

**Relationship of Organizational justice, Organizational Cynicism and
Job Stress among College and University Teachers.**



BY

MARYAM LEGHARI

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

2017

**Relationship of Organizational Justice, Organizational Cynicism and
Job Stress among College and University Teachers**

BY

MARYAM LEGHARI

A Research Report submitted in
partial fulfillment for the requirement of
The Degree of Masters of Science in Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

2017

**Relationship of Organizational Justice, Organizational Cynicism
and Job Stress among College and University Teachers**

By

Maryam Leghari

Approved by



(Syed Muhammad Imran Bukhari)
Supervisor



(Dr. Syed Sajjad Hussain)
External Examiner



(Prof. Dr. Anila Kamal)
Director, NIP

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that thesis prepared by **Ms. Maryam Leghari** entitled “Relationship of organizational Justice, organizational Cynicism and Job Stress among College and University Teachers” have by approved by **Mr. Syed Imran Bukhari** for submission to National Institute of Psychology.



(Syed M. Imran Bukhari)

Supervisor

**RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE,
ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AND JOB STRESS
AMONG COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHERS**

Dedicated to

My Beloved Father

Nasir Leghari & my loving mother

Zaib-un-Nisa.

LIST OF CONTENTS

Tittles	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Appendices	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Organizational Justice	3
Organizational Cynicism	9
Job Stress	14
Relationship between OJ, OC and JS	20
Rationale of the study	24
CHAPTER II: METHOD	
Objectives	26
Hypotheses	27
Operational Definitions	27
Organizational Justice	27
Organizational Cynicism	28
Job Stress	28
Sample	29
Instruments	30
Organizational Justice	30
Organizational Cynicism	31
Job Stress	31
Procedure	31

CHAPTER III: RESULTS	32
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION	44
References	50
Appendices	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Descriptive Statistics of the Sample ($N = 201$)	29
Table 2	Psychometric Properties of the Study Variables ($N = 201$)	33
Table 3	Inter-correlation among Study Variables ($N = 201$)	34
Table 4	Linear Regression along Distributive Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress ($N = 201$)	35
Table 5	Linear Regression along Procedural Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress ($N = 201$)	36
Table 6	Linear Regression along Interactional Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress ($N = 201$)	37
Table 7	Linear Regression along Age, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress ($N = 201$)	38
Table 8	Linear Regression along Job Experience, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress ($N = 201$)	39
Table 9	Group Differences on Gender along Study Variables ($N = 201$)	40
Table 10	Group Differences on Marital Status along Study Variables ($N = 201$)	40
Table 11	Group Difference on Education on study variables ($N = 201$)	41
Table 12	Group Difference on Education Comparison on Study Variables ($N = 201$)	42
Table 13	One-way ANOVA for overall effect of Job Designation on Study Variables ($N = 201$)	43

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix -A	Informed Consent
Appendix -B	Demographic Sheet
Appendix -C	Organizational Justice Scale
Appendix -D	Organizational Cynicism Scale
Appendix -E	Job Stress Scale

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful and Beneficent

Foremost, I would like to thank Almighty Allah, for helping me and giving me courage to face all the obstacles in this time period and making me able to complete this research work within given time which was a great challenge for me. Secondly, I would like to thank my supervisor Syed Muhammad Imran Bukhari, whose guidance, support, patience, constructive ideas were key elements which helped me a lot in completing this research project. Thirdly I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, husband and siblings for being there when I needed support. Their love, care, prayers and trust in me are the most precious things in my life. I would also like to thank my in laws for being supportive from beginning till end. Fourthly I would like to thank my friends Iqra Ameer, Shanza Fayyaz, Baseera Zahra, Umama Wajid, Zarnosh Wazir and Maliha Haider for always standing next to me and helping me through every thick and thin.

Maryam Leghari

ABSTRACT

The present research was conducted to explore the relationship between organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional), organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. It also aimed to study these variables with respect to demographic variables including gender, age, job status, job experience, marital status, job designation and education. The sample consisted of 201 teachers (66 college teachers & 134 university teachers) with age ranged from 25 to 64 years ($M = 36.25$, $SD = 7.36$) of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The data was collected by using convenient sampling technique. The major constructs of the study were assessed with Organizational Justice Scale (Lim, 2002), Organizational Cynicism Scale (Dean, Dharwadkar & Brandes, 1998) and Job Stress Scale (Parker & De Cotiis, 1983). Results of the main study showed that the categories of organizational justice named as distributive justice, interactional justice and procedural justice were negatively associated with organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers. In addition to it organizational cynicism and job stress were positively related to each other. The results of the demographic variable of educational comparison showed that university teachers were facing more interactional justice as compared to college teachers. However, non-significant group differences were found in relation to gender, age, education, marital status and job experience.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The reason behind conducting this study is to explore the relationship of the dimensions of organizational justice namely distributive, procedural and interactional justice with organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. This study shall also explore whether demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status, education, job designation, education comparison and job experience are related with organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) , organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers.

Organizations are termed as the systems where we have employees as the most important element because of their usefulness and affectivity. The objectives of the organizations can only be achieved if they have effective managers and personnel's as a workforce. An organization is unable to achieve its objectives if the employees are having lower levels of commitment and are not putting in efforts (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006).

Organizations are the strength of the present world which assistances in achieving aims and goal. In order to accomplish these aims and goals an organization needs employees which form a good work force. Employee's satisfaction does matter in achieving these goals. Organizations correspond of team which comprise of people who put a combined effort to succeed an objective that is common to every personnel of the organization. HRM research has assisted employees of numerous organizations by putting forth conclusions to the problems they face in their day to day work environment.

Every organization that possess employees have to face costs due to different issues like employees making mistakes on the job, adopting such means to earn money which are unethical in nature, missing work, not reporting at the work and leaving the job. These problems and their effects and costs vary across organizations and jobs. For some organizations these can be insignificant and ignorable but for



others these might be critical. Organizational justice is the key component which can be of great help in reducing or minimizing the costs faced by the organizations with respect to the employees. Injustice has negative effects on employee's psychological health and as well as the work environment in which he carries out day to day assigned tasks.

It has been observed that organizational justice has significant negative relationship with organizational cynicism. Job stress also significantly negatively correlates with organizational justice among employees of different organizations.

According to Dean, Dharwadkar, and Brandes, (1998) the term organizational cynicism involves negative attitudes an employee has formed about his place of working. The person who entertains cynicism is known as cynic and he accepts it as true that his employing organization has no integrity. The employee may also face negative emotions for the organization and tend to display critical behaviours which are consistent with his belief about the organization and emotions (Dean et al., 1998). Hence we see that organizational cynicism is a source of huge threat for the organization. There are chances that the organization may collapse as well.

The term "job stress" is utilized as a part of various terms like "work stress, occupational stress or organizational stress". Much of the time every one of these terms has been utilized conversely as indicated by the distinctive circumstances. Despite the fact that occupation stretch is not another marvel but rather it is nearly an alternate and another idea. Occupational stress or job stress is not limited to organizations, employment or enterprises but rather it is extremely broad concept and it can be harmful. On the other hand it can influence anyone at any time. Hence it is necessary to manage it so that the workforce remains stress free.

Job stress is formally defined as the confrontational response an individual have against disproportionate stresses or different types of solicitations put on them at work. A sound occupation is the one in which equity is considered, organizational cynicism is not winning in the workplace and a positive stress is given to the representatives.

Organizational Justice

According to Colquitt (2001) employees play an important part in decision making processes carried out in different organizations and these decisions are often addressed and questioned for their fairness. The practices of representatives toward equity turned into an area of study as the significance of the idea of justice expanded in the organizations (Greenberg, 1990).

As indicated by Dinc and Ceylan (2008) organizational justice is sort of a structure which plays an important role in influencing the work related dispositions of representatives towards quality of wages, how work has been divided and rewards etc. The factors that are included in organizational justice are those related to employee's perception of decision making procedures, rewards, outcomes, participation in decision making procedures. Most of the individuals consider problems related to impartiality and fairness as important. At an early age, kids also appear to comprehend whether certain things are reasonable or not reasonable.

In the organizational settings, justice is viewed in terms of a ratio of reward and contribution, the degree of justice in decision making processes, or how courteous the supervisor is towards the employees. Individuals need to be approached with deference, and they need their commitments to be similarly coordinated with rewards. Not exclusively would individuals like to be uniformly compensated for their efforts, however they have a preference for the fairness of procedures that include delegate outcomes and the individuals associated with it.

In short, those methods should be used that are reliable, fair-minded, and illustrative of laborer needs (Greenberg, 1986; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). According to Bies and Moag (1986) and Colquitt (2001) employee and supervisor should interact with each other in a respectful manner and also should have good interpersonal relationship with each other. These are the important factors that are related to general perceptions about justice in the minds of employees.

Organizational justice is viewed as an important area of study in the field of psychology named as industrial and organizational psychology having prime focus on perception of fairness in the workplace. In other words it is the psychology of justice

that is applied to workplace settings (Lind & Tyler, 1988). According to Greenberg (1990) organizational justice is defined as the perception of fairness an employee has towards his working environment. Organizational justice is essential as a fundamental prerequisite for the compelling working of the organization.

According to Yazıcıoğlu and Topaloğlu (2009) the conviction of laborers regarding fairness prevailing in the organization particularly the conviction regarding reliability of fair administrative process by the next person in chain of command directly or indirectly influence how they behave and react in organizational environment. Greenberg, (1990) recommended that research on the construct of “organizational justice” can differentiate between different organizational justice dependent outcomes. Role of fairness is described by the term organizational justice. Fairness identifies with the work environment directly.

Moorman (1991) have described what organizational justice particularly concerns with. According to Moorman (1991) employees evaluate how they are treated at their workplace and make assumptions. The treatment given to them have an immense influence on work related outcomes. Sometimes employees retaliate when the outcomes are not equitable and such processes and interactions take place that in inappropriate. In such situations, explanation is given by organizational justice (Alsalem & Alhaiani, 2007).

Types of Organizational Justice

Organizational justice has three dimensions which are differentiated on the basis of how employee perceives justice. These dimensions are explained as under.

Distributive justice. According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998) perceived fairness of the results that a representative gets from the organization is known as distributive justice. Employees intentionally or unintentionally evaluate the reasonableness of dispersion of outcome by making comparisons with fellow employees. Hence, it is there by necessary that outcomes should be announced on the basis of fairness and equity (Alsalem & Alhaiani, 2007).

