

Analyzing the relationships between organization justice dimensions and selected organizational outcomes - empirical research study

Ghadeer Mohamed Badr ElDin Aboul-Ela
Future University, Egypt

Keywords

Organization justice, leader evaluation, outcome satisfaction, rule compliance, employee's trust.

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between organization justice dimensions namely; procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice and selected organizational outcomes. Based on the review of the previous literature and studies the research objectives and hypotheses were posed. Organization justice in relation to organizational outcomes was not fully understood particularly in the Eastern countries with a specific focus on Egypt. A questionnaire was constructed, tested and administered to teachers in the International schools in Cairo, Egypt. Results indicate the presence of a relationship between organization justice dimensions and the selected organizational outcomes. Future research should extend to other study sectors within the Egyptian environment as well as expanding the research to include several other organizational outcomes.

1. Introduction

Organization justice is an effective tool that is adopted to reduce the feelings of uncertainty and alleviate the level of discomfort (Thau et al., 2007; Elovainio et al., 2005; Judge et al., 2004). The presence, survival and growth of organizations are reluctant on the employees who work within it. The job related attitudes and work-related behaviours have a significant impact on the organizations' ability to achieve its goals and objectives. The employees' evaluation of their working environment and the organization determines their willingness to continue working with the organization. Organization justice has been a focus of research that gained attention over three decades (Colquitt et al., 2001). Employees will act and react based on their perception of fairness, equity, ethics and religion. Generally, employees are attentive to justice of events and situations in their daily lives and across a variety of contexts (Gopanzano, 2009). Organization Justice has attracted attention as a potential predictor of employees' health. The extent to which the previous research findings of organization justice studies can be generalized to other countries as well as to work groups is still not well explored.

2. Literature Review

a) Organization Justice

Organization justice refers to people's (employees) perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg et al., 2005). Greenberg (1990 b) described organization justice as a literature "grown around attempts to describe and explain the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace" (p. 400). This fairness has been demonstrated to have effects on various attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Cohen-Charash et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). The organization justice literature is largely influenced by the work of Adams (1965) and Homans (1961). Adams' (1965) equity theory argues that human motivation is influenced by the outcomes and the returns that people receive for their inputs in comparison to the outcomes and inputs of other people (Pierce et al., 2002). Organization justice is deeply rooted in the social exchange theory that assumes that social relationships are viewed as exchange processes in

which people make contributions against which outcomes become expected; and that individuals will evaluate the fairness of these exchanges based on the information gained through social interactions (Mowday, 1991). Originally, organization justice was viewed from two dimensions namely; distributive justice and procedural justice. Bies et.al (1986), suggested a third organizational justice dimension; interactional justice. On the other hand, Greenberg (1993) argued that interactional justice is made up of two components; interpersonal justice and informational justice.

b) Distributive justice

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the amounts of outcomes employees receive (Greenberg, 1990); it's the fairness with regard to the distribution of outcomes (Jones, 1998). It is a reflection of how valuable rewards, benefits and compensation from coordinated organizational efforts are fairly distributed among employees (Chou, 2009; Clay-Warner et al., 2005; Farh et al, 1990; Folger et al., 1989).

c) Procedural justice

Procedural justice relates to a person's judgments about the fairness of the process of making outcome allocations decisions (Greenberg, 1990). It focuses on the process that leads to the results (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Konovsky et al., 1991). A number of procedural justice criterion have been outlined such as opportunities for control of the process and the outcomes, ability to voice one's point of view (Folger et al., 1998), and the use of accurate information following ethical norms and lack of bias (Leventhal, 1998).

d) Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is a unique perception of fairness in the interpersonal treatment of employees by an organization (Bies, 2005; 2001; Pillai et al., 1999; Bies et al., 1986). It is concerned with how individuals in charge of "allocating resources and rewards in the workplace behave towards the recipients" (Chou, 2009, p.72). Interactional justice is the quality of treatment that the employee receives inside the workplace.

e) Informational Justice

It is the procedural explanations for why something occurred (Colquitt et al., 2001). It is concerned with the perception of fairness based on the clarification of performance expectations, feedback received and justification of decisions.

