



Series: HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE

Series Editor: ALEXANDER-STAMATIOS ANTONIOU

Current Perspectives in Occupational Health Psychology

Edited by: Alexander-Stamatios Antoniou

VOLUME B



Science is ever-changing

New research accomplishments and clinical experience has expanded the field of medical knowledge and represent an ongoing process. With this in mind, it is imperative that we make the appropriate changes as far as it concerns the course of action, in the treatment of our patients.

The content of this textbook reflects all the most recent knowledge and internationally accepted techniques as they are analyzed by experienced authors in the field, in each chapter.

Nevertheless, the authors and the editor acknowledge that every medical opinion is under the limitations of the time frame that this book was created, as well as possible mistakes that might have escaped their attention.

Readers of this textbook are encouraged to keep that in mind, while at the same time we hope that the information included will become a starting point for young colleagues or the more experienced ones, for new research projects, clinical trials or maybe an updated version of the book in the near future.

BROKEN HILL PUBLISHERS LTD

16 PRINCESS DE TYRA STR., KARANTOKIS BUILDING

1642 NICOSIA, CYPRUS

e-mail: info@brokenhill.com.cy

<http://www.brokenhill.com.cy>

ISBN: 978-9963-716-73-9



Current Perspectives in Occupational Health Psychology

Copyright © 2015 by Broken Hill Publishers LTD. All rights reserved. Printed in Greece. Except as permitted under the Greek Laws, no part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Organisational Justice: Procedural, Distributive and Interactional Justice

Chapter

6

Maria Armaou & Alexander-Stamatios Antoniou

Organizational justice constructs involve fairness evaluations over outcomes, processes and interpersonal interactions. Judgments regarding the fairness of outcomes or allocations have been termed "distributive justice." Judgments regarding the fairness of process elements are termed "procedural justice," and judgments regarding the fairness of interpersonal interactions are termed "interactional justice." (for reviews see Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Greenberg, 1990a).

The study of distributive justice is based on Adams' work on equity theory (1965) that evaluates fairness using social exchange theory. According to Adams' equity theory fairness outcomes could be calculated based on a ratio of one's contributions or "inputs" to one's outcome and then compare that ratio with that of a comparison other. Although the comparison of the two input-outcome ratios gives Adams' equity theory an "objective" component, he was clear that this process was completely subjective. Whereas Adams's theory advocated the use of an equity rule to determine fairness, several other allocation rules have also been identified, such as equality and need (e.g., Leventhal, 1976). Studies have shown that different contexts (e.g., work vs. family), different organizational goals (e.g., group harmony vs. productivity), and different personal motives (e.g., self-interest motives vs. altruistic motives) can activate the use or primacy of certain allocation rules (Deutsch, 1975). Nevertheless, all of the allocation standards have as their goal the achievement of distributive justice.

Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice to the literature on organizational justice but their work focused primarily on disputant reactions to legal procedures. Leventhal and colleagues extended the notion of pro-

cedural justice into nonlegal contexts such as organizational settings (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal et al., 1980). In doing so, Leventhal and colleagues also broadened the list of determinants of procedural justice far beyond the concept of process control. Leventhal's theory of procedural justice judgments focused on six criteria that a procedure should meet if it is to be perceived as fair. Procedures should (a) be applied consistently across people and across time, (b) be free from bias (e.g., ensuring that a third party has no vested interest in a particular settlement), (c) ensure that accurate information is collected and used in making decisions, (d) have some mechanism to correct flawed or inaccurate decisions, (e) conform to personal or prevailing standards of ethics or morality, and (f) ensure that the opinions of various groups affected by the decision have been taken into account.

Bies and Moag (1986) introduced the concept of "interactional justice" in the justice literature that focuses attention on the importance of the quality of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented. More recently, interactional justice has come to be seen as consisting of two specific types of interpersonal treatment: interpersonal and informational justice (e.g., Greenberg, 1990a, 1993b). Interpersonal justice, reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. Informational justice, on the other hand, focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion. On the basis of Bies and Moag's initial research, interactional justice typically has been operationalized as comprising two broad classes of criteria: (a) clear and adequate explanations, or justifications, and (b) treatment of recipients with dignity and respect (for a recent conceptual elaboration on the content domain of interactional justice, see Bies, 2001).

