Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational trust
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Abstract: The present research aimed to examine the mediating role of organizational trust between perceived organizational justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and employee engagement (i.e., job engagement and organizational engagement). The data was collected from 251 employees of different organizations who filled in standardized measures of perceived organizational justice, organizational trust, and employee engagement. Using AMOS 26, path analysis was conducted to see the mediational role of organizational trust between organizational justice and employee engagement. The analyses indicated significant indirect effects of all three dimensions of organizational justice on job engagement as well as on organizational engagement through organizational trust. However, the strength of the indirect paths of all three dimensions of organizational justice for job engagement was relatively weak. These findings supported the expected mediational role of organizational trust between
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organizational justice and employee engagement. The findings implicate that justice-based dealings of organizations with their employees can build up their trust in the organizations which may improve their job engagement and organizational engagement.
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1. Introduction

Employee engagement has become a strong point for organizations that seek to attain sustainable growth (Rasool et al., 2021), client satisfaction (Salanova et al., 2005), and financial returns (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009) thus, help the organization to increase their competitive benefits (Macey et al., 2011; Swarnalatha & Prasanna, 2013). The competition organizations counter today has made engagement a crucial element for present organizations as an individual-organization relationship (Schaufeli, 2013). For instance, the individual-organization relationship of employees’ perception of organizational justice influenced the engagement of employees (Saks, 2006). Considering all these aspects, it is essential to study the factors that contribute to employee engagement as well as the mechanisms through which employees engage in their jobs and organizations. Therefore, the present study aimed at examining the mediating role of organizational trust between three types of organizational justice and two types of employee engagement in the employees.

Bibliometric analysis (Piotrowski, 2014, 2016) indicated that in organizational settings, organizational justice is an important research area. Organizational justice refers to the fairness of a decision an organization makes, the procedure they use in making decisions and the interpersonal treatment employees receive (Wan, 2016). Perceived organizational justice represents the perception of the equality of trade occurring in the organizations. This trade can be societal or financial and may relate to the person in his or her association with seniors, juniors, colleagues, and organizations in the shared structure (Beugre, 1998). Justice in organizations is an important field of psychological research that emphasizes equality-based practices in organizations (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001). It is the intangible glue that shapes employees’ attitudes and behaviors to work more efficiently and effectively in a team (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; Rupp et al., 2017).

Organizational justice has different facets. First, *distributive justice* can be defined as the perception of employees about the fair or unfair distribution of benefits (R. G. Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). It is the distribution of responsibilities, rights, and benefits considering the skills and contributions of employees. Second, *procedural justice* is referred to as employees’ perception of fair procedures or methods for decisionmaking (R. Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Third, *interactional justice* is defined as a type of justice where employees are concerned with interpersonal dealings received from others and key organizational sanctions (Colquitt et al., 2005). Initially, Greenberg (1990) proposed a two-factor model including distributive justice and procedural justice. Later on, a three-factor model was proposed by Bies and Moag (1986) by dividing procedural justice into two types (i.e., procedural and interactional) along with distributive justice.
The justice perception of employees leads to various outcomes and work engagement is one of them. Work engagement has been viewed as one of the most critical drivers of business success (Decuyper & Schaufeli, 2021). Employee engagement is a different and exclusive concept that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements related to the person’s job performance (Saks, 2006). Saks (2006) further divided employee engagement into two dimensions (i.e., job engagement and organizational engagement). Job engagement is the degree to which organizational members are psychologically present in their work roles. Whereas organizational engagement is the degree to which organizational members are psychologically present in their role as organizational members. Employees are more likely to engage when they perceive that their organization deals with them fairly in terms of benefits, responsibilities, procedures, and social dealings.

A significant amount of research has indicated the role of organizational justice in employee engagement (Abbasi & Alvi, 2012; Ghosh et al., 2014; Javed & Tariq, 2015; Özer et al., 2017; Rasheed et al., 2013). For instance, Saks (2006) and Rasheed et al. (2013) established the positive association of distributive and procedural justice with job engagement and organizational engagement. Researchers also found a positive significant association between all the three dimensions of justice and employee engagement (Abbasi & Alvi, 2012; Ghosh et al., 2014; Javed & Tariq, 2015; Özer et al., 2017). However, prior studies have mainly focused on the role of organizational justice in employee engagement. Consequently, the present study extended this line of inquiry by further examining the mechanism of organizational trust between organizational justice and employee engagement.

Organizational trust is among the various outcomes of organizational justice. Organizational trust is the confidence of the employees in the organization and management. Employees consider that management will not take any step that is damaging to them but rather management operate in a manner that is advantageous to them. It is the conviction that both parties will perform consistently and will act or react in an expected and jointly satisfactory way (Paliszkiewicz, 2010). When employees have trust in their organization, they devote more time and energy to perform in the organization (Bromley & Cummings, 1996). Recently, Sheeraz et al. (2021) stated that the association of organizational justice was most frequently explored with organizational trust. Findings of empirical investigations demonstrated a well-established positive association between organizational justice and organizational trust (Kulekci Akyavuz, 2017; Özgan, 2011; Polat & Celep, 2008; Yildiz, 2013). Moreover, with reference to specific facets, the strength of association of organizational trust with procedural and interactional justice was relatively higher than with distributive justice (Khiavi et al., 2016).

Literature has also indicated the predictive role of organizational justice in organizational trust (Connell et al., 2003; Kulekci Akyavuz, 2017; Ruder, 2003; Ullah & Rabsana, 2013) as well as the predictive role of organizational trust in employee engagement (Chughtai & Buckley, 2008). The most recent, bibliometric analysis (Sheeraz et al., 2021) showed that researchers explored procedural justice more as compared to other dimensions of organizational justice. To bridge this gap, the present study aimed to get an insight into all three types of justice.

Moreover, the mediating role of organizational trust has been established for a few employee and organizational level variables (e.g., Aruoren et al., 2021; Aryee et al., 2002; Chen et al., 2015; Iqbal & Ahmad, 2016). Although, existing empirical evidence revealed well-established associations between organizational justice, trust, and work engagement, the mediating role of trust in paths between organizational justice and work engagement is yet to be explored. A thorough search of the relevant literature yielded only one study that explored the role of one type of organizational justice (i.e., procedural justice) in the job engagement of employees considering felt trust as mediating mechanism (Melhem & Al Qudah, 2019). In their study, the variable “felt trust” was defined as the feeling of employees being trusted by their supervisors. In light of existing
literature, the greater interest was to focus on the mediational role of organizational trust between all three types of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and employee engagement (job engagement and organizational engagement).

The bibliometric analysis of seven decades of the research status on organizational justice also indicated that it’s a highly studied area around the globe, however, the scarcity of research was identified in the Asian region (particularly in the sub-continent; Sheeraz et al., 2021). Therefore, this topic is worth exploring in the specific cultural context of Pakistan. Moreover, literature indicated that organizational justice and organizational trust were explored in different sectors (such as manufacturing; Melhem & Al Qudah, 2019). However, most often studies were conducted considering educational-sector employees (Kulekci Akyavuz, 2017; Ozgan, 2011; Polat & Celep, 2008) also indicated by a meta-analysis too (Huseyin, 2018). Therefore, in the present study, participants from two sectors (educational and banking) were considered. These two sectors were considered because banks are the economical backbone of any society whereas universities are the agents of socializations which may cause change as a whole. To minimize the chances of difference in samples from different sectors, their homogeneity was also ensured through median and Levene’s test (for details please see method section).

The theoretical structure of current research is supported by social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). As per Blau (1964), social exchanges are an individual’s voluntary actions that are influenced by the payback they expect to get from others. Saks (2006) suggested that social exchange theory provides a strong logical basis for employee engagement arguing that the duties are caused by a chain of relations between groups that are in mutual reliance. A central tenet of social exchange theory is that the association develops over a period of time into trustful, faithful, and reciprocal obligations till both parties abide by certain rules of exchange. Taking insight from the social exchange theory, the research model of the present study is proposed in Figure 1.

The figure shows that three types of organizational justice improve employees’ engagement in the job and organization through enhancing their trust in the organization. Justice is often of vital importance to organizations due to the repercussion of perception of inequality can influence feelings and manners in the workplace. Organizational justice entails matters related to the observation of workplace equality, wages, the same chances for promotion, and recruitment measures. Employee perception of justice and their growth of organizational trust are very important aspects of engagement. This research will help us to find the mediating role of organizational trust between perceived justice and employee engagement in Pakistani employees.

Figure 1. Proposed research model of the present study.
Hypothesis: The effect of organizational justice on job engagement and organizational engagement is mediated by organizational trust.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The cross-sectional research design was employed to conduct this study. The sample consisted of 251 employees (n = 158 males, n = 93 females) from different organizations, such as banks and universities utilizing the purposive sampling technique. A purposive sampling strategy was utilized as only the graduated employees with at least 1 year of job experience within the same organization were taken. Engagement is the psychological presence of the employee in their task and organization (Rothbard & Patil, 2011), so an employee needs some time after being initially recruited to be settled and mentally engrossed in the job and the organization.

The mean age of employees was 36.14 years (SD = 8.96, range = 24–59 years). They were highly educated as 188 have a post-graduate degree, and 63 have a graduate degree. The mean job tenure of employees was about 8.67 years (SD = 7.42). To ensure the homogeneity of both the groups, medians were computed for all of the study variables, which were quite closer in both samples (range of median for bank employees; 3.47–4.67, range of median for university employees; 3.58–4.89). Moreover, Levene’s test for equality of variance also supported the homogeneity of these two groups (F = .00–1.17, p > .05).

2.2. Instruments

The Perceived Organizational Justice Scale (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) is a 20-item measure assessing three domains of perceived organizational justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice). These subscales are measured by five, six, and nine items respectively. Participants provide ratings of each item on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The sample item is “My work schedule is fair”. Internal consistencies of all the three dimensions of the measure were α ≥ .90 (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Confirmatory factor analysis performed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) supported the three-factor model.

The Organizational Trust Questionnaire (Paliszewicz, 2010) is a 15-item measure assessing perceived organizational trust. Participants rate each item about their perception of organizational trust on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The sample item is “There is an atmosphere for honest cooperation among employees”. The internal consistency of the measure was α = .87 (Paliszewicz, 2010).

The Employee Engagement Scale (Saks, 2006) is an 11-item measure assessing two dimensions of employee engagement at work. The job engagement subscale consisted of five items, while the organizational engagement subscale consisted of six items. Participants rate each item describing the psychological presence of an organizational member in their work role on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The sample item is “Sometimes I am so into the job that I lose track of time”. Internal consistencies of the job engagement and organizational engagement were α = .82 and α = .90, respectively (Saks, 2006).

2.3. Procedure

All necessary ethical approvals were sorted to conduct this study. A large number of employees were approached from different banks and universities in three major cities of Pakistan (LAHORE, Islamabad, and Multan). Prior approval was sort from the concerned authorities. The participants were briefed about the purpose and requirements of the study. Participants have provided
appropriate informed consent and details about the nature of the research. Participants signed the consent forms that explained their rights, that the information they supplied would be kept private and they had the right to quit research at any time. Initial information regarding the employment period in the same organization was also asked. The employees who express their consent and fulfilled this condition of job tenure were approached. In total, 350 participants were approached. The participants were requested to complete all the above-listed assessment measures utilizing a paper-pencil-based survey. However, 283 participants returned the questionnaires. The response rate was about 80%. These 283 participants were further screened for extreme cases and erroneous response styles through descriptive analysis. The final dataset consisted of 251 participants.

3. Results
All of the preliminary analyses were conducted using SPSS. Preliminarily analyses, such as descriptive and reliability were, conducted to examine internal consistencies and descriptive statistics of the measures. Further, to ensure the normality of the data, skewness, and kurtosis were calculated. Table 1 provides an overview of mean, standard deviations, minimum, maximum, Cronbach alphas, skewness, and kurtosis of measures.

Table 1 shows that all of the measures utilized in the present study have good to excellent internal consistencies which ranged between $\alpha = .92$ (interational justice) to $\alpha = .60$ (job engagement). Moreover, the minimum and maximum values indicated that all scales demonstrated satisfactory variability in response; however, the range of job engagement was somehow restricted. Furthermore, the values of skewness and kurtosis were in between $\pm 1$ which indicated the normality of the data.

After these analyses, another preliminary analysis (Pearson product moment correlation) was conducted. It was assumed that organizational justice correlates positively with organizational trust, job engagement, and organizational engagement. Analysis indicated significant positive relationship of all the three dimensions of organizational justice with organizational trust ($r = .51 \text{ to } .68$, $p < .001$) as well as with organizational engagement ($r = .27 \text{ to } .34$, $p < .001$). However, no association was found between dimensions of organizational justice and job engagement. It further showed a positive association of organizational trust with both of the engagements namely, job engagement ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) and organizational engagement ($r = .46$, $p < .001$).

Considering the strongest correlation between organizational justice and organizational trust, it was necessary to establish their discrimination before conducting the main analysis. For this purpose, the first-order Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) model was assessed using AMOS. The model included two latent endogenous factors, organizational justice and organizational trust. The indicators of perceived organizational justice were three of its subscales; distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, while 15 items of organizational trust scales were the indicators of the latent factor of organizational trust. CFA supported the distinction of organizational justice and organizational trust indicated by the model fit indices as well as by the regression weights. The model fit indices were not supported by $\chi^2 (134) = 400.48$, $p < .05$. However, the other baseline comparisons (Comparative Fit Indices: CFI, Normed Fit Index: NFI, Tucker Lewis Index: TLI), Goodness of fit indices (GFI), and Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA) values were within the acceptable range (Hooper et al., 2008; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

After conducting the preliminary analysis and ensuring the discrimination of organizational justice and organizational trust, assumptions of normality, independence, and homoscedasticity were assessed. These assumptions are prerequisites for mediation (Hayes, 2012). The mediational role of organizational trust between organizational justice and employee engagement was explored using AMOS 26.0. As there were three independent variables and two dependent variables and the greater
Table 1. Descriptive statistics, reliability, and normality of study variables

| Variables           | Min | Max | M   | SD  | α    | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|----------|----------|
| Distributive Justice| 1.00| 7.00| 4.45| 1.30| .87  | −0.55    | −0.38    |
| Procedural Justice  | 1.00| 7.00| 4.42| 1.19| .87  | −0.44    | −0.02    |
| Interactional Justice| 1.00| 7.00| 4.67| 1.12| .92  | −0.53    | 0.42     |
| Organizational Trust| 1.47| 4.73| 3.45| 0.63| .88  | −0.42    | 0.01     |
| Job Engagement      | 2.40| 5.00| 3.71| 0.51| .60  | −0.06    | −0.31    |
| Organizational Engagement| 1.33| 4.67| 3.52| 0.61| .71  | −0.65    | 0.63     |

Note. N = 251.
interest was to analyze the model at once, therefore AMOS facilitates to analyze the whole model at once. Table 2 presents the model fit indices of the initial model and final model.

Table 2 indicates that most of the fit indices, such as baseline comparisons, and GFI were within the acceptable range (Hooper et al., 2008; Hu & Bentler, 1999), however, the RMSEA value was quite high; therefore, the model modifications were checked. One suggested modification (i.e., the correlation between the error terms of both dependent variables) was done which provided a good fit for the final model.

Figure 2 shows the direct effects of organizational justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) on organizational trust and organizational trust on employee engagement (i.e., job engagement and organizational engagement).

Figure 2 represented the standardized direct effect of study variables. The direct effects of all three forms of justice on organizational trust were significant. Moreover, the standardized direct effects of organizational trust on both subscales of employee engagement were significant too. However, the indirect effects were of special importance.

Therefore, the indirect effects were analyzed using a bootstrap of 1000 samples with a 95% confidence interval. Table 3 shows the indirect effects of all three kinds of organizational justice for job engagement and organizational engagement through organizational trust.

![Table 2. Model fit indices (N = 251)](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2022.2080325)
Table 3. Standardized indirect effect of perceived organizational justice on employee engagement through organizational trust

| Variables          | Job Engagement | Organizational Engagement |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
|                    | $\beta$ | SE  | UL  | UL  | $\beta$ | SE  | UL  | UL  |
| Distributive Justice | .02*   | .01 | .00 | .06 | .06*   | .03 | .00 | .12 |
| Procedural Justice  | .06*   | .03 | .01 | .13 | .18*** | .03 | .12 | .25 |
| Interactional Justice | .05*  | .03 | .01 | .11 | .14*** | .04 | .08 | .22 |

Note. $N = 251$. *$p < .05$. ***$p < .001$. 
The analyses indicated that indirect effects of all three types of organizational justice were significant for both job engagement and organizational engagement. This indicated that organizational justice enhances the trust of the employees in their organization and consequently they become more engaged in their jobs as well as in their organizations. Thus, the findings supported the indirect effect of organizational trust between these two forms of organizational justice and organizational engagement.

4. Discussion
The current study deals with the proposition that mainly reflects that perceived organizational justice and organizational trust influence the job and organizational engagement of employees. The greater interest was to identify the mediational role of organizational trust between organizational justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and employee engagement (i.e., job engagement and organizational engagement). Perceptions of employees about organizational justice and organizational trust were taken to infer organizational justice and their trust in their organization. The study contributed to international literature by taking a sample from the less-researched work context of Pakistan regarding organizational justice (Sheeraz et al., 2021) and evaluating the mediational role of organizational trust between organizational justice and employee engagement. Overall, the findings guided that perception of organizational justice and organizational trust plays an important role in the job and organizational engagement of the employees.

Preliminary correlational analysis indicated that all dimensions of organizational justice are meaningfully related to organizational trust and organizational engagement. However, all three kinds of organizational justice did not correlate with the job engagement of the employees. These findings can be supported by existing literature in the case of the association between organizational justice and organizational trust. A meta-analysis of organizational trust indicated the strong correlation between organizational justice and organizational trust among education sector employees. However, they did not consider dimensions of organizational justice, and the university employees were limited in this meta-analysis (Huseyin, 2018). To bridge this gap, university employees were considered in the present research. The findings were also supported by the studies that considered the dimensions of organizational justice. For instance, Al-Abrow et al. (2013) found that distributive and procedural justices have a significant association with trust in an organization and interactional justice had a significant association with trust in the supervisor. Studies also found the association of a particular type of justice with organizational trust (e.g., procedural justice; Ruder, 2003) or all three types of justice with organizational trust (Wong et al., 2006). Similar to the present findings, the bibliometric research analysis indicated a high association between procedural justice and organizational trust than the other two dimensions of organizational justice (Sheeraz et al., 2021).

Furthermore, literature also guided on the positive association of organizational justice with organizational engagement as found in the present study. Castellano (2013) stated that employee justice has been believed as one of the chief predictors of employee affective state, including engagement. Studies from Pakistan established a positive association between organizational justice and employee engagement (Abbasi & Alvi, 2012; Javed & Tariq, 2015). Moreover, the literature also established that perceptions of justice had a significant correlation with the employees’ level of commitment to the organization (i.e., similar to engagement, Crow et al., 2012; Elamin, 2012; Yaziçioğlu & Topaloğlu, 2009). The absence of association between any dimension of perceived organizational justice and job engagement can be minimally supported by the existing literature.

Correlation analysis indicated that organizational trust was associated with both dimensions of employee engagement although the association with job engagement was relatively lower than organizational engagement. Ugwu et al. (2014) found that organizational trust was a predictor of work engagement. Hough et al. (2015) found that trust in an organization is positively linked to the
engagement of employees and managers in the organization. Similarly, in the present research, the banking managers and higher education-level university employees were taken.

The low correlations of job engagement with organizational trust and non-significant correlation with organizational justice can be interpreted in terms of the sample characteristics. Most of the literature cited in the meta-analysis (Huseyin, 2018) reported findings based on a sample from one sector (such as educational organizations) whereas the findings of the present study are based on the sample from two major sectors including public and private universities and banks. Although both of the samples were highly educated, however, the scale used to measure employee engagement was not developed in the cultural context of Pakistan and has slangs in it. Misinterpretation of the slangs such as “throw myself into the job”, “goings-on in the organizations” and “being a member of this organization makes me come alive” might be one of the reasons for non-significant and weak associations. Another factor that could have impacted the results might be the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the term “engagement” by the employees. In general, employees interpret the word engaged as being busy in their work which is different from the definition of employee engagement. The last factor that could have affected the response on the employee engagement scale is the individual self-serving bias. Employees may not be engaged, but they may think of themselves to be engaged workers as it is expected behavior and attitude.

According to the main hypothesis of the study, it was expected that the effect of organizational justice on job engagement and organizational engagement is mediated by organizational trust. The result indicated that organizational trust mediated the relationship between organizational justice and employee engagement. More specifically, organizational trust mediated the relation of all three types of organizational justice and both kinds of employee engagement. The findings were in line with another relevant research by Melhem and Al Qudah (2019) who established the mediational role of “felt trust” between procedural justice and job engagement. The evidence about the mediational role of organizational trust between the other two dimensions of organizational justice (i.e., distributive justice and interactional justice) and organizational engagement cannot be supported due to the scarcity of literature in this regard.

However, the strength of the indirect effects of procedural and interactional justice was stronger than distributive justice. This finding was consistent with a cross-sectional study, that explored the association between all three types of organizational justice and organizational trust (Khiai et al., 2016). However, more evidence cannot be collected due to the fact that researchers across the globe more often explored procedural justice (Sheeraz et al., 2021).

In terms of two dimensions of employee engagement, the strength of the relationship was weaker for job engagement. The findings implicated that the employees trust those organizations that boost the employee’s perception of organizational justice. A higher propensity to trust in the administration, superiors, and colleagues enhance engagement with the work. Aryee et al. (2002) stated that in an organizational context, the social exchange might begin with an employer’s fair treatment with the employees. Fair actions of the employer enhance employees’ trust in the organization and oblige them to reciprocate the good deeds of the organization. There is a lack of literature in this regard; however, literature indicated the mediating role of organizational trust between organizational justice and organizational commitment (i.e., similar to engagement of employees, Chen et al., 2015; Iqbal & Ahmad, 2016), affective commitment (Mukherjee & Bhattacharya, 2013).

4.1. Conclusion
To sum up, this study is of special importance due to providing evidence about the role of three dimensions of organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) in employee
engagement through the organizational trust from less studied work settings of Pakistan concerning these variables. Although the sample consisted of two different sectors, however, their homogeneity was ensured. This research provided the results that perceived organizational justice, organizational trust, and employee engagement among employees are significantly associated with one another (except for organizational justice and job engagement). Moreover, employee engagement is indirectly predicted by all three types of organizational justice through the perception of organizational trust. This study adds to the pragmatic support for the link between perceived organizational justice, trust, and employee engagement in educational and banking sectors. This research provides food for thought to future researchers from Sub-Continent to understand the phenomena better.

4.2. Limitations and suggestion
The present study has a few limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, the sample included only educated employees such as lecturers, software engineers, and bankers. The diverse sample from different designations and professions can be used in future studies to analyze the antecedents and mechanism of employee engagement and to confirm the findings of the present research. Second, the study is cross-sectional in nature and is unable to support a strong causal claim. Therefore, in the future, this mechanism can be tested using different designs. For instance, longitudinal design can be used to investigate causal relationships while diary design can be used alternative to longitudinal design in case of time restriction. Thirdly, the scales were not translated and adapted concerning Pakistani culture and administered in English, which may influence the findings as seen for the job engagement subscale. Therefore, in the future, the tools should be used after translation and cultural adaptation or more appropriate tools can be developed by the researchers. Fourth, self-ratings were taken in the present research, and response bias is possible due to the self-report questionnaires, which also restrict the generalization of the study. Therefore, to reduce response bias, others-ratings may be taken along with self-ratings. Lastly, no pilot testing was done before conducting the main study to validate the existing scales in the Pakistani work context. Therefore, in the future, pilot testing should be done before conducting the main study if the utilized measures are not validated in a particular culture.

4.3. Implications
The findings of this research can implicate the research linkage between perception of organizational justice, organizational trust, and employee engagement from a less-studied cultural context of Pakistan. The findings can be used as a platform for the awareness of chief antecedents of employee engagement, which are, perceived organizational justice and organizational trust. The findings also implicate the importance of all three dimensions of organizational justice and organizational trust in the engagement of banking and university employees. Banks and Universities can indoctrinate the procedures of fairness and trust for improved and better engagement of their employees, thereby, enhancing the productivity of their employees and ultimately of their organization. The research also calls for the confirmation of findings from other sectors. Employee engagement is a major source in the shaping of employee feelings, actions, efficiency, performance, turnover, monetary performance, and investor returns (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Respect for people and civility are part of an individual’s perception of procedures to be fair (Bies & Moag, 1986). The study can be helpful for the employers to improve the engagement of employees in their job as well as in organizations by analyzing the fairness in procedures, distribution of resources and incentives, and the respect and support to employees. By ensuring the procedural, distributive, and interactional justice in organizations they enhance the trust of employees and ultimately employees become more engaged. Another important implication is the consideration of the supervisory trust due to the direct interaction of employees with supervisors.

The findings can be utilized by the organizations during policy formulation as the presence and absence of organizational fairness in procedures, distribution, and interactions. This function of organizational policy may influence the trust of employees in their organization thus improving
their engagement at work. The results can also serve as a guide for organizations to attain effective organizational practices to enhance organizational trust in employees because developing trustful relationships will consequently yield engaged employees.

The findings can be utilized by HR managers to maintain a fair procedures, fair performance appraisal system, give rewards and compensation, and promotions following the performance of the employees (i.e., to ensure procedural and distributive justice). Moreover, the decisions made by those on the top of the hierarchy should be communicated to the subordinates along with the reasoning behind the decision (to ensure interactional justice). These justice-based practices may promote the trust in the employees for the organization and ultimately may benefit the organization.
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