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Abstract
The study is carried out in order to investigate the relationship of distributive, procedural and interactional justice on the readiness to change of employees working in telecom sector in the presence of employee trust as the mediator. The aim of the study is to find a correlation between organizational justice and readiness to change. The sample was carried from the employees working in telecom sector. The sample was carried from 309 employees. Previously used scales for the measurement of variables was carried out. The results of linear regression predicted that some factors of organizational justice are strong predictor of readiness to change.
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Introduction
With the globalization, everything is changing at a very rapid pace, the change in technology, change in working environment, new communication tends and other social aspects of life which provides the difficulties to managers for making their employees cope with the environment. Human resource in an important aspect for the managers with a very good and positive effect on the organization. According to the (Bass, 1995) for than a decade the main
goal of the managers is to effectively leading the employees which can give positive results to the organization in managing the change. Change is a difficult thing to handle and not every organization is ready to handle the change so as a result of which organization go through several decisions which are not in the favor of the employees but one can only handle them if they are trustworthy of the employees (Shah, 2011) Although there have been many researches on the readiness for change in organization but mainly the researchers have failed to examine the direct relation of organizational justice and readiness to change, past studies of (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Newman, Curtin, Bertsch, & Baskin-Somers, 2010; Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011; Patel et al., 2010; Rawling, 2008) the relationship of organizational justice in the light of layoffs, turnover intention and resistance... The perception of the justice lies in three dimensions based on the equal allocation of resources to all the stakeholders, the process used in the distributions should fair and it should be biased towards any one of the parties and the relations between the rewarding, reward taking party (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010). For more than 30 years of research has clearly made a point that organizational justice plays an important role in shaping the attitudes of employees towards their job and it has revealed great results not only for employees but for the organization as well (Carmeli & Josman, 2006; Cherniss, 2000) Researchers have emphasized exclusively on how the employees perceive they have been treated at one single point however the point of judgment is when they are exposed to new experiences (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005) argued that “perception of justice at one time is based on past experiences and current circumstance. Yet temporal effects remain under-researched.” For the last few decades, the most studied subject in the field of HRM is organizational justice (Cherniss, Goleman, Emmerling, Cowan, & Adler, 1998).

**Purpose of the Study**

Researchers have used numbers of variables between RTC and its outcomes (Bond, Kahler, & Paolicelli, 1985; Butler, 1991) have discussed the importance of readiness to change. Readiness to change is often used as the buffer to resistance. Many researchers have argued that leaders have failed to produce the desired result because of their trust and the importance of an individual in bringing the change (Day & Carroll, 2004; DeConinck, 2010). (Krot & Lewicka, 2012; Kumar, Sareen, & Barquissau, 2012; Lai & Ong, 2010) examined the positive relation of self-efficacy, manager’s support, personal value appropriateness on readiness to change. The variables of organizational justice are never used with the employee trust as a mediating role to check its impact on the readiness to change. It is expected that when employee trust is combined with the organizational justice (distributive, interactional and procedural) will decrease the chances of resistance to change and more of the employees will welcome the change as an opportunity for their growth. Pakistan Telecom sector is changing at a rapid pace and employees are open to new experiences every day in different aspects it can be from the entire shift to a change in operations, this study will help to identify the role of employee trust on their supervisors if they are treated fairly how will that going to affect their readiness to change. Readiness to change is studied extensively in the field of psychology and numbers of studies have shown the positive impact on trust on readiness to change (Vakola, 2013, 2014) It is expected that the presence of employee trust will mediate the relationship between organizational justice and employee’s readiness to change.
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Research Objectives
Following are the research objectives of this study:
➢ To find out the impact of DJ on employees’ RTC.
➢ To find out the impact of PJ on employees’ RTC.
➢ To find out the impact of IJ on employees’ RTC.
➢ To find out the combined effect of DJ and OT on RTC.
➢ To find out the combined effect of PJ and OT on RTC.
➢ To find the combined effect of IJ and OT on RTC.