Construct discrimination

A common debate in the literature of organizational justice has been the independence of organizational justice constructs. The oldest one concerns the independence of procedural and distributive justice but it applies even more to the constructs of procedural and interactional justice. For example, Bies and Moag (1986) originally declared interactional justice to be a third type of justice but later Bies retracted that position (Tyler & Bies, 1990). The author's retraction of his earlier stance has become widely held, as one recent narrative review treated interactional justice as a social form of procedural justice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Similarly, many researchers have

operationalized procedural justice by measuring process control or Leventhal criteria, along with interactional justice, in one combined scale (e.g., Brockner, Siegel, Daly, & Martin, 1997; Brockner, Wiesenfeld, & Martin, 1995; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; Skarlicki & Latham, 1997).

However, other research has renewed the debate surrounding the distinctiveness of procedural and interactional justice. Studies that have examined the two constructs separately have shown that they have different correlates or independent effects, or both (e.g., Barling & Phillips, 1993; Blader & Tyler, 2000; Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Moye, Masterson, & Bartol, 1997; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Blader and Tyler (2000), in a survey of 404 U.S. workers, found that system-originating procedural factors and leader-originating procedural factors remained distinct in a confirmatory factor analysis. Masterson, Lewis, et al. (2000) drew on social exchange theory to show that procedural and interactional justice affected other variables through different intervening mechanisms. Specifically, procedural justice affected other variables by altering perceived organizational support perceptions; interactional justice affected other variables by altering leader-member exchange perceptions (Graen & Scandura, 1987).

Colquitt et al. (2001) carried out a meta-analysis of 120 separate meta-analyses of 183 empirical studies. The first type of question was related to construct discrimination. Process control and Leventhal criteria were highly correlated, although perhaps not as highly as one would think given that they are used interchangeably to express the same construct. Similarly, interpersonal and informational justice were highly correlated, but again not so highly that it seems prudent to lump them together under the "interactional justice" label. Indeed, their correlation was not significantly higher than the correlation between procedural justice and distributive justice, two constructs whose separation has become canon. Further analyses showed that the procedural justice-distributive justice relationship varied to some degree by how the researcher operationalized the former.

Furthermore, Colquitt et al. (2001) meta-analysis tested three separate reactive models: Leventhal's (1980) distributive dominance model, Sweeney and McFarlin's (1993) twofactor model, and Bies and Moag's (1986) agent-system model. Support for these models can be evaluated by examining the relative effects of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice on the basis of the size of their meta-analytic correlations, as well as their unique effects in the meta-analytic regressions. We find little support for the distributive dominance model, which predicts that distributive justice will have stronger effects than the other justice dimensions. This model was supported for outcome satisfaction and withdrawal but not for any of the oth-

er nine outcomes. The two-factor model predicts that procedural justice will have stronger effects than distributive justice on system-referenced variables but weaker effects than distributive justice on person-referenced variables. This model seemed to receive support only for person-referenced and system-referenced attitudes such as outcome satisfaction, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and system-referenced evaluation of authority. The two-factor model's predictions were not supported for more behavioral variables such as OCBs, withdrawal, and negative reactions. The only exception to this observation involved performance.

Procedural justice was more capable of predicting performance than distributive justice, which supports the two-factor model if performance is assumed to be a system-referenced outcome. The agent-system model predicts that interpersonal or informational justice will have stronger effects than procedural justice on agent-referenced variables but weaker effects than procedural justice on system-referenced variables. This model was supported for agent-referenced outcomes, including agent-referenced evaluation of authority and OCBs, but not for trust, which was more related to procedural and distributive justice. The agent-system model was also supported for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance. The model actually seems to underestimate the importance of interpersonal or informational justice for behavioral variables. Interpersonal or informational justice was a strong predictor of OCBs, withdrawal, and negative reactions, which would not have been predicted on the basis of the agentsystem model.