3. Research Objectives

The research objectives are developed from the review of previous scholars work and the documented literature and are listed as follows:

- a) Understanding the relationship between distributive justice and outcome satisfaction.
- b) Understanding the relationship between procedural justice and rule compliance
- c) Understanding the relationship between interpersonal justice and leader evaluation
- d) Understanding the relationship between interpersonal justice and informational justice and employee's trust.

4. Research Methods

a) Procedure

The researcher collected data from teachers working in the International Schools located in Cairo governorate, Egypt through a professional association specialized in the data collection. Participants who filled the questionnaires were full - time employees who were contacted by e-mail and invited to participate. Because of the specific nature of the research questions, the data were collected by using one source namely; a questionnaire. In order to minimize the common method variance (CMV) issues, (Podsakoff et al., 2012; Podsakoff et al., 2003) procedural

remedies were used. A video that explains the research purposes was sent with the questionnaire over the email whereby participants were informed that all the collected data will be used only for the purpose of the research and that all the information will remain confidential.

b) Participants

The researcher selected the international schools sector for the adoption of the empirical study. Through the review of previously published data about this sector it is concluded that most of the employees working in this sector share a relative degree of homogeneity. The teachers employed in this sector share similar educational linguistic based background along with relatively similar salary and compensation packages. The total numbers of employees working in this sector in Cairo is 2100 employees. The researcher conducted one-to-one interviews with the key personnel inside some selected schools to explain the research purpose and scope. Due to the inability to cover the total population, the research depended on a proportion stratified random sample. A number of 330 questionnaires were distributed and those who agreed, completed the electronic questionnaires and returned them complete and valid summed up to 300 employees. The response rate was 90.9%.

c) Measures

The researcher used questionnaires to collect the data. Procedural justice was measured by Leventhal (1980), distributive justice was measured by Leventhal (1976) scale, Interpersonal justice and informational justice were measured by Bies et al (1986) scale, employee trust was measured by Tzafir et al. (2004), and rule compliance was measured by Tyler et al (1996). Outcome satisfaction and leader evaluation were measured by the self-reported scale developed and tested by Colquitt (2001).

5. Research Hypotheses

Previous research studies in the field of organization justice focused on a variety of organizational behavioural outcomes including job satisfaction (Parker et al., 1997; Sweeny et al., 1993), organization citizenship behaviour (Skarlicki et al., 1996; Moorman, 1991), turnover, organization commitment, retaliation and involvement (Folger et al., 1999; Shapiro et al., 1993; Witt et al., 1993; Dailey et al., 1992; Cropanzano et al., 1991). Several other organizational outcomes have been tested in relation to organization justice. The subsequent section predicts linkages between distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice and the four selected organizational outcomes that will be the focal concern of this research study namely; outcome satisfaction, rule compliance, leader evaluation and employee trust. It is worth mentioning that up to the knowledge of the research few research studies were adopted on the Eastern countries especially the Egyptian environment.

Outcome satisfaction is one of the commonly explored organizational outcomes in relation to organization justice. From the analysis of the previous literature it is concluded that distributive justice judgments is a better predictor of outcome satisfaction than procedural, informational and interpersonal justice. Distributive justice was more related to person-centered evaluations like outcome satisfaction, whereas procedural justice was more related to systems' or organizational assessment (Sweeney et al., 1993; Mc Farlin et al., 1992; Folger et al., 1989; Lind et al., 1988). Accordingly, the first hypothesis is concluded as:

H1: Distributive justice will be positively related to outcome satisfaction

Rule compliance is explained as the adherence to the guidelines which govern as system (Tyler, 1999; Tyler et al., 1996; Aquino, 1995). This includes acceptance of decisions by made third parties or authority figures (Korsgaard et al., 1995; Lind et al., 1993). The agent system -

model supports the relationship between procedural justice as a better predictor of system variables than agent variables enhancing the expectation of a strong significant relationship between procedural justice and rule compliance. Accordingly, the second hypothesis is concluded as:

H2: Procedural justice will be positively related to rule compliance

Leader evaluation is commonly investigated in the organization justice domain (Greenberg, 1990b). Based on the agent-system model, the researcher expects leader evaluation to be strongly related to interpersonal justice. Previous research studies show that interpersonal justice is a strong predictor of leader member exchange than other forms of organizational justice (Masterson et al., 2000; Cropanzo et al., 1999; Moye et al., 1997). Accordingly, the third hypothesis is concluded as:

H3: Interpersonal justice will be positively related to leader evaluation

Employees' trust is a crucial variable that influence organizational performance, effectiveness and efficiency (Dirks et al., 2002; Mayer et al., 1999; Kramer et al., 1996). Trust relates to individuals' beliefs in honesty, strength of veracity and justice. Trust appears to be an essential intangible resource in organizations, that bonds managers and subordinates. Colquitt (2001) contends that employees who are treated fairly in terms of interpersonal justice have trust in their managers. Based on the previous findings of (Konovsky et al., 1994; Alexandar et al., 1987) and through the review of theoretical literature and the agent-system model the researcher expects employees' trust to have a stronger relationship with both interpersonal justice and informational justice. Accordingly, the fourth hypothesis is concluded as:

H4: Interpersonal justice and informational justice will be positively related to employees' trust

- a) **Descriptive Statistics:** The questionnaires distributed included items related to the demographic statistics. The gathered data included: gender, age group, and marital status. A summary of the demographic characteristics is presented in the following table

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	53	17.7
Female	247	82.3
Age Group		
20-29	1	0.3
30-39	295	98.3
40 and above	4	1.4
Marital Status		
Single	106	35.3
Married	102	34
Divorced	79	26.3
Widow	13	4.4

Table (1): shows the demographic characteristics of the research study

b) Statistical Analysis

A pilot study was conducted on 30 questionnaires to check for the reliability of the instruments and scales used. The results are presented in the following table:

Dimension	Number of Items	Alpha Cronbach Coefficient
Procedural Justice	6	0.962
Distributive Justice	4	0.946
Interpersonal Justice	4	0.945
Informational Justice	4	0.94
Outcome Satisfaction	2	0.912
Rule Compliance	3	0.926
Leader Evaluation	3	0.93
Employee Trust	13	0.984

Table (2): shows the results of the pilot study items reliability

From Table (2) it is concluded that all the research dimensions showed a high degree of reliability ranging from (0.912-0.984), this confirms that the research scales are reliable and valid to be used for the research purposes. The researcher analyzed the correlation between the research variables and the results showed a strong, linear and a positive relationship between the independent and the dependent variables. The results are presented in the following table

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables			
	Outcome Satisfaction	Rule Compliance	Leader Evaluation	Employee Trust
Procedural Justice		0.978**		
Distributive Justice	0.968**			
Interpersonal Justice			0.973**	0.991**
Informational Justice				0.989**

** : denote to Pearson Correlation Coefficient at 0.01 level of significance

Table (3): Shows the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Results

6. Statistical Results

H1: Distributive justice will be positively related to outcome satisfaction

Simple linear regression analysis was used and the results are presented in the following table:

Outcome Satisfaction = 0.078+ 0.989 Distributive Justice (1.541)+ (67.044**)
F-ratio= 4494.914**, degrees of freedom=(1,298) R2= 93.8%, Standard Error = 0.345

** : denotes the level of significance for F - test and T- test at 0.01 level of significance

Table (4): shows the relationship between distributive justice and outcomes satisfaction using simple linear regression

The results presented in the previous table indicate a strong, significant and a positive relationship between distributive justice and outcome satisfaction. The F- test indicated this (F-Calculated= 4494.14) at 0.01 level of significance. Accordingly, hypothesis number one can be accepted

H2: Procedural justice will be positively related to rule compliance

Simple linear regression analysis was used; results are presented in the following table:

Rule Compliance = -0.017+ 0.993 Distributive Justice (-0.395)+ (81.498**)
F-ratio= 6641.996**, degrees of freedom=(1,298) R2= 95.7%, Standard Error = 0.280