Significance of the Study
Positive relation between Organizational justice and readiness to change, for the last decade or more the variable of organizational justice is under research (Bond et al., 1985; Butler, 1991; Cropanzano & Kacmar, 1995; DePaulo & Pfeifer, 1986; Furnham, Chamorro-Premuzic, & McDougall, 2002; Harris & Beckhard, 1987; Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Zohar & Luria, 2005) and is used as independent variable. Variable of trust is widely used for its outcome on satisfaction and turn over, burnout and other organizational related variables (Abu Elanain, 2010; Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007; Tyler, 2006; Yousaf, 2008). This study is unique in its nature as the variable of trust will be used for the first time in between the organizational justice and readiness to change. Telecom sector in Pakistan is playing an important role in the development of economics and the speed at which the changes are occurring in this sector is beyond the control of managers, it can be from the merger and acquisition of the company, privatization, technological changes and it can be changed in the operation procedure to meet the new challenges in market. In such cases only if the employees believe that they will be treated fairly on their new tasks and they can welcome the change because they believe it will provide an opportunity to them for growth rather than taking it as a threat against their current knowledge and experience, it is also being found that the organization which involves the employees in decision-making process tends to have strong LMX (Beer & Walton, 1987). This study will help the managers for the better handling of the employees during the process of change and it will also provide the help to organize in the better and fair treatment of resources across the employees and in different departments because, in the today's world of rapid changes, you need to be at the pace of the game only if you want to survive in the market. In addition to this study will help in the existing literature of employee trust it will also be a contextual contribution.

Research Questions
Following are the specific research questions:

1. Does DJ impacts on employees’ RTC?
2. Do PJ impacts on employees’ RTC?
3. Do IJ impacts on employees’ RTC?
4. Does OT mediate the DJ-RTC relationship?
5. Does OT mediate the PJ-RTC relationship?
6. Does OT mediate the IJ-RTC relationship?

Literature Review
The idea of the change originates from the theory of Kurt Lewin for managing the change in the organization, change is a three-stage process consisting on the unfreezing, moving and
refreezing (Lewin, 1947) the process of bringing a change in any organization is not an easy task and it equally involves the acceptance and input from the employees in their readiness to change. (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993) also, second the idea of the three-stage process of unfreezing, moving and refreezing of Kurt Lewin with a little more research on the predictor and driving forces of the change with a focus on the readiness of employees to change. He proposed a definition of change as the intentions and belief of the employees in bringing the change and how much they see the capability of the organization in coping with the change. (Armenakis et al., 1993) also, identified the two basic components of the change readiness; the belief of the employee in bringing the change and the trust in top management in handling the change. This concept was later on focused by (Vakola, 2013) that employees should be willing to bringing the change and they should perceive the working environment favorable in bringing the change. According to (Rafferty, Jimmieson, & Armenakis, 2013) readiness to change is not bounded to any positivity or negativity it is the perception of the employees in bringing the change, it is the boundary line or the perception of the employees in the organization. Furthermore, he argues the difference between the readiness’s to change is often taken as to remove the resistance to change, the idea was further discussed by (Foster-Fishman & Watson, 2012) as the individuals are more prepared for the change, and their higher readiness to change will eliminate the chances of resistance on the other hand without even exerting extra efforts to it. Change is believed to be as tridimensional concept with cognitive, affective and intentional aspects, therefore the change is viewed as what the individuals think about the change (cognition), what the change will bring to the organization (affective) and how will the change bring to the workout expected from them (intuitional) (Oreg et al., 2011). (Rafferty et al., 2013) proposed that the antecedents of the individual level differ from that of the organizational level it has been found that individual-level will lead to job performance, job attitude and changed behaviors where the organizational level will lead to OCB and changed attitudes of groups. Employees perceive themselves as the part of the family, an organization they are working in and they believe that their organization will treat them the same as a family. Employees are always willing to learn new ways of doing things only if they believe injustice of their organization (Farahani & Mirzaie, 2014). According to (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010) the role of organizational justice is perceived more important than the job satisfaction or motivation, the employees believe that only if the organization is treating them fairly in the context of distribution (distributional justice) will have more impact on the OCB as compared to other justice. In the today’s world, due to the pace of change employees are more worried about the challenges they have to face every day in their life related to the task and the environment they are working in, they only feel comfort at workplace when they perceive it to be fair as compared to what they are investing in the organization. The subjective state of employees in the organization will also reflect the resistance to change of the employees and organizations overlook the matter. There are two emotional regulations discussed in the literature (a) adaptive (b) maladaptive. The study conducted by (Fugate, Harrison, & Kinicki, 2011)) states that the maladaptive functions like the denial, isolation, hindrance are positively linked to the resistance to change, where the adaptive functions like the humor, supporting, backing are negatively linked to the resistance to change. It clearly implies that the maladaptive strategies are the one that causes resistance whenever the change is brought in the organization. There is a strong bond between the organizational justice and HR practices it even starts at the process of hiring, (Zohar & Luria, 2005) linked the different stages of hiring process to four
dimensions of justice, during the early phase of hiring the process of recruiting and initial selection the (informational justice) plays the role and when the process of screening and selection comes (procedural justice) come into play and later on when the final interview is called on the (interactional justice) is there, it is to be kept in mind that interpersonal justice always there during the whole process and late on when then employee is performing the job the equal and fair distribution of reward is linked to the (distributional justice). Apart from the HRM organizational justice is also important in the field of HRD, training, and development, organizational development, personal development, and career development. The allocation of the resources and granting the training programs are also linked to the distributional and procedural justice (Fang, Chiu, & Wang, 2011) on the other hand only if the employees have trust in their organization they will the opportunity for career development, they will perceive it as the reward from the organization. Organizational support is under the observation of the researchers and there is a number of definitions to it according to (Vardaman et al., 2016) the expectation and the belief of employee on the organization that they will value his contributions. It is believed that the perceived organizational support is far important to be focused on, as defined by (Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, & Zagency, 2013) the degree to which employee perceives they are being treated fairly on the basis of their inputs which can be in the form of rewards, good working conditions, supervisor support, and justice. The research further expands to the point that if the employees perceive the organizational support they will feel justice and in the return OCB and commitment (Allen & Shanock, 2013).