Outcome variables

Outcome satisfaction

Many justice studies have measured satisfaction with the outcomes of a decision making process, such as pay, promotions, and performance evaluations. Given the logic presented earlier, we expect that distributive justice judgments will be a better predictor of outcome satisfaction than will procedural justice or interpersonal and informational justice. This pattern has been empirically supported through the use of pay satisfaction and satisfaction with job restructuring (e.g., Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), and it is consistent with both the distributive dominance and two-factor models.

Job satisfaction

Many studies also ask about employees' satisfaction with their jobs in general. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) showed that distributive justice was a more powerful

predictor of job satisfaction than was procedural justice. However, this does not seem to fit the two-factor theory argument that procedural justice predicts system-referenced outcomes, whereas distributive justice predicts person-referenced outcomes. Job satisfaction is a more general, multifaceted, and global response than is outcome satisfaction. Consistent with this reasoning, other studies have shown high correlations between procedural justice and job satisfaction (e.g., Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997). In addition, Masterson, Lewis, et al. (2000) showed procedural justice to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than interactional justice, although both had significant independent effects. These results are consistent with the twofactor model and the agent-system model.

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment represents a global, systemic reaction that people have to the company for which they work. Most measures of organizational commitment assess affective commitment, the degree to which employees identify with the company and make the company's goals their own (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Prior work by Tyler (e.g., Tyler, 1990) argues that procedural justice has stronger relationships with support for institutions than does distributive justice. This is also consistent with the two-factor model and has been supported in several studies (e.g., Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). However, we should note that several studies have instead supported the distributive dominance model. For example, Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) found a stronger relationship for distributive justice and organizational commitment than for procedural justice, as did Greenberg (1994). Other results support the agent-system model, in which procedural justice is a stronger predictor of organizational commitment than interactional justice (Masterson et al., 2000).

However, Ohana and Meyer (2010) study among 101 permanent French employees in 27 work integration social enterprises shows that distributive justice may not influence employees' intention to quit in social enterprises. Specifically, distributive justice had no incidence in their model on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It means that involvement in the organization and overall work satisfactions are independent of the employees' perception of equity in payments. It can be explained by the specific nature of our field. Individuals who desire to join non-profit organizations are less money oriented than those who want to enter for-profit firms and agree to accept to earn less than in for-profit firms (Rawls and Nelson, 1975; Rawls, Ulrich, and Nelson, 1975). Indeed, individuals who join social enterprises are "ideological workers" (Rose-Ackerman, 1996). They are particularly interested in

nonmonetary benefits that are the result of collective more than individual choices (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006).

Trust

Trust has recently emerged as a popular topic in organizational research (as evidenced by the 1998 *Academy of Management Review* special issue devoted to the topic). Tyler (1989) argued that trust in decision makers or authorities is important because these people typically have considerable discretion in terms of allocating rewards and resources. Whereas Tyler (1989) initially conceptualized trust in relation to a third party or an authority, Folger and Cropanzano (1998) made the point that trust reactions are relevant to any person with whom one is interdependent. Given the centrality of trust in theorizing on procedural justice, we would expect to find stronger relationships between trust and procedural justice than between trust and distributive justice, consistent with past research (e.g., Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

However, given that trust is usually referenced to a particular person, the agent-system model would predict that interpersonal and informational justice are even better predictors of this outcome than procedural justice. *Evaluation of authority.* A number of studies of third-party dispute resolution procedures have asked disputants to make evaluations of the third party (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Still other work in organizations asks respondents to rate the acceptability of their supervisors or management in more general terms. Much of the research on evaluation of authorities comes from work merging psychology and political science (e.g., Tyler, 1990). Tyler's (1990) work, along with the two-factor model, would suggest that we should find stronger relationships between procedural justice and evaluation of authorities than between distributive justice and evaluation of authorities.

