

The sense of fairness in attitudes of treatment at the workplace and working motivation of the lecturers

Ph.D. Hoang Thanh Tung

University of Labor and Social Affair
No.43 Tran Duy Hung St, Cau Giay Dst, Hanoi, Vietnam
Email: hoangthanhtung15@gmail.com
Phone number: 84.98.800.6643

Ph.D. Nguyen Thuy Dung

Vietnam National University, Hanoi
Email: dungtrangm@gmail.com
Phone number: 84.96.491.878

Abstract

The paper presents the test results on the impact of fairness in treatment attitudes of direct managers, colleagues and students to the working motivation of the lecturers. The research was carried out by combining both qualitative and quantitative methods with lecturers working in public and non-public universities in Hanoi. Research results showed that the lecturer's perceptions of fairness in the behavior of direct managers, colleagues, and students had a significant impact on their motivation. In addition, the study also indicated that there was a difference in motivation between male and female faculty members, and among senior lecturers under the impact of these perceptions of fairness.

Key words: Behavior, equity in the organization, working motivation

1. Introduction

Many studies have shown that fairness in organization influences employees' attitudes and behaviors at the workplace (Greenberg, 1993). Some manifestation such as commitment of employees with the organization, their satisfaction with their work and their trust with the managers exist if they are treated fairly (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987). In contrast, unjust treatment behaviors might cause lower performance, reflected by frequent absence, or work less; or unethical actions (Skarlicki, Folger et al., 1997). Equity in the organization is related to the motivation of employees (Adams, 1965). Therefore, equity in the attitude of treatment in the organization influences the behavior and motivation of the employees.

University lecturers are regarded as a specific workforce because the quality of their work has a great influence on the quality of national human resources. With a culture of respect for equity of Vietnamese "No fear of lack, just fear not fair", the theory of fairness in the organization is considered appropriate in studying the motivation of the lecturers at Universities in Hanoi (Nguyen Thuy Dung, 2014). Moreover, Vietnam is a country that appreciates the importance of social relationships due to the influence of collective culture, lecturers are always bound by their relationships with their directly managers (ie, department heads, deputy heads and faculty leaders),

colleagues, students and other relationships (such as relatives or friends). So, in the context of universities in Vietnam, how does the equity of the above stakeholders influence the motivation of the lecturer? This is a gap in previous studies. Therefore, the objective of this study will provide an answer to the above question. In accordance with the research results, the research team will propose some recommendations related to this issue to improve the quality of teaching at the universities in Vietnam.

2. Theoretical foundation of equity and motivation

2.1. Theoretical foundation of fairness in organization

The concept of fairness used in this study was defined by Greenberg (1993). Accordingly, the fairness in an organization is stated as all activities that were expressed through management decisions related to rationality, equality, clarity, and impartiality in the workplace. The theoretical model of fairness in the organization studied and applied is the "Awareness of fairness" model or the "Feeling of fairness" model. This model identifies three aspects of fairness in the organization: (1) *equity in outcomes* - fairness in the distribution of benefits obtained from job outcomes; (2) *equity in the process* - fairness in the implementation of management decisions such as payment salary process, reward, appointment, etc; and (3) *equity in treatment* - fairness in attitudes and relationships that employees receive from their managers, colleagues and those who are involved in their work.

According to the researchers, workers would like to receive three aspects of fairness. Workers tend to evaluate what they receive from work (salary, bonus, and recognition) with the effort they put into it (effort, experience, knowledge, suitability, and attitudes), and they will compare the ratio between their output and inputs with other people (Adams, 1965). If there is an equality in their ratio with others, the fairness will appear; otherwise, there will be a sense of inequality that can lead to tension or anger in these people. It can be said that feeling of injustice affects the working spirit of the workers.

Many researchers believe that workers are more sensitive to fairness in relationship and attitude of treatment. Employees often connect fairness or unfairness through the way of communication and behavior they receive from the manager with the transmission of information and subsequent decisions of the manager (Cropanzano and et al., 2002). When workers feel being unreasonable and unequal in attitude of treatment, they will take some negative actions, such as defaming the manager or breaking of regulations in work (Skarlicki et al., 1997).

The "Awareness of Equity" model has been applied in many studies on organizational issues such as salary payment, recognition and appointment (Colquitt, Greenberg and Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Awareness of fairness shown in studies affects behavior and attitudes (one of the motivations of work) as analyzed above. In this study, the authors used the fairness aspect from the "Awareness of Equity" model to test the effects of fairness in treatment of direct managers, co-workers and students on the motivation of the lecturers. This is supposed to be the factor having a strong influence on motivation.

2.2. Motivation of employees

Working motivation is the subject of many researchers. In this study, the authors used the Stee & Porter's definition of motivation (1983). Accordingly, motivation is the desire and willingness of the employees to increase efforts towards achieving organizational goals; motivation is impulse, consistent and persistent in the working process. This definition is also supported by

many other researchers, such as Mitchell et al. (1997) with a dynamic view that motivation is a process which demonstrates strength, consistency and persistence in individual effort towards achieving the goal. Ifinedo (2003) points out in his study that with a motivated employee, it can easily be seen enthusiasm, dedication and focus on work contributing to the goal and the overall target of the organization.

In this study, the authors put forward some of the following hypothesis:

H1: fairness in the behavior of direct leaders has a positive impact on the motivation of the lecturers.

Research by Oren et al. (2013) suggests that supportive and cooperative leadership (an aspect of equity in behavior) will have a positive effect, greatly enhance the intrinsic motivation of the lecturers and reduce stress and fatigue in the workplace. This finding is consistent with many studies suggesting that equity in an organization influences worker's behavior and attitudes, such as Folger and Konovsky (1989); McFarlin and Sweeney (1992).

H2: Fairness in the attitudes of colleagues has a positive effect on the motivation of the lecturers.

Colleague relationship is an integral part of the daily lives of most workers. Some studies have shown that colleague relationships can affect the organization's atmosphere, contribute to building excitement in working, or may destroy them. Forret and Love's (2007) studied and pointed out that the perception of fairness in distribution, process and organizational behavior is related to the perception of relationships among colleagues. Specially, these studies have found that each of the three aspects of equity in the organization has a positive impact on their beliefs and work morale.

Negative perception about social relationships with coworkers is related to the negative behavior in the workplace, to the bad behavior of the employees, especially to the unqualified employees, who has low working capacity (Hung, Chi, & Lu, 2009).

Forret & Love (2007); Fernet et al. (2010); Basford and Offermann (2012) show that colleague relationships affect motivation and intention to stay in the workplace of the employees. Research by Akhtara et al. (2010) suggests that the positive working atmosphere (here is the relationship of colleagues) influences the motivation of the lecturer.

H3: Fairness in students' attitude of treatment has a positive impact on the motivation of the lecturer.

Equity in the students' attitude of treatment is understood as the sense of respect, honesty, and sincerity of students to the lecturer. This attitude is also reflected in the positive attitude to learning of students.

With professional characteristics, lecturers have a great deal of time with students. Therefore, students' attitude and proficiency have an impact on lecturers' motivation. Most lecturers believe that working with young people is a source of inspiration in their work. Lee, Dedrick and Smith (1991) argue that positive attitude of students and classroom activities have a positive effect on teacher satisfaction and motivation. Sinclair (2008) also discovered the most motivation for a person who wants to become a teacher is the desire to work with students who are young, always happy and ambitious. Research performed by Dung N.T and Anh P.T.T (2012) at a Hanoi university also indicates that there is a relationship related to the quality of training between lecturers and students. Lecturers play a great role in students' learning motivation. Similarly, the level and attitude of student in learning has a direct effect on the motivation of the lecturers through the quality of teaching hours.

3. Resreach method

3.1. Research design

This study was conducted through the four following steps:

- **Step 1:** Overview of the research works in the world and Vietnam related to the topic, from that set up preliminary research model, questionnaires and scales. The authors then conducted qualitative study to develop a formal research model, in consultation with a number of lecturers about words and semantics in the questionnaire.
- **Step 2:** Create preliminary quantitative study to initially assess the reliability of the scales and take some adjustments to the questionnaire before a large-scale survey.
- **Step 3:** Study quantitative survey formally done with 500 lecturers at universities in Hanoi. Data collection was used to re-evaluate the scale, factor analysis, regression analysis using SPSS software version 20.0.
- **Step 4:** Additional qualitative research to find answers to give better explanation quantitative research results.

3.2. Sampling method

Qualitative research was conducted by in-depth interviews with 6 lecturers from 6 universities (4 public universities in the economic, technical, social and agricultural sectors, 2 non-public universities in the economic, business and technical fields). All public universities were over 50 years of age, with multi-disciplinary training. All interviewed lecturers were working in the main field of university. Non-public universities were over 20 years of age and working in one of the top non-public universities in Hanoi.

For quantitative research, due to the difficulty in accessing and collecting the full list of respondents, the authors combined a convenient sampling method and a snowball method (Next respondent based on the suggestion or introduction of the interviewee) to ensure sufficient sample size as required.

Preliminary quantitative research was conducted with 50 lecturers in the form of online and face-to-face interviews at 3 universities. The results of this study was used to evaluate the reliability of the scales and to adjust the suitable questionnaires before making wide investigation.

The main quantitative study was conducted with 500 lecturers who are currently working at over 30 universities in Hanoi. The authors divided respondents into groups based on gender, type of university, seniority, position, age, and teaching specialty. In each university, the authors requested for the comments of 20-30 lecturers. From some of them, the authors asked for their relationship at other university to collect more responses to ensure that the required number was available. In addition, the authors collected online votes through faculty email addresses and their relationships at more than 20 universities. The number of faculty email addresses collected by the authors is about 2000. Direct and online voting ensured a broad spectrum of the number lecturers by type of university and gender characteristics. Due to the low online response rate, the authors had to email and phone a number of lectureres and expanded the number of survey universities to ensure a satisfactory response rate.

Additional qualitative research was conducted with a team of 6 lecturers from four universities (including two non-public), some of them were interviewed in the qualitative research. Additional qualitative research was needed to better understand the specific manifestations of equity in attitudes at universities. This gave the authors an in-depth looking at the issue being investigated.

The time to complete the required collection was more than 3 months. The number of available votes was 395/500 (reached 79%), of which 172 votes were direct collection (reached 43.5%) and 223 votes collected by online (reached 56.5%); The number of female lecturers was 264 (62.3%) and male was 147 (37.7%); 95 lecturers from 5 non-public universities participated in the survey.

3.3. Develop questionnaires and scales

The official questionnaire, except for the general information, was 31 variables that examined the lecturer's motivation, the feeling of fairness in the behavior of the direct leaders, the colleagues and the students.

The scale for the variable "*motivation of the lecturer*" included of 9 observations on the level of motivation, consistency and persistence of the lecturer in the work process to accomplish the task, meeting the organization goals. These questions were modified from the study of Stee & Porter (1983).

To measure teachers' perceptions of equity in the behavior of their direct leaderships, colleagues and students, the authors used the adjusted scale proposed by Niehoff and Mooman (1993). These scales were also used by Malik and Naeem (2011); Ibrahim & Perez (2014), Oren et al. (2013) in their studies.

The perception of fairness in the attitude of treatment was expressed by the lecturer's assessment on the level of respect, sincerity, and good behavior; and that lecturers were provided with complete and truthful explanations of the relevant matters when they request.

The variable "*the fairness of direct leaders*" with 12 observations measured the lecturer's perceptions about the direct leaders' fairness in attitudes toward the lecturer, through job assignment and benefits distribution at the organization and the implementation of decisions related to the lecturers;

The variable "*fairness of the attitudes of co-workers*" with 7 observations was assessed on the lecturer's perception of fairness in the relationship with colleagues, that reflected in behavior of colleagues with individual lecturers;

The variable "*Fairness in attitude and evaluation of students*" with 3 observations evaluated based on lecturer perception of fairness in student's attitude of treatment toward lecturer.

All observational variables used a 5-levels Likert scale with the level 1 named "*completely disagree*" and level 5 named "*totally agree*" with the statement.

3.4. Analysis and data processing

After collecting the required votes, the authors cleaned the votes and entered into the software followed by test the reliability of the scales and conducted an analysis of the EFA factor. The Cronbach'Anpha coefficient reliability test showed that 3 observational variables of the motivation range scale were not reliable and rejected, while the remaining scales were eligible for analysis EFA factor (with coefficient Cronbach'Anpha > 0.8, coefficient KMO = 0.958). With eigenvalue greater than 1 (table 1 below), four factors were extracted, which could explain 73.08% of the data variability. The factor loading indicated that the scales had a high degree of adhesion in explaining the factors. Survey results did not find the phenomenon of multicollinearity between variables.

Table 1: Results of factor analysis of variables in the model

	The fairness of direct leadership	Fairness in relationships with colleagues	Fairness in the attitude of the students	Working motivation
Variables	12	7	3	6
Extraction variance	48.974	11.147	5.209	7.757
Eigenvalue	13.713	3.121	1.458	2.172
Cronbach'Alpha	0,971	0,926	0.864	0.889

N= 395, Principal components; Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

4. Research results

The correlation coefficient Pearson was used to evaluate the correlation between variables in the model. In this study, we found that the correlation coefficient (r) > 0 indicating that the variables were positively correlated. In addition, $|r| \rightarrow 1$ could show the close relationship between variables

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation and correlation coefficient of variables in the model

	Mean	Standard deviation	1	2	3	4
1. Working motivation	3.9511	.62382	1			
2. The fairness of direct leadership	3.5906	.69754	.427**	1		
3. Fairness in relationships with colleagues	3.7033	.55843	.428**	.670**	1	
4. Fairness in the attitude of the students	3.9376	.56703	.418**	.396**	.507**	1

**p< 0.01

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

Table 3 showed that the adjusted R^2 and the F-test with significance level ($p = <0.001$) indicated the models were consistent with the data set. The normalized regression coefficient (β) pointed out the "net" impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. In which the fairness in the student's behavior had the greatest impact on the motivation of the lecturer.

Table 3: Results of regression analysis of factors influencing motivation of lecturer

Variables	Model 1 β	Model 2 β
Sex		-148**
Senior working		.010*
Equity in the treatment of direct leadership	.207***	.224***
Equity in the treatment of colleagues	.160*	.172*
Fairness in the attitude of the students	.280***	.273***
Adjusted R Square	.262	.283
F	46.863***	6.787**

N=395, + p< 0.1, * p< 0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

The results of the analysis showed that the fairness in the attitude of treatment of direct leaders, colleagues and students had a positive impact on the motivation of the lecturers and all three hypotheses H1, H2, H3 were supported.

Independent-Sample Ttest and One-way ANOVA results showed that working motivation varies in gender (male motivation is lower than female lecturers). Lecturers with different seniority had different working motivation. The highest motivation could be seen in the group of teachers with over 31 years experience followed by the group of lecturers who have seniority from 21 to 25 years while the group of 16-20 year seniority was the lowest motivation. Young lecturers (1-5 years of work) and a group of 6-10 year-old teaching experience had average motivation (Table 4). The differences in the working motivation between high and low seniority lecturers were shown significantly in the effort, the hard working, the excitement with the work and the thorough thinking of the job even at home.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics on motivation for seniority

	Number of votes	mean	Standard deviation	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1- 5 year of work	165	3.9725	.59824	.04657	3.8806	4.0645	1.00	5.00
6-10 year of work	108	3.9198	.58471	.05626	3.8082	4.0313	1.50	5.00
11-15 year of work	56	3.9524	.71965	.09617	3.7597	4.1451	1.33	5.00
16-20 year of work	39	3.7923	.68793	.11016	3.5693	4.0153	2.00	4.83
21-25 year of work	10	4.3000	.50796	.16063	3.9366	4.6634	3.17	4.83
26-30 year of work	7	4.0952	.76290	.28835	3.3897	4.8008	2.83	5.00
Over 31 year of work	5	4.5333	.46248	.20683	3.9591	5.1076	3.83	5.00
Total	390	3.9548	.62639	.03172	3.8924	4.0171	1.00	5.00

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

It could be said that lecturers had seniority (over 21 years) could have higher motivation. This is group of lecturers who show their passion for the profession and are able to spend almost their energy and contribution for teaching. However, this group accounted for a small proportion in the total number of lecturers (about 4% according to survey data). The average motivation group was in higher rate in most universities. It was worth mentioning that the group of 16-20 year of teaching had the lowest motivation. This group of lecturers own working experience and maturity. Hence, this is a problem that need to pay attention now.

Equity in the behavior of direct leadership

Statistics results about the feeling of fairness in the behavior of direct leadership (Table 5) showed that there were still issues of inequality in decision making. Direct leaders in departments/faculties also bias in their behavior, not really consistent in attitude of treatment between lecturers and this affected the motivation of them.

Table 5: Statistics describing fairness in the treatment of direct leadership

	Variables		mean	Standard deviation
	Answer	Not answer		
My direct leadership always makes decisions in an objective way	393	2	3.57	.821
My leaders are always interested in the opinions of their subordinates before making decisions	391	4	3.56	.814
My leaders often make decisions based on accurate, complete information	392	3	3.53	.776
All decisions are made by my leadership consistently for all people in the faculty	392	3	3.52	.828
All leadership decisions made are consistent with ethical standards	391	4	3.64	.759
Leaders always respect and friendly with subordinates	392	3	3.72	.789
My leaders always discuss with the faculty their decisions related to their work	392	3	3.65	.818
I am satisfied with the leadership's explanation of the issues that the trainer cares about	394	1	3.48	.789
My leaders always assign work according to the capacity and ability of each person	394	1	3.62	.814
My direct leadership is not biased in job assignment	392	3	3.56	.847
I get job opportunities like other colleagues	393	2	3.65	.765
In general, my direct leadership is always fair to subordinates	393	2	3.60	.824

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

The results of this study were further clarified by additional qualitative research. Specifically, a 36-year-old female lecturer working at a public university shared:

"... In the job assignment, the leader is focused on only a few people, the extra income is focused on these people, others feel like "to be forgotten ", they feel nothing to do at work so they ignore it ... "

A 41-year-old male teacher working at a non-public university added:

"... Some other interests are focused only on leader and some lecturers. Participating in and earning income from other training courses such as in-service training, inter-associate, master's degree, other lecturers almost be put outside "

Regarding the fairness in making management decisions within the faculty / department, the two interviewed teachers also said:

"... leaders often think of ways to put policies in order to gain more benefits for them, the lecturers can not take part in making the regulation..."

"... The direct leadership of the my faculty is very authoritarian, his decisions are often imposed, not for the common benefit of the lecturer ... In professional meeting seems only his opinion, no one have the opportunity to express their opinions, or also been overwhelmed ... "

The results of qualitative research showed more clear about the lecturers perception on the fairness of direct leadership. Most of the universities, which were object of research, were large-scale, multidisciplinary training. Moreover, with the current organizational structure in these universities, each faculty/department is treated as an independent organization. So it can be said that the role of the direct leader is very important. Quantitative and qualitative research results showd that equity in the behavior of the direct manager had a significant impact on the motivation of the lecturer. Survey results also showed that if direct leader was not fair in the work, it could lead to indifference, irresponsibility, even discontent of many lecturers. This could inevitably affect the motivation, the professional performance and the quality of the training. The conclusions of the authors were similar to the conclusions of the study made by Eyal & Roth (2011). These authors

argued that leadership, who had supportive and cooperative style (an aspect of equity in behavior) could positively impact, significantly enhance the intrinsic motivation of the lecturer and reduce the stress or tired at work. This result was consistent with many studies suggesting that equity in organization had an influences to employee behavior and attitudes, such as of Oren et al. (2013), Folger and Konovsky (1989) , McFarlin and Sweeney (1992).

Equity in the attitude of colleagues

Equity in relationships with colleagues is one of the factors that significantly influence the lecturer's motivation. Statistically, almost lecturers had relatively good perception of fairness in their colleagues' attitude of treatment. Lecturers felt more working motivation if they received friendly behavior form colleagues; they were respected and considered as member of a workgroup, were interested from their colleagues and acknowledged their professional accomplishments, table 6 below demonstrated this issue.

Table 6: Statistics describing fairness in the treatment of colleagues

	Variables		Mean	Standard diviation
	Answer	Not answer		
Colleagues often recognize my success	393	2	3.62	.635
I was always considered a member of the team	393	2	3.77	.620
When deciding on issues related to my job, my colleagues often care and considerate	394	1	3.68	.659
Colleagues respect my own characteristics	394	1	3.71	.701
I always have friendly colleagues	393	2	3.82	.660
I always get the sincerely advice from my colleagues	393	2	3.59	.731
In general, colleagues treated me fairly	394	1	3.73	.682

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

These results were similar to the results of additional qualitative research. Most of the interviewed lecturers said that the co - workers relationship in their work place was not too complicated due to the relative independence of individuals in the workplace.

Almost respondents said that their colleagues' attitude of treatment, especially the acknowledgement of their competence and the achievement, made them feel more motivative to work. A 36-year-old female lecturer at a public school shared her thoughts:

"... Colleagues' acknowledgement of professional competence such as good teaching, scientific research capacity ... has a positive impact on the motivation of the lecturers. I think everyone is looking forward to have that. "

Based on the survey data (both qualitative and quantitative), it could be seen that the perception of fairness in the attitude of colleagues had significantly influence the motivation of the lecturer. Some previous studies had the same conclusion. For example, Akhtar et al. (2010) pointed out in their study that a positive working atmosphere influenced the motivation of the lecturer.

Fairness in the attitude of the students

Fairness in student attitudes is one of the factors that influence the lecturer's motivation. Table 7 below showed the lecturer's high appreciation for the attitude of respect, affection, gratitude and the sincere treatment of the students.

Table 7: Statistics describing fairness in student attitudes

	Variables		Mean	Standard deviation
	Answer	Not answer		
Students always respect me	395	0	3.98	.613
I always receive the love and gratitude of students	395	0	3.92	.638
Students always treat me with proper attitude and sincerity	395	0	3.91	.645

(Source: Compiled from the study of the authors)

Qualitative research also showed similar results. Some lecturers working in public and non-public schools shared the same idea:

"I like working with students. The students gave me the motivation, the opportunity to practice my ideas, thoughts, views and can transmit it to students".

"... What I like most is that the students in the university are very active and expressed affection for the lecturers are very sincere, not just because the obligation. For example, November 20, students do not even learn the lecturer anymore but that day also call for congratulations. This make me very touched. "

Although there were not many studies on the fairness between student's attitude and working motivation, but there have many studies showed that students' attitudes had an impact on the motivation of the lecturer. Research by Lee et al. (1991) had shown that students' positive learning behavior had an impact on satisfaction and motivation of the lecturer

The qualitative results also showed other finding in student attitudes towards lecturer through annual assessments. This made many lecturers quite pressing. A lecturer at a public university shared his opinion:

"... According to the general opinion of all lecturer, the results of the assessment of students is not accurate. Lecturer, who give strict grades to student are often underestimated, if lecturer give more easily, high scores, the assessment results are often high. Therefore, if this result is used to assess the teaching capacity of lecturers, it is not correct, it should only be regarded as a source of reference".

To sum up, it could be said that the results of both quantitative and qualitative research showed the attitude of the students towards the lecturers in an equitable manner has a positive impact on the lecturer's motivation. By contrast, unfair attitudes of students in evaluating faculty could lead to a negative impact on the lecturer's motivation.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis, it can be said that the feeling of fairness in the behavior of direct leaders, colleagues and students has a significant impact on the lecturer's motivation. The research results also showed that there is existence of some problems in behavior of the direct leaders in making decision. Many leaders have unfairness in attitude of treatment among lecturers and take a bias in the division of work or benefits in the organization.

The results of the study also showed that the attitude of the students in evaluating the instructors is not fair. This is partly due to the lack of responsibility of many students. However, according to the author's observation, the method to process student's assessment results about lecturers in some universities had not brought real results as the target set out. That because many universities bias, afraid to collide so they do not have specific methods to handle or assist lecturers improve the quality of teaching. This situation has created a sense of unfair for lecturers who have

good teaching ability and this is one of the reasons lead to the quality of university teaching has not improved significantly.

From the research results, the authors suggest that university's leaders and state management agencies should pay more attention to the leadership, direction and building of cultural environment in specialized faculties. The process that allows students to evaluate lecturers should also be based on specific criteria that are made carefully and thoroughly elaborated. Lecturers who do not meet the requirements in attitudes and quality of teaching should be seriously treated or the university has the support measures to improve their quality teaching. Universities should also pay more attention to increase working motivation for male lecturer and lecturer being in energetically working age (6-10 years seniority).

The results of this study only showed the lecturer's perceptions about the fairness in the behavior of the leaders, colleagues and students at the organizational level. Another issue that needs to be further studied is how the sense of fairness in the behavior of the friends, the family member and the social community affects to working motivation of the lecturer. With the modern life as well as a series of issues related to professional ethics that have occurred, how is the position of the teacher in Vietnamese society? How do lecturers love the profession? These raising questions have created a foundation for the authors to carry out next research to assess more accurately and comprehensively the impact of fairness on the motivation of the lecturers.

Reference

1. Adams, J. S (1965), 'Inequity in Social Exchanges in L. Berkowitz (ed.)', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 267-299.
2. Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987), 'The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior', *Social Justice Research*,1, pp. 177-198.
3. Akhtar, S.N, Hashmi, M.A, Naqvi, S.I.H (2010), "A comparative study of job satisfaction in public and private school teachers at secondary level", *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), pp. 4222–4228.
4. Basford, T.E and Offermann, L. (2012), "Beyond leadership: The impact of coworker relationships on employee motivation and intent to stay", *Journal of Management & Organization*, 18(6), pp. 807–817.
5. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005), *What is organizational justice? A historical overview in J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.)*, Handbook of organizational justice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
6. Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A., & Chen, P.Y. (2002), 'Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice', *Group & Organization Management*, 27, pp. 324-352.
7. Eyal, O., and Roth, G. (2011), 'Principal's leadership and teacher's motivation, self-determination theory analysis', *Journal of Education Administration*, 49(3), pp. 256-275.
8. Fernet, C., Gagné, M., & Austin, S. (2010), "When does quality of relationships with coworkers predict burnout over time? The moderating role of work motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp.1163–1180.
9. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989), 'Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions', *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, pp.115-130
10. Forret, M., & Love, M. S. (2007), "Employee justice perceptions and coworker relationships", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 29(3), pp.248–260.
11. Greenberg, J. (1993), 'The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice, In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the workplace', *Approaching fairness in human resource management*, trang 79-103.

12. Hung, T., Chi, N., & Lu, W. (2009), "Exploring the relationships between perceived coworker loafing and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of a revenge motive", *Journal of Business Psychology*, 24, pp.257–270.
13. Ibrahim, M.E & Perez, A.O, (2014), 'Effects of Organizational Justice, Employee Satisfaction, and Gender on Employees Commitment: Evidence from the UAE', *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(2), pp. 45-59.
14. Ifinedo, P. (2003), "Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction in Finnish Organizations: A Study of Employees in the Oulu Region, Finland", *Master of Business Administration Thesis*, University of London.
15. 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), pp.527-556.
16. Nguyen, T.D (2014), 'Organizational equity theory and its application in Vietnamese education system', *Innovation, competitiveness and international economic cooperation*, the 12th IFEAMA International Conference Proceeding, National Economics University Publishing House, pp. 256-268.
17. Malik, M.E & Naeem, B. (2011), 'Role of Perceived Organizational Justice in Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan', *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*; 8(3), pp. 662-673.
18. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992), 'Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes', *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), pp.626-637.
19. Moorman, R.H., and Niehoof, B.P. (1993), 'Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior', *Academy of Management Journal*, 3(36), pp. 527-556.
20. Mitchell, T.R, Terrence R., Cummings, L.L and Staw, B.M (1997), 'Matching motivation strategies with organizational contexts.In Research in organizational behavior', *Greenwich, CT: JAI Press*, 19, pp. 57–149.
21. Lee, V.E., Dedrick, R.F., and Smith, J.B (1991), "The effect of social organization of school on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction", *Sociology of Education*, 64, pp.190-208.

22. Oren, L., Tziner, A., Nahshon, Y. and Sharoni, G., (2013), “Relations between OCBs, organizational justice, Work motivation and Self- efficacy”, *The Protection of Consumer Rights in the Field of Economic Services of General Interest*, 15(34), pp.505-516.
23. Phan, T.T.A & Nguyễn, T.D (2012), “Factors influencing student motivation: studying at a university in Hanoi”, *Economics and Development Journal*, November. National Economics University, pp. 24-30.
24. Shah, M.J, Rehman, M.U, Akhtar, G., Zafar, H. and Riaz, A. (2012), ‘Job satisfaction and Motivation of Teachers of Public Education Institutions’, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8(3), pp. 271-281.
25. Skarlicki, D.P and Folger, R.,(1997), “Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice”, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(3), pp.434-443.
26. Sinclair (2008), “Initial and changing student, teacher motivation and commitment to teaching”, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(2), pp.79-104.
27. Steers, R.M and Porter, L.W (1983), “Motivation: New directions for theory and research”, *Academy of Management Review*, 17(1), pp.80-88.