & Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100(2), 202–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.08.007>
- Ozcelik, H., Langton, N., & Aldrich, H. (2008). Doing well and doing good: The relationship between leadership practices that facilitate a positive emotional climate and organizational performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2), 186–203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810850817>
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327–340. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786079>
- Pillai, R., Kohles, J. C., Bligh, M. C., Carsten, M. K., & Brodowsky, G. (2011). Leadership in "confucian Asia": A three-country study of justice, trust, and transformational leadership. *Organisation Management Journal*, 8(4), 242–259. <https://doi.org/10.1057/omj.2011.38>
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for trans-

formational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897–933. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500606>

Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., & Bommer, W. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200204>

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>

Prentice, W. C. H. (2004). Understanding leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(1), 102–109. <https://hbr.org/2004/01/understanding-leadership>

Rawls, J. (1958). Justice as fairness. *Contemporary Political Theory: A Reader*, 67(2), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446215272.n2>

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice. Revised edition*. Harvard University Press.

Reb, J., Chaturvedi, S., Narayanan, J., & Kudesia, R. S. (2019). Leader mindfulness and employee performance: A sequential mediation model of LMX quality, interpersonal justice, and employee stress. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(3), 745–763. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3927-x>

Rupp, D. E., Shapiro, D. L., Folger, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Shao, R. (2014). A critical analysis of the conceptualization and measurement of organizational justice: Is it time for reassessment? *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0051>

Sánchez, I. D., Andrade, J. M., & Losada-Otálora, M. (2020). Beyond organisational boundaries: The complex relationship between transformational leadership, organisational justice, and work-family conflict. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 20(3–4), 322–348. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHRDM.2020.107990>

Sfantou, D., Laliotis, A., Patelarou, A., Sifaki-Pistolla, D., Matalliotakis, M., & Patelarou, E. (2017). Importance of leadership style towards quality of care measures in healthcare settings: A systematic review. *Healthcare*, 5(4), 73. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare5040073>

Shanafelt, T. D., Gorringer, G., Menaker, R., Storz, K. A., Reeves, D., Buskirk, S. J., Sloan, J. A., & Swensen, S. J.

(2015). Impact of organizational leadership on physician burnout and satisfaction. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 90(4), 432–440. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0025619615000713>

Song, J. H., Kang, I. G., Shin, Y. H., & Kim, H. K. (2012). The impact of an organization's procedural justice and transformational leadership on employees' citizenship behaviors in the Korean business context. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(4), 424–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812446659>

Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work engagement: The roles of organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813485437>

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tichy, N. M., & Ulrich, D. O. (1984). The leadership challenge – a call for the transformational leader. *Sloan Management Review*, 26, 59–68.

Turner, J. H. (2009). The sociology of emotions: Basic theoretical arguments. *Emotion Review*, 1(4), 340–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073909338305>

Tyler, T. R. (2010). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 117–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075900399411>

Tziner, A., & Shkoler, O. (2018). Leadership styles and work attitudes: Does age moderate their relationship? *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 34(3), 195–201. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2018a21>

Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000114219>

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organisations* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Zeffane, R. (1994). Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Human Relations*, 47(8), 977–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679404700806>

Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor-job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3), 675–697. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.1110>

Paulina Wojciechowska-Dzięcielak is a PhD student at the Wrocław University of Economics and Business in Wrocław (Department of Organization and Management Theory). Her research interests are organizational behavior, in particular perceived organizational justice and employees' attitudes toward the organization. She conducts research with the participation of students and academic staff of Polish and foreign universities, also in the field of the publication effectiveness of university research staff.

Witold Szumowski, possessing a PhD degree in economics, post-doctoral degree in social sciences, is the professor at the University of Economics and Business in Wrocław, Department of Organization and Management Theory, specialized in process management, public administration and human resources. Author of dozens of publications in the field of public management, process management and HRM. He has participated in dozens of national and international projects, both research and consulting ones. Currently, he is implementing projects focused on the issues of HR function implementation models and the use of the concept of good governance in management systems.