However, as with organizational commitment, this prediction has been supported in multiple studies (e.g., Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1993; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). and refuted in multiple studies (e.g., Conlon, 1993; Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll, 1995). In addition, the agent-system model would predict that interpersonal and informational justice are better predictors of evaluation of authority in cases in which the authority in question is one's leader as opposed to management in general. For this reason, our examination of the reactive models distinguishes between agent-referenced evaluations of authority (e.g., focusing on one's supervisor) and system-referenced evaluations of authority (e.g., focusing on management in general).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

Organ (1990) defined OCBs as behaviors that are discretionary and not explicitly

rewarded but that can help improve organizational functioning. Organ (1990) posited that OCBs are driven largely by fairness perceptions. He suggested that people in organizations assume, at the outset, a social exchange relationship. This expectation continues until unfairness is evidenced, at which time the relationship is reinterpreted as economic rather than social. Research on OCBs has repeatedly demonstrated stronger linkages between procedural justice and OCBs than between distributive justice and OCBs (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Moorman, 1991). For example, Moorman (1991) reported that procedural justice influenced four of five OCB dimensions, whereas distributive justice failed to influence any dimensions. Skarlicki and Latham (1996) even showed that training supervisors on procedural justice principles was capable of improving OCB levels. To the extent that OCBs were measured in relation to supervisors rather than the organization as a whole, we would expect interpersonal and informational justice to be stronger predictors, consistent with the agent-system model and the results of Masterson, Lewis, et al. (2000). Thus, our examination of the reactive models distinguishes between agent-referenced OCBs and system-referenced OCBs. Following Williams and Anderson (1991), we refer to the former as individual OCBs (OCBIs) and the latter as organization OCBs (OCBOs).

Withdrawal

Behaviors and behavioral intentions such as absenteeism, turnover, and neglect are often subsumed under the heading of job withdrawal. Although withdrawal is a relatively common outcome in the justice literature, it has not been examined in the context of the two-factor model. Withdrawal can occur as a result of a thorough, reasoned evaluation of the organization as a system or on a more "spur of the moment" basis in reaction to an unsatisfactory outcome or poor interpersonal treatment by an authority. However, because employees who withdraw are typically leaving the overall organization, we would argue that withdrawal is system referenced in nature, similar to organizational commitment. Unfortunately, the literature linking different justice dimensions to withdrawal is somewhat muddled, with some studies showing that distributive justice influences job withdrawal (e.g., Horn, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984) and other studies revealing effects for procedural justice (e.g., Dailey & Kirk, 1992). Moreover, Masterson, Lewis, et al. (2000) showed that procedural justice had more of an impact on withdrawal than interactional justice. Thus, past research has, at various times, supported the distributive dominance model, the two-factor model, and the agent-system model.

Negative reactions

Some recent justice research has looked at the relationship between perceived unfairness and a variety of negative reactions, such as employee theft (e.g., Greenberg, 1990a, 1993c) and organizational retaliatory behaviors (ORBs; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). As with withdrawal, negative reactions have not been examined from the standpoint of the two-factor model. Whereas negative reactions can occur because of purely cognitive evaluations of the merits of the organization as a whole or as strong emotional reactions to one's own treatment, reactions such as theft and ORBs clearly damage the larger organizational system. However, Skarlicki and Folger (1997) found that ORBs had approximately equal correlations with distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, with interactional justice having the strongest unique effect. To the extent that ORBs are system-referenced outcomes, this provides little support for any of the three reactive models.

Performance

Perhaps the most unclear of all relationships in the justice literature is the relationship between procedural justice and performance. For example, Barley and Lind (1987) found a relationship between procedural fairness judgments and performance in a laboratory study but not in a field study. Kanfer, Sawyer, Barley, and Lind (1987) found a negative correlation between procedural justice and performance. Keller and Dansereau (1995) found a moderately strong relationship between procedural justice and performance as measured by performance appraisal records. Other studies have linked distributive justice to performance, consistent with equity theory's predictions (e.g., Ball et al., 1994; Griffeth, Vecchio, & Logan, 1989). It is difficult to apply the logic of the agent-system and two-factor models to the prediction of performance. On the one hand, performance supports, and is often measured by, agents such as one's supervisor. For this reason, Masterson, Lewis, et al. (2000) predicted, and found, stronger interactional justice effects on performance, consistent with the agent-system model. On the other hand, performance reflects members' contributions to organizational goals (Borman, 1991), giving it a system-referenced character and suggesting that procedural justice should be its primary predictor.

