

THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON ORGANIZATIONAL REPUTATION: EMPIRICAL INSIGHTS FROM THE PHARMACEUTICAL CONTEXT

Dr. HAITHAM ALI HIJAZI

Jerash University, Jordan. Email: info@hijazi-km.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8068-2061

Dr. SHEHADEH MOFLEH AL-GHARAIBEH

Abu Dhabi University, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Email: shehadeh.algharibeh@adu.ac.ae, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2845-6651

Dr. SUZAN SALEH DARWAZEH

The World Islamic Science & Education University, Jordan. Email: suzandarwazeh6@hotmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1781-1064

Dr. JUMANA BASHEER ABU RUMMAN

Al-Balqa Applied University, Jordan. Email: Jumana@bau.edu.jo, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0611-2922

Dr. HOSSAM KORANY

Abu Dhabi University, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Email: hosam.aly@adu.ac.ae

NADIA ABDUL QADER ABU KWAIK

The University of Jordan, Jordan. Email: nasamat_n@yahoo.com

Abstract

Purpose: This study aimed to identify the effect of applying *organizational justice* on *organizational reputation* from the perspective of workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan. **Methodology:** The study population consisted of 51,000 workers in the pharmaceutical industry, and the sampling and analysis unit consisted of administrative employees with different job titles (11,555). Accordingly, a simple random sample of 387 employees was selected. **Findings:** The study's findings showed that the aforementioned industry conducts significant organizational justice and has a high level of organizational *reputation* for this sector from the point of view of its employees. The study also found that there is an effect of the practice of *organizational justice* on *organizational reputation* from the viewpoint of workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan. **Originality/value:** This research examined the impact of *organizational justice* with its four types (procedural, evaluative, moral, and distributive) on *organizational reputation* in the pharmaceutical industry, as the four types of *organizational justice* had not been studied before. Each has been examined individually to see how it affects *organizational reputation*, which has enriched scientific research in this area.

Keywords: "Organizational Justice", "Organizational Reputation", Pharmaceutical industries, Jordan.

INTRODUCTION

The dynamism of organizational frameworks is increasingly becoming a focal point of analysis in contemporary business environments. Among the plethora of factors that contribute to the perception and operational efficacy of organizations, the concept of organizational justice

emerges as a crucial determinant (Bustaman et al., 2019). Encompassing distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, organizational justice reflects the fairness and ethical orientation of organizational practices, which in turn significantly influence the organization's reputation (Kumari et al., 2021). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational reputation is a pervasive theme that transcends sectoral boundaries, proposing a universal framework of ethical management practices essential for fostering a positive public image (Lee et al., 2022).

The Jordanian pharmaceutical industry presents a compelling context to explore this relationship, given its significant economic footprint and upward growth trajectory (Hameed Al-ali et al., 2019). As of 2021, the market size of the pharmaceutical sector in Jordan stood at a robust \$1.16 billion, with the industry being recognized for its internationally certified workforce, cutting-edge medical technology, and excellent medical facilities (Jordan Healthcare, n.d.). The sector has not only evolved over the decades with 23 operational pharmaceutical companies but also emerged as a net exporter, with exports reaching JD1 billion over 2020–2021, underscoring its pivotal role in the national economy (Times, n.d.).

The discourse surrounding organizational justice traces back to seminal theories posited by scholars such as Greenberg (1987) and Adams (1965), who laid the groundwork for understanding fairness within organizational settings. Over the decades, this discourse has evolved, intertwining with the fabric of organizational reputation management. The alignment or disparity between organizational justice practices and stakeholders' expectations forms a critical narrative that shapes the public image of the organization, more so in sectors like the pharmaceutical industry that are intricately linked to public health and welfare (Onyango et al., 2022).

This research endeavors to delve into the nuanced relationship between organizational justice and organizational reputation within the Jordanian pharmaceutical industry, exploring the underlying mechanisms through which justice-oriented practices influence public perception and, consequently, organizational reputation (Nan & Mohamad, 2022). This study aims to find out how different aspects of organizational reputation are affected by three types of organizational justice: distributive, procedural, and interactional. It will do this by reviewing a lot of existing literature and doing its own empirical research. Moreover, this research seeks to propose a conceptual framework that elucidates the pathways through which organizational justice practices can be strategically harnessed to bolster organizational reputation, leveraging the competitive and economic potentials inherent in the Jordanian pharmaceutical sector.

A growing body of literature that highlights the impact of organizational justice on various organizational outcomes like employee engagement, organizational commitment, and trust emphasizes the importance of looking into this relationship (Hoang et al., 2022; I. et al., 2019; O'Connor & Crowley-Henry, 2019). Furthermore, in today's globalized business world full of moral dilemmas and reputational problems, comprehending the connection between organizational justice and reputation is a strong way to promote a culture of fairness and honesty that fits well with stakeholders and society as a whole.

By bridging theoretical and practical insights, this study aims to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on organizational justice and reputation management, providing actionable recommendations for organizations within the Jordanian pharmaceutical industry striving to enhance their reputational capital through justice-oriented practices.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 "Organizational Justice"

1.1.1 Concept

Because of the changes the world is seeing right now in a number of fields, the intensification of competition between organizations of different sizes and industries, the pressures exerted by unions and Labor unions, and the tightening of governmental laws and regulations related to work and workers, organizations have become, more than ever before, more responsive with regard to the treatment of workers justly and equitably (*Singh, 2013*).

This led to the emergence of the term "**Organizational Justice**" which expresses how senior management interacts with employees and reflects on their sense of justice within the organization (*Mukherjee et al, 2016*). According to *Young (2010)*, "**Organizational Justice**" describes a person's awareness of the fairness of the distributions made by the organization. *Niehoff & Moorman (1993)* believes that "**Organizational Justice**" is the degree of achieving equality and integrity in rights and duties among workers, and it expresses the existence of the required organizational trust between the organization and workers.

The existence of justice is of great importance, as *Wilson (2010)* concluded that the lack of "**Organizational Justice**" leads to the desire of workers to leave the work of the organization to which they belong. The study conducted by *Novitasari et al. (2020)* indicated that "**Organizational Justice**" positively affects employees' internal and external satisfaction. According to the literature, "**Organizational Justice**" has several dimensions, such as the "**Distributive Justice**" dimension, which refers to the justice of the outputs that the employee gets (*Adams, 1965*), which can be achieved through fairness, equality, and need (*Deutsch, 1975*). Additionally, according to *Greenberg (1991)*, there is a third aspect of "**Organizational Justice**" called "**Procedural Justice**," which is concerned with the fairness of the processes used to determine the outcomes that the employee receives.

Knowledge progress has contributed to the development of a new concept of "**Organizational Justice**" that includes a number of organizational dimensions, such as (1) **Procedural Justice** (Procedures, Structure) (2) **Distributive Justice** (Distributions, Structure) (3) **Informational Justice** (Procedures, Social) (4) **Personal Justice** (Distributions, Social) (*Coquitm, 2001*).

1.1.2 The importance of practicing "Organizational Justice"

If we take into account that today's economy is an economy based on knowledge and innovation, the practice of justice in organizations affects the behavior of employees to a large extent, specifically in high-tech service-oriented jobs that require workers to obtain high-quality knowledge to perform their daily job activities (*Safa & Solms, 2016; Afsheen et al.,*

2015) especially since every dimension of "**Organizational Justice**" contributes effectively to knowledge sharing (Akram et al, 2017). According to Colquitt's (2001), one of the crucial dimensions of "**Organizational Justice**" is "**Distributive Justice**". The results of Moazzezi et al. (2014) conducted on workers in the field of higher education in Pakistan showed that procedural and interactional justice have a significant impact on employee satisfaction.