** : denotes the level of significance for F - test and T- test at 0.01 level of significance

Table (5): shows the relationship between procedural justice and rule compliance using simple linear regression

The results presented in the previous table show a strong, significant and positive relationship between procedural justice and rule compliance. The F- test indicated this (F-Calculated= 6641.996) at 0.01 level of significance. Accordingly, hypothesis number two can be accepted

H3: Interpersonal justice will be positively related to leader evaluation

Simple linear regression analysis was used and the results are presented in the following table:

Leader Evaluation = 0.072 + 0.964 interpersonal justice (1.578)+ (72.622**)
--

F-ratio= 5273.922**, degrees of freedom=(1,298) R2= 94.7%, Standard Error = 0.308
--

** : denotes the level of significance for F - test and T- test at 0.01 level of significance

Table (6): shows the relationship between interpersonal justice and leader evaluation using simple linear regression

The results presented in the previous table reveal a strong, significant and positive relationship between interpersonal justice and leader evaluation. The F- test indicated this (F-Calculated= 5273.922) at 0.01 level of significance. Accordingly, hypothesis number three can be accepted.

H4: Interpersonal justice and informational justice will be positively related to employees' trust

Multiple linear regression analysis was used and the results are presented in the following table:

Employee Trust = 0.005 + 0.543interpersonal justice*+ 0.457 informational justice* 0.541**+0.458** (0.225) (17.506)*** (14.814)***
--

F-ratio= 13621.090***, degrees of freedom=(2,297) R2= 98.9%, Standard Error = 0.140
--

*: denotes the unstandardized regression coefficient

** : denotes the standardized regression coefficient

***: level of significance for F - test and T- test at 0.01 level of significance

Table (7): shows the relationship between interpersonal justice, informational justice and employee trust using multiple linear regression

The results presented in the previous table show that there is a strong, significant and positive relationship between interpersonal justice and employee trust, and informational justice and employee trust. The F- test indicated this (F-Calculated= 13621.090) at 0.01 level of significance. Results revealed that employee trust was affected by interpersonal justice more than informational justice. Accordingly, hypothesis number four can be accepted.

7. Discussion

This research study tested empirically the relationship between organization justice with its various types and selected organizational outcomes. It was assumed that all the independent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice) will impact all the dependent variables (outcome satisfaction, rule compliance, leader evaluation and employee's trust) positively. The following discussion addresses the key insights that highlight the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and the selected organizational outcomes.

Distributive justice had a strong, significant and a positive impact on outcome satisfaction. This finding suggests that organizations should be alert to the method of distributing the outcomes (both financial and morale outcomes) as employees tend to link the fairness of the distribution process to their feelings of satisfaction which would directly impact their sense of overall satisfaction towards their jobs. Failure in the distribution process would directly affect the level of satisfaction held among employees.

Procedural justice had a strong, significant and positive impact on rule compliance. This suggests that when employees feel a lack of bias and that ethical norms are adopted fairly and strictly, they will be willing to increase their abidance to the governing organizational norms, rules and regulations. Organizations should be alert to the employees' needs through allowing them to voice out their demands through a formal channel to foster an environment of compliance to the preset organizational procedures.

Interpersonal justice had a strong, significant and positive impact on leader evaluation. Employees' perception of the level of interpersonal justice is considered as one of the criterion used by employees to assess their leaders. A leader who knows how to influence his/her employees in the sense of disseminating a level of perceived fairness in the relationships among his followers might be very successful in getting his/her employees to believe more in his leading capabilities and to follow his steps towards professional effectiveness.

Interpersonal justice has a higher, strong and significant positive relationship on employees' trust than informational justice. This could be further related to the perception process of human beings. Employees and particularly in the east cultures, and in this specific domain of the research, Egypt would tend to care more about the level of human interaction and fairness. The human touch and the degree of personal interaction fairness affect the level of employees' trust directly. The Egyptian culture tends to be more towards the individualism and femininity concepts. Accordingly, employees' level of trust will be directly linked to the level of interpersonal justice that they acquire within the organization more than the level of informational justice. Though informational justice is an integral part of developing employees' trust nevertheless, results indicated that interpersonal justice plays a crucial role when compared to informational justice.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between organization justice and its types in relation to a set of selected organizational outcomes. Organization justice is an integral part of employees' performance towards improved efficiency and effectiveness. The study revealed that distributive justice has a positive impact on outcome satisfaction; procedural justice has a positive impact on rule compliance, interpersonal justice has a positive impact on leader evaluation and interpersonal justice has a more positive impact on employees' trust than informational justice. The research showed that organization justice can predict directly organizational outcomes. To improve employees' attitudes towards the organizations it is necessary to adopt internal disclosure policies with the intent to comply with the employees' needs, code of conducts and ethics, and willingness to support employees fairly. The tendency to foster and environment of organizational justice remains a value of honesty that enforces and fosters improved level of employees' performance, trust in their organizations, perception of their leaders as role models and willingness to abide to the organizational rules and regulations.

9. Research Limitations and direction for future research

Due to the limitations in time and the economic costs that are associated with covering a wider scope of participants the study was administered on Cairo and governorate, Egypt as it

was difficult to cover other geographical districts in Egypt. The researcher recommends that the research could be extended to other governorates within Egypt to gain a better insight for the generalization of the results. Future research could extend to include several other organizational outcomes such as: performance, intention to leave and many others as this will enrich the existing academic literature.

References

- Adams, J.S., 1965, 'Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, New York: Academic Press, Vol.2, pp.267-299
- Alexander, S. & Ruderman, M., 1987, 'The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior', *Social Justice Research*, Vol.1, pp.177-198
- Aquino, K., 1995, 'Relationships among pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship', *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 8, pp.21-33
- Bies, R.J., 2001, 'Interactional (in)justice: the scared and the profance', in Greenberg,J., Cropanzano,R. (Eds), *Advances in Organizational Justice*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp.85-108
- Bies, R.J., 2005, 'Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct?', in Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J.A (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp.85-112
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S., 1986, 'Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness', In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Z. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations*, pp. 43-55, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Chou,R.I.A, 2009, 'Organizational justice and turnover intention: a study of direct care workers in assisted living facilities for older adults in the United States ', *Social Development Issues*, Vol.31, pp. 69-85
- Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J. and Roman, P., 2005, 'Organization justice and job satisfaction: a set of three competing models', *Social Justice Research*, Vol.18, pp.391-409
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E., 2001, 'The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.86,pp. 278-321.
- Colquitt, J.A. 2001, 'On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct Validation of a measure', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.86, pp.386-400
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon,D.E., Wesson,M.L., Porter,C.O.L.H, & Ng,K.Y.,2001,'Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.86,pp.425-445
- Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R., 1991, 'Procedural justice and worker motivation, In R.M. Steers&L.W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and worker behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Vol.5, pp.131-143.
- Cropanzano,R., Greenberg,J., 1997, 'Progress in organizational justice: tunneling through the maze', in Cooper C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Wiley, New York, NY, pp. 317-372
- Cropanzano, R., & Prehar, C. A., 1999, 'Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice', Presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA
- Dailey,R.C., & Kirk, D.J., 1992, 'Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover', *Human Relations*, Vol.45, pp.305-317
- Dirks,K.T., & Ferrin, D.L., 2002, 'Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.87,pp.611-628

- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R., 1998, 'Organization Justice and Human Resources Management', Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A., 1989, 'Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.32, no.1, pp.115-130
- Gopanzo, R.E. & Stein, J.H., 2009, 'Organizational Justice and behavioural Ethics: promises; prospects', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol.19, pp.193-233
- Elovainio M, Van den Bos K, Linna A., 2005, 'Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty model of fairness judgments among Finnish public sector employees. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol.61, no.12, pp.2501-2512
- Farh, J.L., Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W., 1990, 'Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction', *Journal of Management*, Vol.16, no. 4, pp. 705-721
- Folger, R. and Skarlicki, D. P., (1999), 'Unfairness and resistance to change: hardship as mistreatment', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol.12, pp.35-50.
- Greenberg, J., 1990, 'Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow', *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 399-432.
- Greenberg, J., 1990b, 'Organization Justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow, *Journal of Management*', Vol.16, pp.399-432
- Greenberg, J., 1993, 'The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informational categories of organizational justice', in Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp.79-103
- Homans, G.C., 1961, *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace
- Jones, F., 1998, 'Pay procedures and voluntary turnover: does procedural justice matter?', *Psychological Reports*, Vol.83, pp. 475-482
- Judge, T.A., Colquitt, J.A., 2004, 'Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.89, no.3, pp.395-404
- Konovsky, M.A., Cropanzano, R., 1991, 'Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as predictor of employee attitudes and job performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.76, pp.698-707
- Konovsky, M.A., & Pugh, S.D., 1994, 'Citizenship behavior and social exchange', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.37, pp.656-669
- Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L., 1995, 'Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussion', *Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, pp. 657-669
- Kramer, R., Tyler, T., 1996, 'Whither trust, in Tyler, T. and Kramer, R. (Eds), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research* Sage, Thousand Oaks, C.A', pp.1-15
- 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.
- Lind, E. A., Kulik, C., Ambrose, M., & de Vera Park, M., 1993, 'Individual and corporate dispute resolution: Using procedural fairness as a decision heuristic', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.38, pp. 224-251
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R., 1988, 'The social psychology of procedural justice', New York: Plenum.

- 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*, Vol.43, pp. 738-748.
- Mayer, R.C. & Davis, J.H., 1999, 'The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: a field quasi-experiment', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.84, no.1, pp.123-136
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992), 'Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.35 No.3, 626-637
- Moorman, R.H., 1991, 'Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.76, pp.845-855
- Mowday, R., 1991, 'Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations', in Steers, R. and Porter, L. (Eds), *Motivation and Work Behavior*, 5th edition, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, pp. 111-131
- Moye, N. A., Masterson, S. S., & Bartol, K. M., 1997, 'Differentiating antecedents and consequences of procedural and interactional justice: Empirical evidence in support of separate constructs', Presented at the 56th Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Management, Boston, MA.
- Parker, C.P., Baltes, B.B. & Christiansen, N.D., 1997, 'Support for affirmative action, justice perceptions, and work attitudes: A study of gender and racial -ethnic group differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.83, pp.376-389
- Pierce, J.L., Gardner, D.G., 2002, 'Management and Organizational Behavior: An Integrated Perspective, South-Western, Cincinnati, OH
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C.A. and Williams, E.S. (1999), "Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: a two-sample study", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 897-933.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S., Lee, J. and Podsakoff, N., 2003, 'Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88, pp. 879-903
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B. and Podsakoff, N.P., 2012, 'Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it', *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol.36, pp.539-569
- Shapiro, D.L., Brett, J.M., 1993, 'Comparing three processes underlying judgements of procedural justice: A field of study of mediation and arbitration', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.65, pp.1167-1177
- Skarlicki, D.P., Latham, G.P., 1996, 'Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory, *Journal of Applied Psychology*', Vol.2, pp.161-169
- Sweeney, P.D., & McFarlin, D.B., 1993, 'Workers evaluations of the "Ends" and the "Means": An examination of the four models of distributive and procedural justice', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.55, pp.22-40
- Thau S., Aquino K., and Wittek R., (2007), 'An extension of uncertainty management theory to the self: The relationship between justice, social comparison orientation, and antisocial work behaviors', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.92 No.1, pp. 250-258
- Tyler, T.R. (1999), "Why people cooperate with organizations: an identity-based perspective", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 21, pp. 201-46.

- Tyler, T. R., & DeGoey, P., 1996, ' Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attributions on willingness to accept decisions', In R. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* , pp. 331-356, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tyler, T. R., DeGoey, P., & Smith, H. J., 1996, ' Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 913-930.
- Tzafir, S., Simon L., 2004, 'Trust Me: A scale for measuring manager-employee trust', *Management Research: The Journal of Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, Vol.2, no.2, pp.115-132
- Witt, A.L., & Broach, D., 1993, ' Exchange ideology as a moderator of the procedural justice-satisfaction relationship', *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.133, pp.97-103
-