Performance-HRM

In studying the outcomes of HCPM, it is interesting to explore not only what practices are implemented, but also how they are experienced by employees (Gratton & Truss, 2003). Guest (1999) argues that the way in which employees per-

ceive and evaluate HRM practices impacts employee behaviour and attitudes. Employee perceptions of performance management practices are thus of crucial importance (Purcell et al., 2003; Wright and Nishii, 2004), and can be explained with the help of organisational justice theories. Organisational justice can explain a wide range of employee behaviours and highlights the importance of the ideals of justice and fairness as a requirement for organisations to function effectively (Greenberg, 1990). The two most prevalent forms of organisational justice discussed in the literature are distributive and procedural justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990).

Distributive justice refers to the perceived equity of outcomes for individuals, for example, whether the performance appraisal process results in what the individual perceives to be a fair evaluation. Procedural justice refers to the individual's perception of the fairness of the process carried out, for example, to reach a final performance grading. An employee is said to be more likely to find the outcomes of HRM practices fair, if the process of those practices is perceived to be equitable (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). A process that allows employee involvement is also often perceived as being more fair (Greenberg, 1990).

Extant research shows that perceptions of procedural justice in HRM are related in particular to measures such as trust in management, job satisfaction and employee commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Distributive justice on the other hand is more closely related to outcome satisfaction, such as fairness of levels of pay and performance evaluations (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990). Procedural justice is therefore a stronger predictor of evaluations of an organisation as an institution, whereas distributive justice relates more closely to specific personal outcomes (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). There is some debate in the literature regarding the extent to which distributive and procedural justice can actually be measured independently.

However, Greenberg (1990) presents an overview of studies that have identified measures of distributive and procedural justice which are statistically independent, and show that employees are intuitively aware of the distinction, supporting the idea that these are separate, though related measures of organisational justice. There is also a third type of organisational justice: interactional justice. This is argued to be a subset of procedural justice (Cropanzano et al., 2002), and is described as the interpersonal aspects of procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990). Whereas procedural justice focuses on the fairness of procedures relating an employee to an organisation, interactional justice focuses on the interpersonal treatment employees receive from their managers during these procedures (Chang, 2005). Organisational justice can thus help explain employee

attitudes and behaviour, triggering employee commitment in organisations (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Organ, 1990; Purcell et al., 2003).

Farnedale et al. (2011) explored the relationship between employees' perceptions of a particular subsystem of HRM practices (performance management) and their commitment to the organization. The findings show that the link between employee experiences of high commitment performance management (HCPM) practices and their level of commitment is strongly mediated by related perceptions of organisational justice. In addition, the level of employee trust in the organisation is a significant moderator. All the hypotheses received some support. There is a strong positive relationship between employee experiences of HCPM practices and perceptions of justice, and between perceived levels of justice and employee commitment, which is in line with previous studies (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992).

Work stress

Judge and Colquitt (2004) found a relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and work stress in faculty from 23 US universities. Furthermore, work-family conflict had a mediating role, such that justice seemed to allow better management of work and family lives, which led to lower stress levels even after controlling for job satisfaction and family-friendly workplace policies. A longitudinal study by Kivimäki, Elovainio, Vahtera, and Ferrie (2003) showed that perceptions of organizational justice predicted health and mental health outcomes, including sickness absence, in hospital workers. After adjustment for age, income and health behaviours, perceptions of low procedural and interactional justice were related to long sickness absence spells, especially in situations of high uncertainty (Elovainio et al., 2005).

