

OVERALL INJUSTICES, WORKPLACE DEVIANCE AND TURNOVER INTENTION AMONG EDUCATORS AND SUPPORTERS IN OGUN STATE UNIVERSITIES

SHEYIN, Adejoke O, Ph. D

Department of Educational Management,
College of Applied Education & Vocational Technology,
Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun,
Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State
E-mail Address: tobidaughter@yahoo.com

Abstract

This descriptive survey explores the relationship between the perception of overall injustice and unfairness in the Higher Institution's organizational climate, to the negatively-oriented employees' behaviours, like workplace deviance and turnover intention among workers (educators and supporters). One federal and a state Universities in Ogun State were studied. Using stratified quota sampling method, questionnaire on the perception of workers of overall injustices on workplace deviance and turnover intention (QPIDTI) was administered on workers, who were classified into two strata, educators (Academic staff) and supporters (Non-academic staff). The respondents were approached on convenience of approach basis, using research assistants. Data collected were analyzed using SPSS. The result of the study revealed that perception of overall organizational injustice is positively correlated to workplace deviance; turnover intention among educators is higher than that of all supporters; Perceptions of non-teaching staff for overall organizational injustice was also high; ($M=5.96$, $SD=0.99$). It was ($M=5.52$, $SD=.92$). There was positive correlation between overall intention and organizational injustices, for organizational deviance; ($M=5.46$, $SD=0.92$), for interpersonal deviance and ($M=5.92$, $SD=1.02$) for work deviance. Turnover intentions experienced by non-teaching staff was relatively low ($M=5.29$, $SD=0.98$). The study then recommends that Managers should pay close attention to justice violations in the workplace since these may give rise to employees' negative responses; that organizations adopt humane and attractive working condition packages to workers; make workplace conducive for them; and remunerate commensurately, to make workers happy and feel belong in decision on issues affecting them.

Keywords: Overall organizational injustice, workplace deviance, turnover intention.

Introduction

A fundamental concept in assigning task, distribution of rewards or any other type of social exchange is fairness and justice. Justice is viewed from two aspects, positive, when it is there and negative, a consequence of its absence. Researchers in this field have agreed that when employees perceive fairness or justice in the organisation it affects their attitudes and behaviors positively. They exhibit increased job commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) - (Colquitt, 2001; Williams, 2002; Wat and Shaffer, 2005) high job satisfaction (Colquitt, 2001); high organisational trust and psychological empowerment (Wat and Shaffer, 2005); high organizational commitment, social behavior, team loyalty (Murphy, 2006); increased job performance (Colquitt, 2001) and satisfaction with performance appraisal system (Pareke, 2005).

Perception of organizational injustice is also found to affect employees' health. In a longitudinal research brought about in Finland, it was identified that lack of organizational justice causes decline in the self-rated health status (Elovainio, Kivimaki, & Vahtera, 2005), absence at work due to sickness (Kivimaki, 2007), and psychiatric disorders (Kivimaki, Elovainio, Virtanen, & Stansfeld, 2003). Positive or negative effects of injustice are actually the ultimate outcome of the employees' behavioural responses to injustice.

Most of the previous researches provided empirical evidences about the effect of two dimensions of organizational injustice (distributive and procedural) on employee's job satisfaction (Fields, Lam, 2000). Pareke (2005) argued that distributive and procedural justice influence employee's job satisfaction. Samad (2006) concluded

that procedural and distributive justice affect job satisfaction. While Martinez-tur, (2006) concluded that distributive justice is the main determinant factor to predict customer's satisfaction, followed by procedural, and interactional justice, respectively.

Procedural justice concentrates on the fairness of processes and procedures related to employee in an organization while interactional justice is concerned with the interpersonal dealing employees receive from their managers during these procedures (Chang, 2005). Originally, interactional justice was a third type of justice as described by Bies and Moag (1986). However, studies identified interactional justice as the "social" side of procedural justice, rather than any different type of justice (Folger & Bies, 1989; Tyler & Bies, 1990; Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997;). Yet some studies have recommended interactional justice as distinct form of justice (Malatesta & Byrne, p 997; 3

Masterson, Lewis-McClearn, Goldman, & Taylor, 1997; Moye, Masterson, & Bartol, 1997). People react, not only to outcomes and procedures, but also to interpersonal treatments. So, there are both structural and social elements that affect justice perceptions (Greenberg, 1993; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Folger & Skarlicki, 1998; Brockner, Ackerman, & Fairchild, 2001;).

Statement of the Problem

When an organization maintains an environment of fairness and justice in the distribution of rewards and procedures and other issues pertaining to the employee's interaction, the response is positive; the gap to cover in this study is where there is the

perception of absence of fairness. The study investigates whether workers' attitudes and behaviours will be negatively affected. Will their OCB tend low? Will there be evidence of increasing crimes, intention to protest, feeling of anger and disrespect? Will there be Organizational misbehaviour (OMB)? Counter productive work behaviour (CWB) and workplace aggression? Will such unsatisfied employees develop grievances against the organizations and subsequently, workplace deviance? Will they look for alternative job opportunities? The study, therefore, explores the perception of employees about organizational injustice and its relational impact on their behaviour.

Research Questions

Two main research questions were focused in the study:

1. What is the perception of educators and supporters of overall organizational injustice on work place deviance?
2. What is the perception of educators and supporters of overall injustice on turnover intention?

Literature Review

Fairness and justice are core issues for managers interested in providing equal employment opportunities; they adopt fair labour practices to improve performance-based compensation system at workplace. Fair treatment among employees is viewed from all the three dimensions of justice (distributive, procedural and interactional). Fairness is multidimensional and there are different answers to questions depending on whether the focus is on outcomes, procedures or motives. Since the beginning of the organizational justice research, scholars were concerned about maintaining fairness in organizational domains such as conflict resolution, personnel selection, labour disputes and wage negotiation etc.

This study focuses on the negative response to injustice perceived by workers.

Historically, Adams's (1965) equity theory has been the main focus of researchers to address issues of justice. The theory compares the ratios of workers' perceived outcomes (rewards) to their perceived work inputs (contributions). If the ratios are not equal, the person whose ratio is higher is thought to be inequitably overpaid, whereas the person whose ratio is lower feels that he was inequitably overpaid.

The theory points out that comparatively, low reward would produce discontent which would then motivate individuals to act for the purpose to reduce the discrepancy. This gives rise to negative emotions and motivates the individual to reduce the imbalance. (Cropanzano, 1993). This study is conducted to determine how employees behave when they perceive injustice. Managers should pay close attention to justice violations in the workplace since these may give rise directly to employees' negative responses. Injustices, however, can also generate negative consequences that are less direct.

Various studies have examined the influence of fair treatment of employees on organizational variables such as job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), trust in and loyalty to the leaders (Deluga, 1994), organizational citizenship behaviour (Morrison, 1994, Greenberg, 1990). The fair and equal treatment of employees will increase job satisfaction, improve relationships between supervisors and employees, encourage organizational citizenship behaviour and reduce cases of employee's theft, thus benefiting the organization.

According to Leventhal (1976), people use three major justice rules to determine outcome justice: the contributions rule

(equity, needs, equality). The equality rule is used when the goal is to preserve social harmony while the needs rule is applied when the objective is to foster personal welfare. All these are set to achieve productivity and a high level of performance.

Distributive justice is not only a relevant issue but equally important. Skarlicki and Latham (1996), defined procedural justice as "the extent to which fair procedures and processes are in place and adhered to and to which individuals see their leaders as being fair and sincere and logical or rational in what they do" (Ivancevich and Matteson, 2002). Folger and Cropanzano (1998:26) define procedural justice as the "fairness issues concerning the methods, mechanisms, and processes used to determine outcomes."

In 1975, Thibaut and Walker conducted research into employees' reactions to the dispute resolution process. This led to the development of their theory of procedural justice.

According to these authors, employees judge fairness of procedures, according to two types of control: the amount of control they have over the procedures used to make a decision (referred to as process control) and the amount of control they have over influencing the decision (referred to as decision control). People want procedures that allow them to feel that they have participated in developing a decision that will affect them. Being able to voice their opinions thus affords them the opportunity to influence others' decisions. Further research revealed that procedures that provided employees with opportunities to influence a decision were perceived as fairer than procedures that denied process control.

Bies and Moag (1986) introduced the concept of interactional justice. It is defined as "the quality of interpersonal treatment that people expect to receive when procedures are implemented" and emphasizes "the importance of truthfulness, respect and justification as fairness criteria of interpersonal communication" (Bies, 1987; Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990). Thus, interactional justice deals with the human aspect of organizational practices and, as such is related to the communication aspects between the source and target of justice, such as politeness, honesty and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990). It has been argued that fairness is not only determined by the formal policies and procedures of the organization but leaders are also considered to be an important source of fairness (Cobb, Vest & Hills, 1997). This treatment is exhibited by the content of the message conveyed by the leaders as well as their conducts (Bies, Shapiro & Cummings, 1988; Cobb, 1992; Tyler, Lind *et al.*, 1998), or the way of implementing the policies and procedures (Bies, Martin & Brockner, 1993; Cobb & Frey, 1996; Tyler & Bies, 1990).

Interactional justice is one of the most important considerations in an organization due to its impact on individual's feelings, perceptions and consequent behaviour (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt *et al.* 2001). Moreover, research has proved a positive relationship between interpersonal justice and employees' level of trust and collective esteem of the group experiencing the treatment or interaction (Colquitt, 2001). Normally, although organizations make efforts to display fair conduct, employees will perceive some types of interpersonal treatment to be unfair and vice versa (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

That is why it has been observed that the interpersonal sensitivity component of interactional injustice is associated with the quality of the interpersonal treatment an employee receives within an organization (Colquitt et al., 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Folger & Konovsky, 1989). It has also been stated that interpersonal treatment is related to varied emotions: that individuals feel towards agents or authority figures in response to decision making within an organizational structure (Tyler, 1989).

Despite the fact that there is considerable amount of research that focuses on three dimensions of justice perceptions, there is evidence that recent researches shifted their emphasis on the examination of overall justice judgments (Tomblom & Vermunt, 1999; Lind, 2001a, b; Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005). One of the reasons is that different types of justices may not accurately express individuals' justice experience (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Bies, 2001) and individuals feel more strongly affected by unfair incidents than fair incidents (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Judge & Colquitt, 2004). Therefore, instead of discussing justice, it would be more appropriate to discuss injustice that will make a more logical sense for the readers (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). The study further looks into injustice in relation to the workplace deviance and (WD) and turnover intention (TI).

According to Sheppard *et al* (1992), employees generally deal with injustices in one of four ways. Firstly, they live with it and continue as if nothing has happened. Secondly, they can change their behaviour to remove the injustice.

Thirdly, they can rationalize the injustice by renaming, removing or redefining it. Lastly, employees can decide to resign or request a transfer in order to avoid it.

In literature, workplace sabotage (WPS) is a behaviour that "damage, disrupt, or subvert the organization's operations for the personal purposes of the saboteur by creating unfavorable publicity, embarrassment, delays in production, damage to property, the destruction of working relationships, or the harming of employees or customers" (Crino, 1994, p. 312). Most recent researches argue for conceptualizing sabotage as a rational behaviour that stems from an individual's reaction to his or her environment (Analoui, 1995; DiBattista, 1996; Jermier, 1988). In literature workplace sabotage (WPS) and work deviance (WD) are used with overlapping definitions, yet WPS is broader category of WD (Ambrose *et al*, 2002). In this research, we will consider WD as a limited concept of WPS.

Work deviance has been conceptualized as behaviours of employees that violate significant company norms, policies, or rules and threaten the well-being of the organization and its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Examples of workplace deviance include both behaviours directed at organizations (e.g., theft, coming to work late, putting little effort into work) and individuals in the workplace, such as supervisors or co-workers (e.g., making fun of others, playing mean pranks, acting rudely, arguing).

In this limited sense WD have two perspectives, organizational deviance (OD) and interpersonal deviance (ID). The former refers to a situation based perspective that is caused as a result of unpleasant work environment, while the latter is person-based and depend upon the personality and the tendency of individuals behaving in such disappointing situation irrespective of the nature of the situation.

Unfair treatment in the organization has also been frequently linked to increased intention to leave the organization (Li & Cropanzano, 2009; Cole *et al.*, 2010). A turnover intention is defined as, the extent to which an employee plans to quit the organization, reflect an alternative form of withdrawal and is the strongest predictor of actual turnover. Theoretically, a fair treatment in the organization provides the evidence to the employees that the organization values them as important members of the organization (Lind & Tyler, 1988), while unfair treatment may be an indication of disrespect for the employees, who will decide not to stay further in this organization. This study explores how overall organizational injustice affects educators and supporters and the work deviance actions it manifests.

Research Methodology

The cross sectional field survey focuses on the relationship between perception of overall injustice, work deviance and turnover intention of workers. Data were obtained through the use of questionnaire on the perception of workers on organizational injustices on workplace deviance and turnover intention (QPIDTI) from the relevant respondents to ascertain any causal relationships.

The population of the research comprised all the employees of Ogun State

higher institutions. Using stratified quota sampling method, the participants sampled from the Universities of Agriculture, Abeokuta (Federal) and Olabisi Onabanjo (State) in Ogun State of Nigeria were classified into two strata, educators - Academic staff (lecturers, Assistant Professors, Professors) and supporters - Non-academic staff who are engaged in administrative and office assignments (Clerical staff, Assistant Directors, Deputy Directors, Directors etc.) The respondents were approached on convenience of approach basis.

Research Instruments

Questionnaire on the perception of workers on organizational injustices on workplace deviance and turnover intention (QPIDTI) elicits employee's perceptions of injustice which were assessed with six-item scale, developed and validated by Ambrose and Schminke (2009), with a slight modification. The three parts of the QPIDTI are: -The OOIj scale which assesses individuals' perception of injustice and fairness of the organization by agreeing or otherwise with each OOIj statement (as well as those for work deviance and turnover intentions) on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Responses to the items were recorded to parallel the specific injustice items, such that higher ratings reflect greater perceptions of unfairness. α for overall injustice was .9; Organizational deviance on the part of the employee was assessed with a 9-item ($\alpha = .94$) organizational deviance scale (Bennett & Robinson, 2000); -Turnover intention (TI) was measured via a 5-item scale adapted from Horn and Griffeth (1995). Responses to all items were made on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "Strongly Disagree" to (7) "Strongly Agree" Three hundred

Questionnaire on the perception of workers on organizational injustices on workplace deviance and turnover intention (QPIDI)

Data Analysis: Data was analyzed using SPSS.

were distributed among teaching and non-teaching staff of the universities, out of which 235 responded.

Table 1

Categories	Teaching		Non-Teaching		
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%	
1. Gender	Male	84	60	72	68
	Female	56	40	23	32
2. Marital Status	Married	95	68	78	82
	Unmarried	45	32	17	18
3. Educational Level	Master and above	84	88	140	100
	Below Masters	-	-	11	12
4. Job Experience	Less than 5 years	70	74	83	59
	More than 5 years	25	26	57	41
Total		95		140	

From Table1, the overall response rate remained about 78%. Among the respondents 66 % (156) were male and 44% (79) were female, 60% (140) were teachers and 40% (95) were supporting staff.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the studied variables

To confirm the pre-specified relationship and for evaluating the

distinctiveness all the measured variables, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using covariance matrix was undertaken using 20 items were used to identify the respondents' responses. 6 items used to measure the perception of overall organizational Injustice (OOIj); 5 items to measure the organizational deviance (OD); four items for measuring interpersonal deviance (ID); and 5 items for turnover intention (TI).

Table 2. Modification Process and Convergent Validity of the Overall Organizational Injustice, Work Deviance and Turnover Intention

RMSE Items	GFI			A		
Initial Model of Overall organizational Injustice	OOIj ₁	OOIj ₂	OOIj ₃	OOIj ₄	OOIj ₅	OOIj ₆
	1.00				0.000	
Initial Model of organizational Deviance	OD ₁	OD ₂	OD ₃	OD ₄		
	1.00				0.000	
Initial Model of Interpersonal Deviance	ID ₁	ID ₂	ID ₃	ID ₄		
	0.95				0.159	
Initial Model of Turnover Intention	TI ₁	TI ₂	TI ₃	TI ₄	TI ₅	
	1.00				0.000	

Table 2 explains the iteration process that was followed in obtaining the perfect-fit of the model. It is clear that the initial model of overall organizational injustice has perfect fit and model required no modification (GFI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.000). Similarly, the model of organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance required no modification. While the initial model of turnover

intention represented a poor fit though an acceptable GFI = 0.95 and a high RMSEA 0.159, repeated iteration leads to dropping of (TI1) and finally a perfect model fit was obtained (GFI=1.00, RMSEA = 0.000). As a result of dropping one item for turnover intention construct (TI1), nineteen items remained valid for the model.

Table 3a. Teacher

Variables	Number of items	Items Deleted	Cronbach's alpha a	CFI	NFI
OOIj	6	-	0.82	1.00 0	0.96
OD	5	-	0.79	1.00 0	0.96
ID	4	-	0.80	1.00 0	1.00
TI	4	1	0.91	1.00 0	0.98

Table 3b. Non Teachers

Variables	Number of items	Items Deleted	Cronbach's alpha a	CFI	NFI
OOIj	6	-	0.82	1.00	0.96
OD	5	-	0.79	1.00	0.96
ID	4	-	0.80	1.00	1.00
TI	4	1	0.76	1.00 0	0.98

As it is evident from the table that the reliability of overall organizational injustice is .87 and for dependent variables organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance and turnover intention are .79, .81 and .76 respectively, representing acceptable internal consistency of the study variables. The value of comparative fit index (CFI) is higher than .90. This indicates the strong

evidence of undimensionality. Further, NFI (Normed Fit Index) values range between .90 and 1.00. This is the indication of convergent validity. All the CFI and NFI values for teachers and supporters are given in Table 3a and 3b. The descriptive statistics and correlation among the study variables (predictor and criterion variable) are shown in Tables 4a and 4b.

Table 4a: (Teachers) Mean Scores. Standard Deviation and Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables

Variables	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation(SD)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Organizational Injustice (OOIj)	5.88	1.05	-				
Organizational Deviance (OD)	5.63	0.87	.52**				
Interpersonal Deviance (ID)	5.29	0.77	.48**	.83*			
Work Deviance (WD)	5.83	1.05	.50**	.59**	.74**		
Turnover Intention (TI)	5.91	1.02	.68**	.66**	.68**	.63**	

Note: N = 140, $p < 0.01$, All items used a 7- point Likert Scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Teachers' perceptions of overall organizational injustice were relatively high; (M=5.88, SD=1.05). It was (M=5.63, SD=.87) for organizational deviance, (M=5.29, SD=.77) for interpersonal deviance and collectively (M=5.83, SD=1.05) for work deviance. The level of turnover intentions experienced by the respondents was relatively high (M=5.91, SD= 1.02).

All study variables were found to be significantly inter-correlated. Correlations among overall organizational injustice and dependent variables were significantly high, ranging from $r=.48$ ($p < 0.01$) to $r=.83$ ($p < 0.01$). Accordingly, the correlations between overall organizational injustice and organizational deviance, interpersonal

deviance, work deviance were ($r=.52$, ($p < 0.01$), $r=.52$, ($p < 0.01$), $r=.83$, ($p < 0.01$), $r=.74$, ($p < 0.01$), and $r=.63$, ($p < 0.01$).

The perceptions of non-teaching staff for overall organizational injustice was also high; (M=5.96, SD=0.99). It was (M=5.52, SD=.92), for organizational deviance, (M=5.46, SD=0.92), for interpersonal deviance and collectively (M=5.92, SD=1.02), for work deviance. The level of turnover intentions experienced by non-teaching staff was relatively low (M=5.29, SD=0.98). Correlations among overall organizational injustice and dependent variables were significantly high, ranging from $r=.63$ ($p < 0.01$) to $r=.83$ ($p < 0.01$).

Table 4b: Non- Teaching Mean Scores, Standard Deviation and Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables

Variables	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation(SD)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Organizational Injustice (OOIj)	5.96	0.99	-				
Organizational Deviance (OD)	5.52	0.92	.68**				
Interpersonal Deviance (ID)	5.46	0.84	.76**	.83*			
Work Deviance (WD)	5.92	1.02	.63**	.59**	.74**		
Turnover Intention (TI)	5.29	0.98	.41**	.66**	.68**	.48**	

Note: N=95, $p < 0.01$, All items used a 7- point Likert Scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree

As it is evident from the table that for the teachers' data, overall organizational injustice was found to explain 48% ($R^2 = .48$, $p < 0.01$) of the observed variations in organizational deviance, 38% to explain interpersonal deviance ($R^2 = .38$, $p < 0.01$), 40% of work deviance ($R^2 = .40$, $p < 0.01$) and 68% of turnover intention ($R^2 = .68$, $p < 0.01$). While looking at the results of the

data related to non-teaching staff, it was found that overall organizational injustice was found to explain 52% ($R^2 = .52$, $p < 0.01$) of the observed variations in organizational deviance, 48% to explain interpersonal deviance (Model = .48, $p < 0.01$), 66% of work deviance ($R^2 = .66$, $p < 0.01$) and 36% of turnover intention ($R^2 = .36$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 5: Result of Hierarchical Regression of Perception of Overall Organizational Injustice (OOIj) on ID, WD, Ti

Model	Model (Educators)			Model 2 (supporters)		
	Std. β	R^2	F	Std. β	R^2	F
Perception of Organizational Injustice (OOIj)			55.0			35.0
Organizational Deviance (OD)	.48	.42	0	.58	.52	0
Perception of Organizational Justice		45.0			14.5	
Interpersonal Deviance (ID)	.39 .38		.42 .48			0
Perception of Organizational Injustice (OOIj)		21.0			23.0	
Work Deviance (WD)	.42	.40	.58	.66		0
Perception of Organizational Injustice (OOIj)		34.5			16.0	
Turnover Intention (TI)	.58	.68	.42	.36		0

All values are reliable at 0.05 Significant level

Discussion

It was found that perception of overall organizational injustice has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance, Work Deviance and Turnover Intention. This result is consistent with the previous studies. An interesting finding is that educators are less sensitive to overall organizational injustice and their response towards work deviance (.42) is less than the response of supporters (.66). On the other hand, their turnover intention (.58) is higher than the turnover intention of the supporters (.42); the same is the case with interpersonal deviance. Comparatively, the perception of organizational injustice among the educators shows low interpersonal deviance (0.39) as supporters (0.42), revealing that educators are more conscientious. In terms of R square values, OOIj explains 68% of the variation in turnover intention for educators, while OOIj explains about 38% of the variation in interpersonal deviance. For supporters, the highest R-square value is 0.66 and 0.36 for work deviance and turnover intention, respectively.

OOIj reaches a threshold level for educators, then they are more likely to exhibit turnover behaviour. They would rather leave the organization than engage in interpersonal deviance. Non-teaching staff is connected to the public, so they involve in workplace deviance more frequently than teaching staff; their alternative jobs are not

readily available, their turnover intention is low.

Conclusion

Although previous research established negative relationship between the three dimensions of organizational justice, (distributive, procedural and interactional), workplace deviance and turnover intentions, this study validates the construct of overall injustice and establish a direct relationship between workplace deviance and overall turnover intention, using the two Universities sampled. The limitation to the study is a small size of the sample. It is being suggested here that larger sample may be used in further research for a more advanced accuracy.

Recommendation

The study recommends that Universities should be made conducive for both the learners and workers. The working condition packages to workers should be attractive, one that explores maximum discharge of duties from workers while equally treating them with respect and honour. The workplace should be made conducive for staff taking into consideration their health, mental development and capacity enhancement. The remuneration of workers should be commensurate to their labour, to make them happy. Their morale will be boosted if they are allowed to express themselves through their unions and made to feel belong in decision making on issues affecting them.

References

- 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 Organization Behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 177 – 198.
- Allyn & Bacon Aquino, K., Griffeth, R. W., D.G & Hom, P.W. (1997), Integrating Justice Constructs into the Turnover Process: A test of a Referent Cognition Model, *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1208 -1227.
- Ambrose M.L., Seabright, M.A., & Schminke M. (2002), Sabotage in the work-place: The Role of Organization Justice, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 947 -965
- Ambrose M.L, & Arnaud, A. (2005), Distributive and Procedural Justice: Construct Distinctiveness; Construct interdependence, and overall justice. In J Greenberg & J Colquit (Eds.) *The handbook of Organizational Justice*: 59-84. Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, Mahwah: New Jersey.
- Baron , R.M., & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The Moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality & Social psychology*, 51, 1173 – 1182.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. 1993. Interactional, formal and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology: interdisciplinary and Applied*, 127: 649 – 656.
- Bies, R.J. (2001). Interactional (in) Justice: The sacred and the profane. In J Greenberg & R Cropanzano (Eds.) *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F (1986) International Justice: communication criteria of fairness. In R.L Lewicki, B.H Sheppard, & R.J Bies (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in Organization* (vol. 1, pp. 43 -55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bobocel, D.R., & Holmvall, C. 2001. Are international justice and procedural justice different? Framing the debate. In S. Gilliland. D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in Social issues in Management: Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice*: 85 -110. Greenwich CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Byrne, Z.S., & Cropanzano., R. (2001). The history of organizational Justice: The founders speak. In R: cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in workplace: From theory to practice* (Vol. 2., pp. 3 -26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E, 2001. *The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organization behavior and Human Decision processes*, 86:278-321
- Cohen, R.L., & Greenberg J. (1982) The justice concept in social psychology. In J. Greenberg & R.L. Cohen (Eds.) *Equity and Justice in social behavior* (pp. 1-41) New York: Academic
- Colquitt, J.A (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86: 386 – 400.

- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O., & 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
- Colquitt, J.A., & Shaw, J.C. (2005) How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg and J.A. Colquitt (Eds.) *The handbook of organizational justice*: 113-152. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J.A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed), *Organizational behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 165 – 210)
- Colquitt, J.A., & Greenberg, J., & Scott, B. A (2002) Organizational Justice: Where do we stand? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds) *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 589 -619). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 14
- Colquitt, J. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 165-210).
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Scott, B. A. (2005) Organizational justice: Where do we stand? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 589- 619). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (2001), Procedural and distributive justice is more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*: 119-151. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. R. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58: 164-209.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002), *Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice*. *Group & Organization Management*, 27: 324- 351.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. Copper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 105-108.
- Fair brother, K., & Warn, J. (2003). Workplace dimensions, stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 8-21.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advance in organizational justice* (pp.

- 89- 118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Folger, R & Greenberg, J. 1985. Procedural justice: an interpretative analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, (3):141-183
- Folger, R & Konovsky, MA. 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1): 115-130.
- Folger, R & Skarlicki, D. 1999. Unfairness and resistance to change: hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(1): 35-50.
- Folger, R. 1977. Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of "voice" and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35: 108- 119.
- Greenberg, J. (2001)a. Setting the justice agenda: Seven unanswered questions about "what, why, and how." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58: 210-219.
- Greenberg, J. 1987. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, (12):9-22.
- Greenberg, J. 2001b. The seven loose cannons of organizational justice. In Cropanzano & Greenberg(Eds.): *Advances in organizational justice*: 245-271. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, J. 1988. Equity and workplace status: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73: 606-613.
- Greenberg, J. 1990. Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 6(2):399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568. 15.
- 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*; Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Greenberg, J. (1997). A social influence model of employee theft: Beyond the fraud triangle. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Beis & B. H. Sheppards (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 6, pp. 29-52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Greenberg, J. (2004). Stress fairness to fare no stress: Managing workplace stress by promoting f I organizational justice. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 352-365.
- Greenberg, J., & Lind, E. A. (2000). The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application. In C. L. Cooper & E. A Locke (Eds.). *I/Q psychology: What we know about theory and practice?* (pp. 72-105). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Greys, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic group processes* (pp. 235-256). New York: Springer-Versa.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality.

- Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17, 247-263.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17, 247-263. Herzberg, F. (2003, January).
- Hauenstein, N. M. T., McGonigle, T., & Flinder, S.W. 2001. A meta-analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and distributive justice: Implications for justice research. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13: 39-56.
- Janssen, O. (2004). How fairness perceptions make innovative behavior more or less stressful. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 201-215
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(3), 395-404.
- Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., Vahtera, J., Virtanen, M., & Stansfeld, S.A. (2003). Association between organizational inequity and incidence of psychiatric disorders in female employees. *Psychological Medicine*, 33, 319-326.
- Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J.E., Brunner, E., Head, J., Shipley, M.J., Vahtera, J., et al. (2005). Justice at Work and Reduced Risk of Coronary Heart Disease Among Employees. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 165, 2245-2251.
- Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Elovainio, M., Virtanen, M., & Siegrist, J. (2007). Effort reward imbalance, procedural injustice and relational injustice as psychosocial predictors of health: complementary or redundant models? *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 64, 659-665
- Konovsky, M. 2000. Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26: 489-511.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698-707.
- Lemons, MA & Jones, CA. 2001. Procedural justice in promotion decisions: using perceptions of fairness to build employee commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(4):268-281.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). Fairness in social relationships. In J. W. Thibault, J. T. Spence & R. C. Carson (Eds.), *Contemporary topics in social psychology* (pp. 211-239). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press
- Lind, E. A., & Van den Bos, K. (2002). When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management. In B. W. Staw & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 24, pp. 181-223). Boston: Elsevier. 16.
- Lind, E. A. 2001 a. Fairness Heuristic Theory: justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg, & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*: 56-88. CA: Stanford University Press.

- Lind, E. A. 2001b. Thinking critically about justice judgments. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58:220-226.
- 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), 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.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
- Pareke, F. Js. (2005). Employee perception of justice in the performance appraisal process: evidence from small business in DI Jogjakarta Province, Indonesia. Prasetya Mulya *Management Journal*, 10 (2).
- Shapiro, D. (2001). The death of justice theory is likely if theorists neglect the "wheels" already invented and the voices of the injustice victims. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58: 235-242.
- Taylor, M. 2001. Reflections on Fairness, Continuing the Progression-of Justice Research and Practice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58: 243-253.
- Tepper, B. J. (2001). Health consequences of organizational injustice: Test of main and interactive effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 197- 21
- Thibault, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). Cooperation in groups: *Procedural justice, social identity, and behavior engagement*: Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Vermunt, R., & Steensma, H. (2005). How can justice be used to manage stress in organizations? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 383- 410). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Terick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 590-598.