Moreover, Gim & Desa (2014) conducted a study at the University of Singapore with the intention of examining the connection between "**Procedural Justice**" and employee commitment in distance learning schools, and concluded that the effective commitment of employees is significantly and positively associated with "**Distributive and Procedural Justice**." Also, other studies have found that the dimensions of "**Organizational Justice**" as a whole are necessary and have an important role in the performance of the organization's employees (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005).

This study chose to evaluate the dimensions of "**Organizational Justice**" represented in (1) "**Distributive Justice**," or the justice of distributing available resources within an organization (2) "**Procedural Justice**," which is the justice of the decision-making process (3) "**Moral Justice**," which is the degree of the employee's sense of human and moral justice drawn from the sources' Creed, cultural and civilized values, and their interaction with the prevailing atmosphere in the organization (4) "**Evaluative Justice**," which is the degree of the employee's sense of integrity of the administrative evaluation issued for his right to performance, behavior, and work, which enhances his reassurance regarding his promotion, career growth, and performance evaluation.

1.2 "Organizational Reputation"

1.2.1 Concept

A company's reputation is an important and influential factor that must be considered in the decision-making stage by stakeholders in any organization, especially investors, given that reputation includes the cognitive and emotional aspects that investors may be guided by in one way or another (Nawrocki & Szwajca, 2022). According to Fombrum (2010), "**Organizational Reputation**" is a mass idea that expresses an organization's outputs and activities, which in turn decides whether or not it can offer crucial goods and services to satisfy the needs of many stakeholders. Dowling (2011) indicates that "**Organizational Reputation**" refers to corporate values that are embraced by stakeholders. One of the most essential issues for intangible resources in organizations is their reputation. Reputation is built over time and is based on the conduct of the organization's members, as well as the value of its goods and services (Gluszek 2013).

The concept of "**Organizational Reputation**" has been interpreted based on three pillars: "**Awareness**" means that stakeholders are generally aware of the organization's existence but do not evaluate it. The second pillar is "**Assessment**," which means that stakeholders are involved in one way or another in assessing the state of the organization. The third pillar, which is an "**Asset Component**," indicates the importance of the organization's reputation as a resource or an intangible value (Barnett et. al, 2006).

1.2.2 Importance of "Organizational Reputation"

Since businesses with a good reputation produce high financial outcomes and are able to sustain it for extended periods of time, "**Organizational Reputation**" has a favorable impact on the organization's position in the market and its financial standing (*Dbrowski 2012*). According to *Cyfert & Krzakiewicz (2015)*, reputation is an essential intangible asset that influences an organization's market worth. *Jucevicius & Samaiziene (2010)* confirm that an "**Organization's Reputation**" contributes significantly to increasing profits, customer satisfaction, and loyalty. The results of studies conducted in many countries show the importance of the non-financial and emotional aspects of reputation, their impact on investor decisions, and the financial performance of companies (*Rasheed et., al. 2018; Marzouk, 2018*).

A report submitted by the *American Reputation Institute*, which has been working on reputation dynamics since 1997, indicates that "**Organizational Reputation**" needs a new set of competencies and capabilities, which must intersect with various functions and tasks such as communication, research, training, and data modeling (*Institute Reputation, 2014*).

The head of the institute also indicated that reputation as a joint evaluation of previous jobs reflects the ability of the organization to achieve valuable results from the point of view of stakeholders (*Golata, 2013*). *Awang (2010)* mentioned that "**Organizational Reputation**" is achieved based on the success of managers and their excellence in managing their organizations.

Fombrun et al. (2004) developed a six-dimensional scale of reputation to measure the views of internal and external stakeholders. These dimensions are: (1) emotional appeal and trust inspired by the organization; (2) products and services expressing the perception of value, quality, creativity, and reliability of the organization's products and services; (3) vision and leadership; (4) workplace environment and quality of organization management; (5) social responsibility; and (6) financial performance and regulatory risk perceptions. In this study, "**Organizational Reputation**" will be measured through three dimensions: **Social Responsibility, Quality, and Creativity**. Thus, this study is based on measuring "**Organizational Reputation**" based on the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders, as follows:

- **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR):**

Social responsibility is a strategic factor in building reputation (*Costa & Menichini, 2013*). Thus, behaving in a socially irresponsible manner leads to the destruction of an organization's reputation (*Boulstridge & Carrigan, 2000*). Some studies have indicated that some stakeholders tend to perceive social responsibility initiatives as an "Impression Management Strategy" rather than as Corporate Social Responsibility" to address stakeholder concerns and legitimize their behavior (*Colleoni, 2013*).

- **The quality:**

Burke et al. (2018) find that a firm's good reputation is expressive of quality, a link between the performance of internal stakeholders, such as employees, and external stakeholders, such as customers. Quality refers to the relative preference for stakeholder assessment of an

organization's ability to provide products with the required specifications, whether organizations produce goods or provide services that meet and exceed customer expectations and needs, as well as design and build high-performance operations. *Helm (2013)* explains that the good reputation of the company may increase the belief of customers that the products are offered to them in a way that achieves their satisfaction and avoids opportunistic behavior by those organizations, thereby reducing the costs (time, effort, and money) necessary to supervise the relationship and ensure that the organization does not engage in opportunistic behavior.

- **Creativity:**

Creativity plays an important role in administrative and economic development and in achieving development and competitive advantage for organizations. It is defined as a set of processes through which new ideas have been presented that result in the creation of something new of high value. Thus, creativity enables organizations to advance and keep pace with changing needs, thus raising their status and reputation (*Corkindale & Belder, 2009*). An organization's ability to innovate positively reflects customers' confidence in it and has a positive impact on the organization's reputation, thus positively affecting the evaluation of products (*Blomback and Alexsson, 2007*).

1.3 "Organizational Justice" & "Organizational Reputation"

There is evidence from a number of studies that "**Organizational Justice**" and "**Organizational Reputation**" are closely related. (*Bustaman & Tambi, 2018, Beduk et al., 2016*). Justice and equality are subjective and shaped by individuals' perceptions of individuals (*Robbins & Judge, 2015*).

Research results show that the perception of justice generates differences between individuals, groups, and cultures, each according to their perception of the concept of justice. Studies have also indicated that employees treated fairly are more committed to their organizations and that there is a reciprocal relationship between perceived justice and emotional commitment (*Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001*). On the other hand, a company's reputation is perceived in two dimensions: internal and external.

Accordingly, both concepts (reputation and justice) can be considered as a combination of individual perception (*Fombrun et al., 2004*), and thus "**Organizational Reputation**" results in a relationship of appreciation, respect, and trust in the organization by workers (*Akgöz & Çağlıyan, 2014*). The high level of loyalty and trust among the workforce is influenced by how the workers view "**Organizational Justice**", and thus the two concepts through individuals' perceptions constitute a strong motive for increasing trust and loyalty to organizations.

1.4 The Study Problem

The researchers worked in two Jordanian universities: official (governmental) and private. During their dialogues with graduate students, they found that a large number of them preferred joining institutions that work in the fields of pharmaceutical industries over joining institutions operating in other industries, and attributed this to the fact that this sector enjoys a positive reputation among other sectors, according to what they heard from individuals who work in

this sector. Hence, the researchers wanted to understand the reasons behind this positive reputation of the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan. Random meetings were held with workers in this sector and their views were heard. Thus, the research problem was born, which is summarized as "an attempt to identify the impact of "**Organizational Justice**" on "**Organizational Reputation**" from the viewpoint of workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan."

1.5 Study Questions

Based on the study problem, the researchers asked the following questions:

The first question: From the perspective of those who operate in this field, how much "**Organizational Justice**" is actually practiced in Jordan's pharmaceutical industry?

The second question: From the perspective of those who operate in this field, how much "**Organizational Reputation**" is actually practiced in Jordan's pharmaceutical industry?

The third question: From the perspective of employees in Jordan's pharmaceutical business, how does the application of "**Organizational Justice**" affect "**Organizational Reputation**"?

1.6 Study Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed in response to the third study question:

The main hypothesis:

H₁: Applying "**Organizational Justice**" and its combined dimensions (**Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice**) has a statistically significant impact on "**Organizational Reputation**" and its combined dimensions (**Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service**), as seen from the perspective of workers in the Jordanian pharmaceutical industry.

The following **sub-hypotheses** emerge from the main hypothesis:

H_{1.1}: There is a statistically significant effect of the application of "**Distributive Justice**" on "**Organizational Reputation**" with its combined dimensions (**Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service**) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

H_{1.2}: There is a statistically significant effect of applying "**Procedural Justice**" on "**Organizational Reputation**" with its combined dimensions (**Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service**) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

H_{1.3}: There is a statistically significant effect of the application of "**Moral Justice**" on "**Organizational Reputation**" with its combined dimensions (**Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service**) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

H_{1.4}: There is a statistically significant effect of applying "*Evaluative Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" with its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

1.7 Study Objectives

- 1) Finding out the extent to which "*Organizational Justice*" is actually practiced in Jordan's pharmaceutical sector, as well as the degree to which this sector has an "*Organizational Reputation*" as seen by its employees.
- 2) To identify whether there is an effect of applying "*Organizational Justice*" in this sector on the "*Organizational Reputation*" it enjoys, in order to identify factors that can enhance "*Organizational Reputation*," including "*Organizational Justice*," and to provide appropriate recommendations to those concerned in this sector.

1.8 Study Importance

The researchers believe that their study will be important for the following entities:

- For decision-makers in the institutions operating in the pharmaceutical industry, it will reveal to them aspects of weakness to address them and aspects of strength to enhance them.
- For those wishing to work in pharmaceutical industry institutions, the results of the research will provide them with a picture of the reality of these institutions from the point of view of workers in the sector.
- For decision-makers in institutions in the rest of the sectors to benefit from the results of this study
- For researchers in general, there is a scarcity of studies dealing with the issue of "*Organizational Reputation*" in the Arab environment.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 The pharmaceutical industry sector in Jordan

The number of pharmaceutical manufacturing companies operating in Jordan is (23) companies that manufacture medicines, and the total number of employees in the aforementioned companies is (51,000), including (11,555) employees working in administrative positions in various job titles, while the rest, approximately (40,000) work in support service jobs (packaging, drivers, messengers, cleaning workers, etc.).

2.2 Study population and sample

The study population consisted of all (51,000) employees working at pharmaceutical manufacturing companies in Jordan. We obtained a simple random sample of (387) employees.

2.3 "Sampling and Analysis" Unit

It consisted of (11,555) administrative employees, and employees working in supportive jobs (e.g., service workers, cleaning, packaging, drivers, and others) were excluded.

2.4 Study Approach

This study is a "survey study" that followed the descriptive-analytical approach.

2.5 Study Tool

In order to obtain data and information that help achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers designed a questionnaire to measure the reality of "**Organizational Justice**" and the "**Organizational Reputation**" of institutions operating in the pharmaceutical industry.

The *questionnaire* was divided into (3) sections, as follows:

- **The first section:** It includes the demographic information of the respondents.
- **The second section:** Was devoted to measuring the level of the independent variable "**Organizational Justice**" with its dimensions, as follows:
 - *Distributive Justice*: Paragraphs (1-5)
 - *Procedural Justice*: Paragraphs (6-10)
 - *Moral Justice*: Paragraphs (11-15)
 - *Evaluative Justice*: Paragraphs (16-21)
- **The third section:** Its focus was on quantifying the dimensions of the dependent variable "**Organizational Reputation**" to determine its level:
 - *Creativity*: Paragraphs (22-26)
 - *Social Responsibility*: Paragraphs (27-31)
 - *Quality of Service*: Paragraphs (32-37)

A *five-point Likert scale* was used to answer the questionnaire items.

2.6 Validity and Reliability of scales

A group of arbitrators with academic backgrounds and expertise from several Jordanian universities, both private and public, were provided with the study tool (questionnaire), where they numbered (10) arbitrators to express an opinion on it and ensure its suitability, and their observations were taken into consideration.

The reliability of the study tool was confirmed by calculating its internal consistency (*Cronbach's Alpha*), as the values ranged between (0.91 - 0.70)

2.7 Correcting the study tool

A triple-level *five-Points Likert* Scale was used to assess the answers of the sample respondents. Answers ranged from 1 (Low) to 5 (Extremely High), which was calculated by

dividing the scaling range (5–1) by 3 and adding the result to the minimum level of each category, so the answer levels will be as follows:

$$5-1 = 4, 4/3 = 1.33$$

– 2.33 1	2.34 - 3.67	3.68 - 5
Low level	Medium Level	High Level

3. ANALYSES

3.1 Normal Distribution Test

To determine whether the data used in the analysis followed a Normal Distribution or not, a Normal Distribution Test was performed on data dependent on the value of the Skewness Coefficient. The findings demonstrated that all the questionnaire's paragraphs had Skewness Coefficient values that were less than 1, indicating that the data were distributed normally.

Checking whether the study model is compatible with the statistical methods being used:

Based on the Variance Inflation Coefficient (VIF) and tolerance tests for each independent variable, a linear Correlation Test was used to confirm that there was no significant correlation between the independent variables. The conclusions are as follows:

Table 3: the Variance Inflation Coefficient (VIF) Test and Tolerance Test for study variables

Independent Variables	Tolerance	Variance Inflation Coefficient (VIF)
Distributive Justice	0.381	2.622
Procedural Justice	0.574	1.743
Moral Justice	0.313	3.190
Evaluative Justice	0.843	1.186

Table 3 shows that the values of the *Variance Inflation Coefficient* (VIF) for all variables are less than 10, while the value of the Tolerance Test for all variables is more than 0.05, This means there is no High correlation problem between the variables, this shows that there isn't a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables shown in the correlation table. Based on this, its usability in the model is improved (*Gujarati, 2004, 352*).

To ensure that there were no multiple linear correlations between the independent variable's sub-variables, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the dimensions of the independent variable to corroborate the prior conclusion. The results are presented in Table (4).

Table 4: Pearson correlation matrix for sub-variables in the independent variable

	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Moral Justice	Evaluative Justice
Distributive Justice	1			
Procedural Justice	0.571**	1		
Moral Justice	0.781**	0.643**	1	
Evaluative Justice	0.306**	0.271**	0.396**	1

** *Statistically significant level ($\alpha \leq 0.01$)*

According to **Table 4**, the two variables "*Distributive Justice*" and "*Moral Justice*" have the highest correlation among the sub-variables of the independent variable, with a correlation coefficient of (0.781), while the values of the correlation coefficient between the other independent variables were lower. This finding suggests that there is no phenomenon of high multi-linear correlation between the sub-variables of the independent variable because they were all lower than (0.80); therefore, the sample is free from the problem of high multi-linear correlation (*Gujarati, 2004, 352*).

3.2 Characteristics of the study sample

Table 5: Frequencies and Percentages according to the study variables

	Categories	Frequency	Percentage%
Sex	Male	240	62.0
	Feminine	147	38.0
Age	Less than 30	2	.5
	30 - less than 40	92	23.8
	40 - less than 50	194	50.1
	50 and over	99	25.6
Qualification	Bachelor's degree or less	229	59.2
	Master degree	139	35.9
	Ph.D.	19	4.9
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	3	.8
	From 5 years to less than 10 years	49	12.7
	From 10 years to less than 15 years	172	44.4
	15 years and over	163	42.1
Job Title	Head of the Department	104	26.9
	Manager	174	45.0
	Manager Assistant	81	20.9
	General Director	28	7.2
	Total	387	100.0

It is noticed that the number of the sample of "Males" far exceeds the number of sample of "Females," and the concentration of the "Ages" of the sample was in the category of 40-50 years, as for the "Educational Qualification," most of the qualifications of the participants were concentrated with a "Bachelor's degree or less."

With regard to the "Years of Experience", was concentrated in the two categories of 10- less than 15 years and 15 years and over, and with regard to the "Job Title", most of the participants in the study held the position of "Manager".

4. DISCUSSION OF DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Discussion of Data Analysis and Conclusions of "Organizational Justice"

First: Answering the first question: From the perspective of those who operate in this field, how much "*Organizational Justice*" is actually practiced in Jordan's pharmaceutical industry?

To answer this question, the Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the study sample's responses to the dimensions of "*Organizational Justice*" were extracted as follows:

Table 6: The Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the "Organizational Justice" variable are arranged in descending order

Number	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level
3	Moral Justice	3.88	.686	1	High
4	Evaluative Justice	3.80	.594	2	High
1	Distributive Justice	3.74	.800	3	High
2	Procedural Justice	3.30	.565	4	Medium
	Organizational Justice	3.69	.520		High

According to Table 6, "*Organizational Justice*" received a high-level response, with a general arithmetic mean of (3.69) and a standard deviation of (.520), while "*Moral Justice*" came in first place with an arithmetic mean of (3.88) and a standard deviation of (.686). While "*Procedural Justice*," which had a medium level and an arithmetic mean of 3.30 and a standard deviation of (.565), came in last.

We notice from the results in Table 6 that the average level of respondents' responses on all domains as well as the overall level was high, except for the field of "*Procedural Justice*," in which the average level of responses was medium.

This result may indicate that the respondents are largely satisfied with the institution's practices towards employees and that justice, in general, is achieved through these practices, and the most important of them, as shown by the results, are the practices related to "*Moral justice*" - which ranked first in terms of level - which is represented by keenness on ethical values, cooperation between employees, building a relationship of friendship and respect among them, as well as impartiality when dealing with them, and instilling a spirit of belonging and loyalty to the institution among them.

Likewise, with regard to the field of "*Evaluation Justice*" - which ranked second in terms of level - obtaining a high level is an indication that the method of evaluating employees in the institution is successful from their point of view and that there are clear criteria for evaluation and announced to them, which qualifies them to evaluate themselves and compare their performance with the performance of their colleagues, as well as the possibility of objecting to the evaluation and reviewing it.

In addition to the possibility of identifying their mistakes, strengths, and weaknesses from the perspective of their superiors in preparation for learning from these mistakes, and perhaps increasing training in the areas in which it is found that they have weaknesses.

This result also means that the workers trust their bosses and that the evaluation is based on accurate information that the bosses obtain about the work of each of them. This also means that there is no interference from personal factors between the workers and their bosses in the subject of evaluation.

As for the field of "*Distributive Justice*" - which ranked third in terms of level - its attainment of a high level also may indicate the workers' satisfaction with the policy of wages, rewards, and incentives and their suitability to the nature of their work and the effort they make in executing the work without bias by the superiors, it could also indicate their conviction in the method of reward and punishment followed in the institution and that it is not based on personal relationships between employees and their superiors.

In addition, this result may indicate that the training and development program in the performance of the employees followed by the institution reflects the institution's keenness to improve the performance of the employees and develop the work to reach outputs that meet the aspirations of the institution and the aspirations of the employees for progress and development.

With regard to the field of "*Procedural Justice*" - which ranked fourth and last in terms of level - obtaining a medium level may indicate that the institution, although it has clear policies at work, the implementation process is tainted by some doubts by some employees, who believe that the organization's application of rules, regulations, and laws to employees is not entirely correct, and perhaps there is some bias in the application.

Some may also believe that the institution avoids clearly answering employees' inquiries about these laws and regulations, and some also believe that their freedom to express their opinions and criticize work procedures and methods is restricted to some extent.

Therefore, the level of responses was medium, which indicates that the opinions of the respondents are not compatible, as some of them see things as good and some of them see them as not.

In general, the high level of the "*Organizational Justice*" variable as a whole indicates that "*Organizational Justice*" practices in pharmaceutical industry institutions are going well and satisfactorily for the workers in these institutions.

Perhaps the result came in this way because of the specificity of these institutions. In addition to being institutions that aim at profit and continuity, they are among the most institutions that must bear a moral responsibility towards society and humanity, as they cannot risk people's lives in any way. Therefore, they will be more careful to meet the desires and needs of their employees, ultimately relying on them to produce pharmaceutical products according to the required specifications and at the required time, which will not be achieved if the workers feel that dealing with them is not done fairly, whether in terms of comparing wages and rewards with the effort exerted, feeling biased in treatment, or feeling injustice resulting from some unjust policies and laws, or not evaluating them with what they deserve...etc. are among the factors that make workers feel uncomfortable, which may lead to neglect at work, and an attempt to search for another job. All this means that the pharmaceutical industry must be fully aware of the importance of its employees and try to control and develop their performance in line with the policies of this very important industry, which is done through the application of "*Organizational Justice*" that it adopts towards workers.

4.2 Discussion of Data Analysis and Conclusions of "Organizational Reputation"

Second: The answer to the second question: From the perspective of those who operate in this field, how much "*Organizational Reputation*" is actually practiced in Jordan's pharmaceutical industry?

To answer this question, the Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the study sample's responses to the dimensions of "*Organizational Reputation*" were extracted as follows:

Table 7: The Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the "Organizational Reputation" variable are arranged in descending order

Number	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level
3	Quality of Service	4.09	.581	1	High
2	Social Responsibility	4.07	.617	2	High
1	Creativity	4.01	.695	3	High
	Organizational Reputation	4.06	.574		High

Table 7 makes it evident that the "*Organizational Reputation's*" Arithmetic Mean level was high, with a general Arithmetic Mean of (4.06) and a Standard Deviation of (.574).

Meanwhile, with an Arithmetic Mean of (4.09) and a Standard Deviation of (.581) at a high level, the field of "*Quality of Service*" came in first, and finally, the field of "*Creativity*" came last with an Arithmetic Mean of (4.01) and a Standard Deviation of (.695) at a high level.

We notice from the results in Table 7 that the average level of respondents' answers in all domains, as well as the overall level, was high. This result may indicate that the "*Organizational Reputation*" of the pharmaceutical industry from the perspective of employees is a high and distinguished reputation.

The most important of them, as shown by the results, is the field of "*Quality of Service*" - which ranked first in terms of level - which means that the respondents believe that the pharmaceutical industry institutions are keen to provide their products in accordance with international quality standards and that they are making every effort to follow up on scientific and technological developments in the pharmaceutical industry. It is also keen on continuous improvement in this industry, not to waste time and to provide its products and services in a timely manner.

In addition, the pharmaceutical industry institutions, as the respondents see, are always keen to communicate with recipients of their services and products to receive feedback for continuous improvement. Through this communication, the respondents see that the recipients of the service feel satisfied and appreciated for the services provided by the pharmaceutical industry institutions, and this indicates that these institutions have gained the confidence of their customers, suppliers, or competitors, and this means that the "*Quality of Service*" provided by these institutions is high and distinct.

As for the field of "*Social Responsibility*" - which ranked second in terms of level - it may mean, from the employees' point of view, that "*Social Responsibility*" in the pharmaceutical industry is widely available, as it gives great importance to public opinion about the products

and services provided; therefore, it is keen on continuous communication with the local community, as well as on health awareness through bulletins and seminars.

It also provides voluntary services to the local community in a manner that is commensurate with the community's needs, customs, and traditions. This means that these institutions do not work in isolation from society and their needs and requirements, and they try to a large extent to meet them because they feel that they are an important part of society and have a responsibility towards society.

With regard to the field of "**Creativity**" - which ranked third in terms of level - as it appears from the employees' responses - the environment of the pharmaceutical industries is a supportive environment for "Creativity," this appears through its keenness to develop and implement policies for creativity, which indicates its great interest in creativity because - perhaps according to its vision - "**Creativity**" is considered the shortest way to achieve excellence, renewal, and development.

Encouraging creativity among workers and encouraging them to present creative ideas, rewarding them for their creativity, an unbiased view of creators, and treating them with justice and equality leads to motivating workers to creativity and continuity in exerting efforts to find and develop creative ideas for the interest of the work and the interests of the workers themselves.

In general, a major indicator of the good reputation and professionalism enjoyed by the pharmaceutical business in Jordan may be the high level of the "**Organizational Reputation**" variable overall and across all fields.

In general, the fact that the "**Organizational Reputation**" variable as a whole and all fields are at a high level may be strong evidence of the high reputation and professionalism enjoyed by the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan, which helps them build partnerships with other institutions in the same field, and build relationships based on trust and credibility with suppliers and customers, as well as expanding business relationships outside Jordan.

The high level of "**Organizational Reputation**" as approved by the results is the result of hard work by the pharmaceutical industry to reach this level, and continuing to maintain it by paying attention to the quality of the service provided and its competition with similar institutions locally and globally, and its keenness on customer satisfaction and appreciation for its products and services, and building bridges of trust between them.

Likewise, the sense of responsibility towards society, being part of this society, and providing voluntary services in all its forms, may have helped a lot in building a high organizational and professional reputation.

As for "**Creativity**," it may have been the unique factor that contributed greatly to building this reputation because of its positive effects on the institution, the employees, and the recipients of the service, because in the end, the results of creativity are received by the recipients of the service.

Returning to what was previously mentioned regarding the privacy enjoyed by the pharmaceutical industry, their keenness to enjoy a high professional and organizational reputation may be considered a necessity, given the privacy of their products and services related to human health.

Therefore, if these institutions want to compete in achieving the best in the field of pharmaceutical health care, they must build and maintain an "*Organizational Reputation*," professionalism, and high credibility, which are among their ethical and human duties.

4.3 Discussion of Data Analysis and Conclusions of the effect of applying "Organizational Justice" on "Organizational Reputation"

Third: the answer to the third question (Hypothesis Testing): From the perspective of employees in Jordan's pharmaceutical business, how does the application of "*Organizational Justice*" affect "*Organizational Reputation*"?

4.3.1 The first main hypothesis H₁:

H₁: Applying "*Organizational Justice*" and its combined dimensions (*Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice*) has a statistically significant impact on "*Organizational Reputation*" and its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*), as seen from the perspective of workers in the Jordanian pharmaceutical industry.

To validate the first hypothesis, a multiple linear regression analysis of the impact of the application of "*Organizational Justice*" in its dimensions (*Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Ethical Justice, Evaluation Justice*) was used on "*Organizational Reputation*." The outcomes are as follows:

Table 8: Multiple linear regression analysis of the effect on "Organizational Reputation" of implementing "Organizational Justice" and its dimensions (Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice).

Dependent Variable	Model Summary		Variance Analysis ANOVA			Coefficient Table					
	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R ²	F calculated	degrees of freedom DF	Statistical significance Sig. F	Statement	B	Standard Error	Beta	t calculated	Statistical significance Sig. t
Organizational Reputation	.782	.612	150.613	4	.000	(Constant)	.738	.143		5.149	.000
						Distributive Justice	-.043	.037	-.060	-1.157	.248
						Procedural Justice	.397	.043	.390	9.273	.000
						Moral Justice	.313	.048	.374	6.561	.000
						Evaluative Justice	.252	.034	.261	7.506	.000

The findings show that the application of "**Organizational Justice**" and its dimensions (**Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice**) has a statistically significant impact on "**Organizational Reputation**," as the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.782$) shows that there is a statistically significant correlation between the independent variables combined (**Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice**) and "**Organizational Reputation**", and it was demonstrated that the application of "**Organizational Justice**" with its dimensions (**Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Moral Justice, and Evaluative Justice**) explained 61.2% of the variation in "**Organizational Reputation**," as indicated by the value of the Coefficient of Determination ($R^2 = 0.612$), while the value of ($F = 150.613$) at a confidence level equal to ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$), thus verifying the significance of the regression at the significance level ($0.05 > \alpha$), while the remaining portion is related to other variables that were not included in the model.

The Coefficients table shows that the values of (B) at the "**Distributive Justice**" dimension were (-.043), and the value of (t) was (-1.157), with a statistical significance of (0.248), indicating that this dimension's impact was not statistically significant.

The coefficients table shows that the values of (B) at the "**Procedural Justice**" dimension were (.397) and that (t) was (9.273) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this effect is significant.

The coefficient table shows that the values of (B) in the dimension of "**Moral Justice**" were (.313) and (t) was (6.561), with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a significant statistical effect.

The coefficients table shows that the values of (B) at the "**Evaluative Justice**" dimension were (.252), and the value of (t) was (7.506), with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this effect is significant.

This finding supports the main hypothesis, according to which there is a relationship between "**Organizational Justice**," as an independent variable, and "**Organizational Reputation**," as a dependent variable. The percentage of the explained variance in the dependent variable that the "**Organizational Justice**" variable alone was able to explain was 0.612, which is considered a high percentage. This means that the remaining percentage is due to many other variables, which may number in hundreds. The effect shown by the data analysis is clear and significant and not due to chance.

The results of the analysis of the variance table and the coefficients table prove that this effect is real. Perhaps this effect is due to the fact that the pharmaceutical industry cannot build an "**Organizational Reputation**" for it without taking into account its employees who are the main pillar of work and production. Workers must live in a healthy work environment that meets their needs and aspirations.

Thus, the employees' satisfaction with what the institution does to them, the way it deals with them, preserving their rights, rewarding them, establishing the rules of trust and credibility between the institution and them, business ethics and impartiality, ensuring the spirit of

cooperation among workers, and obtaining feedback from service recipients on the products and services provided by these institutions are all expected to build a good reputation for these institutions.

Therefore, the presence of such an effect reinforces the importance of institutions paying attention to workers mainly because making mistakes in pharmaceutical industries, which depend on access to suitable products that meet production standards, is not allowed because of the seriousness of the consequences that result from that related to the health of citizens. Hence, attention to workers and justice is a necessity in the pharmaceutical industry.

4.3.1.1 The first sub-hypothesis H_{1.1}

H_{1.1}: There is a statistically significant effect of the application of "*Distributive Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" with its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

When the impact of "*Distributive Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" was examined from the perspective of Jordanian employees, the first sub-hypothesis was validated. The findings are as follows:

Table 9: Results of a simple linear regression examination of the effect of "Distributive Justice" on "Organizational Reputation" from the viewpoint of Jordanian workers

Dependent Variable	Model Summary		Variance Analysis ANOVA			Coefficient Table					
	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R ²	F calculated	degrees of freedom DF	Statistical significance Sig. F	Statement	B	Standard Error	Beta	t calculated	Statistical significance Sig. t
Organizational Reputation	.681	.464	333.087	1	.000	(Constant)	1.846	.123		14.990	.000
						Distributive Justice	.570	.031	.681	18.251	.000

According to the findings, applying "*Distributive Justice*" has a significant effect on "*Organizational Reputation*" from the perspective of Jordanian employees. The correlation coefficient was (R = 0.681), indicating that there is a statistically significant correlation between the independent variable "*Distributive Justice*" and the dependent variable "*Organizational Reputation*", which demonstrated that the value of the coefficient of determination (R² = 0.464) showed that "*Distributive Justice*" explained 46.4% of the variation in "*Organizational Reputation*," with the remaining variation being caused by other variables that were not included in the model.

The significance of the regression is confirmed at the significance level ($0.05 > \alpha$) by the value of ($F = 333.087$) at a confidence level of ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$).

The coefficients table shows that the values of (B) at the "*Distributive Justice*" dimension were (.570), and the value of (t) was (18.251) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a statistically significant impact. According to this finding, the first sub-hypothesis - according to which "*Distributive Justice*" has an impact on "*Organizational Reputation*" Organizational Reputation' -is accepted.

As the proportion of the explained variance in the dependent variable reached .4640, which is a high percentage, and indicates that the "*Distributive Justice*" variable was able to explain, the effect demonstrated by the data analysis is apparent, significant, and not the result of chance.

The results of the analysis of the variance and coefficient tables show that this impact is real because it accounts for 460% of the change in the dependent variable, and the remaining percentage is caused by numerous other variables.

The significance of employees in obtaining the previously mentioned "*Organizational Reputation*" may be the cause of this effect.

Therefore, institutions should use a reward and punishment system that punishes the wrongdoer and rewards the hardworking without bias or personal considerations, giving workers' wages that are commensurate with the effort they put forth at work, as well as rewards and incentives granted to them for their diligence and dedication to work, the distribution of tasks and responsibilities to employees fairly and objectively, as well as the provision of management and equal opportunities for training and development to help them achieve their goals and aspirations.

These are all expected to foster a sense of satisfaction, loyalty, and belonging among the staff members, which motivates them to work diligently and honestly and adopt the institution's goals in order to build the business.

4.3.1.2 Second Sub-Hypothesis H_{1.2}

H_{1.2}: There is a statistically significant effect of applying "*Procedural Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" with its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

The application of "*Procedural Justice*" to "*Organizational Reputation*" from the perspective of workers in Jordan was examined using a simple linear regression to validate the second sub-hypothesis, as follows:

Table 10: Findings of a simple linear regression analysis of the impact of "Procedural Justice" on "Organizational Reputation" from the viewpoint of Jordanian workers

Dependent Variable	Model Summary		Variance Analysis ANOVA			Coefficient Table					
	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R ²	F calculated	degrees of freedom DF	Statistical significance Sig. F	Statement	B	Standard Error	Beta	t calculated	Statistical significance Sig. t
Organizational Reputation	.667	.445	308.620	1	.000	(Constant)	1.821	.129		14.090	.000
						Procedural Justice	.678	.039	.667	17.568	.000

The results indicate that there is a statistically significant effect of the application of "Procedural Justice" on "Organizational Reputation" from the point of view of workers in Jordan, where the Correlation Coefficient ($R = 0.667$), which indicates the existence of a statistically significant correlation between the independent variable "Procedural Justice", and the dependent variable "Organizational Reputation", The findings show that, from the perspective of Jordanian workers, the application of "Procedural Justice" has a statistically significant impact on "Organizational Reputation," as shown by the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.667$), which shows a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable "Procedural Justice" and the dependent variable "Organizational Reputation", The value of the Coefficient of Determination ($R^2 = 0.445$), which shows that "Procedural Justice" explained 44.5% of the variation in "Organizational Reputation," while the remaining portion is due to other variables that were not included in the model, and the value of ($F = 308\ 620$) at a Confidence Level equal to ($sig. = 000$), which confirms the significance of the regression at the significance level ($\alpha > 0.05$).

The coefficients table shows that the values of (B) at the "Procedural Justice" dimension were (.678), and the value of (t) was (17.568) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a statistically significant impact.

This finding suggests that the second sub-hypothesis, according to which "Procedural Justice" has an impact on "Organizational Reputation".

The proportion of the explained variance in the dependent variable was .4450, which is regarded as a high percentage, indicating that the effect demonstrated by the data analysis is apparent, significant, and not the result of chance.

The findings in the analysis of the variance and coefficients tables show that this effect is real because the "Distributive Justice" variable was able to explain .4450 percent of the change in the dependent variable, and the remaining percentage is due to many other variables.

Perhaps this effect is due to the prevailing institutional work in the pharmaceutical industry, which is governed by a clear policy at work, and the application of regulations and laws fairly to workers, giving workers the freedom to inquire about any subject mentioned in these regulations, as well as the freedom available to workers to express their opinions regarding the nature of work and its distribution and to ask about its objectives and outputs, as well as giving them the right to object to work procedures and discuss them with the institution in order to reach the best possible procedure, all of which may lead to the workers feeling comfortable, that they are part of the institution, and that they have the right to participate, and that they are not tools for carrying out the work, but rather active and important elements in the organization's environment. They have an opinion and a vision in implementing the work in order to reach outputs that fulfill their personal ambitions and the aspirations of the institution in which they work. Therefore, as evidenced by the outcomes, their perceptions may have played a significant role in helping these institutions establish a positive organizational reputation.

4.3.1.3 The third sub-hypothesis H_{1.3}

H_{1.3}: There is a statistically significant effect of the application of "*Moral Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" with its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

A simple linear regression was performed to examine the impact of "*Moral Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" from the perspective of Jordanian workers in order to validate the third sub-hypothesis, and the outcomes were as follows:

Table 11: Results of a simple linear regression of "Moral Justice's" impact on "Organizational Reputation" from the viewpoint of Jordanian workers

Dependent Variable	Model Summary		Variance Analysis ANOVA			Coefficient Table					
	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R ²	F calculated	degrees of freedom DF	Statistical significance Sig. F	Statement	B	Standard Error	Beta	t calculated	Statistical significance Sig. t
Organizational Reputation	.681	.464	333.087	1	.000	(Constant)	1.846	.123		14.990	.000
						Moral Justice	.570	.031	.681	18.251	.000

According to the findings, the application of "*Moral Justice*" has a statistically significant impact on "*Organizational Reputation*" from the perspective of Jordanian workers. The correlation coefficient, $R = 0.681$, shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable "*Moral Justice*," and the dependent variable "*Organizational Reputation*," and the dependent variable "*Organizational Reputation*" revealed the value of the Coefficient of Determination ($R^2 = 0.464$), indicating that "*Moral Justice*" explained 46.4% of the variation in "*Organizational Reputation*," with the remaining variation caused by other variables not included in the model. The value of ($F = 333.087$) indicates the significance of the regression at the significance level ($0.05 > \alpha$) with a confidence level equal to ($\text{sig.} = 000$).

The values of (B) in the dimension of "*Moral Justice*" appear to be (.570) in the table of coefficients, and the value of (t) was (18.251) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a statistically significant impact. This finding confirms the acceptance of the third sub-hypothesis, which states that "*Moral Justice*" influences "*Organizational Reputation*".

The values of (B) in the dimension of "*Moral Justice*" appear to be (.570) in the table of coefficients, and the value of (t) was (18.251) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a statistically significant impact.

This finding confirms the acceptance of the third sub-hypothesis, which states that "*Moral Justice*" influences "*Organizational Reputation*".

This effect may be explained by the institutions' adoption of ethical values, working on them, planting them among workers, and trying to create an atmosphere of kindness, respect, and friendship among workers, finding ways to cooperate with each other in teamwork, resolving conflicts between employees in an objective manner, avoiding personal and non-professional bias, and using methods that increase the employees' belonging to the organization, perhaps by holding them accountable and participating in decision-making, setting goals and procedures, etc., all of which may result in workers feeling safe and secure, the working environment being healthy and supportive, all working towards the same goal and reaching the same end, and the management and workers being one body with the same vision and ambition. That is why they may have the determination and strength to make their institutions work and bring them to their "*Organizational Reputation*" that befits them.

4.3.1.4 The fourth sub-hypothesis H_{1.4}

H_{1.4}: There is a statistically significant effect of applying "*Evaluative Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" with its combined dimensions (*Creativity, Social Responsibility, and Quality of service*) from the perspective of the workers in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

A simple linear regression was used to examine the impact of "*Evaluative Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" from the perspective of Jordanian workers to validate the fourth sub-hypothesis, as follows:

Table 12: Results of a simple linear regression analysis of the impact of "Evaluative Justice" on "Organizational Reputation" from the viewpoint of Jordanian workers

Dependent Variable	Model Summary		Variance Analysis ANOVA			Coefficient Table					
	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R ²	F calculated	degrees of freedom DF	Statistical significance Sig. F	Statement	B	Standard Error	Beta	t calculated	Statistical significance Sig. t
Organizational Reputation	.496	.246	125.528	1	.000	(Constant)	2.235	.165		13.563	.000
						Evaluative Justice	.480	.043	.496	11.204	.000

The findings show that, from the perspective of Jordanian workers, the application of "Evaluative Justice" has a statistically significant impact on "Organizational Reputation," as shown by the correlation coefficient (R = 0.496), which shows a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable "Evaluative Justice," and the dependent variable "Organizational Reputation" displayed a value for the coefficient of determination (R² = 0.246), indicating that "Evaluative Justice" only accounted for 24.6% of the variation in "Organizational Reputation," with the remainder being explained by other variables not included in the model.

The significance of the regression is confirmed at the significance level (0.05 >) by the value of (F = 125.528) at a confidence level of (sig. = 000).

The coefficient table shows that the "Evaluation Justice" dimension had values of (B) of (.480) and (t) of (11.204) with a statistical significance of (0.000), indicating that this dimension has a statistically significant impact.

This finding suggests that the fourth sub-hypothesis, according to which "Evaluative Justice" has an impact on "Organizational Reputation".

Given that the proportion of the explained variance of the dependent variable reached .2460, which is a high percentage, the effect revealed by the data analysis was obvious, substantial, and not the result of chance. This means that the "Moral Justice" variable was able to explain .2460 percent of the change in the dependent variable.

The results of the analysis of the variance and coefficient tables show that this impact is real because it accounts for .2460 percent of the change in the dependent variable, and the remaining percentage is caused by numerous other variables.

This result may be explained by the institutions' use of clear criteria to evaluate the performance of employees and their announcement of these standards and not dealing with them

confidentially, as well as the institutions' verification of information about employees on which the evaluation process will be based, allowing the workers to object to the evaluation results and discuss and dialogue with the establishment about them to reach conviction on both sides, and giving the workers the opportunity to identify the strengths and weaknesses in their performance, which allows them to focus more on their strengths and address their weaknesses and improve them.

All of this may lead employees to feel confident in the institution and that the evaluation system used is fair, especially since it is announced to all, and any individual has the right to object to their evaluation, which leads to the formation of conviction among individuals that the management of these institutions stands at the same distance from the employees. This certainly gives a feeling of comfort and reassurance that workers' rights and gains are in safe hands. It also makes them feel that the institution's management stands by them and seeks to improve their performance.

Therefore, there is no doubt that the employees' feeling that they are being evaluated properly, objectively, and without bias will create in their love and belonging to the institution, and they will be keen to show the institution in the best way and to achieve the appropriate "*Organizational Reputation*".

There is no doubt, therefore, that employees' feelings of being properly assessed, objectively, and impartially, will create love and affiliation for the institution, and they will be eager to show the institution in the best way and achieve a decent "*Organizational Reputation*."

5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Recommendations

The study's findings led the researchers to make the following recommendations:

- 1) The pharmaceutical industry sector in Jordan continued to maintain the degree of application of "*Organizational Justice*" and try to improve it, as the results showed that the level of application was "*High*."
- 2) Giving the pharmaceutical industry sector in Jordan special attention to "*Procedural Justice*" in terms of applying work policies, laws, and regulations to workers, impartiality in the application, and the participation of workers in their opinions in this aspect, as the results showed that the level of application of "*Procedural Justice*" was "*Medium*."
- 3) The continuity of the pharmaceutical industry sector in Jordan by preserving the "*Organizational Reputation*" that it enjoys and tries to benefit from in expanding work, establishing partnerships with similar entities, and marketing inside and outside Jordan: The results showed that the level of "*Organizational Reputation*" in all its dimensions was "*High*."
- 4) Focusing and paying attention to the relationship between "*Organizational Justice*" and "*Organizational Reputation*" and maintaining the positive relationship between them by paying attention to each of the two variables and improving and developing them, as the

results showed that there is a positive and real impact of "*Organizational Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*."

- 5) The researchers suggest conducting similar studies in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan by identifying other variables that may have an impact on the "*Organizational Reputation*".
- 6) The researchers suggest conducting studies similar to this study in other industrial sectors, such as the food, cosmetics, and household appliances industries, among the industries that are of interest to members of society.

5.2 Conclusions

This study addressed two questions: the main hypothesis and four sub-hypotheses. It focused on the level of application of "*Organizational Justice*," the level of "*Organizational Reputation*," and the impact of "*Organizational Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

If the pharmaceutical industry wants to achieve a distinguished "*Organizational Reputation*" in order to reach high competitiveness with similar institutions inside and outside Jordan, then it must pay attention to some factors that may have a strong impact on the "*Organizational Reputation*" such as "*Organizational Justice*" as proven by the results of this study.

On the other hand, the failure to achieve a distinct "*Organizational Reputation*" may be due to a lack of attention to such factors.

This study addressed two questions: the main hypothesis and four sub-hypotheses. It focused on the level of application of "*Organizational Justice*," the level of "*Organizational Reputation*," and the impact of "*Organizational Justice*" on "*Organizational Reputation*" in the pharmaceutical industry in Jordan.

If the pharmaceutical industry wants to achieve a distinguished "Organizational Reputation" in order to reach high competitiveness with similar institutions inside and outside Jordan, then it must pay attention to some factors that may have a strong impact on the "*Organizational Reputation*" such as "*Organizational Justice*" as proven by the results of this study.

On the other hand, the failure to achieve a distinct "*Organizational Reputation*" may be due to a lack of attention to such factors. Understanding the level of application of "*Organizational Justice*" in the pharmaceutical industry and the extent of its impact on the "*Organizational Reputation*" of these institutions may be an indication to some extent for researchers and those interested in this subject to conduct further studies on this subject.

Data were collected from a sample of workers in pharmaceutical industries in all regions of Jordan, which were selected randomly, using the questionnaire tool to measure the study variables, "*Organizational Justice*" and "*Organizational Reputation*". Returning to the results of this study, it is clear that both levels of the independent and dependent variable were high, as indicated by the arithmetic means, and that there is a statistically significant effect of the independent variable "*Organizational Justice*" on the

dependent variable "**Organizational Reputation**," in pharmaceutical industries, as indicated by simple and multiple linear regression analysis.

From the foregoing, we can conclude that the "**Organizational Reputation**" of pharmaceutical enterprises is very good and the application of "**Organizational Justice**" is also very good, and there is a real relationship between the two variables, which has led to a causal relationship through the ability of the independent variable to influence the dependent variable. These findings may encourage researchers to undertake more research on new topics in the pharmaceutical industry and conduct similar studies in other sectors such as food, cosmetics, and household appliances.

References

- 1) Adams, J. S. 1965. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press.
- 2) Akgöz, E., & Çağlıyan, V. (2014). İtibar Yönetimi. In A. Bedük (Ed.), *Örgüt Psikolojisi Yeni Yaklaşımlar, Güncel Konular* (Vol. 2). Konya: Atlas Akademi.
- 3) Akram, T., Lei, Sh., Haider, M, J., Hussain, S, T., Consuelo,L., Puig,M (2017). The effect of organizational justice on knowledge sharing: Empirical evidence from the Chinese telecommunications sector, *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 2 (3), 134-145.
- 4) Awang, Z. (2010). Analyzing the effects of corporate reputation on the competitiveness of telecommunication industry using the structural equation modelling: the case of kelantan. In *proceedings of the regional conference on statistical sciences*, Malaysia Institute of Statistics, Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University Technology, MARA (UTM), Malaysia (pp.283-396).
- 5) Barnett, M.L.; Jermier, J.M.; Lafferty, B. (2006). Corporate Reputation: The Definitional Landscape. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* 9, 26–38.
- 6) Beduk,A., Unsacar,M,K., & Eryesil,K (2016). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Corporate Reputation in Footwear Manufacturing Company, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6 (12), 530-542.
- 7) Blomback, A. and Alexsson, B. (2007), "The role of corporate brand image in the selection of new subcontractors", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 418-30
- 8) Boulstridge, E., & Carrigan, M. (2000). Do consumers really care about corporate responsibility? Highlighting the attitude—Behaviour gap. *Journal of Communication Management*, 4 (4), 355 – 368. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb023532>
- 9) Burke, P.F., Dowling, G., & Wei, E. (2018). The relative impact of corporate reputation on consumer choice: beyond a halo effect. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 34(13–14), 1227–1257. DOI: 10.1080/0267257X.2018.1546765..
- 10) Bustaman, H. A., & Tambi, A. M. A. (2018). Organizational Justice from the Perspective of Potential Applicants, 7, 153-158.
- 11) Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 86(2), 278-321. Colleoni, E. (2013). CSR communication strategies for organizational legitimacy in social media. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 18 (2), 228 – 248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281311319508>.

- 12) Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386>.
- 13) Corkindale, D., & Belder, M (2009). Corporate brand reputation and the adoption of innovations, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, ISSN: 1061-0421.
- 14) Costa, R., & Menichini, T. (2013). A multidimensional approach for CSR assessment: The importance of the stakeholder perception. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40 (1), 150 – 161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.07.028>
- 15) Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, justice heuristics, social entities and denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-209.
- 16) Dąbrowski T. (2012). *Reputacja przedsiębiorstwa [Reputation of a business]*, Wolters Kluwer, Warsaw.
- 17) Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-50.
- 18) Diouf, D., & Boiral, O. (2017). The quality of sustainability reports and impression management: A stakeholder perspective. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 30 (3), 643 – 667. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-04-2015-2044>.
- 19) Dowling G. (2011). *Creating Corporate Reputations – Identity, Image and Performance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 20) Fombrun Ch. (2010). *The value to be found in corporate reputation*, Pearson Education, London.
- 21) Fombrun, C., Gardberg, N. A., & Sever, J. M. (2004). The reputation quotient: A multistakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *Journal of Brand Management*, 7(4), 241-255 .
- 22) Gim, G. C. W., & Desa, N. M. (2014). The Impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, and affective commitment on turnover intention among public and private sector employees in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4(6), 487.
- 23) Głuszek E. (2014). Zarys modelu dojrzałości zarządzania ryzykiem reputacji [An outline of the reputational risk management maturity model], *Management Forum 2*, G. Bełz, A. Wierzbic (eds.), UE Wrocław.
- 24) Greenberg, J. 1991. Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, *Journal of Management*, 16, 606-613.
- 25) Helm, S. (2013). How corporate reputation affects customers' reactions to price increases. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*. 12(5), 402–415. DOI: 10.1057/rpm.2013.12.
- 26) Joseph, H, p., (2014), " Exploring how Managers Perception of Organizational Justice Influences Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention " Submitted to North Central University, Prescott Valley, Arizona, pp. 1-8.
- 27) Krzakiewicz, K., & Cyfert, S. (2015). Organizational reputation risk management as a component of the dynamic capabilities' management process. *Management*, 19(1), 6-18
- 28) Marzouk, W.G. (2016). The Role of Cognitive and Affective Corporate Reputation in Investor Behavior: An Empirical Investigation in Egyptian Stock Exchange Market. *J. Res. Mark.* 2016, 6, 485–509
- 29) Moazzezi, M., Sattari, S., & Bablan, A. Z. (2014). Relationship between organizational justice and job performance of Payamenoor university employees in Ardabil Province. *Singaporean Journal of Business, Economics and Management Studies*, 51(1120), 1-16.
- 30) Mukherjee, S., Singh, A & Mehrotra, S, (2016). " Organizational Justice in Relation to competence, commitment and self-Motivation, *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue2, No. 5.

- 31) Nawrocki, T. L., and Szwajca, D. (2022). The Importance of Selected Aspects of a Company's Reputation for Individual Stock Market Investors—Evidence from Polish Capital Market, *Sustainability*, PP 1-15, 9187. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159187>
- 32) Niehoff, B. and Moorman, R. (1993). Justice as Mediator of the Relationship between Methods of Monitoring and organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- 33) Novitasari,D., Asbari,M., Wijaya, M, R., Yuwono,T (2020). Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction, *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 3(3).
- 34) Rasheed, M.H.; Rafique, A.; Zahid, T.; Akhtar, M.W. (2018) Factors influencing investor's decision making in Pakistan: Moderating the role of locus of control. *Rev. Behav. Financ*, 10, 70–87.
- 35) Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Örgütsel Davranış-Organizational Behavior* (İ. Erdem, Trans. I. Erdem Ed. 14 ed.). Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık .
- 36) Safa, N .S and Solms, R. V.(2016). An information security knowledge sharing model in organizations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 57 (2016), pp. 442-451.
- 37) Schons, L., & Steinmeier, M. (2016). Walk the talk? How symbolic and substantive CSR actions affect firm performance depending on stakeholder proximity. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 23 (6), 358 – 372. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1381>.
- 38) Wilson, Thomas, (2010)," Workplace aggression behavior organizational justice intention to leave, among us. *Telecommunications Workers*, *Journal of Management*.
- 39) Young, I. (2010), "Is Organizational justice enough to promote citizenship behavior at Work? A Retest in Korea ", *European Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol, 45, No. 4, pp637 - 648.