Adams (1963) explained that perception related to an unequal dispersion of work related rewards with respect to work related inputs are responsible for creating

stress inside an individual and the individual is inspired to determine the stress and resolve it.

Equity theory. The main theme of equity theory is that people experience distress when the efforts they had put in and the outcome they received do not correspond with each other. When distress is experience, people try to manage it and hence put in efforts so that equity can be restored (Adams, 1965).

Exchange, social comparison and dissonance theories originated theory of equity which was given by Adams (1963). It can predict that how the relationship with others at work are managed by the individuals. There are four propositions proposed by the theory. According to the first proposition, people tend to evaluate they have been rewarded according to their efforts and in doing so they make certain comparisons with other people around them in the organization. According to second proposition, inequity exists when the ratio of the outcome and input of an individual and comparison others are perceived to be unequal. According to third proposition, distress appears as a result of inequity. An increase in inequity causes an increase in distress. Inequity can be in the form of both under reward and over reward and according to fourth proposition, how hard an individual will try to restore equity depends upon the degree of distress an individual has experienced. An individual will work hard to restore inequity if the distress experienced is greater, thereby reducing the distress.

For the purpose of re-establishing equity an individual uses variety of techniques that include changing the fellow employees, with whom comparison is made, dismissing the relationship or modifying or distorting the inputs and outcomes cognitively. This theory assumes that equity matters to everyone and the prediction about distress is based upon this premise. The general preference is that outcome to input ratios should be equal to that of the comparison other. This premise has been termed as the "norm of equity" (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Walster & Berscheid, 1978), and both laboratory studies (Austin & Walster, 1974; Messe, Dawson, & Lane, 1973) and field research (Finn & Lee, 1972; Goodman, 1974; Telly, French, & Scott, 1971) show support for the norm.

Yet, research into reward allocations i.e how individuals distribute outcomes among receivers has identified other norms that appear to contradict the norm of equity. Leventhal (1976) suggested three distribution rules that an individual might employ when allocating outcomes to others. The contribution rule suggests that others are rewarded outcomes in proportion to their inputs. According to needs rule others are rewarded based upon their legitimate needs, and lastly the equality rule, where others receive equal outcomes irrespective of their individual inputs. These distribution rules, as Mowday (1983) indicated, suggest that different norms govern the allocation of rewards. Also, a number of studies (Shapiro, 1975; Reis & Gruzen, 1976; Greenberg, 1978) have shown that allocators do not universally adhere to the equity norm when distributing outcomes to others. Thus, evidence suggests that the norm of equity has important exceptions, at least in terms of how one allocates to others.

The equity theory is especially valuable in diagnosing problem and suggesting solution to motivational problems. Embedded in equity theory are two key concepts that are social exchange and social comparison (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). We often see people involved in exchange relationships with other parties, this behavior is known as “social exchange”. When people tend to make comparisons with others regarding their exchanges and treatments, this behavior of the people is known as “social comparison”.

Justice judgment model. Justice judgment model is based upon three prime rules that are related to distributive justice. These rules are named as contribution rule, equality rule and need rule (Bos & Lind, 2002). There is a four stage sequence that is theorized by this model. These stages describe how fairness of outcome is evaluated by an individual. It is decided by the individual that out of four justice rules which rule would be appropriate for the use in certain situation and what value of outcome should be should be given to it.

The individual is also expected to estimate how much of the outcome the recipient deserves and the type of outcome is also specified. Later, the evaluations of the actual outcome and deserved outcome of the individual are compared, discrepancy shows inequity and this is how the fairness is estimated. According to Leventhal

(1980), distribution rules of the justice judgment model are applied by the individuals differently and they use different rules at different times, this is focal idea around which this model works.

Accordingly, the person's fundamental criteria to assess decency may differ across circumstances. Therefore, it is appropriate to say that it is different from equity theory because in equity theory only relevance of contribution rule is taken into account. On the other hand justice judgment model indicated the significance of different norms which are used to determine allocation and these norms define criteria by which equitable outcomes are dispersed (Bos & Lind, 2002). After it was found that the strategies that decide the outcomes are more compelling as compare to outcomes only, the accentuation has moved to procedural justice.

Procedural justice. According to Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry, (1980) and Thibaut and Walker (1975), there is another form of justice in which subordinates do not visualize justice as equitable distribution of inputs and outcomes rather they see justice as “procedures that are fair in nature and that lead to outcomes”. This dimension of justice is called procedural justice.

According to Nabatchi, Bingham, and Good, (2007) procedural justice involves what are the perceptions of the participants regarding the equity of rules and processes that are a part of a decision making procedure. In contrast, distributive justice is how an individual experiences satisfaction as a result of the outcome. There are various standards of procedural justice like reasons for decisions, impartiality, voice or chance to be heard (Bayles, 1990).

Tyler and Lind (1992) said that Procedural concerns for instance neutrality of the procedure increases procedural justice. Bies and Moag (1986) and Tyler and Lind (1992) explained that the way participants are treated may also effect procedural justice where as Tyler and Bies (1990) focused on the credibility of decision making body for alleviating procedural justice. Multiple researches supported that procedural justice leads to satisfaction of an employee (Tyler & Lind, 1992). According to Tyler and Lind (1992) the employees will be more contended, will have positive attitude

toward his or her employing organization if procedural justice is prevailing fairly in the organization.

Interactional justice. The idea of interactional justice is defined by organizational justice analysts as, how the employee is treated at interpersonal level and the treatment given to an employee when organizational procedures are taking place (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice deals with impartiality of those interactions that are not a part of procedural aspects of organizational behavior.

According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998) there are two dimensions of procedural justice, for instance, informational justice and interactional justice. Colquitt (2001) suggested that both of these dimensions of interactional justice have resemblance but they ought to be considered independently as they both influence justice perception but in a different manner.

Interactional justice incorporates different actions exhibiting social sensitivity for example when subordinates are treated with deference and nobility. According to Mikula, Petri, and Tanzer (1990) significant fraction of distributional or procedural problems were not considered by perceived injustice but these were referred in such a way in which people were treated at interpersonal levels when meetings and communications took place. Unlike institutionally sectioned formal procedures, interactional factors are under the discretion of the decision maker.

Bies and Folger (1989) identified two main dimensions of interactional justice; proper enactment of procedures and proper interpersonal treatment. Proper enactment of procedures refers to behavior that demonstrates the decision maker's integrity, such as the suppression of personal biases, timely feedback and justification for the decision. Proper interpersonal treatment refers to behavior that demonstrates the decision maker's interpersonal sensitivity, such as communicating in a truthful manner and giving respect to people. Furthermore, interactional justice is more strongly related deviant behaviors (Colquitt, Conlon, & Wesson, 2001).

Organizational Cynicism

Abraham (2000) defines Organizational cynicism as "a destructive attitude that an employee exhibit towards the organization in which he is employed". The

central conviction is that standards of trustworthiness, decency and earnestness are relinquished to facilitate the self-interests of the authority figure, encouraging activities in view of concealed thought processes and fraud.

Namie and Lutgen (2010) pointed out that it is very important to combat negativity both for the sake of employee and the organization. According to Cole, Bruch, and Vogel, (2006) cynicism is a type of an evaluative conclusion which originates as a result of an individual's occupational practices and proficiencies. Likewise, it is independent of how accurate or reliable the perception of the employee may be, on which the employee cynicism assumption is made, it is genuine in its outcomes.

Cole et al., (2006) proposed that studies on the construct of organizational cynicism are somewhat new and should not be mixed with the concept of Scepticism. Sceptics question the probability of accomplishment, however, are still sensibly confident that positive change will happen (Reicher, 1997). Sceptic manages queries regarding the feasibility of progress in accomplishing its expressed goal while the Cynics are not hopeful regarding the successfulness of any change (Stanley, Meyer, & Topolnytsky, 2005).

Dean et al., (1998) stated that cynicism incorporates disappointment, hindrance and a negative emotion which an individual has formed against his place of work. Organizational cynicism is not an innate characteristic rather it is a response that is learned (Wanous, Reichers, & Austin, 2000).

According to Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly (2003) organizational cynicism do not just include the sentiments that "adverse" individuals experience in the association, yet that it is basically moulded when certain encounters at workplace are experienced. Individuals don't actually choose to end up noticeably as cynics.

Reicher (1997) described that, organizational cynicism is specifically approved via organization's combined record of effective change and also by other individuals in the organizations who express comparable perspectives. Abraham (2000) and Kalimo and Taris (2003) proposed that cynicism is a type of reaction in

which employees become defensive and therefore it serves as a protection for employed workers against feelings accompanied by emotions that are strong enough and make them ready if any unavoidable disappointment occur in near future. Cynicism exists on a continuum and the degree of cynicism varies from person to person (Dean, 1998).

Dean et al., (1998) also suggested that for the purpose of communicating cynicism, there are two ways. Firstly, for example, through direct explanations, scrutinizing the trustworthiness of the association, this is an overt way. Secondly, by using ironic cleverness and non-verbal practices, for example, knowing looks, moving eyes, and grins, this is a covert way. Dean et al., (1998) said that cynicism can serve as a reaction to various aspects in an organization. These aspects include leadership, procedural injustice and power distribution.

According to Clark and Koonce (1995) downsizing and restructuring can cause cynicism in an organization. On the other hand corporate mergers and out placement are also responsible for giving rise to cynicism in an organization (Marks & Mirvis, 1997; Summerfield, 1996). Andersson (1996) proposed that when an executive gets highly compensated in the event of layoffs are then there are more chances of cynicism to take place.

Andersson and Bateman (1997) defined cynicism in a broader way and argued that cynicism is defined as a “situational” variable in most of the researches which means that it is subject to vary because of the factors in the organizational environment. Anderson and Bateman (1997) have explained it as an attitude which can be general to specific. The person faces both frustration and disappointment. It is also explained in terms of pessimistic sentiments and wariness for an individual, group, system, social tradition or foundation.

Dean et al., (1998) are of the same opinion about this conceptualization of the construct of cynicism. Dean et al., (1998) conceptualized cynicism as an attitude which is specifically negative in nature toward an organization in which an individual is employed. Tripartite model explained this negative attitude in three components. Firstly, the employee accepts that there is low level of honesty at his workplace.

Secondly, there are negative emotions in the employee for the employing organization. Thirdly, the employee tends to exhibit or display precarious behaviours at workplace. These behaviours are usually consistent and emerge as a result of experience negative emotions and cognitions.

The description put forth by Dean et al., (1998) became a valuable cornerstone to the literature on organizational cynicism. Cynicism can be recognized from other work environment ideas like job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust by utilizing the tripartite model of attitude. For example, in spite of the fact that job satisfaction may contain components of negative emotions and deriding and deviant workplace practices, since it is corresponding to one's occupation but not to one's employing organization, it likely would exclude a conviction that the organization does not possess honesty and truthfulness. An individual, who is not pleased with his job, might find alternative employment more satisfying in the same organization.

According to Hirschfeld and Field (1993) work alienation does not have belief component of tripartite model of attitudes, therefore it is not related to an employee's perceptions but it is somehow more related to one's occupation. According to Dean et al., (1998) the construct of organization commitment does not have the affective component of organizational cynicism therefore the employees who possess low level of organizational commitment will not be have an adverse approach or negative sentiments towards their organization.

Organizational cynicism is likewise not quite the same as trust. Trust is involved essentially of beliefs, lacking the emotional and behavioural segments (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). Cynicism is an attitude but trust is not (Dean et al., 1998). An individual faces cynicism when an unpleasant event is experienced by him. On the other hand, trust cannot be gained if the individual does not have sufficient knowledge about his organization (Dean at al., 1998). Despite of the fact that a new employee having less experience might be uncomfortable with the tasks proposed by the organization and hence will not have trust in his organization. There are other ways in which Tripartite model of attitudes is applicable to organizational cynicism.

According to Zanna and Rempel (1988) attitudes are subjective in nature that involves judgements about an object or an event that helps in development of social environments. Organizational cynicism does not need to be founded on actuality. The purposes for choices made by administration are frequently open to clarification, and what the laid-off labourer sees as self-serving benefit boost may undoubtedly be survival measures for a battling organization and the employees having high levels of organizational cynicism might be certain that the organization does not honour its employees which might be true.

Cascio (1995) reports that more organizations that downsize as such for vital reasons than as a measure to redress for lost benefits. It has additionally been demonstrated that individuals can have distinctive view of their organization's activities.

According to Brockner, Grover, Reed, DeWitt, and O'Malley, (1987) labourers who are downsized got indistinguishable benefits differed essentially in their impression of the procedural and distributive justice displayed by the organization. Accordingly, what makes a difference is that the labourer has cynicism toward the organization and it is not necessary that the cynicism should be reasonable and defensible. An employee can have varying levels of organizational cynicism at different times. It is possible that different levels of cynicism might exist among employees who are treated alike and work together in the same office.

Krosnick and Petty (1995) proposed that cynicism can be measured on its relative strength. Features that describe the relative strength of the organizational cynicism include determination, resistance, influence on information processing and judgements, resistance and ability to guide behaviour.

Dimensions of Organizational Cynicism

Cognitive. The cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism deals with the fact that employees tend to have some negative beliefs about the organization in which they are employed. These beliefs are responsible for making employee display cynical attitudes. Few of the beliefs that are included in cognitive dimension of

organizational cynicism involve that the organization is insincere, there is no equity in organization and nothing holds authenticity in the organization.

Basically, at the end of the organization there is no strong comprehension of hierarchical standards and rules by authority are disregarded by the individuals. Relations are being performed relying upon the individual intrigue and there is no trust in alternate workers in the association (Balıkçioğlu & Altay, 2014).

Affective. The affective dimension of the organizational cynicism deals with the negative emotions experienced by the employee as a result of cynicism. According to Yuksel (2015) the negative emotions depicted by the employee are mostly in the form of disregard, antagonism, frustration and humiliation.

Behavioral. This is the third dimension of organizational cynicism and according to this dimension; employees who depict skeptical attitudes create suspicious estimates about the proceedings that are yet to come in the organization. It is mostly expected that these cynics will display negative behavior which will dramatically affect the organizational environment and as well as other co-workers can be degraded and mortified (Kalagan & Aksu, 2010). Accordingly, these negative individuals utilize funniness and wry diversion to express their critical demeanors. In this way, with their critical states of mind, these individuals can deride with the authoritative purposes, can change their sets of responsibilities and can make offending remarks (Beduk & Kaygusuz, 2015).

Organizational Justice and Cynicism

According to Colquitt et al., (2001) all three dimensions of the perception of organizational justice are correlated with positive outcomes. These positive outcomes incorporate organizational trust, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees.

Dean et al., (1998) argued that if justice perceptions increase organizational commitment and organizational trust, it ought to decrease organizational cynicism. Colquitt and colleagues the results of the meta-analysis conducted by them showed

that low levels of the perceptions of justice in the organization are responsible for creating negative responses in an employee for the organization. In short, it can be said that higher levels of cynicism takes place when there is organizational justice at low levels.

Educational Organizations and Cynicism

According to Dorman (2003) cynicism has been rarely researched in educational institutes but construct of burnout is researched among the sample of teachers. According to research conducted by Dorman (2003) it is proved that secondary teachers show large amounts of stress when contrasted with other desk representatives.

Further Hock (1988) added that burned out teachers effect students negatively in case they continue to teach them. Abraham (2000) related these researches with organizational cynicism as it is somewhat similar to the period of depersonalization that takes place in the process of burnout.

Job Stress

According to Roberts, Lapidus, and Chonko, (1997) the construct of stress is elucidated differently across literature. Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau, (1975) have described it as a stimuli that have an effect on an individual. Additionally Selye (1982) said that stress comprise of a response that occurs when a demand is put on an individual. Moreover, Schuler (1980) defined stress as an external force that operates on an individual. Beehr and Newman (1978) explained job stress in the form of a condition which comprises of an employee's interaction with the factors of the job and effects the psychological functioning of the employee in such a way that affects his normal functioning and it becomes difficult for an employee to carry out tasks assigned to him.

Roberts, Lapidus, and Chonko, (1997) on the fact that actually the situation is not essentially stressful but how an individual interpret the situation as stressful originate stress.

Parasuraman and Alutto (1981) also agreed with the statement of Roberts, Lapidus, and Chonkom, (1997). Danna and Griffin (1999) further explained that, stress related stimuli provoke strain, which is defined as a response an individual gives to a stress. An individual experiences strain in three forms. It can be physical in nature, psychological or it can also be behavioral. Selye (1982) argued that it is not necessary that whenever an individual experiences stress it would result in negative ways, it can result in positive outcomes as well.

Transactional model of stress. Holroyd and Lazarus (1982) explained that the transactional model of stress outlines stress as emerging from the evaluation that specific demands from the surroundings are about to challenge an individual's personal assets, thereby threatening well-being.

This explanation about stress incorporates various themes that express the transactional idea of stress. Primarily, stress occurs when individual and environment interact with each other. How strong the transaction might be depends upon how it has been appraised by the individual. Lazarus, Leblond, and Mouchrif, (2001) described that the appraisal of the individual about the stressful situation creates a relational meaning in his mind that serves a dominant part to the process of stress.

Types of appraisals. Lazarus (1999) said that in order to evaluate a stressful event an individual uses two types of appraisal processes namely primary appraisal and secondary appraisal. These appraisals process oriented, firstly it identifies with what an individual thinks, these cognitions then lead to behaviour when a stressful encounter takes place. This process of appraisal is responsible for causing different feelings which define the nature of stress that an individual has experienced. Lazarus (2001) and Lazarus and Cohen (2001) additionally said that the process of appraising events cause an individual to experience different feelings that demonstrate the idea of unpleasant experience. These two types will be explained independently:

Primary appraisal. The first type of appraisal is primary appraisal. Lazarus and Cohen (2001) said that primary appraisal takes place when it is identified by an individual that there is something in question and it is necessary to deal with it. It is of vital importance that whether something is in question or not. It answers the question

of having a goal at stake and the possibility of one's own important values being involved or endangered. Lazarus (1999) further explained that this is the point where consideration about the essentialness of the experience and assesses it regarding its own significance.

There are three distinguished forms of primary appraisals. The first form is "hurt or misfortune" which identifies with an event that has just taken place. The second form of primary appraisal comprises of a "threat" which deals with the likelihood of some mischief and the third form consists of a "challenge" in which the individual draws in with the request. Originally there were three forms of primary appraisals as explained above but later forth form of appraisal was added which was depicted as "benefit", where advantage is being searched by people in a challenging experience (Lazarus & Cohen, 2001).

Dewe, O'Driscoll, and Cooper, (2012) suggested that appraisals are linked with discrete emotions and both positive and negative emotions are under prominence. Lazarus (1999) said that these appraisals function like a cognitive underpinning for the process of coping because an individual performs vigorous exploration for collecting information and giving meaning to it, the action is an outcome of this search and how the meaning is given to the information.

Secondary appraisal. In secondary appraisal the individual assesses his sources for overcoming the stressful situation (Lazarus & Cohen, 2001). The main focus over here is about the situation, the person asks himself what is possible about the situation (Lazarus, 1999). Coping is an important phenomenon through which an individual makes rapidly changing efforts (cognitive and behavioural) in order to manage demands (internal or external) that are viewed as threatening and overcoming it does not fall in the range of personal resources (Lazarus, 1999).

Types of coping. Folkman and Lazarus (1988) distinguished between two forms of coping strategies namely problem focussed coping strategies and emotion focussed coping strategies. In problem focussed coping the main focus or emphasis is on dealing with the stressful situation where as emotion focused coping is feeling

centred and attention is drawn on managing the feelings related to problem there by coping it.

Folkman and Moskowitz (2004) defined broad bush approach as categorization of coping strategies as problem focussed or emotion focussed coping. After that researchers gained interest in categorizing coping strategies in a variety of methods other than problem focussed and emotion focussed coping strategies.

Folkman (2013) added two other forms of coping namely meaning centred and relationship social coping. There is no mutual agreeableness to the categories of coping and it is yet to be explored. Anyways researchers do agree on this point that none of the classification is superior to the other one. The reason is behind this is each classification ought to be reflected in its own context of an unpleasant experience and how that experience is assessed by the individual because everyone makes different assessment out of the situation. Regardless of whether an agreement will ever be made to the way coping strategies ought to be characterized is a disputable subject because coping depends on the context in which it has taken place.

The job demands control support model. The underlying recommendation set forward by Karasek (1979) is alluded to as the Job Demands Control Model. The expression discretion was likewise utilized as an equivalent word for control. This model is a theory of work design. It was initially proposed by researcher Karasek (1979) and after that Theorell and Karasek (1996) continued working on it and expanded it as well. Karasek (1979) indicated that no doubt extreme employment burdens and stresses employee.

The stress can be physical and psychological. It influences the intensities of the stress experienced by an employee particularly psychological stress but these requests are not the most critical supporters of strain. Karasek (1979) also said that the control an individual has over stressful situation at workplace that is in question also determines how stressful an employee will get after experiencing such situation. In other words, there is an interactive effect among demands of the stressful situation and the control or discretion an individual has on demands. Hence it can be said that control buffer the relationship of demands and stress (Karasek, 1979).



A few issues stayed uncertain with deference of this model. The first issue was of the relationship of effect of demands and the control of an individual over it. Whether this relationship is additive or multiplicative in nature, Researchers are separated on this inquiry, and there is bolstering for the two perspectives. Another issue that arouse and remained un-determined was about the causal factor for stress reaction. There are mixed concepts regarding subjective and objective control for this issue.

In a few researches, researchers have utilized proxy variables to understand objective control in stressful situations. However, most of the researches that have worked on this model have primarily focussed on subjective control in stressful situations. Researchers have argued that as compare to any objective type of control, the control an individual have over stressful situation has more significance.

According to Beehr, Glaser, Canali, and Wallwey, (2001) there is significant positive correlation among subjective and objective control but these two types of control do not necessarily overlap with each other. Job Demand Control model is empirically valid and many studies have proved that control played a role of moderator and buffered the relationship of job demands and stress.

Still, there has been heated discussion or disagreement upon the generalization of this model, one of the latest studies by Panatik, O'Driscoll, and Andersson, (2011) did not find perceived job control as a moderator for the sample of Malaysian mechanical employees but found that the feeling of self-efficacy worked as a moderator and buffered the relationship among demands and stress. Non-western cultures are more collectivistic in nature. Hence, it is conceivable that western cultures which are more individualistic in nature find personal control more important as compare to non-western cultures.

JDC model was reformulated and another perspective was proposed by two group of researchers Johnson and Hall (1988) and Theorell and Karasek (1996). They have added another variable that called social support to other variables that will have an impact on an individual's stress level and psychosocial prosperity at organization.

When social support got added in the revised version the name of the model became the Job Demands Control and Support model of stress. It was proposed by Theorell and Karasek (1996) that supportive influences of control will be furthermore improved in a case when the employee will acquire social support from immediate work associates and boss.

Cooper, Dewe, and O'Driscoll, (2001) recommended that the extension of social support to the JDC model rest on comprehensive proof that this variable will definitely have a significant part in influencing stress in professionals. In spite of the fact, there has been huge discussion about the type of effect social support has over stress among employees. There are two views about it. According to first view the effect of social support over stress is direct which means that social support and stress are directly linked and the second view states that social support and stress are indirectly linked which means there is buffering effect of social support over stress. The second view about social support and stress makes natural sense but has not been accepted widely across literature (Cranford, 2004; Kickul & Posig, 2001).

Kickul and Posig (2001) proposed a different view about these variables which explains that social support and stress are negatively inter related with each other and sometimes there exist positive correlation among social support and stress. This is named as reverse buffering. Three way relations are also depicted in some studies among these variables. Group of researchers contended that the reason behind why social support and control have positive effect on reducing stress and strain thereby improving prosperity is that when an individual has enough social support and control then he or she becomes more empowered and hence adapt well to the stressors.

The stressors may include requests being put on at work place and these requests tend to mount up after some time (Daniels, Beesley, Cheyne, & Wimalasiri, 2008). It is observed that both types of coping namely problem focussed and emotional focussed are assisted by social support and control that an individual has over stressful situation. Reduction of dangerous conclusions, exhaustion and number of mistakes are some of the factors that are related to the coping strategies above mentioned (Daniels et al., 2008).

Many applications have been given by JCDM which are helpful for the employee and organization as well. The model recommends techniques for improving prosperity at work and diminishing the stress faced by employees and its adverse effects.

Relationship between Organizational Justice, Organizational Cynicism, Job Stress and Demographic Variables

It has been observed significant negative relationship of organizational justice with organizational cynicism and job stress across literature. It has been seen that the amount of researches that emphasis on organizational justice and job stress are meager. This is shocking but yet acceptable because these variables have been under research since the beginning of 1960's.

As we see across literature, Adams (1965) studied the negative reactions to unfair outcomes. In this study Adams (1965) defined psychological distress as a reaction which includes emotions of an individual and the distress is caused by unfair decision making in the organization. Adams (1965) also defined it in terms of negative behavior that psychological distress brings about and this behavior may include reduced effort in completing the assigned task.

According to Vermunt and Steensma (2005), Person's capacities are a standout amongst the most notable qualities of stress. These capacities are similar to entities that include traits of an individual. It is not possible for the individual to adapt more to his or her capacity. These capacities are mostly stable in nature. On the basis of the stability of individual capacities a new twist takes place for the unfair situation that has taken place and causes stress. Therefore, when the discrepancy exists between individual resources and the demands put forth by the individual, stress is likely to take place (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Because there is a relationship of stress with health, hence, there are many studies that have explored variables that are somewhat very similar to perceived stress. Study that was carried out by Greenberg (2006) demonstrated that those nurses that were insomniac and experienced a change in their pay were more stressful as

compare to control group of nurses that were also insomniac but did not experience a change in their pay. It is believed that those employees who find their organization as fair can ultimately trust that the organizational decisions are reached via fair and transparent manner, thereby reducing employees' feelings of mistrust, stress, and uncertainty (Robbins, 2012).

The study conducted by Judge and Colquitt (2004) states that there is a significant negative relationship of procedural and interpersonal justice. Work family conflict was used as a mediating variable and it mediated the relationship between procedural justice, interpersonal justice and stress. The stressors that were casted were injustice related to procedures; inter personal relationships and information on 174 faculty members of different universities. When justice was high the participants managed the interference of their family and work in a good way and as a result experienced lesser stress. Same results were observed when control for job satisfaction and organizational work family policies was established (Judge & Colquitt, 2004).

Research conducted by ÖZTÜRK, ERYEŞİL and BEDÜK (2016) on the Banking Sector of Turkey reports that organizational justice and organizational cynicism demonstrates statistically significant negative relationship with each other. According to Taxman and Gordon (2009), distributive justice and procedural justice, which are two aspects of organizational justice, correlate negatively with work related stress and organizational commitment. The sample they conducted researched on was of correctional officers.

Ahmed, Kyani and Hashmi conducted a research on organizational cynicism, organizational injustice and breach of psychological contract and hypothesized that these variables will cause deviant workplace behavior among doctors and nurses of Pakistan. The results of the study showed that there was a significant positive relationship between organizational cynicism, organizational injustice and deviant workplace behaviour (Ahmed, Hashmi, & Kyani, 2016).

The study on justice, cynicism, and commitment, indicates that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice correlate negatively with

organizational cynicism among employees working on the product line (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, & Walker, 2007). According to James, Ferris, and Hochwarter, (2005), organizational cynicism and job strain are positively correlated with each other. Same results were observed for the relation of cynicism with job tension and burnout.

According to Bateman & Andersson (1997) when an individual experience injustice in an indirect way then they are vulnerable to be more suspicious, distrustful and frustrated towards the organization.

According to Tyler and Lind (1992) when perceived injustice is carried out against single group member, it is not perceived as only against that member of a group rather it is taken as against all the other members of the group as well. There for in such cases each member of the group is likely to take the unfair treatment personally. As a result the individual is likely to have feelings of cynicism and frustration due to indirect unfairness that is faced.

James, Ferris, and Hochwarter, (2005) studied how organizational cynicism brought forth positive and negative effects among employees of educational sector like teachers, administrative staff, principal etc. The results of his study revealed that perceived organizational justice was significantly negatively related to organizational cynicism.

The research conducted by Shaharruddin, Ahmad, and Muhaizam, (2016) On “Cynicism in Organizations: Does Organizational Justice Matter?” revealed that organizational justice negatively influenced organizational cynicism, where organizational cynicism may decrease if organizational justice is high. Additionally, procedural justice was found to be the strongest organizational justice dimension that negatively related with organizational cynicism.

According to Tayfur, Bayhan Karapinar, and Metin Camgoz, (2013) employees who perceived procedural injustice are more likely to have negative feelings and cynical attitude. As a result, employees tend to develop cynical attitudes.

Thus, procedural justice is important to shape employee attitudes. This is because procedural justice is a symbol that employees are valued by the organizations.

Past findings have specifically examined that interactional justice was positively associated to trust (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Barling and Phillips, 1993) and negatively related to workplace deviance (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999) and withdrawal behaviour (Barling & Philips, 1993). The findings of the employee wellbeing research among the non-professionals workers which was conducted by a group of researcher in Spain indicates that the lowest levels of burnout were observed in situation where employees perceive a fair treatment (Moliner, Martinez-Tur, Peiro, Ramos, & Cropanzano, 2013).

In study conducted by Strom, Sears and Kelly (2014), it is stated that employees work related behaviours and attitudes are strongly influenced by perceptions of distributive justice. Another study reports that organizational justice acts as a source of motivation, which allows employees to trust and to keep respect toward their organization even during unstable situations (Manaf, Latif, & Ali, 2014)

According to Tata and Bowes-Sperry (1996), as compare to women, men are likely to be more affected by distributive justice in an organization. They also observed differences in interactional justice among men and women and concluded that women value interpersonal components of procedural justice more than men. These include respect for rights and being kind with each other. Men reported being less likely to take into account interactional justice while assessing the fairness of wages/salary as compare to women.

Major (1989) reported in his research that men are more sensitive to work place equity as compare to women. According to Major (1989) women's preference for giving more than they receive in the workplace may be a function of status differences between men and women that result in objectively lower rewards for women despite similar inputs. Thus, the variance in equity sensitivity scores may reflect not gendered preferences but, instead, acquiescence on the part of low-status individuals.

Brockner and Adsit (1986) explored gender difference in satisfaction with an exchange relationship on the perception of the equity of that relationship. They found that satisfaction with an exchange relationship was more strongly related to perceptions of equity among men as compare to women. As predicted, the relationship of equity and satisfaction was considerably more pronounced for male than female.

According to Inoue et al., (2010) procedural justice and interactional justice have significant negative relationship with psychological distress. They also explored relationship of procedural justice and interactional justice with marital status and reported that married males and females scored high on procedural and interactional justice as compared to unmarried males and females.