Roberts and Young (1997) found that workers who had disputed their compensation claim outcome were found to be most influenced by the quality of the interaction with decision makers. A large two-wave study of workers with repetitive motion injuries by Roberts and Markel (2001) found perceptions of organizational fairness measured soon after the injury, specifically of interactional justice, to predict claiming behaviour. These authors suggest that claiming can be regarded as a retaliatory behaviour, given the costs it causes to the employer and the implicit discouragement to lodge a compensation claim, which is often reported. It is interesting therefore that Goldman (2003) found not only that the filing of discrimination claims by terminated workers was related to perceived organizational justice, but also that anger mediated and moderated this relationship.

Winefield et al. (2008) compared perceptions of work characteristics in cases and

controls of white-collar workers' compensation claims for psychological injury. Among them, those particularly relating to procedural justice, most clearly differentiated cases from controls. Roberts and Markel (2001) found interactional justice to predict claim making by workers with repetitive motion injuries, but in contrast, our findings support procedural justice perceptions-the fairness of policies and procedures governing workplace decision making-as a negative predictor of claiming. Our variable 'trust in heads of department/school' (interactional justice) was also but less strongly predictive of claims, as was work autonomy. In combination, our findings suggest that it is workers who believe decisions are made unfairly, who feel helpless and who believe they are treated without respect who are the most likely to claim for psychological injury.

Employee deviance

Prior research suggests that deviance can be directed interpersonally or against organizations. Aquino et al. (1999) tested a model that uses organizational justice variables and the personality trait of negative affectivity to explain two forms of deviant employee behavior. Aquino et al. (1999) note that although equity theory and relative deprivation models provide a partial explanation for deviant behavior, they largely ignore the effects of procedural justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Abundant evidence shows that organizational justice perceptions include not only judgment of outcome fairness, but also judgments about the way the allocation decision was made (Greenberg, 1990b; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Bies, 1990).

Additionally, several researchers (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1990b; Tyler & Bies, 1990) have proposed a third category of justice perceptions revolving around judgments of the quality of interpersonal treatment a person receives from a decision maker or authority during the enactment of organizational procedures. These perceptions have been referred to as interactional justice (Bies and Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990). They proposed a model that links unfavorable perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, as well as the dispositional trait of negative affectivity, to both types of deviant acts. To test the model, a survey was distributed to employees from a government agency and an international manufacturer of paper products. Responses to the survey were analysed using structural equation modeling to evaluate the theoretical model to the data. Results showed that the model fits the data well and that nearly all of the hypothesized relations among constructs were supported. Implications of the results for the prediction and control of deviant behavior are discussed and future research directions are offered.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 177-198.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: a proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1073-1091.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 299-322.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K. & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1993). Justice and organizational punishment: Attitudinal outcomes of disciplinary events. *Social Justice Research*, 6, 39-67.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology*, 127, 649-656.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Bies, R. J. (2001). International (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organization justice* (pp. 89-118). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2000, August). *A four-component model of procedural justice: What makes a process fair in work settings?* Paper presented at the 59th Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Management, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
- Borman, W. C. (1991). Job behavior, performance, and effectiveness. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 271-326). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Borzaga, C. and Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35(2), 225-248.
- Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Martin, C. L. (1995). Decision frame, procedural justice, and survivors' reactions to job layoffs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 63, 59-68.
- Brockner, J., Siegel, P. A., Daly, J. P., & Martin, C. (1997). When trust matters: The moderating effect of outcome favorability. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 558-583.
- Chang, E. (2005). Employees' overall perception of HRM effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 58(4), 523-544.
- Conlon, D. E. (1993). Some tests of the self-interest and group value models of procedural justice: Evidence from an organizational appeal procedure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1109-1124.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.