Resistance to change is the topic under observation for a very long time and as it seems to be very easy to handle it is not because many organizations fail to meet the need of overcoming the resistance to the change, (Tyler, 2006) even in the field of management the literature is not able to come at one point if definition. However, it is believed that as per the change indicators the resistance is also dependent on three factors, (a) what the individuals think about the change or how well they perceive the requirement for the change, cognitive (b) will the change occurring will be beneficial for the individual and for the organization, emotional, (c) will the change affect the current working environment and what needs to be done to meet the changes, behavioral. (Oreg et al., 2011) Therefore, it is clear that change cannot be treated as a unified concept rather than a tridimensional concept. According to the effective event theory certain event will have their effect on the behavior of the person, according to AET individuals go through number of events that are not up to the expectation of the person, in certain cases of the events related to the change requirement individual behaviors will reflect the perception they have about the change (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Apart from the emphasis on AET researches are more focused on the perception of the justice, therefore the variable of justice is used extensively in the context of change (Holt et al., 2007; Holtz, 2013). Perception of justice is a far important point of focus on justice itself, people believe that they are treated fairly or unfairly depending on their view towards organizational justice. Therefore, it is important to focus on what an individual believes because of the differences in their point of views.

**Methodology**

**Research Design**
The study was casual in nature where the impact of Organizational justice (distributive, procedural and distributive) on the dependent variable (readiness to change) in the presence
of mediating role of (employee trust) was measured on self-reported bases. Participants are contacted on their job from the telecom sector of Pakistan to fill the questionnaire based on the knowledge and experiences they had in context to the variable, making it the field study involving the natural environment. The data collected for the research was throughout the period of study and was cross-sectional in nature.

Population and Sampling
The population used for the current study comprises of the telecom sector of Islamabad. Total of 309 samples was taken from (Telenor, Warid, and Zong). The study is based on convenient sampling due to time limitations. The data will have collected from line managers and employees, the rationale for which is that data collection from this population was easy and convenient. A sample of 400 telecom employees of telecom sector from the twin cities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi was selected, a total number of 400 questionnaires were distributed where 309 were only suitable for analysis with the response rate was 77%.

Data Analysis
The results obtained in the study of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, the mediating role of employee trust is also reported using SPSS 23. Results are based on the empirical analysis presented in the section. Quantitative and descriptive analysis was run to analyze findings. To measure the degree of association between different variables Pearson correlation is used.

Results
Descriptive statistics helps in determining the maximum, minimum and the arithmetic means, variance and standard deviations for the computed variables and for dimensions of organizational justice, results are as under

| Statistics                  | Distributive justice | Procedural justice | Interactional justice | trust | Readiness to change |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|
| N Valid                     | 309                  | 309                | 309                   | 309   | 309                 |
| Missing                     | 0                    | 0                  | 0                     | 0     | 0                   |
| Mean                        | 5.1516               | 5.4892             | 5.1931                | 5.348 | 5.5626              |
| Std. Deviation              | 1.03                 | .98                | .9930                 | .9184 | .87506              |
| Variance                    | 1.060                | .979               | .986                  | .843  | .766                |
| Skewness                    | -.650                | -1.073             | -.642                 | -.893 | -1.314              |
| Std. Error of Skewness      | .139                 | .139               | .139                  | .139  | .139                |
| Kurtosis                    | .890                 | 1.698              | .629                  | 1.381 | 1.534               |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis      | .276                 | .276               | .276                  | .276  | .276                |
| Minimum                     | 1.33                 | 1.50               | 1.50                  | 1.44  | 1.33                |
| Maximum                     | 7.00                 | 7.00               | 7.00                  | 7.00  | 7.00                |

Table: Descriptive Statistics of Main Variables
as per the results, the mean of the variables for distributional justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, employee trust and readiness to change is 5.15, 5.4, 5.1, 5.3 and 5.5 which is above the mean value of 5 clearly means that individuals have understood the questions depending upon their knowledge and experience. The high deviation of standard error clearly shows that every employee has perceived justice in a different way depending on the work and supervisory experience.

Correlation is used to measure the associations between variables. The higher the value the stronger will be the relation, the defined range for correlation is between 1 to -1 which is considered to be perfectly positive and negative. Bivariate correlation among variables is as under

|       | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| DJ    | 0.582** |         |         |         |         |
| IJ    | 0.505*  | 0.533*  |         |         |         |
| PJ    | 0.495** | 0.543** | 0.652** |         |         |
| ET    | 0.499** | 0.407** | 0.546** | 0.623** |         |
| RTC   |         |         |         |         |         |

*Note. DJ=Distributive justice; IJ= Interactional justice; PJ= Procedural justice: RTC=Readiness to change; ET= Employee trust. *p < .05, **p < .01

Concluding the results, it is noted that Distributive justice is a moderate and positively related to interactional justice (r=0.582, p<0.01) where the procedural justice is moderate and positively related to distributive justice (r=0.505, p<0.01) and Interactional justice (r=0.533, p<0.01). In case of employee trust it is positively related to distributive justice (r=0.495, p<0.01), Interactional justice (r=0.543, p<0.01) and procedural justice (r=0.652, p<0.01). Readiness to change is moderate and positively related to distributive justice (r=0.499, p<0.01), Interactional justice (r=0.407, p<0.01), procedural justice (r=0.546, p<0.01) and employee trust (r0.623=, p<0.01).

**Conclusion**

The research has revealed the importance of having a fair and healthy system at the telecom companies because of the ongoing changes in this field, the more the employees have trust in the organization and the immediate supervisor it will give him a push in believing the policies and the working of the company only then it will give a push in opting for the changes that are frequently in happenings. The major contribution of the mediating role of employee trust revealed that it is a strong predictor of readiness to change, in the presence of the employee trust over the immediate supervisor and the organization the employee felt that the change occurred was in the best fit for the organization and they don’t feel any harm from the change. The results concluded that organizational justice is the strongest predictor of readiness to change in the presence of trust followed by procedural justice and interactional justice. It means that the employee feels the sense of interactional lacking in the telecom companies, in the last few years the telecom industry is at a boom and everything is moving at a rapid phase.
Limitations and Directions for Future Research
While the insights offered in this article add to our understanding of the relationships between readiness and organizational justice, there are noteworthy limitations that merit consideration. Consequently, inferences drawn between the posited impact of readiness to change on organizational justice must be made with employee trust. Future studies could enhance our understanding of the true relationships between this readiness to change and organization justice through cross sectional, empirically based analyses. It should also be noted that the recommendations and insights offered in this article are based on selected change models. Future research in the area of readiness to change and organizational justice might be enhanced by making comprehensive comparisons between some of the most widely respected models.
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