Rationale of the Present Study

The present study will bring forth the relationship between organizational justice, organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers of Islamabad an Rawalpindi. It has been seen from previous account that the phenomenon of organizational justice has gained increasing importance, as the trends towards restructuring, globalization and strong international competition continue. Hence organizations are increasingly pressured to make rapid changes and accommodations to their workforce. The implications for ethical practices are of great concern. The understanding of how individuals react to organizational actions and how these reactions ultimately effects organizational cynicism and job stress is of growing importance as the workforce is engaging in closer scrutiny of such actions. The subject of research has come under discussion from different perspectives by a number of researchers in various sectors like manufacturing, banking, and public sector etc. However, a limited research exists on educational sector organizations. Particularly, in a developing country like Pakistan, where a large number of educational sector organizations are playing an essential role in development of the country in different dimensions, organizational justice being the corner stone of any organization's success needs further insights. This will help us to reach to viable conclusions for future guidance. The existence of organizational justice or otherwise has its bearing on the performance of its employees, because the individual performance of each and every member of the organization leads towards overall performance of the organization to achieve its goals. Keeping this background in view

this study was planned to have further insights with respect to the impact of organizational justice on employee so as to reach to viable conclusions for future guidance.

On the other hand organizational cynicism is new emerging variable in psychological inquiry that needs immediate attention for the research purposes and exploring this variable as an effect of injustice is necessary need of the time in Pakistani context. Similarly there have been more industrial and organizational psychology research on banking, telecommunication and industrial sector and less importance is given to educational sector. Hence, I wanted to contribute where less contribution is given. We have seen that many teachers face organizational injustice and as a result they face organizational cynicism and job stress. In order to bring about awareness about injustice and its negative effects on organizational environment, this study has been conducted. Limitations of the past researchers were accounted in this study. There by filling the gap in the literature.

Job stress is ever growing phenomenon in Pakistani context and has to be assessed as a result of organizational injustice. So that higher authorities can become aware of the crucial effects of the injustice i-e organizational cynicism and job stress, and treat them fairly and as a result bring forth a good working environment in which justice is kept as a key component where compromise is not possible.

METHOD

METHOD

Objectives

Following are the objectives of the present study:

1. To explore the relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers.
2. To explore the relationship of gender differences, job status, educational differences, age differences, marital status and job experience in relation to distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers.

Hypotheses

1. Distributive justice will have negative correlation with organizational cynicism among college and university teachers.
2. Procedural justice will have negative correlation with organizational cynicism among college and university teachers.
3. Interactional justice will have negative correlation with organizational cynicism among college and university teachers.
4. Distributive justice will have negative correlation with job stress among college and university teachers.
5. Procedural justice will have negative correlation with job stress among college and university teachers.



6. Interactional justice will have negative correlation with job stress among college and university teachers.

7. Organizational cynicism and job stress will have positive correlation among college and university teachers.

Operational Definitions of Variables

Distributive justice. Folger and Cropanzano (1998) described distributive justice as the perceived fairness of the outcomes. These outcomes are received by individuals from organization. In the present study it was assessed by Organizational Justice Scale by Lim (2002). This scale has 3 subscales that are distributive justice subscale, procedural justice subscale and interactional justice subscale. Higher scores on the distributive justice subscale indicate high level of distributive justice whereas low scores indicate low level distributive justice.

Procedural justice. Nabatchi, Bingham, and Good, (2007) defined procedural justice as how the employees perceive fairness related to rules through which procedures are regulated. In the present study it was assessed by Organizational Justice Scale by Lim (2002). This scale has 3 subscales that are distributive justice subscale, procedural justice subscale and interactional justice subscale. Higher scores on the procedural justice subscale indicate high level of procedural justice whereas low scores indicate low level procedural justice.

Interactional justice. Interpersonal relations are carried out from employee Bies and Moag (1986) have defined interactional justice as how interpersonal treatment is carried out in the organization during the enactment of procedures. In the present study it was assessed by Organizational Justice Scale by Lim (2002). This scale has 3 subscales that are distributive justice subscale, procedural justice subscale and interactional justice subscale. Higher scores on the interactional justice subscale indicate high level of interactional justice whereas low scores indicate low level interactional justice.

Organizational cynicism. According to Abraham (2000) the term organizational cynicism is defined as a negative attitude an individual possess against the organization in which he is employed. In cynicism following things are sacrificed for instance equity, morality and genuineness of employees. The employees become more self-involved which lead to such behaviours and activities that centred on deception and hidden drives. In the present study it was assessed by Organizational Cynicism Scale (Dean et al., 1998). Higher scores on organizational cynicism subscales (Affective, Cognitive and emotional) will indicate higher level of organizational cynicism.

Job stress. It is a subjective feeling that results due to work requests that are put on individual and the individual also faces the feeling of being unable to adapt to the stressful situations (Folkman & Lazarus, 1991). In the present study it was assessed by Job Stress Scale by Parker and De Cotiis (1983). Higher score on Job Stress Scale determined higher level of job stress.

Sample

The sample consisted of college and university teachers working in different colleges and universities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The total numbers of respondents were 201 comprising of 66 college teachers and 134 university teachers. The mean age of the sample was 36.25 and SD .50 whereas mean job experience of the sample was 6.41 and SD 6.02.

Table 1*Sample demographic description for study (N = 201)*

Demographics	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	105	52.2
Female	96	47.8
Total	201	100
Education		
Graduate	17	8.5
Post Graduate	184	91.5
Total	201	100
Marital status		
Single	66	32.8
Married	135	67.2
Total	201	100
Job Designation		
Lecturer	144	71.6
Assistant Professor	35	17.4
Associate Professor	12	6.0
Professor	10	5.0
Total	201	100
Education comparison		
College teacher	105	52.2
University teacher	96	47.8
Total	201	100

Table 1 describes how the sample is distributed on the basis of demographic variables for example gender, education, marital status, job designation and education comparison.

Instruments

Organizational Justice Scale. Organizational Justice Scale by (Lim, 2002) was used for assessing level of organizational justice among college and university teachers of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The scale consisted of 17 items. Organizational Justice Scale has three subscales that measured distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Five point likert scale (1 stands for *strongly agree* and 5 stands for *strongly disagree*) was used. The score ranged from 13 - 65. There was no reverse item in the scale. Distributive justice subscale had alpha reliability of .81 whereas procedural justice subscale and interactional justice subscale both had alpha reliability of .80 and .80, respectively. The subscale of distributive justice consisted of items from 1-5. The subscale of procedural justice consisted of items from 6-12. The subscale of interactional justice consisted of items from 13-17.

Organizational Cynicism Scale. For measuring the construct of organizational cynicism the Scale of Organizational Cynicism was utilized which was developed by Dean et al., (1999). The items were rated on 5 point Likert scale ranging from 5 (*strongly agree*), to 1 (*strongly disagree*). The alpha reliability of the scale was found to be .77. The total number of items was 13 and score on this scale ranged from 13 to 65.

Job Stress Scale. The scale of Job Stress by Parker and De Cotiis (1983) was utilized and the alpha reliability of the scale was found to be .77, which was adequate hence it was used for the research purpose (Jamal & Baba, 2000). The scale comprised of 13 items. The minimum and maximum score of the scale were 13 and 65 respectively.

Procedure

In order to carry out the research various universities and colleges were mapped out for the purpose of convenience. After this, permission was taken from head of the departments and teachers for the purpose of data collection. The teachers who agreed upon participating in the study were informed about the whole process verbally. Informed consent was taken from every participant and it was made sure that the information of the teachers will be kept confidential. They were also told that they

can quit from the study anytime because participation in the study is solely their own choice. Instructions were given to the participants regarding questionnaires and the research purpose so that they give accurate and genuine data. Their queries were answered immediately in simple language that was understandable. After the completion of each data set the respondent was thanked for their time and participation in the study and well wishes were given. After the collection of data, analysis process was carried out on SPSS software.

RESULTS

RESULTS

The present study was carried out to examine the relationship between Organizational Justice (Distributive, Procedural and Interactional), Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress among college and university teachers of Rawalpindi and Islamabad. It also aimed to study these variables with respect to demographic variables including gender, age, job status, job experience, marital status, job designation and education. The study aims to provide a view of various occupational differences among university and college teachers. First of all descriptive were computed by using following measures like reliability co-efficient, skewness, kurtosis, mean and SD. In order to study the relation between study variables, correlation was applied. Furthermore, for investigating inferential statistics, ANOVA, *t*-test and regression was applied in relation to various demographic variables. *t*-test was used to find out whether there exist mean differences across gender, single and married employees, graduate and post graduate employees and college teachers and university teachers on Organizational Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress. Regression was used to explore whether age and job experience have an impact on the variables of the study.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Co-efficient and Skewness for Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Scales	No. of items	A	M	SD	Range		skewness	Kurtosis
					Potential	Actual		
DJT	5	.81	15.60	4.70	5-25	6-25	-.09	-1.31
PJT	7	.80	21.71	6.86	7-35	7-35	.00	-1.15
IJT	5	.80	16.80	4.56	6-30	5-34	-.41	-.21
OCT	13	.77	38.96	10.85	13-65	13-60	-.14	-.99
JST	13	.77	38.36	11.40	13-65	14-62	-.08	-1.16

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for all the variables used in the study. Mean score for Distributive Justice is 15.60 and ranges from 5-25. Mean score for Procedural Justice is 21.71 and ranges from 7-35. Mean score for Interactional justice is 16.80 and ranges from 6-30. Mean score for Organizational Cynicism is 38.96 and ranges from 13-65. Mean score for Job Stress is 38.36 and ranges from 13-65.

The mean values of all the subscales of Organizational Justice shows that the maximum value is obtained on Procedural Justice that is 21.71 and the minimum is for Distributive Justice that is 15.60 that represent more reporting of Procedural Justice in present sample. Procedural Justice has highest SD value that is 6.86 which shows much variability in responses and Interactional Justice has lowest SD value that is 4.56 that represent homogeneity in responses of participants. All the values of skewness are in normal range i-e (-1 to +1) so the data is normally distributed on the other hand kurtosis for all scales is in normal range i-e (-3 to +3).

Table 3*Correlation among Study Variables (N =201)*

Variables	DJT	PJT	IJT	CYNT	JST
DJT	-	.83**	.52**	-.70**	-.63**
PJT		-	.50**	-.65**	-.60**
IJT			-	-.50**	-.42**
CYNT				-	.80**
JST					-

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress. (** $p < .01$)

To study the relationship between Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress Pearson Product Moment Correlation was computed (see Table 3).

Distributive Justice is significantly negatively correlated with Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress. Procedural Justice is significantly negatively correlated with Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress. Interactional Justice is significantly negatively correlated with Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress. Organizational Cynicism is significantly positively related to Job Stress.

Table 4

Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Distributive Justice on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Distributive Justice					
Variables	B	S.E	B	95% CI	
				UL	LL
Constant	64.02	1.91		60.25	67.80
CYN	-1.61	.12	-.70	-1.84	-1.40
R ²	.49				
F	187.90***				
Constant	62.29	2.17		58.02	66.55
JS	-1.54	.13	-.63	-1.80	-1.30
R ²	.40				
F	133.16***				

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 4 illustrates linear regression analysis with Distributive Justice as a predictor variable. The table suggests that Distributive Justice significantly predict Organizational Cynicism negatively. The table also indicates that Distributive Justice significantly predict Job Stress negatively.

Table 5

Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Procedural Justice on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Procedural Justice					
Variables	B	S.E	B	95% CI	
				UL	LL
Constant	61.31	1.93		57.50	65.13
CYN	-1.03	.08	-.65	-1.20	-.90
R ²	.43				
F	146.95***				
Constant	59.96	2.16		55.74	64.20
JS	-.99	.09	-.60	-1.18	-.81
R ²	.36				
F	111.52***				

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 5 illustrates linear regression analysis with Procedural Justice as a predictor variable. The table suggests that Procedural Justice significantly predict Organizational Cynicism negatively. The table also indicates that Procedural Justice significantly predict Job Stress negatively.

Table 6

Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Interactional Justice on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Interactional Justice					
Variables	B	S.E	B	95% CI	
				UL	LL
Constant	58.97	2.54		53.96	63.99
CYN	-1.20	1.46	-.50	-1.50	-.90
R ²	.25				
F	66.72***				
Constant	56.06	2.80		50.55	61.60
JS	-1.05	.16	-.42	-1.40	-.74
R ²	.18				
F	43.06***				

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 6 illustrates linear regression analysis with Interactional Justice as a predictor variable. The table suggests that Interactional Justice significantly predict Organizational Cynicism negatively. The table also indicates that Interactional Justice significantly predict Job Stress negatively.

Table 7

Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Age on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Age					
Variables	B	S.E	B	95% CI	
				UL	LL
Constant	42.60	3.85		34.98	50.17
CYN	-.10	.10	-.07	-.31	.11
R ²	.00				
F	.92				
Constant	41.60	4.05		33.60	49.60
JS	-.09	.11	-.06	-.31	.13
R ²	.00				
F	.66				

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 7 illustrates linear regression analysis with Age as predictor variable. The table suggests that Age has non-significant effect on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress.

Table 8

Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Job Experience on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress (N = 201)

Job Experience					
Variables	B	S.E	B	95% CI	
				LL	UL
Constant	40.08	1.12		37.87	42.28
CYN	-.18	.13	-.10	-.43	.08
R ²	.01				
F	1.90				
Constant	42.60	3.85		34.98	50.20
JS	-.10	.10	-.07	-.31	.11
R ²	.00				
F	.92				

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress

Table 8 illustrates linear regression analysis with Job experience as predictor variable. The table suggests that Job Experience has non-significant effect on Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress.

Table 9*Mean Difference across Gender on Study Variables (N = 201)*

Variables	Men (n = 105)		Women (n = 96)		<i>t</i> (199)	<i>P</i>	95% CI	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
DJT	15.90	4.40	15.22	5.00	1.03	.30	-.62	1.99
PJT	22.13	6.25	21.24	7.50	.92	.36	-1.02	2.81
IJT	16.90	4.22	16.66	4.91	.37	.71	-1.03	1.51
CYNT	38.72	10.23	39.21	11.53	.32	.75	-3.51	2.54
JST	37.85	10.25	38.93	12.56	.67	.50	-4.26	2.10

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 9 illustrates the results of the *t*-test for measuring gender differences among all the study variables. The mean scores on all variables showed non-significant differences on gender for men and women.

Table 10*Mean differences across Marital Status on Study Variables (N = 201)*

Variables	Single		Married		<i>t</i> (199)	<i>P</i>	95% CI	
	<i>(n</i> = 66)		<i>(n</i> = 134)				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
DJT	14.91	4.90	15.96	4.60	1.50	.14	-2.43	.34
PJT	21.17	7.43	22.06	6.52	.87	.40	-.292	1.13
IJT	16.97	4.28	16.74	4.70	.34	.74	-1.12	1.58
CYNT	39.95	11.22	38.37	10.64	.98	.33	-1.62	4.80
JST	39.21	12.02	37.83	11.05	.81	.42	-1.99	4.76

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 10 illustrates the results of *t*-test for measuring marital status differences on all the study variables. The mean score for all variables showed non-significant differences on marital status for single and married college and university teachers.

Table 11*Mean Difference across Education on Study Variables (N = 201)*

Variables	Graduate		Post Graduate		<i>t</i> (199)	<i>P</i>	95% CI	
	(n = 17)		(n = 184)				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
DJT	15.35	3.50	15.60	4.80	.21	.84	-2.60	2.11
PJT	20.47	6.37	21.82	6.91	.78	.44	-4.80	2.10
IJT	17.60	6.28	16.70	4.38	.75	.45	-1.40	3.16
CYNT	36.41	11.90	39.19	10.74	1.01	.31	-8.20	2.64
JST	36.94	13.90	38.50	11.17	.53	.60	-7.26	4.15

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress.

Table 11 illustrates the results of *t*-test for measuring education differences on all the study variables. The mean scores on all the variables showed non-significant differences on education for graduate and post graduate college and university teachers.

Table 12*Mean Difference across Education Comparison on Study Variables (N = 201)*

Variables	Col Teachers		Uni Teachers		<i>t</i> (199)	<i>P</i>	95% CI		Cohn's <i>d</i>
	<i>(n</i> = 66)		<i>(n</i> = 134)				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
DJT	15.02	4.80	16.20	4.55	1.77	.08	-2.47	.13	
PJT	21.00	7.15	22.50	6.50	1.53	.13	-3.38	.43	
IJT	15.44	4.70	18.25	3.93	4.60	.00	-4.02	-1.60	.65
CYNT	40.05	11.45	37.80	10.07	1.50	.14	-.72	5.30	
JST	39.76	11.30	36.83	11.40	1.83	.07	-.23	6.10	

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress; Col Teachers = College Teachers; Uni Teachers = University Teachers.

Table 12 illustrates that there was a significant mean difference found on the scale of Interactional Justice used in the study and university teachers scored high on this scale as compare to college teachers. The table clearly indicates a large effect size of education comparison on Interactional Justice. For Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress scales, the mean differences were non-significant.

Table 13

Analysis of Variance for the Effect of Job Designation on Variables of the study (N = 201)

Variables	Lecturer (n = 144)		Assistant Professor (n = 35)		Associate Professor (n = 12)		Professor (n = 10)		F	p	95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL
DJT	15.40	4.88	16.08	4.88	16.41	4.62	16.70	3.86	.42	.69	14.98	16.32
PJT	21.83	8.09	21.74	7.18	22.00	6.91	23.40	5.12	.13	.90	20.83	22.98
IJT	16.60	5.07	17.85	3.93	16.42	3.34	18.10	2.38	.93	.42	16.23	16.54
CYNT	38.79	11.45	39.71	10.10	39.00	7.06	38.60	9.04	.07	.98	37.45	40.46
JST	38.48	11.99	37.35	10.05	38.33	10.02	42.10	6.71	.45	.72	36.88	40.04

Note. DJ = Distributive Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; IJ = Interactional Justice; OC = Organizational Cynicism; JS = Job Stress

Table 13 illustrates One-way ANOVA for the effect of Job Designation (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor) on all the study variables. Results indicate non-significant differences among the categories of Job Designation on study variables.

DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

The current study was undertaken to examine how the perceived fairness of ones outcomes which is known as distributive justice, the degree of the fairness of the process by which disputes are given in an organization known as procedural justice, and degree to which the people affected by decision are treated by dignity and respect known as interactional justice, have an impact on negative attitude of an employee towards the organization in which he is employed termed as organizational cynicism and job stress which can be defined as harmful physical and emotional responses that take place when there exist a discrepancy between requirements of the job and resources of the employee.

In order to conduct the study, reliability analysis was carried out for the instruments that were going to be used. The scales of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice had reliability .81, .80 and .80 respectively. Organizational cynicism scale had reliability .77 and job stress scale also had the reliability of .77, Hence the reliabilities of these scales were within the range of .65 - .95 therefore these scales were appropriate for the study to be carried out.

The first hypothesis of the present study was that “there will be significantly negative relationship between distributive justice and organizational cynicism among college and university teachers”. This hypothesis was accepted by the results (see Table 3) as there was found to be a significant negative relationship between distributive justice and organizational cynicism ($p < .01$). Cropanzano and Ambrose (2015) also showed similar results in their study i-e distributive justice had significant negative relationship with organizational cynicism.

The second hypothesis of the present study was that “there will be significantly negative relationship between procedural justice and job stress among college and university teachers”. This hypothesis was accepted by the results (see Table 3) as there was significant negative relationship between procedural justice and organizational cynicism ($p < .01$). Cropanzano and Ambrose (2015) have highlighted

that there is a significant negative relationship between procedural justice and organizational cynicism.

The third hypothesis of the present study was that “there will be significantly negative relationship between interactional justice and job stress among college and university teachers”. This hypothesis was also accepted as showed in Table 3. There was a significant negative relationship between interactional justice and organizational cynicism ($p < .01$). The same study by Cropanzano and Ambrose (2015) have studied the effect of interactional justice on organizational cynicism and reported negative relationship among variables.

Next three hypotheses of the study were related to the relationship of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice with job stress. It was hypothesized that all three types of organizational justice will be significantly negatively related to job stress ($p < .01$) among college and university teachers. The results proved the hypotheses right and hence it was accepted (see Table 3). The study by Tepper (2001) also shows that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have negative relationship with job stress.

The last hypothesis of the present study was about the relationship of organizational cynicism and job stress. It was hypothesized that both of the variables will have significant negative relationship with each other among college and university teachers. The results accepted the hypothesis (see Table 3). There was significant positive relationship of organizational cynicism with job stress ($p < .01$). Koçoglu (2014) also showed similar results in his study which was aimed at exploring the role of cynicism as a mediator of relationship between job stress and work alienation. All of the seven hypotheses were accepted and had a good literature base as well.

Furthermore linear regression analysis was carried out in order to check whether distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice significantly predict organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers. Linear regression analysis of distributive justice with organizational cynicism gave value of R^2 that was found to be .50 which indicated that 50% of the variance in

organizational cynicism can be explained by the predictor variable distributive justice. Similarly for job stress value of R^2 was found to be .63, which indicated that 63% of the variance in job stress can be explained by the predictor variable distributive justice.

The second predictor variable for organizational cynicism and job stress was procedural justice which also showed significant results. The value of R^2 for procedural justice as a predictor of organizational cynicism and job stress was found to be .43 and .36 respectively. These values indicate that 43% of the variance in organizational cynicism can be explained by procedural justice where as 36% of the variance in job stress can be explained by procedural justice among college and university teachers.

The third predictor variable for organizational cynicism and job stress was interactional justice which also showed significant results. The value of R^2 for interactional justice as a predictor of organizational cynicism and job stress was found to be .25 and .18 respectively which indicated that 25% of the variance in organizational cynicism can be explained by predictor variable interactional justice where as 18% of the variance in job stress can be explained by predictor variable interactional justice among college and university teachers. Hence linear regression analysis proved all the three types of organizational justice as a significant predictor of organizational cynicism and job stress.

In order to explore whether age and job experience predict organizational cynicism and job stress among college and university teachers, linear regression analysis was carried out. The results showed non-significant results hence indicating that age and job experience do not predict organizational cynicism and job stress in the mentioned sample.

Furthermore Independent sample t -test was used to explore gender, education, marital status and education comparison differences among college and university teachers. The $p > .05$ indicated non-significant mean differences of gender, education and marital status among college and university teachers whereas there was a

significant mean difference among education comparison found on the scale of interactional justice used in the study and university teachers scored high on this scale as compare to college teachers. Which indicated that university teacher have more of interactional justice as compare to college teachers.

In the end One-way ANOVA was used to determine whether there exist any differences among job designation with respect to study variables. Job designation was divided into four categories i-e Lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors for college and university teachers. Results indicated non-significant differences among categories of job designation and study variables.

Conclusion

This study completed an effort to inspect the relationship among distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress. In order to examine the relationship 201 college and university teachers were taken as a sample for the present study from Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The research focused on various hypotheses; which focused on relationship the relationship of above mentioned study variables. Following results were obtained proving the hypothesized relationships among study variables as true. There was negative and significant relationship between types of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice) and organizational cynicism. There was negative and significant relationship between types of justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice) and job stress. On the other hand, there was significant positive relationship between organizational cynicism and job stress. It has been concluded that organizational justice is an essential component for the success of an organization as it results in lesser organizational cynicism and job stress. In order to enhance the construct of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice in an organization, training and workshops should be arranged in collaboration with I/O psychologist thereby bringing forth positive outcomes.

Limitations and Suggestions

No matter how well the study has been conducted there are always some limitations that exist. The present study also had some limitations which will be explained further.

The study aimed at finding the relationship of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and job stress among college and university teachers. This was a correlational approach towards exploring the relationships among variables of the study. The questionnaires used were self-report inventories which had increased chances of biasness towards responses. Qualitative approach could give an in depth understanding of the variables or mixed method approach could be used as well.

The sampling technique that was used was convenient sampling. The sample was taken only from the college and universities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi which represents only a part of a whole country. Hence generalizing the results to other parts of the country is difficult on the other hand larger sample size could give more generalized results. The present study had sample of 201 which is a small sample size. The target sample of the study was college and university teachers, which is a single occupational group. More occupational groups can be studied and more variations can be obtained. There were different number of college and university teachers in each category of job designation (lecturer, assistant professors, associate professors and professors). Equal ratio among job designation and male and female college teachers was not selected. It is suggested that equal ratio should be taken in order to generalize the results to population. Furthermore, social desirability is another area of concern and it could have inflated the results of the study if the respondents have biased their self-reports in an admirable way.

For future researches that aim at exploring the variable of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress, some of the suggestions are given. Firstly, larger sample size should be taken from diverse cities and numerous colleges and universities in order to increase the validity of the study. Secondly, more demographic variables can be taken for the purpose of analysis in future researches. Thirdly, qualitative approach towards studying these variables can give more precise results. Lastly other variables like organizational citizenship behaviour, perceived organizational support and organizational virtuousness can also be explored with organizational justice, organizational cynicism and job stress.

Implications

The present study is a source of information concerning the relationship of all the study variables with each other i-e distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress. This study brings forth a new variable i-e organizational cynicism in relation to types of justice and job stress in Pakistani literature. Distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational cynicism and job stress are important study variables of organizational behaviour.

With respect to the findings of the present study, it is important that an organization should value and practice procedural, distributive and interactional justice in order to decrease the cynical behaviour of the employees working in the employing organization. In case of decreasing job stress of employees it is evident that an organization should have justice and lesser cynicism. To increase organizational justice and decrease organizational cynicism and job stress in employees, this should be introduced to the HR specialist of the organization, this study will help HR manager to bring about organizational justice in the organization with more committed and stressed free workforce that would be facing lesser cynicism. The findings of the current study give new avenues to the researchers to explore these variables with other sample, culture and targeted population.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269-292
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422-436.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2(1), 267-299.
- Ahmed, W., Kiyani, A. A., & Hashmi, S. H. (2013). The study on organizational cynicism, organizational injustice and breach of psychological contract as the determinants of deviant work behavior. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 140(2), 145-154.
- Alsalem, M., & Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between organizational justice and employees performance. *Aledari*, 108(1), 97-110.
- Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11), 1395-1418.
- Andersson, L. M., & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 449-469.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(7), 1073-1091.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
- Austin, W., & Walster, E. (1974). Reactions to confirmations and disconfirmations of expectancies of equity and inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(2), 208-216.
- Balıkçioğlu, S., & Altay, H. (2014). Determining the relationship between the attitudes of organizational cynicism and commitment of the employees in hospitality. *AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(14), 133-157.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology*, 127(6), 649-656.

- Bayles, M. D. (1990). The limits of law. *Procedural Justice* (141-162). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review I. *Personnel psychology*, 31(4), 665-699.
- Beehr, T. A., Glaser, K. M., Canali, K. G., & Wallwey, D. A. (2001). Back to basics: Re-examination of demand-control theory of occupational stress. *Work & Stress*, 15(2), 115-130.
- Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), 303-326.
- Bies, R. J., Moag, J. F., Lewicki, R. J., Sheppard, B. H., & Bazerman, M. H. (1986). *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*. Greenwich, London: JAI Press.
- Brockner, J., & Adsit, L. (1986). The moderating impact of sex on the equity-satisfaction relationship: A field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 585-590.
- Brockner, J., Grover, S., Reed, T., DeWitt, R., & O'Malley, M. (1987). Survivors' reactions to layoffs: We get by with a little help for our friends. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(4), 526-541.
- Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). Organizational change cynicism: The role of employee involvement. *Human Resource Management*, 47(4), 667-686.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French Jr, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau Jr, S. R. (1975). Job demands and worker health (Department of Health, Education and Welfare Publication No. 75-160). *Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*.
- Carrell, M. R., & Dittrich, J. E. (1978). Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations, and new directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(2), 202-210.
- Cascio, W. F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? *American Psychologist*, 50(11), 928-939.
- Clark, J., & Koonce, R. (1995). Engaging organizational survivors. *Training & Development*, 49(8), 22-31.

- Cole, M. S., Bruch, H., & Vogel, B. (2006). Emotion as mediators of the relations between perceived supervisor support and psychological hardiness on employee cynicism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 463-484.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & 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.
- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). *Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications*. California, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cranford, J. A. (2004). Stress buffering or stress exacerbation? Social support and social undermining as moderators of the relationship between perceived stress and depressive symptoms among married people. *Personal Relationships*, 11(1), 23-40.
- Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M. L., Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Procedural and distributive justice are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organization justice* (pp. 119-151). California, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Daniels, K., Beesley, N., Cheyne, A., & Wimalasiri, V. (2008). Coping processes linking the demands-control-support model, affect and risky decisions at work. *Human Relations*, 61(6), 845-874.
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357-384.
- Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management review*, 23(2), 341-352.
- Dewe, P., O'Driscoll, M., & Cooper, C. (2012). Theories of psychological stress at work. In R. J. Gatchel, & I. Z. Schultz (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health and wellness* (pp.23-38). New York, NY: Springer.

- Dewey, C. M., Cenik, B., Sephton, C. F., Dries, D. R., Mayer, P., Good, S. K., & Yu, G. (2011). TDP-43 is directed to stress granules by sorbitol, a novel physiological osmotic and oxidative stressor. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, *31*(5), 1098-1108.
- Dorman, J. (2003). Testing a model for teacher burnout. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, *3*(1), 35-47.
- Finn, R. H., & Lee, S. M. (1972). Salary equity: Its determination, analysis, and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *56*(4), 283-292.
- Fleming, P. (2005). Workers' playtime boundaries and cynicism in a "culture of fun" program. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *41*(3), 285-303.
- Folger, R. G., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. California, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Folkman S. (2013) *Stress: Appraisal and Coping*. In: Gellman M.D., Turner J.R. (Eds) *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Folkman, S. (1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: a theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 839-852.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). The relationship between coping and emotion: Implications for theory and research. *Social Science & Medicine*, *26*(3), 309-317.
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2004). Coping: Pitfalls and promise. *Annual Rev. Psychology*, *55*(1), 745-774.
- Goodman, L. A. (1974). Exploratory latent structure analysis using both identifiable and unidentifiable models. *Biometrika*, *61*(2), 215-231.
- Greenberg, J. (1978). Allocator-recipient similarity and the equitable division of rewards. *Social Psychology*, *41*(4), 337-341.
- Greenberg, J. (1978). Equity, equality, and the Protestant ethic: Allocating rewards following fair and unfair competition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *14*(2), 217-226.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(2), 340-342.
- Greenberg, J. (1988). Cultivating an image of justice: Looking fair on the job. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *2*(2), 155-157.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, *16*(2), 399-432.

- Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*. New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Field, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 789-800.
- Hock, R. R. (1988). Professional burnout among public school teachers. *Public Personnel Management, 17*(2), 167-189.
- Holroyd, K. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Stress, coping and somatic adaptation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 197-215.
- Inoue, A., Kawakami, N., Ishizaki, M., Shimazu, A., Tsuchiya, M., Tabata, M. & Kuroda, M. (2010). Organizational justice, psychological distress, and work engagement in Japanese workers. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 83*(1), 29.
- James, M. S., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of cynicism in organizations: An examination of the potential positive and negative effects on school systems. Tallahassee, FL: *Florida State University*.
- Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(5), 627-647.
- Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (1988). Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: a cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. *American Journal of Public Health, 78*(10), 1336-1342.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: the mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 395-404.
- Kahn, R. L., & Byosiére, P. (1992). Stress in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 571-650). CA, US: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kalağan, G., & Aksu, M. B. (2010). Organizational cynicism of the research assistants: A Case of Akdeniz University. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 4820-4825.

- Kalimo, R., Taris, T. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). The effects of past and anticipated future downsizing on survivor well-being: an equity perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*(2), 91-109.
- Karasek Jr, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 285-308.
- Kaygusuz, I., & Beduk, A. (2015). The relationship between organizational justice and burnout in professional life: A research on police officers. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 8*(1), 79-92.
- Kickul, J., & Posig, M. (2001). Supervisory emotional support and burnout: An explanation of reverse buffering effects. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*(3), 328-344.
- Koçoglu, M. (2014). Cynicism as a mediator of relations between job stress and work alienation: A study from a developing country-turkey. *Global Business and Management Research, 6*(1), 24-36.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 1-24). Oxfordshire, England: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Lamude, K. G., Scudder, J., & Furno-Lamude, D. (1992). The relationship of student resistance strategies in the classroom to teacher burnout and teacher type-A behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7*(4), 597.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Theory-based stress measurement. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*(1), 3-13.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1999). Hope: An emotion and a vital coping resource against despair. *Social Research, 66*(2), 653-678.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1999). The cognition-emotion debate: A bit of history. In *Handbook of cognition and emotion*, 3-19. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2001). Discrete emotions in organizational life. In *Emotions at work: Theory, research and applications for management*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons
- Lazarus, V., Leblond, J. B., & Mouchrif, S. E. (2001). Crack front rotation and segmentation in mixed mode: Calculation of stress intensity factors. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 49*(7), 1399-1420.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(1), 91-131.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In *Social Exchange* (pp. 27-55). New York, NY: Springer US.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. *Justice and Social Interaction*, 3(1), 167-218.
- Lim, V.K.G. (2002), The IT Way of loafing on the job: Cyberloafing, Neutralizing and Organizational Justice, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(5), 675-694.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Major, B. (1989). Gender differences in comparisons and entitlement: Implications for comparable worth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 45(4), 99-115.
- Manaf, A. H. A., Latif, L. A., & Ali, J. (2014). Organizational Justice as a Predictor of Self- Perceived Work Performance: A Perspective from the Malaysian Higher Educational Institution. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23), 319.
- Marks, M. L., & Mirvis, P. H. (1997). Revisiting the merger syndrome: crisis management. *Mergers & Acquisitions*, 32(1), 35-40.
- Messe, L. A., Dawson, J. E., & Lane, I. M. (1973). Equity as a mediator of the effect of reward level on behavior in the Prisoner's Dilemma game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26(1), 60-65.
- Mikula, G., Petri, B., & Tanzer, N. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(2), 133-149.
- Mohammad Mosadegh Rad, A., & Hossein Yarmohammadian, M. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19(2), 11-28.
- Moliner, C., Martínez-Tur, V., Peiró, J. M., Ramos, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2013). perceived reciprocity and well-being at work in non-professional employees: fairness or self-interest?. *Stress and Health*, 29(1), 31-39.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.

- Nabatchi, T., Blomgren Bingham, L., & Good, D. H. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: A six-factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(2), 148-174.
- Namie, G., & Lutgen-Sandvik, P. E. (2010). Active and passive accomplices: The communal character of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Communication*, 4(1), 31-39.
- Nelson, D. L., & Simmons, B. L. (2003). Health psychology and work stress: A more positive approach. *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2(1), 97-119.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Öztürk, M., Eryesil, K., & Beduk, A. (2016). The effect of organizational justice on organizational cynicism and turnover intention: A Research on the Banking Sector. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(12), 543-551.
- Panatik, S. A., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Anderson, M. H. (2011). Job demands and work-related psychological responses among Malaysian technical workers: The moderating effects of self-efficacy. *Work & Stress*, 25(4), 355-370.
- Parasuraman, S., & Alutto, J. A. (1981). An examination of the organizational antecedents of stressors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(1), 48-67.
- Parker, D. F., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1983). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 160-177.
- Reis, H. T., & Gruzen, J. (1976). On mediating equity, equality, and self-interest: The role of self-presentation in social exchange. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 12(5), 487-503.
- Roberts, J. A., Lapidus, R. S., & Chonko, L. B. (1997). Sales people and stress: The moderating role of locus of control on work stressors and felt stress. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 5(3), 93-108.
- Schuler, R. S. (1980). Definition and conceptualization of stress in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 25(2), 184-215.

- Selye, H. (1976). Forty years of stress research: principal remaining problems and misconceptions. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 115(1), 53-56.
- Selye, H. (1982). History and present status of the stress concept. In L. Goldberger and S. Breznitz, (Eds), *Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Shaharruddin, S., Ahmad, F., & MuhaizamMusa, M. (2016). Cynicism in organizations: Does organizational justice matter. *International Journal*, 3(2), 49-60.
- Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., Huo, Y. J., Ortiz, D. J., & Lind, E. A. (1998). The self-relevant implications of the group-value model: Group membership, self-worth, and treatment quality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 34(5), 470-493.
- Spencer, D. G., Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1983). An empirical test of the inclusion of job search linkages into Mobley's model of the turnover decision process. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56(2), 137-144.
- Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), 429-459.
- 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 & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 71-82.
- Summerfield, B. E. (1998). *An analysis of workplace violence incidents in Virginia community colleges and the major employers*. Johnson City, TN: East Tennessee State University.
- Tata, J., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (1996). Emphasis on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice: Differential perceptions of men and women. *Psychological Reports*, 79(3), 1327-1330.
- Taxman, F. S., & Gordon, J. A. (2009). Do fairness and equity matter? An examination of organizational justice among correctional officers in adult prisons. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(7), 695-711.
- Tayfur, O., Bayhan Karapinar, P., & Metin Camgoz, S. (2013). The mediating effects of emotional exhaustion cynicism and learned helplessness on organizational justice-turnover intentions linkage. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 20(3), 193-221.

- Telly, C. S., French, W. L., & Scott, W. G. (1971). The relationship of inequity to turnover among hourly workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 164-172.
- Tepper, B. J. (2001). Health consequences of organizational injustice: Tests of main and interactive effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*(2), 197-215.
- Theorell, T., & Karasek, R. A. (1996). Current issues relating to psychosocial job strain and cardiovascular disease research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *1*(1), 9-26.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1990). *Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice*. In J. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings* (pp. 77-98). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (pp. 115-191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Vermunt, R., & Steensma, H. (2005). How Can Justice Be Used to Manage Stress in Organizations? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 383-410). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). Equity: Theory and research.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change measurement, antecedents, and correlates. *Group & Organization Management*, *25*(2), 132-153.
- Yazicioğlu, İ., & Topaloğlu, I. G. (2009). Organizational justice and loyalty relationship: One in the hospitality industry application. *Journal of Business Research*, *40*(1), 3-16.
- Yuksel, A. (2015). Relationship between the spiritual and organizational leadership cynicism: emotional Intelligence Effect of Vehicle. *The Russian Academic Journal*, *32*(2), 104-108.

Zanna, M. P., & Rempel, J. K. (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D. Bar-Tal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge* (315-334). NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

Informed Consent

I am a M.Sc. research student at National Institute of Psychology (NIP), Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. I am conducting a research that aims to explore the relationship between Organizational justice, Organizational Cynicism and Job Stress among college and university teacher. I request you to support my purpose and participate in this research. This study may prove helpful in understanding the importance of Organizational justice in Pakistani context.. There are no known risks associated with this research. The information required will be kept confidential and your identity will not be revealed in any publication resulting from this study. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or withdraw your consent to participate at any stage of the research.

Your help support and participation will be highly appreciated.

Thank You!

Name of the college/university: _____

Signature: _____

Maryam Leghari

National Institute of Psychology,

Quaid-i- Azam University,

Islamabad.

Demographic Information Sheet

Gender: Male Female

Age: _____

Education:

 Graduate Post Graduate

Marital Status:

 Single Married

Job Experience in current college/university: _____

Designation: _____

Organizational Justice Scale

S.No	Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	This organization has been fairly rewarding you for the amount of effort you have put in?					
2	This organization has been fairly rewarding you for the responsibilities you have?					
3	This organization has been fairly rewarding you for the work that you have done well?					
4	This organization has been fairly rewarding you for the stresses and strains of your job?					
5	This organization has been fairly rewarding you for the amount of education and training you received?					
6	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to provide useful feedback regarding its decision and its implementation?					
7	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to hear the concerns of everyone affected by its decision?					
8	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to allow for the request of clarification or additional information about its decision?					
9	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to have all parties affected by a decision included in the decision making process?					

10	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to help you to collect accurate information for decision making?					
11	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to generate standards so that decisions can be made with consistency?					
12	The organization's procedures are fairly designed to provide opportunities to appeal against or challenge an organization's decision?					
13	My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration					
14	My supervisor take steps to deal with me in a truthful manner					
15	My supervisor is able to suppress personal bias					
16	My supervisor considers my viewpoint					
17	My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about decisions and their importance					

Organizational Cynicism Scale

S.No	Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I believe organization says one thing and does another.					
2	Organization policies, goals and practices seem to have little in common.					
3	When organization says it is going to do something , I wonder if it will really happen.					
4	Organization expects one thing of its employees, but rewards another.					
5	I see little similarity between what organization says it will do and what it really does.					
6	When I think about the organization, I experience irritation.					
7	When I think about the organization, I experience aggravation.					
8	When I think about organization, I experience tension.					
9	When I think about organization, I experience anxiety.					
10	I complain about how things happen at the organization to friends outside the organization.					
11	I exchange "knowing" glances with my co-workers.					
12	I often talk to others how things are run at organization.					
13	I criticize organizations practices and policies with others.					

Job Stress Scale

S.No	Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Working here makes it hard to spend enough time with my family					
2	I spend so much time at work, I can't see forest for the trees					
3	Working here leaves little time for other activities					
4	I frequently get the feeling that I am married to the organization					
5	I have too much work and too little time to complete it					
6	I sometimes dread the telephone ringing at home because the call might be job-related					
7	I feel like I never have a day off					
8	Too many people at my level in the organization get burned out by job demands					
9	I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job					
10	My job gets to me more than it should					
11	There are lots of times when my job drives me up the wall					
12	Sometimes when I think about my job I get a tight feeling in my chest					
13	I feel guilty when I take time off from job					