- Cropanzano, R., & Prehar, C. A. (1999, April). *Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management*, 27(3), 324-351.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45, 305-317.
- 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, 137-150.
- Elovainio, M., Kees van de Bos, A., Kivimaki, M., Ala-Mursula, Pentti, L., & Vahtera, J. (2005). Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public sector employees. *Social Science*, 61, 2501-2512.
- Farndale, E., Hope-Hailey, V., & Kelliher, C. (2011). High commitment performance management: the roles of justice and trust. *Personnel Review*, 40, 1, 5-23.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 175-208). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Gratton, L., & Truss, C. (2003). Three dimensional people strategy: putting human resource policies into action. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 74-86.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1990a). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. (1993b). 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* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greenberg, J. (1993c). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.
- Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288-297.
- Goldman, B. M. (2003). The application of referent cognitions theory to legal claiming by determined workers: the role of organisational justice and anger. *Journal of Management*, 26(5), 705-728.
- Griffeth, R. W., Vecchio, R. P., & Logan, J. W. (1989). Equity theory and interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 394-401.

- Guest, D. E. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 503-521.
- Hom, P. W., Griffith, R. W., & Sellaro, C. L. (1984). The validity of Mobley's (1977) model of employee turnover. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 34, 141-174.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational Justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 395-404.
- Kanfer, R., Sawyer, J. E., Earley, P. C., & Lind, E. A. (1987). Fairness and participation in evaluation procedures: Effects on task attitudes and performance. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 235-249.
- Keller, T., & Dansereau, F. (1995). Leadership and empowerment: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 48, 127-146.
- Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., Vahtera, J., & Ferrie, J.E. (2003). Organisational justice and health of employees: prospective cohort study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60, 27-34.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Folger, R. (1991). The effects of procedures, social accounts, and benefits level on victims' layoff reactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 630-650.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 91-131). New York: Academic Press.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction* (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lowe, R. H., & Vodanovich, S. J. (1995). A field study of distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 3, 99-114.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.
- Mansour-Cole, D. M., & Scott, S. G. (1998). Hearing it through the grapevine: The influence of source, leader-relations, and legitimacy on survivors' fairness perceptions. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 25-54.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- 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, 626-637.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., & Martin, C. L. (1998). A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 131-141.
- Moye, N. A., Masterson, S. S., & Bartol, K. M. (1997, August). *Differentiating antecedents and consequences of procedural and interactional justice: Empirical evidence in support of separate*

- constructs*. Paper presented at the 56th Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Management, Boston, MA.
- Ohana, M., & Meyer, M. (2010). Should I stay or should I go now? Investigating the intention to quit of the permanent staff in social enterprises. *European Management Journal*, 28(6), 441-454.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N. J., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the people and performance link: unlocking the black box*. London: CIPD.
- Rawls, J. R., & Nelson, O. T., Jr. (1975). Characteristics associated with preferences for certain managerial positions. *Psychological Reports*, 36, 911-918.
- Rawls, J., Ullrich, R., & Nelson, O. (1975). A comparison of managers entering or reentering the profit and nonprofit sectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(4), 616-623.
- Roberst, K., & Markel, K. (2001). Claiming in the name of fairness: Organisational justice and the decision to file for workplace injury compensation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(4), 332-347.
- Roberts, K., & Young, W. (1997). Procedural fairness, return to work and the decision to dispute in workers' compensation. *Employees Responsibilities and Right Journal*, 10(1), 193-212.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). Altruism, nonprofits and economic theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2), 701-728.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 161-169.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1997). Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behavior within a labor union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 617-633.
- Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluation of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- Taylor, M. S., Tracy, K. B., Renard, M. K., Harrison, J. K., & Carroll, S. J. (1995). Due process in performance appraisal: A quasi-experiment in procedural justice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 495-523.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 830-838.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and compliance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In J. S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings* (pp. 77-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wesolowski, M. A., & Mossholder, K. W. (1997). Relational demography in supervisor-subordinate

- dyads: Impact on subordinate job satisfaction, burnout, and perceived procedural justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 351-362
- Winefield, H. R., Saebel, J., & Winefield, A. H. (2010). Employee perceptions of fairness as predictor as predictors of workers' compensation claims for psychological injury: An Australian case-control study. *Stress and Health*, 26(1), 3-12
- Wright, P., & Nishii, L. H. (2004). *Strategic HRM and organizational behavior: integrating multiple levels of analysis*. Paper presented at the international seminar 'HRM: What's Next?', Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands.