Perceptions of Leadership Fairness in the Canadian Forces:

Unintended Consequences of Leader Behaviour and Transmission of Core Values

Prepared for:

Canadian Forces Leadership Institute

March 31, 2003

David A. Jones **Sarah A. Carroll**

University of Calgary

Arla L. Day

Saint Mary's University

Contact Information:
David A. Jones, Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4; Phone (403) 220-5232; Fax (403) 282-8249; E-mail: dajone@ucalgary.ca

Abstract

Leaders in the Canadian Forces (CF) can use principles of organizational justice in peacetime and other out of theatre contexts to establish trust and commitment to decisions among subordinates and to reduce the likelihood of negative responses to perceived unfairness (i.e., reduced citizenship behaviour, retaliation, withdrawal behaviour). Moreover, the effects of fair treatment on trust and decision commitment may transfer to attitudes and behaviours while in theatre and, hence, promote operational effectiveness. In Section 1a, we review literature on organizational justice including construct definitions, theory, and major research findings, with a particular focus on situations in which people's concerns for justice are heightened. In Section 1b, we review research on the behavioural and cognitive responses to perceptions of fair and unfair treatment by leaders. In Section 2a, we explore the implications of organizational justice for the CF by reviewing research and reports on the responses to perceived fairness by military personnel. In Section 2b, we highlight particular effects of fair and unfair treatment that might be intensified in a military context. In Section 2c, we explore how organizational justice principles can be used to align individual and group orientations to develop a culture consistent with the espoused ethos. In Section 3, we offer recommendations for training and future research, as well as concluding comments.

Introduction

Effective military leaders not only require technical competencies, but they must also possess effective interpersonal and communication skills to instill commitment to strategy and acceptance of goals among soldiers (Zaccaro, 1999). Indeed, in times of armed conflict and other in-theatre operations, an effective military requires soldiers who strictly adhere to orders from leaders, and who are fully committed to the mission and goals of their unit (Borman, Motowidlo, Rose, & Hansen, 1985). Therein lies a social dilemma: Sacrificing one's motive for self-preservation by unquestioningly obeying orders for the sake of group goals requires an enormous amount of trust in one's leader. Individuals in non-combat roles are also faced with similar social dilemmas in their ongoing attempts to determine whether to cooperate with group goals or pursue self-interested ends at the group's expense (Lind, 2001).

A large research literature on organizational justice[1] has addressed questions pertaining to this type of social dilemma, and has shown that fair treatment is an effective way to establish trust and commitment to decisions and goals. We argue that leaders of the Canadian Forces (CF), at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, can use principles of organizational justice in out of theatre and peacetime contexts to establish trust among subordinates and promote commitment to decisions. Once established, this trust may transfer to attitudes and behaviours while in theatre, thereby promoting operational effectiveness. This notion is consistent with ideas put forth by Hoojiberg, Bullis, and Hunt (1999), who proposed that, although soldiers may prefer directive and decisive leadership and are less concerned with human relations in times of *instability*, maintaining positive interpersonal relations in times of *stability* is essential for effective leader-

[1] Throughout this paper, the terms "justice" and "fairness" are used interchangeably to refer to people's *perceptions* of justice or fair treatment, rather than to an objective state of affairs. Moreover, unless otherwise specified, the terms "justice" and "fairness" refer to the entire spectrum of possible perceptions, ranging from injust to just and from unfair to fair.

follower exchanges among military personnel. Moreover, perceptions of fair treatment by leaders can also minimize subordinates' negative behavioural and cognitive reactions to leadership behaviour. Finally, a key role of military leaders is to align individual and group orientations to develop a culture consistent with the espoused ethos/values, and fair treatment might facilitate the accomplishment of this goal. We develop this thesis throughout this paper.

SECTION 1:
RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND LEADERSHIP FAIRNESS

Section 1 comprises a two-part review of the literature on organizational justice. In Section 1a, we review the constructs of justice and major research findings; in Section 1b, we begin developing our thesis that leaders can use justice principles in out of theatre contexts to establish trust and commitment to goals, and to reduce the likelihood of negative responses, such as reduced citizenship behaviour, retaliation, and withdrawal behaviour, to perceived unfairness. In Section 2, we turn our attention to applying organizational justice to the Canadian Military context.

Section 1a:
An Introduction to Organizational Justice: Constructs, Theory, and Major Findings

The following overview of key justice concepts places emphasis on leadership fairness, justice perceptions over time, reasons why justice is a fundamental human concern, and conditions in which the desire for just treatment is magnified.

Construct Definitions

The organizational justice literature comprises over thirty years of research on people's perceptions of fairness in organizational settings (for recent books and reviews, see Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998;

Gilliland & Chan, 2001; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001; Konovsky, 2000). The principles of justice have been supported in a number of diverse settings and contexts, including the Canadian military. As a result, there exists a considerable amount of knowledge about how people process information to make judgements about justice and about the ways in which people respond to perceptions of fair and unfair treatment. Several constructs have been examined to understand justice in organizational life, which we review next.

Distributive justice. Early research on fairness in organizations began focused on people's perceptions about the extent to which the outcomes they receive (e.g., pay or allotted vacation time) are fair. The fairness of outcomes, referred to as distributive justice (Homans, 1961), is fostered when outcomes are viewed as being consistent with implicit norms for resource allocation, such as the norms of equity (Adams, 1965), need, reciprocity, or equality (Major & Deaux, 1982). Justice researchers soon recognized, however, that perceptions of fairness regarding resource allocation are not limited to an individual's concerns about *ends*; people are also concerned about the *means* by which ends are determined (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993).

Procedural justice. The extent to which an individual perceives the procedures that determine outcomes as fair is referred to as procedural justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Thibaut & Walker, 1975; for a review, see Konovsky, 2000). Justice researchers have focused much of their efforts on understanding the antecedents and consequences to procedural justice, and several studies have shown that people are deeply concerned about issues pertaining to procedural justice, especially when outcomes are unfavourable (see Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The effects of procedural fairness are often dependent upon the enactment of procedures by managers, supervisors, and leaders (e.g., Little, Magner, & Welker, 2002); thus,

many issues pertaining to procedural justice are highly related to perceptions of leadership fairness.

Procedures are perceived as more fair to the extent that (a) they include opportunities for appeal and (b) input from affected parties (also called voice), (c) they are based on accurate information, (d) they are consistently applied across people and over time, (e) they are free from systematic bias, and (f) they are ethical (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). Thus, perceptions of fairness can be fostered by leaders who can explain and demonstrate, for example, that accurate information is used in decision making, and that procedures are applied consistently and without bias. Of all of these aspects of procedural justice, issues pertaining to "voice" have received the most research attention.

Voice. Broadly defined, voice refers to the opportunity for individuals who are affected by a decision to provide input into the decision making process (Folger, 1977). People are more willing to accept outcomes, negative or otherwise, when they have input into the procedure used to determine the outcomes, which enhances perceptions of fairness (e.g., Folger, Cropanzano, Timmerman, Howes, & Mitchell, 1996; Kanfer, Sawyer, Earley, & Lind, 1987).

An instrumental view of voice refers to the notion that people value voice because it can be used to influence decisions and outcomes (see Lind & Tyler, 1988). Procedures that include process-related input can help ensure that the desired outcomes and greatest benefits may be reached over time (Folger, 1993; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkan, 1979; Shapiro, 1993; Thibault & Walker, 1975; Tyler, 1987, 1990).

In addition to the instrumental value of voice, when authorities provide opportunities for voice, they send a signal to people that they are respected and valued by organizational members (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler, Rasinski, & Spodick, 1985). Research has shown that people

value voice as a means for self-expression even when they know their voice will not influence a decision (Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990). One meta-analysis demonstrated that voice, both instrumental (voice that can affect decisions) and non-instrumental (voice that cannot affect decisions), predicted satisfaction with a performance appraisal review, but only non-instrumental voice incrementally predicted trust in one's supervisor (Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995). A more recent meta-analysis showed that participation and input during performance appraisal was related to fairness evaluations, motivation to improve performance, and satisfaction with the appraisal process. Importantly, these authors also found that non-instrumental voice tended to predict outcomes more strongly than instrumental voice (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998). In sum, research has supported both conceptualizations of voice, and the impact of non-instrumental voice is, in some cases, more substantial than instrumental voice (e.g., Conlon, 1993; Earley & Lind, 1987; Lind, Lissak, & Conlon, 1983; Shapiro & Brett, 1993).

Voice is an important part of leadership fairness because leaders can actively solicit voice and, perhaps most importantly, leaders can demonstrate that voice was heard (Bies, 1987a; Tyler, 1987). Showing that people's voice was considered by decision makers is a key condition for the positive effects of voice. For instance, researchers have found, that when voice is ignored, people rate the decision-making process as more unfair than when no opportunity for voice existed (e.g., Folger et al., 1979; Greenberg, Eskew, & Miles, 1991; Van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1996). Perceptions of fairness are higher when people feel that their voice is considered, even if their suggestions are not implemented (Folger, 1977; Greenberg, 1986; Kim & Mauborgne, 1991, 1993; Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995; Leung & Li, 1990; Lind et al., 1990; Singer, Singer, & Bruhns, 1991).

In essence, the positive effects of voice depend upon the extent to which employees perceive that their voice is considered (Harlos, 2001; Shapiro & Brett, 1993); however, consistent with instrumental and non-instrumental views, the consideration of voice only partially mediates the relationship between opportunity for voice and various outcomes (Klammer, Skarlicki, & Barclay, 2002). Thus, as we review below, leaders can play an important role in the decision-making process by soliciting voice and by demonstrating that this input has been considered, when communicating the outcomes of decision making (e.g., Bies & Shapiro, 1988).

Interactional justice. More recently, researchers have begun to distinguish between separate the structural and social aspects of procedures by examining perceptions of fair treatment by an organization's leaders and decision makers, referred to as interactional justice (Bies, 1987a, 1987b, 2001). Interactional justice is influenced by the way in which procedures regarding relevant outcomes are implemented and explained by decision makers or their representatives (Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990), and by the extent to which decision-makers treat employees with sensitivity, dignity, and respect (e.g., Folger & Bies, 1989).

There is debate, however, about whether interactional justice is a separate construct, or whether it is merely the social aspect of procedural justice (for reviews of this debate, see Bobocel & Holmvall, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Konovsky, 2000). It is our view that this debate is purely academic and that there is little question about the utility of separating interactional justice from procedural justice for purposes of, at the very least, understanding people's experience of justice in organizations. Moreover, there is a large body of research demonstrating that procedural and interactional justice have different antecedents (e.g., Schminke, Ambrose, & Cropanzano, 2000; Schminke, Cropanzano, & Rupp, 2002), show differential prediction (for meta-analytic reviews, see Bartle & Hayes, 1999; Cohen-Charash &

Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Fassina, Jones, Carroll, & Uggerslev, 2003), and have incremental validity over each other (e.g., Jones & Skarlicki, in press; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Additionally, recent research has extended this debate by supporting a four-factor model of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Henle, 2002; Jones, 2003a). This four-factor model (Colquitt, 2001) includes the traditional conceptualizations of procedural and distributive justice, but partitions interactional justice into interpersonal and informational components (Greenberg, 1990, 1993a). Interpersonal and informational justice have been shown to independently effect various outcomes, such as theft (e.g., Greenberg, 1993b; Shapiro, Buttner, & Barry, 1994).

Interpersonal justice. Interpersonal justice is defined as an individual's perception of the extent to which decision makers treat employees with sensitivity, dignity, and respect, as well as refrain from demeaning treatment (e.g., Bies & Moag, 1986; Folger & Bies, 1989). Research on abusive supervision has tied abusive behaviours, such as yelling, verbal abuse, and demeaning treatment in front of others, to perceptions of injustice (Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). Notably, as research regarding interpersonal justice and value-expressive voice increased, scholarly views of organizational justice began to move away from conceptualizing fairness as being limited to resource distribution to conceptualizing fair treatment as a socio-emotional outcome in and of itself (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001).

Informational justice. Informational justice refers to perceptions of whether decision-makers or their representatives provide adequate explanations or accounts about outcomes that affect people (e.g., Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Bies, Shapiro, & Cummings, 1988). People who are negatively affected by a decision feel entitled to hear why and how it was made (Bies, 1987;

Brockner, Dewitt, Grover, & Reed, 1990; Folger, 1993; Greenberg, 1990). When authority figures provide accounts for negative outcomes, those people who are affected feel as though a moral obligation was fulfilled and that they were treated as worthy recipients of dignity and respect (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Tyler & Lind, 1992).

Explanations can serve to legitimize the means and/or ends of decision making (Bobocel, McCline, & Folger, 1997). Accounts that legitimize means might describe how a policy was developed or how a particular decision was made, whereas accounts that legitimize ends might focus on why a negative decision was necessary and why other decisions were not deemed viable. As was previously discussed, accounts can be used to demonstrate that a person's voice was considered and examined in "good faith" (Bies, 1987a), and may even mitigate the unfavourable consequences of withholding voice provided that an adequate justification is offered (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Most research pertaining to informational justice has focused on causal accounts (Bies, 1987b), which are explanations that refer to external causes for a negative event that minimize the fault of the communicator (i.e., excuses). Several studies have shown that perceptions of fairness are higher when a causal account is used to explain a decision (typically negative) than when no account is provided (Bies & Shaprio, 1987; Folger, Rosenfiled, & Robinson, 1983; Shapiro, 1991). Causal accounts can help minimize the extent to which leaders are blamed for negative events or decisions and, hence, can reduce people's motivation for retribution (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). Indeed, the provision of causal accounts for negative decisions and events has been associated with, for example, increased job performance (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991) and task cooperation (Baron, 1990), and reductions in organizational conflict

(Bies et al., 1988), retaliatory protest (Jones & Skarlicki, 2002), and theft (Greenberg, 1990, 1993b).

However, merely claiming that a negative event or decision is not one's fault does little to improve perceptions of fairness; the account also must be seen as adequate (Bies & Shaprio, 1987; Shapiro et al., 1994). The perceived adequacy of an account is likely affected by the extent to which the account is perceived as plausible, sincere, and truthful (Baron, 1988; Bies, 1987a; Bies & Moag, 1986; Sitkin & Bies, 1993; Tyler & Bies, 1990), timely (Evans, 1999; Folger & Bies, 1989), clear (Elsbach & Elofson, 2000), and sufficiently detailed (Greenberg, 1990, 1994). Perceptions of interactional justice are further magnified when explanations are provided in a sensitive and respectful manner (e.g., Greenberg, 1990, 1993b, 1994; Shapiro et al., 1994); that is, when interpersonal justice is also present. Research has also shown that people who received an apology following harm were less likely to display aggression and were more likely to have positive emotions (Ohbuchi, Kameda, & Agarie, 1989).

In addition to causal accounts for negative events, researchers have also examined a type of justification called an ideological account (Bies, 1987b). Ideological accounts are explanations intended to appeal to superordinate vales and goals (e.g., "This pay freeze is necessary to prevent job loss for everyone"). Research supports the effectiveness ideological accounts (e.g., Bobocel, Agar, Meyer, & Irving, 1998; Conlon & Murray, 1996; Greenberg, 1994). Moreover, accounts that deflect responsibility (typical of causal accounts) or justify a decision (typical of ideological accounts) have been shown to each contribute unique effects on evaluations of a leader (Bobocel, Agar, Meyer, & Irving, 1998).

Explanations have been shown to enhance perceptions of fairness during various organizational change initiatives that were likely viewed as unfavourable or stressful due to

uncertainty. Adequate explanations, for example, have enhanced employees' perceptions of fairness during an employee relocation plan (Daly & Geyer, 1994), a smoking ban (Greenberg, 1994), an introduction of an electronic control system (Kidwell & Bennett, 1994), move to affirmative action hiring and promotion (Bobocel & Farrell, 1996; Parker, Bales, & Christensen, 1997), a pay freeze (Greenberg, 1990; Schaubroeck, May, & Brown, 1994), and employee layoffs (e.g., Brockner, DeWitt, Grover, & Reed, 1990; Brockner & Greenberg, 1990; Brockner et al., 1994).

In the preceding sections, we reviewed research on justice constructs. To provide a more holistic understanding of concepts central to organizational justice, we now turn to a discussion of justice cognitions as dynamic phenomena that exist over time.

Justice Cognitions Over Time: Social Influence, Blame, and Subsequent Processing

Recent theoretical advances have shed considerable light on the cognitions underlying judgements of justice, and how perceptions of fair and unfair treatment influence subsequent information processing (see Appendix A). Two recent theories of justice – fairness heuristic theory (Lind, 2001; Van den Bos, Lind, & Wilke, 2001) and fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) – offer a more complete view of how people process justice information than perhaps ever before. Many predictions of both theories are well-supported (for integrative reviews, see Cropanzano et al., 2001; Jones & Skarlicki, 2003).

One conclusion that can be drawn from the aforementioned research is that early impressions about fairness are important, especially under conditions of uncertainty. Indeed, initial impressions about fair treatment have stronger effects on subsequent information processing than information encountered at a later time (see Lind, 2001; Van den Bos & Lind, 2001; Van den Bos, Lind, & Wilke, 2001). A second implication of this research is the

importance of attributions of blame: When people perceive that an act of injustice was intentional, or even merely preventable, perceptions of injustice and retributive motivations are exacerbated (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001).

Some researchers (see Appendix B) view justice as socially constructed (e.g., DeGoey, 2000; Lamertz, 2002). People in organizations talk with other organizational members about their experiences of fair and unfair treatment (Jones, 2002), and research suggests that such conversation may play a significant role in people's interpretations of events relating to fairness. Information from one's peers can create expectations for future treatment (Jones & Skarlciki, 2002), facilitate social comparisons (Folger & Kass, 2000) and counterfactual thinking (Folger, 1986; Grienberger, Rutte, & van Knippenberg, 1997; see Appendix B for further information), and confirmatory information from peers can cause one's belief about fairness or unfairness to become more extreme (e.g., Lind, Kray, & Thompson, 1998; Steil, 1983).

Why People Care About Justice

Researchers have focused on four general explanations for why members of organizations are concerned with justice (see Appendix C). The instrumental model posits that people care about fairness out of a concern for maximizing outcomes in the long run (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The relational model, which is discussed in detail later in the paper, proposes that people value fair treatment because it is indicative of group standing (Tyler & Lind, 1992). The deontological model argues that people care about fairness out of a basic respect for human dignity and worth (Folger, 1994, 1998). Finally, the uncertainty model states that fairness is valued because it addresses a fundamental human need by reducing uncertainty in an individual's social environment (Van den Bos & Lind, 2002). All four perspectives are supported

by research, and it seems likely that each model contributes uniquely to our understanding of why people care about justice.

Together, these perspectives suggest that people are deeply concerned about justice for several reasons. People search for information pertaining to fairness to make sense out of their social world, and injustice can be an extremely meaningful psychological experience because it threatens an individual's tangible outcomes, damages one's sense of group identity and belonging, and violates people's beliefs about normative codes of ethical conduct. To summarize, people are generally concerned about fair treatment, and research suggests that these concerns are intensified in certain conditions, which we identify in the following section.

Conditions in Which Fairness Concerns are Magnified

The extent to which people care about an issue relating to justice can vary both within and between people for many reasons (for a review see Jones, 2003a). Researchers have identified particular situations, however, in which people's concerns for fair treatment are consistently shown to be heightened: when outcomes or events are aversive, when expectations for fair treatment are violated, and when conditions are uncertain and changing.

Negative outcomes and aversive events. Perhaps one of the most robust findings in the justice literature is that fair procedures and interpersonal treatment from leaders are especially important when people are negatively affected by outcomes or decisions. Referent cognitions theory (Folger, 1986, 1993) and, more recently, fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001), propose that when people perceive that an event is aversive (e.g., an unfavourable relocation), injustice is perceived to the extent that an individual believes an alternative decision *could* have been made (e.g., another person could have been chosen instead if a different decision rule were used) and *should* have been made (e.g., the decision-maker is biased against

women, and this violates norms for moral conduct). The predictions of these theories are manifested in a statistical interaction between outcome favourability (or distributive justice) and either procedural (Folger, 1986) or interactional justice (Folger, 1993, Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). Resentment is maximized when unfavourable outcomes are decided through unfair procedures or are implemented or communicated by authorities in an unfair manner. This interaction has been observed repeatedly across many settings and contexts (for a review of this finding in over 40 independent samples, see Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). In more straightforward terms, no one enjoys the injury of an unfavourable outcome, but when insult is added to injury, people feel angry and resentful. For example, an individual might not be particularly pleased upon finding out that he or she will be passed over for a desired promotion; however, the same individual can become enraged upon finding out the decision-maker's "pet" employee, who is perceived to be a worse performer, receives the promotion.

This same interactive pattern can also be conceptualized in the reverse fashion: People are much more accepting of an aversive outcome or decision when they view the decision-making procedures as fair, and/or when the decision and decision-making process are communicated effectively and in a manner that demonstrates a concern for dignity and respect. This well-replicated finding has been referred to as the fair process effect (Greenberg & Folger, 1983) and the fair interpersonal treatment effect (Beugre & Baron, 2001).

Expectancy violation. Injustice is perceived more negatively when an affected individual was expecting to be treated fairly (for a review, see Jones & Skarlicki, 2003). People feel entitled to fair treatment and injustice is perceived as a loss of what people believe they deserve (e.g., Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The important role of violated expectancies in judgements of unfairness is consistent with research on the "frustration effect" (Folger, 1977; Greenberg &

Folger, 1983). That is, people perceive less fairness when they are told they will have opportunity for voice but do not receive it, than when they do not expect voice in the first place (Greenberg et al., 1991; Van den Bos et al., 1996). Jones and Skarlicki (2002) found that when people experienced a minor interpersonal injustice by an authority, individuals who expected fair treatment based on information from peers perceived less fairness and retaliated more than people who heard nothing about the authority's prior fairness. The notion that violated expectations for fair treatment results in particularly negative reactions is consistent with social-cognition research on expectancies (see Olson, Roese, & Zanna, 1996), as well as with research on psychological contract breach (Rousseau, 1995; Schalk & Rousseau, 2001), which has been tied to perceptions of injustice (e.g., Kickul, Lester, & Finkl, 2002; Kickul, Neuman, Parker, & Finkl, 2001).

Uncertainty and change. People's concern for justice is more pressing during times of change (e.g., Greenberg, 2001; Lind, 2001; Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001), in which fairness-behaviour relationships tend to be strong. One reason people are concerned with justice during change is that change is typically accompanied by the threat of reduced outcomes (Greenberg, 2000), which threatens self-interest. An alternative, and perhaps more powerful, explanation is that people are motivated to reduce uncertainty, and conditions of change are often uncertain.

Van den Bos and Lind (2002) argue that uncertainty reduction is a fundamental motivator of human behaviour and, as such, it is an end in and of itself. In support of this notion, these authors reviewed a number of studies showing that fairness is a more ubiquitous concern under conditions of uncertainty (e.g., Van den Bos, 2001). Moreover, a recent study showed that justice information had stronger effects on hospital employees' reactions when uncertainty was high (Colquitt, LePine, Rich, & Piccolo, 2003).

Conclusion

The above review demonstrated that much is now known about different types of justice concerns, how and why perceptions of fairness are formed, and the situations in which concerns for justice are heightened. Next, we review the ways in which people respond to perceptions of fair and unfair treatment.

Section 1b:

Responses to Justice: Unintended Consequences and Effects on Trust and Decision Commitment

One reason that workplace fairness is so widely researched is that perceptions of fairness are related to a number of attitudes and behaviours (see Colquitt et al., 2001) that influence organizational effectiveness (e.g., Koys, 2001). In the following sections, we will review the relationships between perceptions of fairness and organizational citizenship behaviour, retaliation, and withdrawal behaviours (i.e., lateness, absence, and voluntary turnover), as well as trust and commitment to decisions. Although justice perceptions predict a number of other behaviours (e.g., job performance, conflict), attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and emotions (e.g., anger), we focus our review on the behavioural and cognitive correlates of justice, because we believe that these responses are most relevant for a Canadian military context.

As noted in the introduction of this paper, our central thesis is that military leaders can use principles of organizational justice in out of theatre and peacetime contexts to facilitate the establishment of trust and decision and goal commitment among subordinates, and to reduce the likelihood of negative responses to leadership behaviour that is perceived as unfair. We also suggested that, in turn, the establishment of trust and commitment through fair treatment in out

of theatre contexts may transfer to operational effectiveness while in theatre; however, no research has examined this issue. In the following section, we describe some of the theory that explains the mechanisms underlying people's responses to fair and unfair treatment. We then review research that describes responses to perceptions of justice.

Theoretical Explanations for the Effects of Justice

Several rich theoretical perspectives explain why and how people react to justice (see Appendix D). First, research on equity theory (Adams, 1965) has shown that people respond to inequitable outcomes that are unfavourable (e.g., unfair pay), through various equity restoration techniques, such as by reducing inputs (e.g., reduced citizenship behaviour, withdrawal behaviour) or by increasing outcomes (e.g., theft). Second, people tend to reciprocate benefits received (i.e., fair treatment) through responding in kind (i.e., engaging in positive and cooperative behaviours; Gouldner, 1960; Organ, 1988a). A more recent view, the agent-system model of justice (e.g., Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000) is based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and proposes that individuals react to injustice by directing their responses toward the source of the unfairness. Thus, responses to procedural and interactional justice are directed predominantly toward the organization and its managers, respectively. Finally, when people perceive managerial treatment, processes, and/or outcomes as unfair (especially when they are perceived as resulting from intentional ill-will), feelings of anger and a desire for retribution are often elicited (Bies & Tripp, 1996, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). These theoretical perspectives have been used to explain many justice-outcome relationships, including the relationship of perceptions of fairness with organizational citizenship behaviour, retaliation, and withdrawal behaviour.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) refers to discretionary, extra-role contributions by organizational members, which are neither rewarded nor explicitly required, but that nevertheless contribute to the effective functioning of an organization (Organ, 1988b, 1997, for reviews, see LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Constructs that are very similar to OCB include prosocial behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Puffer, 1987), spontaneous behaviour (Katz, 1964), and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). OCB can be thought of as "going above and beyond the call of duty", or "doing the little extras", and it includes behaviours such as helping coworkers, performing actions that make other people's jobs easier, speaking approvingly about the organization to outsiders, participating in efforts toward improvement, and withholding complaints about impositions (Organ, 1988a). Research has shown that OCB is related to organizational performance (Koys, 2001), group performance (George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983), and individual performance (e.g., Puffer, 1987; Skarlicki & Latham, 1995). OCB is particularly important in contexts in which team work and group goals are paramount to team success (e.g., Organ, 1988a).

Organ (1988a, 1988b) suggested that the tendency to engage in OCB stems, in part, from an individual's perceptions of fairness. The theoretical link between justice and OCB is explained by the notion that employees might reward fair treatment by performing OCB (Organ, 1988a). Moreover, individuals who perceive unfairness might choose to retaliate by withdrawing OCB because, by definition, such actions are not likely to be formally punished. Moreover, numerous studies have shown that perceptions of fairness have direct and indirect positive relationships with OCB (e.g., Aquino, 1995; Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Aryee & Chay,

2001; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Byrne & Cropanzano, 2000; Colquitt, 2001; Deluga, 1995; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Haworth, Cober, & Snyder, 2000; Kim & Mauborgne, 1996; Klammer et al., 2002; Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Little, Magner, & Welker, 2002; Masterson, 2001; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Schappe, 1998; Tansky, 1993; Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001; Tepper & Taylor, 2003; Zellars et al., 2002). Although it is certainly plausible that OCB is a cause of fair treatment (Fassina et al., 2003) and that a third variable explains variance in both justice and OCB, quasi-experimental research supports the notion that perceptions of fairness do indeed cause OCB (Skarlicki & Latham, 1996, 1997).

Leadership fairness and OCB. Consistent with the agent-system model of justice, Masterson et al. (2000) demonstrated that OCB that benefits the work unit (e.g., altruism) and, hence, benefits the supervisor, is predicted by interactional justice. Furthermore, other facets of OCB (e.g., civic virtue) that more directly benefit the organization are predicted by procedural justice (see also, Malatesta & Byrne, 1997). Recent meta-analytic evidence (Fassina et al., 2003) has shown that interactional justice tends to be the strongest justice predictor of OCB directed toward individuals, and procedural justice tends to be the strongest justice predictor of OCB directed toward organizations (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Thus, leadership fairness is a critical determinant of the decision to direct OCB toward other group members, or whether to withhold it. Moreover, as discussed below, there are reasons to suspect that organizational members might respond to unfairness by leaders through “getting back” (e.g., withdrawing OCB) at the organization that the leader represents.

Retaliation

Deviance and counter-productive behaviours in organizations have become common topics of scholarly study, and research interest is steadily growing (for reviews, see Bennett & Robinson, in press; Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998; Sackett & DeVore, 2001). One type of deviance, retaliatory behaviour, is defined as adverse reactions by disgruntled organizational members toward an organization or its leaders (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). The use of the term "retaliation" refers to the same general class of behaviours examined in other counter-productive behaviour research (Bennett & Robinson, in press); however, the term specifies a motivational component (i.e., a desire to "get back") that is not an essential feature of other counter-productive behaviours. A number of studies have shown that an individual's perceptions of unfair treatment are positively related to the desire for revenge and, ultimately, retaliatory actions (e.g., Blader, Chang, & Tyler, 2001; Kickul et al., 2001).

Research has demonstrated a causal relationship between perceptions of unfairness and retaliation, and this relationship generalizes to workplace settings. The casual link between fairness and theft, for example, has been demonstrated in laboratory experiments (Greenberg, 1993b), and the relationship is observed in cross-sectional field studies (Shapiro, Trevino, & Victor, 1995), as well as in quasi-experimental research (Greenberg, 1990, 1999). Theft, however, is just one form of retaliation, and it may represent the "tip of the iceberg" (Folger & Baron, 1996). Indirect forms of retaliation, such as protest behaviour (e.g., Greenberg, 1987; Jones & Skarlicki, 2002; Van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997), have also been linked to perceived unfairness, as have composite measures of different types of retaliatory actions (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Henle, 2002; Jones, 2003b; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Leadership fairness and retaliation. Consistent with the agent-stem model of justice, procedural justice predicts retaliation against organizations (e.g., Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Henle, 2002; Shapiro et al., 1995) and interactional justice predicts retaliation against authority figures (e.g., Ambrose et al., 2002; Aquino et al., 1999; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Henle, 2002; Jones, 2003b; Jones & Skarlicki, 2002; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). There is some evidence, however, that interactional justice is a better predictor of any type of retaliation, whether directed toward leaders or organizations (Aquino et al., 1999; Henle, 2002), which might be due to the ease of assigning blame when a leader acts unjustly (Aquino et al., 1999; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). People might not only be motivated to retaliate against an offending supervisor for interactional mistreatment, but also against the organization as a whole (Jones, 2003b) because supervisors might be viewed as salient representatives of the organization (e.g., Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989).

Stronger fairness-retaliation relationships when outcomes are aversive. Like many responses to fair and unfair treatment, relationships between perceptions of fairness and retaliation tend to be strong when events are negative. Greenberg (1990) found that a pay cut was associated with increased theft in one manufacturing plant; however, theft was considerably lower in another plant of the same company when the CEO simply explained the reasons for the pay cut in an interpersonally sensitive manner. In another study, Greenberg (1993b) manipulated interpersonal treatment and the degree of information in an explanation about why participants would receive lower pay than expected, and he provided participants with an opportunity for theft. When the explanation was perceived as inadequate, participants stole more money, and outcome equity interacted with interpersonal and informational justice, to predict theft. Skarlicki

and Folger (1997) found that all three aspects of justice interacted to predict retaliation, such that when distributive justice was low, procedural and interactional justice had stronger effects.

"Hot" versus planned retaliation. Retaliation might sometimes be an affectively-driven and immediate response to unfairness. Research has shown that people can feel anger in the face of perceived injustice (Cropanzano & Baron, 1991; Cropanzano & Randall, 1995; Folger, Rosenfield, & Robinson, 1983; Taylor, Moghaddam, Gamble, & Zellerer, 1987; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999), and that anger is implicated in the retributive motivation (Bies & Tripp, 1996, 2001). Thus, retaliation can sometimes be a "hot" reaction, although in other situations, retaliation can be more deliberate (Ambrose et al., 2002).

Jones (2003b) examined predictions from the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) using four variables (i.e., behavioural control, perceived norms, instrumentality, and retaliatory intent) that were worded using retaliatory terms ("getting back"). Jones found that after allowing the theory of planned behavior to account for variance in retaliation towards leaders (50%), justice perceptions accounted for additional variance (10%). This finding suggests that retaliation might, in part, be planned and intended, but it may also occur without prior intention (i.e., a "hot" reaction).

Third-party reactions. People can become morally outraged when they witness injustice perpetrated against other group members because it represents an attack on the group itself (Tyler & Lind, 1992). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) argued that "the inclination to censure or punish wrongful intentions should not depend on having experienced harm directly" (p. 78) because unfair treatment might be seen as an act of intentional ill-will, which displays a willingness to disregard normative and moral obligations for treating people with dignity and respect. Research has shown that third-party observers are willing to retaliate against perpetrators

of mistreatment even though the observers were not personally affected (Mollica, Gray, Trevion, & DeWitt, 1999; Skarlicki, Ellard, & Kelln, 1998).

Withdrawal Behaviour

Withdrawal behaviour includes actions that serve to physically remove one's self from an organization, such as lateness, absenteeism, and voluntary turnover (see Hulin, 1991; Johns, 2001). Most justice research has focused on the negative relationship between perceptions of fairness and turnover intentions (or withdrawal cognitions), which is well-supported (e.g., Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Aryee et al., 2002; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Kickul et al., 2002; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Masterson et al., 2000; Miceli, Jung, Near, & Greenberger, 1991; Robbins, Summers, Miller, & Hendrix, 2000; Roberts, Coulson, & Chonko, 1999; Sujak, Parker, & Grush, 1998; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). Studies have also shown that procedural or interactional justice are stronger predictors of turnover intentions when outcomes are low, unfavourable, or unfair (Brockner et al., 1990; Garonzik, Brockner, & Siegel, 2000; Greenberg, 1994; Kwong & Leung, 2001; Magner, Welker, & Johnson, 1996; Schaubroeck et al., 1994).

Research has shown that intent to turnover is the strongest predictor of turnover behaviour, and most attitudinal models of turnover conceptualize turnover intent as the penultimate outcome (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). Nonetheless, it is one thing to report a willingness to leave when unfairness is perceived; it is another to actually leave the organization. Regardless, studies have shown that procedural and interactional justice directly, indirectly, or interactively predict voluntary turnover behaviour (Aquino, Griffeth, Allen, & Hom, 1997; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998; Jones, 1998; Randall & Mueller, 1995; Sager, 1991). Most recently, Jones and Skarlicki (in press) found that the likelihood for voluntary

turnover was highest when perceptions of low distributive justice were coupled with low interactional justice.

A few studies have found support for the relationship between distributive, procedural and interactional justice with absenteeism (DeBoer, Bakker, Syroit, Schaufeli, 2002; Dittrich & Carrell, 1979; Gellatly, 1995; Hendrix et al., 1998; Jones, 2003a). However, only one study (Jones, 2003a) examined the relationship between justice and lateness, and the perceived fairness of scheduling procedures predicted lateness.

Summary of Unintended Consequences of Unfair Treatment by Leaders

Our review of the literature suggests that military leaders can use principles of organizational justice in out of theatre and peacetime contexts to reduce the likelihood of negative responses to leader behaviour. In Section 2a, we review evidence from military settings that further supports these notions. A second aspect of our thesis, which we turn to next, is that fair treatment from military leaders can facilitate the establishment of trust and commitment to goals among subordinates.

Trust and Decision Commitment

Trust. Research on trust in organizations is steadily increasing (for a review, see Kramer & Tyler, 1996). Trust can be defined as a willingness to be vulnerable to actions by another party (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, see also Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Given this definition, it is not surprising that trust plays a central role in theories of justice that also focus on vulnerability to exploitation (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992). Fairness heuristic theory (e.g., Lind, 2001, see Appendix A), for example, proposes that people are concerned with fairness because it helps them determine trust, which guides people's decisions about whether or not to cooperate with a social entity. Trust also plays a central role in the some of the theories used to explain

justice-behaviour relationships. Social exchange relationships involve unspecified expectations for future reciprocation; thus, cooperative partners in social exchange must trust that the other party will reciprocate in kind (Blau, 1964). People can develop trust in supervisors and in an organization (Whitener, 1997); therefore, people can develop social exchange relationships with both supervisors and management (Becker, 1992).

Perceived fairness and, in particular, interactional justice, has been shown to predict trust in both leaders and organizations (e.g., Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Deluga, 1995; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Korsgaard, Brodt, & Witener, 2002; Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995; Korsgaard et al., 1995; Magner et al., 1996; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999, for a review, see Brockner & Siegel, 1996). Meta-analytic research has also demonstrated that distributive, procedural and interactional justice are related to trust in supervisors and management (Colquitt et al., 2001; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Additionally, research has also shown that trust mediates fairness-outcome relationships, such as the link between justice and OCB (e.g., Aryee et al., 2002; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

The relationships between justice and trust are not surprising given that trust is established by consistent treatment, integrity, truthful and accurate communication, promise fulfillment, relinquishment of control, and the demonstration of respect (e.g., Deluga, 1995; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Whitener, Brodt, Korsegaard, & Werner, 1998). However, fair treatment and other related behaviours are not the only determinants of trust; several other factors influence trust formation, including shared goals, professional respect, and the perception than an authority is competent (e.g., Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000; Deluga, 1995; Kramer, 1996).

Leaders have been described “relational-contract makers” (Rousseau, 1995) and they have a significant influence on the development of trust (e.g., Creed & Miles, 1996). When a leader’s actions violate a subordinate’s sense of trust, the leader must admit harm, apologize, accept responsibility, seek forgiveness through reparation, and engage in subsequent trustworthy behaviour, in order to restore trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Whitener (1997) speculated that, as supervisors build trust by fulfilling psychological contracts and meeting expectations, employees’ trust in the organization grows. Consistent with this notion, Aryee et al. (2002) found that interactional justice predicted both trust in one’s supervisors and in an organization.

Trust is also important for establishing decision commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Tyler & DeGoey, 1995, 1996; for meta-analytic findings, see Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Korsgaard et al. (1995) characterized this relationship well: “If a team’s leader has not created in team members the necessary level of trust, lack of cooperation with decisions, unwillingness to share information, and sabotage of future decision processes may result” (p. 62).

Decision acceptance and commitment. Commitment to a decision can be conceptualized on a continuum, ranging from full commitment (an individual shares and internalizes a leader’s objectives), to compliance (an individual reluctantly conforms to a leader’s request), to resistance (an individual actively attempts to avoid a leader’s request; e.g., Yukl, 1994). Research has shown that when people perceive decision making processes and authorities as more fair, decision acceptance (e.g., Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996; Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, & de Vera Park, 1993; Tyler & Degoey, 1995, 1996) and decision commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Kim & Mauborgne, 1993; Tyler & DeGoey, 1996) are enhanced.

When people believe that their voice was considered in the decision-making process, they are more accepting of, and committed to, decisions. Korsgaard et al. (1995) found that when a

leader adequately considered team members' input, it positively affected their commitment to the decision, attachment to the group, and trust in the leader. Moreover, these effects were observed over and above the effects of instrumental voice. Research on goal setting also supports the important role of voice in decision commitment. Specifically, performance is enhanced when individuals accept, and are committed to goals, and participation in goal setting can facilitate commitment (Locke & Latham, 1990).

When subordinates are a part of the decision-making process, they are almost obliged to be committed to the outcome because of their role in the decision-making process. Thus, leaders might promote decision commitment by soliciting voice and demonstrating that voice was considered, the latter of which can be accomplished by providing explanations about how and why the decision was reached. Such efforts can also affirm an individual's positive standing within a group because they show that the individual is a valued and respected group member (Tyler & Lind, 1992), which, in turn, might facilitate further commitment to group goals and leader decisions. Consistent with this notion, one study found that relational evaluations of authorities (e.g., neutrality and trust) were more highly correlated ($r = .54$) with decision acceptance than were instrumental evaluations of authorities (e.g., the extent to which the authority offers fair rewards, $r = .26$) when identification with the group was higher (Huo et al., 1996).

When decision-making processes are seen as more fair, people have greater decision acceptance, regardless of the perceived fairness of the outcomes (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). For instance, procedural justice is related to acceptance of decisions, even among people involved in lawsuits (Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, & de Vera Park, 1993). Another study demonstrated that trust in an authority predicted decision acceptance, especially when a future relationship was anticipated,

when individuals shared values with the authority, and when individuals obtained a sense of identity from their work (Tyler & DeGoey, 1996). A study of downward influence tactics also supports the fairness-decision commitment link (Tepper, Eisenbach, Kirby, & Potter, 1998). Employees were more likely to resist influence attempts when they felt unfairly treated by the authority. This same study showed that soft influence tactics, such as power sharing and consultation (i.e., voice) and rational influence tactics, such as explanations and persuasion (i.e., informational justice) were seen as more fair than hard influence tactics (pressure, invoking legitimate authority). Other research has shown that managers cooperate more in implementing decisions when they have higher perceptions of procedural justice (Kim & Mauborgne, 1993).

Conclusion

In Section 1b, we reviewed research showing that perceptions of fairness predict OCB, retaliation, withdrawal behaviours, trust, and decision commitment. This research lends support to our thesis that military leaders can use principles of justice in out of theatre contexts to promote positive reactions and minimize negative reactions to perceptions of unfair leadership. One question, however, remains: To what extent do these findings generalize to military personnel? This question is the focus of the next section.

SECTION 2:
IMPLICATIONS OF LEADERSHIP FAIRNESS IN A CANADIAN MILITARY CONTEXT

In Section 2, we explore the implications of organizational justice for the CF. In Section 2a, we review research, as well as military and media reports on justice in the military, that explores the relationships between organizational justice and the responses to perceived fairness reviewed above. In Section 2b, we suggest two general reasons why the impact of justice in the

military may be magnified relative to civilian settings. Finally, in Section 2c, we suggest that informational justice can be used to align individual and group orientations to develop a culture consistent with the espoused ethos.

Section 2a:
Fairness-Behaviour Relationships Among Military Personnel

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The importance of OCB for military effectiveness is reflected in the title of Organ's (1998a) book: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome.* However, few studies have examined this issue in a military context. We located only four studies in which fairness-OCB relationships were examined among military personnel.

Deluga (1995) examined the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of 10 behaviours thought to underlie perceptions of trust in leaders, and supervisory ratings of subordinates' OCB. Data were collected from 64 supervisor-subordinate dyads who were serving in non-combat roles in the US military. Of the 10 behaviours thought to underlie trust, two had justice undertones: Consistency of Treatment (related to procedural justice) and Integrity (an aspect of interpersonal justice). One of the 10 behaviours, Fairness, was operationalized through a direct item about the fairness of supervisory treatment. Results showed that all three variables predicted trust in supervisors, as well as all of Organ's (1988a) five facets of OCB (and, incidentally, in-role performance).

Zellars et al. (2002) examined the justice-OCB relationship among a sample of 373 US Air National Guard members. Subordinates rated their perceptions of abusive supervision, which includes such behaviours as hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, explosive outbursts, the use of derogatory names, withholding needed information, threats of job loss, and humiliating

people in front of others (Tepper, 2000). Subordinates' ratings of abusive supervision predicted their supervisory-rated OCB, and this relationship was partially mediated by procedural justice which also predicted OCB. Moreover, abusive supervision had considerable construct overlap with interactional justice and, in particular, interpersonal justice. These results suggest that the perceived fairness of leaders and of decision making both predict OCB in the military.

Tepper and Taylor (2003) examined data from Zellars et al. (2002), along with supervisors' self-reported ratings of procedural justice and subordinates' ratings of their supervisors' OCB, which was operationalized as mentoring behaviour (e.g., bringing subordinates' accomplishments to the attention of important people, and using his or her influence for subordinates' benefit). Results supported a trickle-down model of justice and OCB in the military. In other words, when supervisors perceived greater procedural justice, they engaged in more OCB, which contributed to subordinates' perceptions of procedural justice and, hence, subordinates' OCB.

Finally, Klammer et al. (2002) examined the fairness-OCB relationship among 262 CF members. These authors found a relationship between the perceived existence of procedures that provide opportunities for voice and the civic virtue facet of OCB (operationalized as peer-reports of the extent to which the subordinates' provided suggestions for improvement). This relationship was partially mediated by the perception that one's voice was heard by a superior officer.

Taken together, these four studies provide support for the relationships between justice and OCB among military personnel. Moreover, there is reason to suspect that this relationship might be stronger in military than in civilian settings because, as we discuss below, withdrawing OCB represents a viable means of retaliating in a military context.

Retaliation

Covert retaliation. Events that are relatively commonplace in the civilian world are not necessarily so in the military; some forms of retaliation observed in the workplace might not generalize to military settings. Direct retaliation, such as "fighting back" during face-to-face interactions, seem less likely to occur in the military because of the large power differentials between military superiors and subordinates that are inherent in the strict military hierarchy. Covert forms of retaliation might be more common because overt actions may trigger further abuse (Zellars et al., 2002) or harsh punishment and court martials. In particular, as Zellars et al. (2002) noted, military personnel might be more likely to retaliate by withdrawing OCB, because it represents a safe way of "getting even". According to Organ's (1988a) definition, withholding OCB is not a punishable offense; therefore, this type of covert action represents low-intensity revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997).

Thus, in addition to the motivation to reciprocate OCB through fair treatment, withdrawing OCB in response to unfair treatment might be a particularly common response in the military. As such, one might expect the justice-OCB link to be stronger among military personnel than in civilian samples. Although this notion is highly speculative, existing evidence supports the idea. The most recent and complete meta-analysis of justice-OCB relationships to date (Fassina et al., 2003) showed uncorrected coefficients between interactional and procedural justice and Organ's (1988a) five facets of OCB ranging from .16 to .29, and the average of the 10 uncorrected coefficients was .22. These coefficients are comparable to previous meta-analytic findings (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2001); however, primary research in military samples has shown higher coefficients. For instance, Deluga (1995) found correlations ranging from .31 to .63, with an average of .46, between supervisory fairness and the five OCB dimensions, and Zellars et al.

(2002) found that procedural justice and supervisor-rated OCB were correlated at .41. Thus, fairness-OCB relationships appear to be stronger in military settings. Moreover, the relationships in the military samples were not inflated by common method variance like many of the studies included in the Fassina et al. meta-analysis[2]. In short, this comparison, albeit crude and simplistic, is consistent with the notion that the withdrawal of OCB might be a common response to perceived unfairness among military personnel, due to the power differences between military leaders and their subordinates.

Severe retaliation. Acts of overt retaliation may be less common in the military, relative to civilian organizations, but even a single act of retaliation can be particularly damaging to the CF due to media scrutiny and soldiers' access to weapons. There were hundreds of reports of "fragging" during the Vietnam War, which refers to the use of a grenade to "cool down" an officer who is seen as too eager to endanger his soldiers ("War Horrors," 2000). Although these alleged incidents of "fragging" were not necessarily responses to perceived unfairness, they demonstrate the potentially lethal nature of negative behaviours by soldiers who have access to tools of destruction.

The 1993 incident of the alleged poisoning of Warrant Officer Matt Stopford (and other superior officers) in Croatia by six soldiers of Delta Company received a considerable amount of media attention (e.g., Schuster, 2001; "Soldier Poisoned," 1999; "War Horrors," 2000). Although we do not know the details or fully understand the soldiers' motivation for the alleged event, newspaper reports suggest that fairness concerns may have played a role in this incident. We recognize that there were likely a number of contributing factors (e.g., concerns for self-preservation, stressful conditions, exposure to ethnic cleansing); nevertheless, mistrust of the

[2] Klammer et al. (2002) is not included in this comparison because perceptions of opportunities for voice is not akin to procedural justice, and Tepper and Taylor (2003) is not included because OCB as mentorship is not similar to any of Organ's five facets of OCB.

Stopford appears to have played a significant role in his alleged poisoning ("War Horrors," 2000).

One newspaper report stated that the soldiers believed they were being "marched to their deaths" during unauthorized night patrols, led by Stopford, into unsecured areas in which there was heavy shelling and fighting ("War Horrors," 2000). Although it was suggested in the article that Stopford conducted the patrols to gain tactical superiority, Master Cpl. Steve Atkins stated that "the troops that he had working for him were completely unable to understand that. And unable to understand why in the hell they were going out at night to do these crazy, ridiculous operations." Atkins noted that "the teenage privates of Delta Company didn't understand the big picture unfolding in the Balkans so they didn't share the commitment of their higher-ranking comrades. Usually, their leaders chose to keep them in the dark. As the details flowed down the chain of command, more and more information was filtered out." This state of affairs, according to Atkins, was "*unfair"* (italics added).

An examination of the Stopford's poisoning from a justice perspective suggests that either (a) he did not offer an explanation about why he was putting soldiers' lives at risk for unauthorized night patrols, or (b) any explanation that might have been offered was clearly insufficient to convince soldiers of the importance of the patrols. In essence, soldiers experienced a highly aversive event, in which Stopford made a decision that placed their lives at risk. Yet, justification for this procedure was lacking (the patrols were unauthorized) and, apparently, inadequate attention was paid to informational justice. These are the very conditions that breed resentment and retaliation (i.e., the well-replicated outcome favourability by procedure/treatment interaction; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Interestingly, Stopford steadfastly refused to believe that he was poisoned by his troops, stating: “I know my men, the guys I served with, and if anyone was out to get me, I’d have known it” (“Soldier Poisoned,” 1999). Stopford reportedly believes that the story is a plot by the Department of National Defence (DND) to prevent him from receiving a disability pension and, as a result, he stated that he no longer “trusts” the military (“Soldier Poisoned,” 1999). Although this scenario is highly doubtful, given that DND is unlikely to accept a substantial amount of negative press to save a few taxpayer dollars, Stopford’s lack of trust is consistent with justice theory and research stating that feelings of exploitation lead to mistrust (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992; Lind, 2001).

Despite the fact that our application of justice theory to the alleged warrant officer poisoning is highly speculative, evidence suggests that issues pertaining to fairness might have played a role in the incident. At the very least, this example illustrates how perceptions of injustice among CF members might lead to acts of severe retaliation that have potentially deadly consequences.

Turnover

We were unable to locate any studies of turnover in response to unfairness among military personnel in the peer-reviewed research literature. Turnover among military personnel in response to unfairness is an important consideration, however, because studies by the CF show that personnel are leaving, in part, because of perceived unfairness regarding the way in which they are treated (“Personnel Resigning,” 2002). Additionally, consistent with equity theory, which predicts that one response to inequity is to “leave the field” (Adams, 1965), military surveys have reportedly shown that one cause of turnover is a perceived inability to get equal pay for work of equal value (“Personnel Resigning,” 2002). Given that the CF spends approximately

$300,000 to train a single soldier, turnover as a response to unfairness is a costly problem ("Personnel Resigning," 2002).

In what may be an example of turnover in response to perceived unfairness, Maj.-Gen. Cameron Ross, director-general of international security policy, is reportedly resigning because of issues relating to the lack of voice, dignity, and respect shown to him by government authorities ("General Quits," 2003). According to newspaper reports (e.g., "General Quits," 2003), a key military decision, sending UN peace-keeping Canadian troops to Kabul, was announced by the Defense Minister without any consultation with top military leaders. This blatant denial of voice might have been perceived by Maj.-Gen. Ross, and possibly others, as an act that showed a lack of respect for Ross' authority, knowledge, and military experience. These issues, according to the article, seem to have contributed to the likely resignation of this senior military commander. Similarly, according to a second newspaper account, a soldier who was investigated for possible misconduct felt that he was not treated with "compassion or fairness". Although he was cleared of the accusations, he is now leaving the CF ("Cleared Soldier," 2003).

Concluding Comments on Behavioural Responses to Justice

The above review of behavioural reactions to perceived unfairness among military personnel provides support for the notion that the well-documented findings in the justice literature generalize to military contexts. In the next section, we explore whether fair treatment by military leaders can promote trust and commitment to decisions.

Trust and Decision Commitment

Military scholars have stressed the importance of subordinates' trust in military leaders (e.g., Brass & Krackhardt, 1999; Hoojiberg et al., 1999); indeed, trust is vital for cohesion between leaders and subordinates (Bartone & Kirkland, 1991). Deluga (1995) stressed the

importance of fairness and trust in military contexts because both variables predict OCB and in-role performance among military personnel. Furthermore, trust, teamwork, and feelings of "specialness" have been found to be features of units judged as excellent by military commanders (Malone, 1983).

Trust in military leaders must be fostered both at the top of the organizational hierarchy and in the lower echelons of military command (Bartone & Kirkland, 1991; Cassel, 1993). This notion is supported by research showing that supervisors' perceptions of fair treatment trickled down to subordinate's perceptions of fair treatment, which, in turn, influenced their level of OCB (Tepper & Taylor, 2003). Indeed, trust in the military is a two-way process: "Leaders trust their subordinates to do their best. Subordinates trust their leaders to orient their actions wisely, inform them fully, provide all possible support, and never abandon them on the battlefield" (Bartone & Kirkland, 1991, p. 406).

One way that military leaders can demonstrate trust in, and respect for, their subordinates is to empower them (Bartone & Kirkland, 1991). Soldiers can be empowered by providing them with voice (i.e., procedural justice) and demonstrating that their voice was considered (i.e., through informational justice). Providing CF members with opportunities for, and consideration of, voice should lead to increased self-esteem, feelings of positive group standing, and trust in leaders.

Earlier in this paper, we reviewed research demonstrating the linkage between trust, fairness, and commitment to decisions. Thus, cultivating trust in military leaders is also important because of its relationship to decision commitment. In military contexts, the importance of commitment to decisions is augmented, as military personnel must strictly obey their commanding officers, especially while in theatre.

The establishment of trust and commitment through fair treatment in out of theatre contexts may transfer to operational effectiveness while in theatre. However, this proposition has not been tested. Nonetheless, Deluga (1995) wrote that “interpersonal trust has long been a critical element in military leadership development, particularly under combat situations” (p. 13).

We are not, however, suggesting that military leaders should use principles of organizational justice surrounding every decision they make while in theatre. On the contrary, if leaders are required to continually explain and justify their decisions, they cannot lead effectively (Tyler & DeGoey, 1996). This line of reasoning seems especially applicable to combat situations, which is why it is vital to establish trust before in theatre operations. By establishing strong feelings of trust among subordinates, military leaders will promote the voluntary acceptance of decisions that require trust (Tyler & DeGoey, 1996). This discussion brings us back to the fundamental social dilemma (e.g., Lind, 2001) we raised in the introduction of this paper: In order for soldiers to forego self-interested concerns for self-preservation and unquestioningly obey orders that place their own lives at risk, they must place an enormous amount of trust in their leaders.

We recognize, however, that establishing trust in a military context might be more difficult than in civilian contexts. In the following section, we discuss two general reasons why this might be the case.

Section 2b:

Magnified Justice Effects in the Canadian Forces

Effects of Military Structure

Previously, we suggested that the relationship between justice and OCB might be particularly strong among military personnel, because the large power distance between leaders

and subordinates promotes the withdrawal of OCB as an act of retaliation for mistreatment. In this section, we argue that power distance, as well as other aspects of military structure, might bolster the effects of justice for a wide range of responses.

Justice effects may be intensified in a military context because the fairness of decision making is inextricably linked to the power hierarchy. Given the class structure inherent in the military rank system, the perceived possibilities for exploitation and, hence, unfairness, may be accentuated. Research on military leaders has shown that personality traits like dominance and power orientation predict leader effectiveness (e.g., Bradley, Nicol, Charbonneau, & Meyer, 2002; Thomas, Dickson, & Bilese, 2001; Youngjohn, 2000). Thus, effective leaders, who tend to have strong needs for dominance and power, might be the same leaders about whom followers have heightened concerns relating to exploitation. Indeed, the ways in which policies are implemented by military leaders might be very salient to military personnel because of the rigid power structure (Williams, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1999).

Using the terminology put forth by Schminke and colleagues (Schminke et al., 2000; Schminke et al., 2002), the structure of the CF can be described along several dimensions. Relative to civilian organizations, the CF is characterized by high degrees of centralization (i.e., policy decisions come from military high command), authority hierarchy (i.e., concentrated decision-making power with regard to performing tasks), vertical complexity (i.e., a large number of levels in the organizational hierarchy), and formalization (i.e., rules, procedures, and instructions are written down and govern procedures and rewards), as well as being large in size. These characteristics have implications for perceptions of fairness in the military, particularly among individuals at lower organizational levels.

Given the size of the CF, bureaucratization and formalization are somewhat necessary to remove the human element from organizational interactions, for the sake of efficiency. However, as size, bureaucracy, and formalization increase, it becomes increasingly difficult to treat people with dignity and respect and, instead, people are treated as numbers (Schminke et al., 2000). As size, authority hierarchy, and vertical complexity increase, "power plays" and "political games" may become more common, and such politicking might be associated with less procedural and interactional justice (Ambrose & Harland, 1995). Moreover, it is difficult to establish trust in organizations in which there is a high degree of centralization and formalization (Creed & Miles, 1996).

Two recent studies (Schminke et al., 2000; Schminke et al., 2002) have linked perceptions of justice to organizational structure. Schminke et al. (2000) found that authority hierarchy was negatively related to procedural and interactional justice. Participation in decision making was positively related to procedural justice, and organization size was negatively related to interactional justice, incremental to other organizational structure variables. In a follow-up study, Schminke et al. (2002) replicated the effect of authority hierarchy on procedural and interactional justice, and also found that centralization and formalization were negatively related to distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and these effects were stronger among individuals at lower organizational levels than among those at higher levels.

As Kramer (1996) noted, trust is a bigger issue for individuals in lower levels of an organizational hierarchy, because these individuals may have a "nagging suspicion" that they are being exploited and treated unfairly. Homans (1974) argued that people who possess less of something place greater value on each unit they possess, as well as on additional units they receive, relative to individual who possess more of something. As Schminke et al. (2002) noted,

a high-ranking official may view an opportunity for increased voice as less of a gain than would an individual with less authority. Schminke et al. also suggest that their finding that fairness is less important to individuals in the upper ranks of organizations may explain why high-level managers often fail to realize the importance of fair treatment. This lack of recognition of the importance of fair treatment might be particularly damaging among military personnel, given its effects on group identity and standing. In the following section, we elucidate the importance of group identity and discuss its relationship with fairness, and review relevant research on military-unit cohesion.

The Importance of Group Identity

The relational model of justice (Tyler & Lind, 1992) proposes that group members' concerns about fairness are magnified when they identify with the group to which they belong. Thus, to the extent that CF personnel identify with their work groups or combat units, their justice concerns may be stronger, relative to civilian populations. We develop this notion further in the following section.

Group identity and justice. Social scientists have known for some time that individuals are concerned with their standing in social groups. Group membership offers many potential benefits, including tangible rewards, status, friendships, opportunities for personal growth, and positive self-esteem (e.g., Lind & Tyler, 1988). Group membership contributes to people's understanding of who they are and what they are worth (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Given the importance of group membership for one's self-concept, it is not surprising that individuals are motivated to achieve and maintain a positive social identity (e.g., Kramer, 1991; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Feeling accepted, included, and welcomed in a group leads to positive emotions and cooperative behaviour (West, 2001).

Tyler and Lind's (1992) relational model of authority in groups proposes that people care about fair treatment from authorities and the organizations to which they belong because it provides signals about their standing within a group. When organizational procedures and interpersonal treatment from authorities support the norms for fair treatment communicated within the group, authorities tend to be viewed favourably by group members (e.g., Lind & Earley, 1992). Additionally, treating individuals in a manner that is seen as impartial, respectful, and trustworthy conveys that they are respected group members, which contributes to their sense of self-worth; as such, authorities who engage in this type of treatment will be perceived as more fair (Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Alternatively, unfair treatment by an authority can cause an individual to feel undervalued, which can lead to the withdrawal of cooperative efforts (Tyler, DeGoey, & Smith, 1996; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Consistent with these ideas, military scholars have argued that when soldiers do not identify with their group, they pursue independent interests at the expense of group goals (Griffith & Vaitkus, 1999).

To the extent that an individual values and identifies with a group, unfair treatment of other group members may be viewed as an attack on the group itself, and may be met with moral outrage (Tyler & Lind, 1992). Research has shown that people can perceive unfairness when they observe members of their in-group experiencing injustice (Mollica, Gray, Trevino, & DeWitt, 1999). When individuals believe that their entire group is mistreated, they perceive it as especially negative, because it threatens their sense of pride in the group to which they belong (Tyler et al., 1996). Indeed, several studies have shown that group members' concerns for procedural and interactional justice are magnified when they have stronger bonds with, and greater commitment to, their group (e.g., Brockner, 1990; Brockner, Tyler, & Cooper-Schneider,

1992; Huo et al., 1996; Kwong & Leung, 2001; Tyler, 1989; Tyler & DeGoey, 1995; Tyler & Lind, 1990).

To recapitulate, research on the relational model of authority in groups (Tyler & Lind, 1992) shows that people want to be valued members of valued groups. Thus, individuals react very negatively to threats to their standing within a group and to threats directed at the group itself. Unfair treatment by an authority threatens group members' self-esteem and group identity, which is dealt with though the withdrawal of cooperative and pro-social actions that are necessary for effective group functioning.

Group-identity effects among CF personnel. Group identity and a sense of group cohesion are central features of the lives of many military personnel (e.g., Bartone & Kirkland, 1991; Griffith & Vaitkus, 1999; Shamir, Zakay, Brainin, & Popper, 2000). For some CF members, a military position is not simply a job, but a way of life. For example, the locations in which many CF members' live, and the people with whom they associate, are largely dictated by their career choice. The social networks of many CF members may predominantly include other military personnel, especially among members who are transferred frequently and must create new social ties in an unfamiliar environment. Thus, a large part of a CF member's self-identity may be derived from their military-group membership. One corollary of this notion is that unfairness and other threats to CF members' group identity might be viewed as particularly negative, relative to the same threats in civilian populations.

Consider the following media report about a Canadian soldier, which exemplifies the negative consequences of treatment that threatens one's group standing ("Cleared Soldier," 2003). Master Cpl. Arron Perry, one of the five Canadian snipers considered for US Bronze Star medals for service during Operation Anaconda, was investigated for possible misconduct

regarding the alleged mistreatment of the remains of Afghanis killed in action. During the investigation, Perry was reportedly removed from the tribute guard at the memorial service for Canadians killed by friendly fire, and was excluded from homecoming celebrations for troops returning from Afghanistan. Perry was later cleared of all accusations, but he stated that, although he understood why he was investigated, he felt was not treated with "compassion or fairness". Perry felt ostracized from his social network of military colleagues and companions, including his former superiors, who he claims never contacted him to see how he was coping with the investigation. Perry is now reportedly leaving the CF due to the treatment he received.

Given the importance of group standing in a military context, CF members might be particularly sensitive to unfair treatment from military leaders or from representations of the larger CF organization (high-level commanders, organizational policies). In addition, justice concerns are especially salient among group members who are required to cooperate with each other and who are dependent upon one another for important outcomes (Tyler & Lind, 1990). These circumstances describe the very conditions under which members of military units operate.

As discussed above, unfair treatment of a CF member signifies that the individual is not a valued military-unit member, which has potentially damaging effects on the individual's self-esteem and willingness to cooperate with group goals. These negative consequences may be more pronounced if mistreatment occurs in the presence of other CF members; for instance, if an individual is belittled by an officer in front of other soldiers or is subjected to a public act of discrimination during resource distribution). This type of public display of unfairness is likely to be deemed more unfair than would the same mistreatment in private, due to the increased ease of making unfavourable social comparisons (e.g., Grienberger et al. 1997).

On a related note, the salience of CF members' social identities may lead them to perceive unfairness perpetrated against other group members, or against the group itself, as particularly negative, relative to the same treatment among civilians. Indeed, moral outrage is a common reaction to injustices perpetrated against other group members, because an attack on a group member represents an attack on the group itself (Bies, 1987b; Tyler & Lind, 1992). These effects, however, might depend upon whether other group members fall within an individual's scope of justice: the group of people that he or she believes are deserving of fair treatment (Brockner, 1990). The strong social identity that is presumed to be tied to military-group membership renders it likely that fellow CF members would fall within the scope of justice of a given CF member. Consequently, when CF leader treats one member of a unit unfairly, the experience of unfairness is shared by all group members, and may jeopardize vertical cohesion (i.e., cohesion between soldiers and their leader) and unit effectiveness.

Fairness and military unit cohesion. Research has shown that positive social identification with military units and leaders can be achieved through the provision of voice as a means of reducing social distance and fostering participative decision making (Shamir et al., 2000). Likewise, supportive behaviours by military leaders, such as demonstrating interest in soldiers' opinions about decisions (i.e., voice), predicted performance motivation among a sample of over 15000 US Army soldiers (Weiner, 1990). In short, supportive behaviours promote cohesion within military units; consequently, group cohesiveness makes a significant contribution to operational effectiveness (Griffith & Vaitkus, 1999).

The link between fairness and group cohesion has also been established in civilian populations. In one study, a leader's consideration of team member input (i.e., voice) predicted their attachment to the team (Phillips, Douthitt, & Hyland, 2001). Moreover, shared perceptions

of procedural justice within a group (i.e., procedural justice climate) predicted team cohesiveness and team performance above and beyond individual perceptions of procedural justice (Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002). These findings are particularly important for understanding the potentially positive effects of fair treatment in the CF, because meta-analytic research has shown that cohesion in military units is related to individual performance and, to a larger extent, group performance (Oliver, Harman, Hoover, Hayes, & Pandhi, 1999).

Group identities as nested within larger social entities. In the preceding sections, we reviewed research suggesting that fair treatment by military leaders leads to perceptions of group standing and self-esteem, positive group identity, cooperative group-directed behaviour, team cohesion and, ultimately, individual and military unit performance. One issue that remains to be addressed, however, is what might happen when a CF member feels fairly treated by his or her immediate superior, but does not feel fairly treated by the larger CF organization.

Most organizations comprise a variety of constituencies that are arranged in a hierarchy, such that membership in one group is often encompassed by membership in a larger social unit (Lawler, 1992). This is particularly the case for military organizations that are characterized by a high degree of vertical complexity (i.e., large number of levels in the organizational hierarchy) and specialized units. As noted above, it is possible that a CF member might feel fairly treated by the leader of his or her unit, yet, simultaneously, the individual might feel unfairly treated by top military-brass who represent the larger CF organization. In this instance, the individual's group identity as a member of the smaller military unit is positive, but his or her group identity relating to the larger CF organization is threatened by unfair treatment. The agent-system model (Masterson et al., 2000) suggests that, in this case, the individual might direct his or her behaviour toward the source of fair or unfair treatment. For example, he or she might perform

OCB that benefits the unit leader, while withdrawing effort that benefits the unfair system represented by high-level military command. But, what might this individual do when the same behaviour benefits both the unit leader and the system, as is so frequently the case? Moreover, how does the individual deal with the identity conflict that may arise from the apparent paradox of feeling valued by the military unit, but not by the larger organization in which the unit is embedded? These same questions can be framed in the reverse: how do individuals respond to situations in which they feel fairly treated and valued by the CF, but unfairly treated and under-valued by their immediate superiors? In short, the answers to these questions are unknown; however, by drawing on parallel issues in another literature, we suggest that these issues warrant attention. We draw from research on organizational commitment for illustrative purposes, although we recognize the presence of other perspectives (e.g., the social identity literature).

Because groups are nested within larger social systems and people draw a substantial portion of their self-identity from group membership, the potential for conflict between multiple group identities is clear (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Reichers, 1985). Indeed, different antecedents underlie, for example, people's commitment to their work group and to their organization (Zaccaro & Dobbins, 1989). Incompatible treatment from nested social identities is a painful experience because it calls one's identity into question, which may prompt psychological withdrawal, or even departure, from one or both social entities (Reichers, 1985).

Other research findings from the organizational commitment literature substantiate the notion that nested identities have consequences for the cognitions and behaviour of organizational members. Occupational commitment, for example, explained variance in outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions and absence) incremental to organizational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Moreover, commitment to top management, one's supervisor,

and one's work group contributed uniquely to the prediction of outcomes such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and OCB, incremental to organizational commitment (Becker, 1992). Finally, commitment to supervisors, based on the internalization of the supervisor's values, was found to be more strongly related to performance than was organizational commitment (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996). Although informative, these studies do not directly address how a CF member might behave when he or she feels fairly treated by a military unit, but not by the larger organization in which it is nested.

The justice literature includes conceptual treatments of issues relating to nested and multiple-group identities (e.g., Clay-Warner, 2001); however, we know of only one relevant empirical study. Huo et al. (1996) examined the relationship between fairness evaluations of authorities, who had previously been involved in a conflict with employees, and decision acceptance, in the context of competing ethnic and organizational identities. Consistent with the relational model, fairness evaluations of the authorities predicted decision acceptance among employees who identified strongly with their organization, regardless of their ethnic group identification. Conversely, among employees with strong ethnic, but weak organizational, identities, authority evaluations were not related to decision acceptance; instead, decision acceptance was predicted by self-interested evaluations of outcomes. These results, although interesting, are tangential to the questions we raised earlier regarding the effects of conflicting group identities resulting from membership in groups that are nested within the organizational hierarchy. Clearly, research is needed to answer these questions, as well as to address how people react when they receive fair treatment from an authority from one group, but receive unfair treatment from an authority representing another group within the same nested system.

Given the importance of group identity in the military and the high degree of vertical complexity and number of specialized units noted above, we offer the following speculation, which we develop in the next paragraph. To the extent that CF members identify with the group to which fair or unfair treatment is attributed, relationships between justice and various reactions will be magnified, regardless of the group's position within a nested system. However, although nested group-identities likely affect CF member reactions in all situations, differences in nested group-identities are likely more salient while in theatre, rather than out of theatre, contexts.

In out of theatre contexts, when CF members perceive unfair treatment by either their unit leaders or the larger organization (e.g., unfair CF policies), their negative reactions will not be as targeted toward the authority or system as the agent-system model suggests, because unit leaders might be viewed as parallel to the larger CF organization. In stark contrast, the fundamental social dilemma (i.e., foregoing self-interest for the sake of the group) becomes much more fundamental, so to speak, while in theatre. Thus, issues relating to trust in military-unit leadership and military-unit identity become very salient while in theatre. In these circumstances, soldiers might make clear demarcations between their military unit, which is subsumed within the larger organizational structure, and the CF as a whole. Thus, nested identity effects, whatever they may be, might be more pronounced while in theatre. Likewise, behavioural responses will be increasingly targeted toward specific authorities or toward the system, depending on which is perceived as responsible for unfairness. These speculations should be tested in future research, given the clear implications for understanding CF members' responses to fairness, which may vary as a function of context.

Conclusion. In this section, we highlighted the importance of group cohesion for operational effectiveness. Accordingly, we explicated the role of justice in promoting a sense of

group identity and fostering unit cohesiveness within the CF. Next, we turn our attention to the ways in which the fair treatment can facilitate the creation of a culture that is in accordance with the ethos of the CF.

Section 2c:
Aligning Individual and Group Orientations with Ethos: The Role of Organizational Justice

Research on transformational and charismatic leadership has shown that effective leaders are those that can instill a sense of vision and mission, show respect and instill pride in subordinates, and inspire them with a capacity to act (Bass, 1985). Leaders can express value-laden ideologies to establish trust, unquestioning acceptance of goals, and a fervent willingness to obey directives (Hartog & Koopman, 2001). Military leaders must instill a sense of importance through communicating values and backing them up through their own actions (Bartone & Kirkland, 1991).

A key role of leaders in the CF is the alignment of individual orientations and group norms to develop a culture that is consistent with the espoused ethos. In this section, we discuss how leaders can use principles of justice to promote the creation and maintenance of desired values among military personnel. We also suggest that fair treatment should be a part of CF culture and we a primary and important step toward this goal can be accomplished through our training recommendations which we explicate in Section 3. In the sections below, we explore the application of organizational justice principles to the promotion of desired values among CF personnel.

Value Systems in a Military Context: Effects of Procedures and Leader Behaviour

Values and procedural justice. A value system is an organized set of principles and rules that help an individual choose between alternative courses of action, resolve conflicts, and make

decisions (Rokeach, 1968). Symbols of a group's values, including visible artifacts like the procedures and rules used to govern behaviour in groups, are used by members to construct and make sense of their social environment (Schein, 1990). Indeed, group members view the fairness of decision-making procedures and policies that govern behaviour as indicative of what the group values, as well as the extent to which the group *is* valued by the larger organization (Tyler & Lind, 1992). For this reason, procedures that are perceived as systematically unfair send signals that an entire group is not valued by members of the larger organization. However, the mechanisms through which values are transmitted are not limited to artifacts such as procedures and policies; social events and communications by leaders are subjected to an interpretative process through which values are inferred (Peterson & Smith, 2000).

Beyond procedural justice: Promoting values through leadership fairness. Military researchers have suggested that leaders can emphasize shared meaning and collective identity and, hence, foster attachment to the unit by developing and encouraging the use of artifacts like slogans, symbols, rituals, and ceremonies that are consistent with members' core values (Shamir et al., 2000). In this manner, the link between military members' self-concept and their group identity is strengthened and a shared commitment to group goals is fostered (Shamir et al., 2000). Leaders also can promote value creation and maintenance through fair treatment.

Leaders can also perform behaviours that demonstrate that subordinates are highly valued members of the CF. To the extent that leaders establish conditions in which CF members are proud to identify with the CF, military personnel will be motivated to internalize the espoused values. In Section 3, we offer training recommendations which are intended to accomplish this goal by creating a culture of fair treatment in the CF, which will promote a proud sense of group identity. In particular, leaders can solicit voice from subordinates and demonstrate that it was

considered, when time permits, to demonstrate that CF members are held in high regard. CF leaders can also show that CF members are values by treating them in respectful ways and by showing a genuine concern for the dignity and well being of CF members. Moreover, leaders can use explanations to invoke values that are necessary for mission success.

Leaders can express various ideological perspectives that provide value-laden meaning to events (Trice & Beyer, 1993). This process can be accomplished through informational justice: When negative or unexpected events are experienced, CF leaders can provide ideological accounts (e.g., Bies, 1987b; Bobocel et al., 1998) that appeal to values deemed important by the CF. People construct the meaning of events by linking them to existing interpretive structures (Ashkanasy & Jackson, 2001); thus, leaders can use explanations to encourage soldiers to interpret a negative or unexpected event through the ideological prism of the CF's ethos. Given the important role that informational justice might play in value creation and maintenance, we focus on this notion throughout the remainder of this section.

Solving the Fundamental Social Dilemma through Invoking Mission Values

Self-interested actions are fundamental to human motivation and behaviour; thus, social dilemmas in which individuals must sacrifice self-interest for the sake of group goals present a serious problem to organized groups (Tyler & Degoey, 1995). This problem, however, might be overcome through the effective promotion of group-oriented values. Research has shown that altering one's values can result in behavioural change (Rokeach & Grube, 1979); thus, CF leaders must instill the values that will promote the behaviours directed toward operational effectiveness.

Behaving in a manner that promotes operational effectiveness might come at the expense of a CF member's self-interest. Indeed, a relatively large portion of the behaviours necessary for

in-theatre operational effectiveness are incompatible with motives for self-preservation. Thus, the promotion of mission-oriented behaviours at the expense of concerns for self-preservation might necessitate the invoking of values related to the CF's strict priority hierarchy (mission, troops, self), which is emphasized throughout soldier training. One way in which this ethos can be invoked is through the provision of ideological accounts that appeal to superordinate values, which might convince CF members to forego self-interested concerns for self-preservation for the sake of the mission success or troop safety.

As previously discussed, Canadian soldiers allegedly poisoned one of their officers, Warrant Officer Stopford. Although Stopford conducted night patrols to gain tactical superiority, the troops did not understand the importance of their patrols for mission success: "the teenage privates of Delta Company didn't understand the big picture unfolding in the Balkans so they didn't share the commitment of their higher-ranking comrades…this was *unfair* (italics added)" ("War Horrors," 2000). This situation emphasizes why leaders should provide ideological explanations to foster commitment to group goals which sometimes come at the expense of self-preservation. Next, we review other applications of value transmission through explanations.

Notwithstanding Clause. Members of the CF in both out of theatre and in-theatre contexts might feel particularly vulnerable to exploitation due to the Notwithstanding Clause of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Although individual rights and freedoms are normally protected under the Charter, the Notwithstanding Clause states that the military can knowingly infringe upon the rights and freedoms of soldiers, if doing so is requisite for the attainment of operational effectiveness. When military leaders invoke the Notwithstanding Clause, perceptions of unfairness may be mitigated by providing an adequate explanation (e.g., an ideological account about values relating to mission priority). CF leaders can use explanations that coincide

with military member values by communicating why the decision or outcome is important for operational effectiveness and, thus, why the infringement is necessary and reasonable. Leaders might also solicit voice so that an individual feels values, and so that the individual's specific concerns can be addressed through an explanation.

Conflicting demands among units. Top-level military leaders manage a number of different units that may have conflicting demands and requirements (Zaccaro, 1996). Thus, top-level leaders must make difficult decisions that might meet the demands of one unit, but which are concomitantly perceived as inconsistent with the espoused core values of another unit. When time permits, top-level leaders should strive to explain the reasons for these perceived paradoxes to members of units who are most negatively affected. By providing this type of account, CF leaders might help maintain the communication of a single set of core values.

Leadership Fairness in the CF: When Not to use the Principles of Justice

Certainly, leaders cannot lead effectively if they must continually explain and justify their decisions, which is why it is vital to establish trust before in-theatre operations to promote the voluntary acceptance of decisions that require trust in the decision maker (Tyler & DeGoey, 1996). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) noted that explanations can be used to mitigate the negative consequences of withholding voice. Thus, military leaders might offer explanations that refer to mission success priorities to clarify why voice might no longer be solicited or considered while in theatre as it was in out of theatre contexts. In general, leadership fairness is most important in out of theatre contexts due to the need for swift decision making while in theatre. There may be situations, however, in which leaders should solicit voice while in theatre. When military leaders solicit the opinions of troops, they can evaluate discrepancies between the values of soldiers and the mission goals in order to take actions designed for concurrence (Bartone &

Kirkland, 1991). Moreover, when time permits, providing explanations that invoke broad mission values can be effective, as we have argued above.

Value Transmission through Leadership Fairness: Conclusion

We believe that CF leaders can use principles of organizational justice to instill values that are consistent with the CF ethos. Our arguments echo those of Bartone and Kirkland (1991), who noted that "Good small unit leaders respect soldiers, compliment them, and make suggestions, but more as a friendly, expert teacher than as a controlling manager. They impart to soldiers a sense of ownership of the mission, and thereby facilitate the internalization of organizational values" (p. 401).

When appropriate, leaders can behave in ways that demonstrate that subordinates are valued members of the CF. Moreover, leaders may be able to provide explanations that invoke mission-related values in order to instill a shared sense of mission and promote behaviours desired for purposes of mission success. In the concluding section of this paper, which is presented next, we offer recommendations for training.

Section 3:

Training Recommendations, Future Research, and Conclusions

Training Recommendations

As this paper has shown, the principles of justice are well-supported: Numerous studies have demonstrated the effects of fairness on a number of behaviours that influence organizational functioning (e.g., OCB, retaliation, and turnover). Given the importance of trust in combat situations, training military leaders in behaviours that facilitate trust, such as fair treatment, would be useful (Deluga, 1995).

In the remainder of this section, we offer answers to five questions relevant to training recommendations:

(1) Does justice training work?

(2) Who should receive justice training?

(3) What content should justice training include?

(4) How should justice principles be trained?

(5) How should justice training be evaluated?

Does justice training work? Research has shown that training leaders in the principles of justice is effective and relatively inexpensive (e.g., Greenberg, 1999). Skarlicki and his colleagues (Jones & Skarlicki, 1998; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996, 1997) have found considerable support for justice training interventions within Canadian organizations using quasi-experimental research methods. These studies showed that, after controlling for pre-training fairness levels, perceptions of fairness increased among subordinates whose leaders were trained in the principles of justice, relative to subordinates whose leaders were not trained. Moreover, in all three of these studies, justice training had the same effects on subordinates' OCB.

Who should receive justice training? Leaders closer to the "front-line" should be trained in the principles of justice because they are most likely to interact with combat and non-combat CF members on a regular basis; thus, subordinates might view these leaders as the most salient representatives of the CF (Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989). To the extent that justice training translates into changes in leader behaviour, CF members will experience increased perceptions of fair treatment, levels of trust, decision acceptance and commitment, and OCB, and they will engage in decreased retaliation and withdrawal behaviours, including voluntary turnover. Providing justice training to leaders who directly lead combat troops is also important because,

to the extent that these leaders can foster a sense of trust out of theatre, they are more likely to garner the trust of subordinates while in theatre. As we have suggested throughout the paper, subordinates who trust their leaders are more likely to obey orders unquestioningly.

Justice training is not only relevant for combat personnel. Indeed, civilian organizations comprise the majority of settings in which justice principles have been supported. Thus, justice training is equally relevant for leaders and managers of non-combat personnel, including personnel officers, administrative staff, and other members in support roles.

In addition to front-line leaders, higher-level leaders should also be trained in the principles of justice. A trickle-down model of justice (i.e., supervisors who felt more fairly treated engaged in more OCB, which led to their subordinates feeling more fairly treated and engaging in more OCB) has been supported in a military setting (Tepper & Taylor, 2003). If leaders at all levels are trained in the principles of justice, a climate of fair treatment might be created (Colquitt et al., 2002; Mossholder et al., 1998; Naumann, 2001; Naumann & Bennett, 2000).

Training at all levels may facilitate culture change by increasing support across the organization. Creating support might be especially important in the CF because members of military organizations tend to be more resistant to change than individuals in civilian organizations (Terriff & Farrell, 2002). Researchers have developed models for effective organizational change that emphasize the principles of justice (e.g., Novelli, Kirkman, & Shapiro, 1995); hence, justice training for leaders at all levels might facilitate culture change not only through creating support, but also through the higher-level leaders' use of newly acquired skills to promote change management.

What should justice training include? Generally speaking, training should include the principles of justice described throughout this paper:

- the reasons why fairness is important to people
- people's responses to unfairness
- the importance of fairness in the CF
- the conditions in which fairness matters most
- the conditions in which military leaders should and should not use the fairness principles.

Training content pertaining to procedural justice should include:

- the aspects of procedures that are related to fairness
- the manner in which leaders can demonstrate the fairness of procedures
- the manner in which leaders can solicit voice and show that it is considered
- the circumstances in which voice is more and less important from the perspectives of both military members and the CF.

Interpersonal justice training should focus on the importance of demonstrating dignity and respect and the importance of refraining from demeaning treatment. Informational justice training should include:

- the situations in which providing explanations is most important
- the various types of explanations
- the characteristics that render explanations adequate.

Finally, several general skills are associated with the promotion of justice: active listening skills, demonstration of empathy, conflict resolution, and general communication. These skills should be included in training program.

How should justice principles be trained? The goal justice training programs is to provide leaders with a systematic language and metaphorical "tool set" with which to identify and handle issues pertaining to fairness in organizations. The length of justice training interventions vary, and include single day workshops, single day workshops with personalized follow-up training through email and phone, and, more commonly, workshops that occurs one afternoon a week for three to four weeks, thereby allowing trainees to practice the principles of justice in between training sessions.

Trainers typically utilize various teaching techniques in which leaders are encouraged to engage in an active experiential learning process. Rather than simply viewing fairness-relevant information in a training manual or listening to a lecture, trainees can share their own experiences of fair and unfair treatment, role play to practice newly acquired skills, engage in group-level brainstorming activities, practice workplace assignments, and individual and group-level debriefings.

Anecdotal evidence from one training intervention (Jones & Skarlicki, 1998) indicated that leaders viewed the workplace assignments and group debriefings as very valuable. In this case, the researchers set personalized workplace goal assignments in a participative manner with leaders and, during the next training session, leaders shared their goals and experiences in attaining them with a group of other leaders. This format was particularly effective because it helped to remove barriers, such as embarrassment about using the principles or difficulty admitting the need to treat subordinates more fairly. Moreover, the group format facilitated buy-in, because leaders could hear the success stories of others.

How should justice training be evaluated? Training can be evaluated in many ways, a few of which are discussed in the following section. To maximizing training efficacy for current

and future training, we suggest that evaluation should consist of: (a) a short test of declarative knowledge following the training, (b) assessment of trainee reactions to specific aspects of each session, and (c) group-level pre- and post-training data from subordinates. Pre-training data on subordinate perceptions of treatment can be useful for personalizing training for increased effectiveness (i.e., addressing the interaction between aptitudes and training methods), and for identifying possible weaknesses to increase buy-in and facilitate goal setting. Post-training data on subordinate perceptions can be valuable for demonstrating change and increasing self-efficacy, for goal setting, and for evaluating the efficacy of the training program as a whole.

Future Research

An action research perspective is recommended in order to apply justice in the CF. Specifically, research should be informed by both the practical needs of the CF (i.e., a potential problem is addressed or practically useful information is obtained through novel research findings) as well as the scientific needs of researchers (i.e., the research is scientifically rigorous and includes outcome measures uncontaminated by same-source bias). One way of identifying potential problems within the CF is to conduct a needs analysis, which might include obtaining baseline measurements of the fairness perceptions of CF members that could also be used as part of a later research design.

An effective approach to research involves developing a leadership training program that incorporates the principles of justice and implementing the intervention. Subordinates' perceptions of fairness measured before and after the training in treatment and control groups can be used to validate the training program and address research questions. From a scientific perspective, the use of treatment and control groups provides a means of manipulating fairness in a real-world setting (i.e., a quasi-experiment). Accordingly, any associated changes in

behavioural responses, measured before and after the training, can be interpreted as having been caused by changes in fairness perceptions.

An important practical question for the CF is whether perceptions of fair treatment, trust, and decision commitment out of theatre transfer to attitudes and behaviours in theatre. We believe that attitudes and perceptions that are fostered out of theatre will generalize to in-theatre contexts, and although ample evidence indirectly suggests that this proposition is likely to be true, it has yet to be tested. This research question could be examined on its own or in conjunction with a training intervention.

Additionally, research on justice perceptions as they unfold over time is needed. A recent model of justice cognitions over time (Jones & Skarlicki, 2003) highlights the importance of initial impressions of fairness, how these impressions bias subsequent information processing, and how they can change in the face of unexpected treatment. This model has implications for changing people's perceptions of unfairness and maintaining their perceptions of fairness, but it has yet to be tested in a field setting.

Another area that has considerable potential for furthering an understanding of justice in the CF pertains to nested group identities, a notion that was developed for the first time in this paper. Research is needed to illuminate what might happen, for example, when CF members feel fairly treated by their immediate superiors, but not by a representative of a the larger social entity (i.e., the CF).

Finally, an important research question concerns the effects of voice. Although a considerable amount of research supports the importance of voice, including research conducted among military personnel, researchers have yet to address the possibility that leaders who offer opportunities for voice might be seen as "soft" rather than respected. We suspect that offering

voice might be viewed more negatively in times of crisis, when swift decision making and trust in leaders' competence is needed.

Conclusion

Canadian Forces leaders can use principles of organizational justice in peacetime and out of theatre contexts to establish trust and goal commitment among subordinates and to reduce the likelihood of negative responses to perceived unfairness (i.e., reduced citizenship behaviour, retaliation, and withdrawal behaviour, such as turnover). The effects of fair treatment on trust and goal commitment may transfer to CF members' attitudes and behaviours while in theatre and, hence, promote operational effectiveness. These suggestions must be tested within the context of the CF.

References

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 67,* 422-436.

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.

Adams, J. S., & Freedman, S. (1976). Equity theory revisited: Comments and annotated bibliography. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 43-90). New York: Academic Press.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50,* 179-211.

Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research, 1,* 177-198.

Ambrose, M. L., & Harland, L. K. (1995). Procedural justice and influence tactics: Fairness, frequency, and effectiveness. In R. S. Cropanzano & K.M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace* (pp. 97-130). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89,* 947-965.

Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships among pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 8, 21*-33.

Aquino, K., Griffeth, R. W., Allen, D. G., & Hom, P. W. (1997). Integrating justice constructs into the turnover process: A test of a referent cognitions model. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 1208-1227.

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.

Aquino, L., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: the effects of blame, attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 52-59.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 267-286.

Aryee, S., & Chay, Y. W. (2001). Workplace justice, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions in a union context: Examining the mediating role of perceived union support and union instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 154-160.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Jackson, C. R. A. (2001). Organization culture and climate. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 398-415). London: Sage.

Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 299-322.

Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology, 127,* 649-656.

Baron, R. A. (1988). Attributions and organizational conflict: The mediating role of apparent sincerity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 41,* 111-127.

Baron, R. A. (1990). Countering the effects of destructive criticisms: The relative efficacy of four interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 235-245.

Bartle, S. A., & Hayes, B. C. (1999, April-May). *Organizational justice and work outcomes: A meta-analysis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Atlanta, GA.

Bartone, P. T., & Kirkland, F. R. (1991). Optimal leadership in small army units. In R. Gal, & A. D. Mangelsdorff (Eds.), *Handbook of military psychology* (pp. 393-409). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 232-244.

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39,* 464-482.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 349-360.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (in press). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science, 2nd ed.*

Beugre, C. D., & Baron, R. A. (2001). Perceptions of systematic justice: The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31,* 324-339.

Bies, R. J. (1987a). Beyond "voice": The influence of decision-maker justification and sincerity of procedural fairness judgments. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 17,* 3-17.

Bies, R. J. (1987b). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, 9,* (pp. 289-319). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bies, R., J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communications criteria of fairness. In R. Lewicki, M. Bazerman, & B. Sheppards (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of social accounts. *Social Justice Research, 1,* 199-218.

Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments. *Academy of Management Journal, 31,* 676-685.

Bies, R. J., Shapiro, D. L., & Cummings, L. L. (1988). Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: Is it enough to say it's not my fault? *Communications Research, 15,* 381-399.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1995). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp.246-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 246-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, K. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. Giaccalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2001). A passion for justice: The rationality and morality of revenge. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice, Vol. 2. Series in applied psychology* (pp. 197-208). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Blader, S. L., Chang, C., & Tyler, T. R. (2001). Procedural justice and retaliation in organizations: Comparing cross-nationally the importance of fair group processes. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 12,* 295-311.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: Wiley.

Bobocel, D. R., Agar, S. E., Meyer, J. P., & Irving, P. G. (1998). Managerial accounts and fairness perceptions in conflict resolution: Differentiating the effects of minimizing responsibility and providing justification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 133-143.

Bobocel, D. R., & Farrell, A. C. (1996). Sex-based promotion decisions and interactional fairness: Investigating the influence of managerial accounts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 22-35.

Bobocel, D. R., & Holmvall, C. M. (2001). Are interactional justice and procedural justice different? Framing the debate. In S. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research*

on Social Issues in Management (Vol. 1, pp. 85-108). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Bobocel, D. R., McCline, R. L., & Folger, R. (1997). Letting them down gently: Conceptual advances in explaining controversial organizational policies. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior,* (Vol. 4, pp. 73-88). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Borman, W. C., Motowidlo, S. J., Rose, S. R., & Hansen, L. M. (1985). *Development of a model of soldier effectiveness.* Minneapolis, MN: Personnel Decisions Research Institute.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10,* 99-109.

Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likeableness on revenge and forgiveness in the workplace. *Journal of Management, 25,* 607-631.

Bradley, J. P., Nicol, A. A. M., Charbonneau, D., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Personality correlates of leadership development in Canadian Forces officer candidates. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 34,* 92-103.

Brass, D. J., & Krackhardt, D. (1999). The social capital of twenty-first-century leaders. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Out-of-the-box leadership: Transforming the twenty-first-century army and other top-performing organizations* (pp. 179-194). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11,* 710-725.

Brockner, J. (1990). Scope of justice in the workplace: How survivors react to co-worker layoffs. *Journal of Social Issues, 46,* 95-106.

Brockner, J., DeWitt, R. L., Grover, S., & Reed, T. (1990). When it is especially important to explain why: Factors affecting the relationship between managers' explanations of a layoff and survivors' reactions to the layoff. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26,* 389-407.

Brockner, J., & Greenberg, J. (1990). The impact of layoffs on survivors: An organizational justice perspective. In J. Caroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings* (pp. 45-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brockner, J., Konovsky, M. A., Cooper-Schneider, R., Folger, R., Martin, C., & Bies, R. J. (1994). Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management Journal, 32,* 397-409.

Brockner, J., & Siegel, P. (1996). Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive justice: The role of trust. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 390-413). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brockner, J., Tyler, T. R., & Cooper-Schneider, R. (1992). The influence of prior commitment to an institution on reactions to perceived unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 241-261.

Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin, 120,* 189-208.

Brower, H. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Tan, H. H. (2000). A model of relational leadership: The integration of trust and leader-member exchange. *Leadership Quarterly, 11,* 227-250.

Byrne, Z. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2000, April). *To which source do I attribute fairness? Differential effects of multi-foci justice on organizational work behaviors.* Paper

presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Cassel, R. N. (1993). Building trust in Air Force leadership. *Psychology - a Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 30,* 4-15.

Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 615-633.

Clay-Warner, J. (2001). Perceiving procedural injustice: The effects of group membership and status. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 64,* 224-238.

Cleared soldier wants to leave army. (2003, February 19). *Calgary Herald,* p. A5.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86,* 278-321.

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., & 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.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Rich, B. L., & Piccolo, R. F. (2003, April). Fairness heuristic theory: A field test. In J. Colquitt (Chair), *Testing New Theories of Organizational Justice.* Symposium conducted at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Colquitt, J. A., Noe, R. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 83-109.

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.

Conlon, D. E., & Murray, N. M. (1996). Customer perceptions of corporate responses to product complaints: The role of explanations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1040-1056.

Creed, W. E. D., & Miles, R. E. (1996). Trust in organizations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and opportunity costs of controls. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 16-38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (2001). Procedural and distributive justice are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 119-151). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cropanzano, R., & Baron, R. A. (1991). Injustice and organizational conflict: The moderating role of power restoration. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 2,* 5-26.

Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58,* 164-201.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. 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 between procedural and interactional justice.* Paper presented at the 14th annual

conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and organizational Management*, 27, 324-351.

Cropanzano, R., & Randall, M. L. (1995). Advance notice as a means of reducing relative deprivation. *Social Justice Research, 8,* 217-238.

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.

Daly, J. P., & Geyer, P. D. (1994). The role of fairness in implementing large-scale change: Employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 623-638.

DeGoey, P. (2000). Contagious justice: Exploring the social construction of justice in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol 22, pp. 51-102). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

DeBoer, E. M., Bakker, A. B., Syroit, J. E., & Scaufeli, W. B. (2002). Unfairness at work as a predictor of absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 181-197.

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology, 7,* 1-16.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 611-628.

Dittrich, J. E., & Carrell, M. R. (1979). Organizational equity perceptions, employee job satisfaction, and departmental absence and turnover rates. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24,* 29-40.

Donovan, J. J. (2001). Work motivation. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 53-76). London: Sage.

Earley, P. C., & Lind, E. A. (1987). Procedural justice and participation in task selection: The role of control in mediating justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 1148-1160.

Elsbach, K. D., & Elofson, G. (2000). How the packaging of decision explanations affects perceptions of trustworthiness. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 80-89.

Evans, M. A. (1999). An analysis and cross-validation of the role of information during downsizing. *Military Psychology, 11,* 345-364.

Farh, J-L., Earley, C. P., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42,* 421-444.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16,* 705-721.

Fassina, N. E., Jones, D. A., Carroll, S. A., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2003). *A Social-Exchange Model of Job Satisfaction and Justice Attitudes and Citizenship Behavior: A Meta-Analysis.* Unpublished manuscript.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

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.

Folger, R. (1986). Rethinking equity theory: A referent cognitions model. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in social relations* (pp. 145-162). New York: Plenum.

Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. In J. K. Murnigham (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 161-183). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Folger, R. (1994). Workplace justice and employee worth. *Social Justice Research, 7,* 225-241.

Folger, R. (1998). Fairness as a moral virtue. In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Moral management of people and processes* (pp. 13-34). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Folger, R. (2001). Fairness as deonance. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management* (Vol. 1, pp. 3-33). New York: Information Age Publishers.

Folger R., & Baron, R. A. (1996). Violence and hostility at work: A model of reactions to perceived injustice. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 51-85). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Folger, R., & Bies, R. J. (1989). Managerial responsibilities and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2,* 79-90.

Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., Timmerman, T. A., Howes, J. C., & Mitchell, D. (1996). Elaborating procedural fairness: Justice becomes both simpler and more complex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 435-441.

Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 1-55). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Folger, R., & Kass, E. E. (2000). Social comparison and fairness: A counterfactual simulations perspective. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research* (423-441). NY: Plenum.

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. Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkran, L. (1979). Effects of "voice" and peer opinions on responses to inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 2253-2261.

Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., & Robinson, T. (1983). Relative deprivation and procedural justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 268-273.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change, 12,* 35-50.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior. 59,* 291-309.

Garonzik, R., Brockner, J., & Siegel, P. A. (2000). Identifying international assignees at risk for premature departure: The interactive effect of outcome favorability and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 13-20.

Gellatly, I. R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16,* 469-485.

General quits over Kabul mission. (2003, February 12). *Calgary Herald,* p. A5.

George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 107-116.

Gilliland, S. W., & Chan, D. (2001). Justice in organizations: Theory, methods, and applications. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 143-165). London: Sage.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25,* 161-178.

Greenberg, J. (1982). Approaching equity and avoiding inequity in groups and organizations. In J. Greenberg & R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior* (pp. 389-346). New York: Academic Press.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 340-342.

Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 55-61.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 561-568.

Greenberg, J. (1993a). 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. (1993b). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational 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.

Greenberg, J. (1999). *Interpersonal justice training (IJT) for reducing employee theft: Some preliminary results.* Unpublished data. The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. Cited in Greenberg, 2000.

Greenberg, J. (2000, April). *Organizational justice: Conceptual background, theoretical issues, and real applications.* An expanded tutorial at 15th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans: LA.

Greenberg, J. (2001). The seven loose can(n)ons of organizational justice. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 245-271). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Greenberg, J., & R. Cropanzano (Eds.). (2001). *Advances in organizational justice.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Greenberg, J., Eskew, D. E., & Miles, J. A. (1991, August). *Adherence to participatory norms as a moderator of the fair process effect: When voice does not enhance procedural fairness.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Miami Beach, FL.

Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P. Paulus (Ed.), *Group Processes* (pp. 235-256). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Grienberger, I. V., Rutte, C. G., & van Knippenberg, A. F. M. (1997). Influence of social comparisons of outcomes and procedures on fairness judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 913-919.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26,* 463-488.

Griffith, J., & Vaitkus, M. (1999). Relating cohesion to stress, strain, disintegration, and performance: An organizing framework. *Military Psychology, 11,* 27-55.

Harlos, K. P. (2001). When organizational voice systems fail: More on the deaf-ear syndrome and frustration effects. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37*, 324-342.

Hartog, D. N. D., & Koopman, P. L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 166-187). London: Sage.

Haworth, C. L., Cober, R. T., & Snyder, D. (2000, April). *Curmudgeons in the workplace: Do nice guys really finish last?* Paper presented at the 15th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Hendrix, W. H., Robbins, T., Miller, J. & Summers, T. P. (1998). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on factors predictive of turnover. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13,* 611-632.

Henle, C. A. (2002, August). *Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality.* Paper presented at the 15th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Denver, CO.

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms.* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms (revised edition).* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hoojiberg, Bullis, and Hunt (1999). Behavioral complexity and the development of military leadership for the twenty-first century. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Out-of-the-box leadership: Transforming the twenty-first-century army and other top-performing organizations* (pp. 111-130). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Hulin, C. L. (1991). Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 445-505). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the problem; is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science, 7,* 40-45.

Johns, G. (2001). The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 232-252). London: Sage.

Jones, F. F. (1998). Pay procedures and voluntary turnover: Does procedural justice matter? *Psychological Reports, 83,* 475-482.

Jones, D. A. (2002). RHR Kendall award winning paper: Employee narratives of procedural justice: A content analysis of 1600 intranet postings. *The Canadian Industrial and Organizational Psychologist, 18,* 15-17.

Jones, D. A. (2003a). *Considering the strength of justice attitudes: Understanding behavioral reactions to (in)justice and explaining why unfairness is more predictive than fairness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada.

Jones, D. A. (2003b, August). Retaliating against supervisors and organizations: Theory of planned behavior and justice predictions. In *Organizational Justice and Remedies.*

Symposium to be conducted at the 16th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Seattle, Washington.

Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2002, April). *The effects of social information on fairness evaluations and retaliation.* Poster session presented at the 17th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2003, April). Integrating fairness theory with fairness heuristic theory: Reactions to interactional injustice. In J. Colquitt (Chair), *Testing New Theories of Organizational Justice.* Symposium conducted at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (in press). The relationship between perceptions of fairness and voluntary turnover among retail employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology.*

Kahenman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (1982*). Judgement under uncertainity: Heuristics and biases*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavior Science, 9,* 131-133.

Kickul, J., Lester, S. W., & Finkl, J. (2002). Promise breaking during radical organizational change: Do justice interventions make a difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 469-488.

Kickul, J. R., Neuman, G., Parker, C., & Finkl, J. (2001). Settling the score: The role of organizational justice in the relationship between psychological contract breach and anticitizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13, 77-93.

Kidwell, R. E., & Bennett, N. (1994). Employee reactions to electronic systems. *Group and Organizational Management, 19,* 203-218.

Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (1991). Implementing global strategies: The role of procedural justice. *Strategic Management Journal, 12,* 125-143.

Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (1993). Procedural justice, attitudes, and subsidiary top management compliance. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 502-526.

Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (1996). Procedural justice and managers' in-role and extra-role behavior: The case of the multinational. *Management Science, 42,* 499-515.

Klammer, J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Barclay, L. (2002). Speaking up in the Canadian military: The roles of voice, being heard, and generation in predicting civic virtue. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 34 (2),* 122-130.

Konovsky, M. A. (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.

Konovsky, M. A., & Folger, R. (1991, August). *Effects of procedural and distributive justice on organizational citizenship behavior.* Paper presented at the meetings of the National Academy of Management, Miami, FL.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 656-669.

Korsgaard, M. A., Brodt, S. E., & Witener, E. M. (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 312-319.

Korsgaard, A. M., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management, 21 (4),* 657-669.

Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 60-84.

Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology***,** *54,* 101-115.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Doherty, M. L. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected issue. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 546-553.

Kramer, R.M. (1991). Intergroup relations and organization dilemmas: The role of categorization processes. In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organization behavior, 13,* 191-228. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.

Kramer, R.M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierchic relation: Trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 216-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (Eds.). (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kwong, J. Y. Y., & Leung, K. (2001). A moderator of the interaction effect of procedural justice and outcome favorability: Importance of the relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 87,* 278-299.

Lamertz, K. (2002). The social construction of fairness: Social influence and sense making in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 19-37.

Lawler, E. J. (1992). Affective attachment to nested groups: A choice process theory. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 327-339.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 52-65.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion.* New York: Plenum.

Leung, K. & Li, W. (1990). Psychological mechanisms of process-control effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 613-620.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.

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.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lind, E. A. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 56-88). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lind, E. A., & Earley, P. C. (1992). Procedural justice and culture. *International Journal of Psychology, 27,* 227-242.

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 952-959.

Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. (1998). The social construction of injustice: Fairness judgments in response to own and others' unfair treatment by authorities. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 75,* 1-22.

Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. (2001). Primacy effects in justice judgments: Testing predictions for fairness heuristic theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 85*, 189-210.

Lind, E. A., Kulik, C. A., Ambrose, M., & de Vera Park, M. V. (1993). Individual and corporate dispute resolution: Using procedural fairness as a decision heuristic. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38,* 224-251.

Lind, E. A., Lissak, R. I., & Conlon, D. E. (1983). Decision control and process control effects on procedural fairness judgments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13,* 338-350.

Lind E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* New York: Plenum.

Little, H. T., Magner, N. R., & Welker, R. B. (2002). The fairness of formal budgetary procedures and their enactment: Relationships with managers' behavior. *Group and Organization Management, 27,* 209-225.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). A *theory of goal-setting and task performance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Magner, N., Welker, R. B., & Johnson, G. G. (1996). The interactive effects of participation and outcome favorability on turnover intentions and evaluations of supervisors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69,* 135-143.

Major, B. & Deaux, K. (1982). Individual differences in justice behavior. In. J. Greenberg & R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior* (pp. 43-76). New York: Academic Press.

Malatesta, R. M., & Byrne, Z. S. (1997). *The Impact of formal and interactional procedures on organizational outcomes.* Paper presented at the 12th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St. Lois, MO.

Malone, D. M. (1983). *Small unit leadership: A commonsense approach.* Novato, CA: Presidio Press.

Masterson, S. S. (2001). A trickle-down model of organizational justice: Relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 594-604.

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.

Masterson, S. S., & Taylor, M. S. (1996). *The broadening of procedural justice: Should interactional and procedural components be separate theories?* Paper presented at the ninth annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Cincinnati, OH.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 38,* 24-59.

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.

Miceli, M. P., Jung, I., Near, J. P., & Greenberger, D. B. (1991). Predictions and outcomes of reactions to pay-for-performance plans. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 508-521.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 538-551.

Mollica, K. A., Gray, B., Trevino, L. K., & DeWitt, R. L. (1999, August). *A social identity perspective on organizational justice among layoff survivors.* Paper presented at the National Academy of Management Meetings, Chicago, IL.

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,* 351-357.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6,* 209-225.

Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., & Martin, C. L. (1998). A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19,* 131-141.

Naumann, S. E. (2001, April). The effects of procedural justice climate on work group performance. In Q. M. Roberson (Chair), *Moving beyond individual justice perceptions: Exploring fairness in multilevel contexts.* Symposium conducted at the 16th Annual Meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 881-889.

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 527-556.

Novelli, L, Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (1995). Effective implementation of organizational change: An organizational justice perspective. In C. L. Cooper, & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (pp 5-36). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ohbuchi, F., Kameda, M., & Agarie, N. (1989). Apology as aggression control: Its role in mediating appraisal of and response to harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 219-227.

Oliver, L. W., Harman, J., Hoover, E., Hayes, S. M., & Pandhi, N. A. (1999). A quantitative integration of the military cohesion literature. *Military Psychology, 11,* 57-83.

Olson, J. M., Roese, N. J., & Zanna M. P. (1996). Expectancies. In E. T. Higgens & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology handbook of basic principles* (pp. 211-238). New York: Guilford.

Organ D. W. (1988a). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1988b). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management, 14,* 547-557.

Organ D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10,* 85-97.

Parker, C. P., Bales, B. B., & Christensen, 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, 82,* 376-389.

Personnel resigning over unfairness in Forces. (2002, Jun 19). *Calgary Herald*, p. A3.

Peterson, M. F. & Smith, P. (2000). Sources of meaning, organizations, and culture: Making sense of organizational events. In N. M. Ashkanansy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 101-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Phillips, J. M., Douthitt, E. A., & Hyland, M. M. (2001). The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 316-325.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management, 25,* 897-933.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10,* 133-151.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*, 513-563.

Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 615-621.

Randall, C. S., & Mueller, C. W. (1995). Extensions of justice theory: Justice evaluations and employees' reactions in a natural setting. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58,* 178-194.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management review, 10,* 465-576.

Robbins, T. L., Summers, T. P., Miller, J. L., & Hendrix, W. H. (2000). Using the group-value model to explain the role of noninstrumental justice in distinguishing the effects of

distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73,* 511-518.

Roberts, J. A., Coulson, K. R., & Chonko, L. B. (1999). Salesperson perceptions of equity and justice and their impact on organizational commitment and intent to turnover. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 7,* 1-16.

Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definitions, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations, 6*, 2-27.

Robinson, S. L. & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 1-30). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M., & Grube, J. W. (1979). Can values be manipulated arbitrarily? In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal* (pp. 241-256). New York: Free Press.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreemen*ts. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rupp, D. E. (2003, April). Testing the moral violations component of fairness theory: The moderating role of value preferences. In J. Colquitt (Chair), *Testing New Theories of Organizational Justice.* Symposium conducted at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89,* 925-946.

Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). London: Sage.

Sager, J. K. (1991). A longitudinal assessment of change in sales force turnover. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 19,* 25-36.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 23,* 224-252.

Schalk, R., & Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Psychological contracts in employment. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 132-142). London: Sage.

Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology, 132,* 277-290.

Schaubroeck, J., May, D. R., & Brown, F. W. (1994). Procedural justice explanations and employee reactions to economic hardship: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 455-460.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45,* 109-119.

Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Cropanzano, R. S. (2000). The effect of organizational structure on perceptions of procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 294-304.

Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organization structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organizational level. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89,* 881-905.

Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology, 36,* 19-40.

Schuster, E. (2001). Canadian soldiers receive a slap on the wrist for seriously poisoning an overzealous officer. *Military Justice, September 10.*

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Brainin, E., & Popper, M. (2000). Leadership and social identification in military units: Direct and indirect relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30,* 612-640.

Shapiro, D. L. (1991). The effect of explanations on negative reactions to deceit. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 614-630.

Shapiro, D. L. (1993). Reconciling theoretical differences among procedural justice researchers by re-evaluating what it means to have one's view "considered": Implications for third-party managers. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management.* (pp. 51-78). Hillsdale, NJ: Erbaum.

Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (1993). Comparing three processes underlying judgments of procedural justice: A field study if mediation and arbitration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65 (6),* 1167-1177.

Shapiro, D. L., Buttner, E. H., & Barry, B. (1994). Explanations for rejection decisions: What factors enhance the perceived adequacy and moderate their enhancement of justice perceptions? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 58,* 346-368.

Shapiro, D. L., & Kirkman, B. L. (2001). Anticipatory injustice: The consequences of expecting injustice in the workplace. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 152-178). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Shapiro, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Victor, B. (1995). Correlates of employee theft: A multi-dimensional justice perspective. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 6 (4),* 404-414.

Singer, M., Singer, A., & Bruhns, C. (1991). Fair managerial selection. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 6,* 22-25.

Sitkin, S. B., & Bies, R. J. (1993). Social accounts in conflict situations: Using explanations to manage conflict. *Human Relations, 46,* 349-370.

Skarlicki, D. P., Ellard, J. H., & Kelln, B. R. C. (1998). Third-party perceptions of a layoff: Procedural, derogation, and retributive aspects of justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 119-127.

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.

Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1998, June). *Managerial justice training: Its effects on retail employees' perceptions of fairness, citizenship, and retaliatory behaviors.* Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. *Canadian Psychology, 39 (2a),* 115.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance in a university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 12,* 175-181.

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.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653-663.

Soldier poisoned by own men, newspaper reports: Retired warrant office says the military told him to keep details quiet. (1999, August, 12). *Vancouver Sun,* p. B8.

Steil, J. M. (1983). The responses to injustice: Effects of varying levels of social support and position of advantage or disadvantage. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19,* 239-253.

Sujak, D. A., Parker, C. P., & Grush, J. E. (1998, April). *The importance of interactional justice: Reactions to organizational drug testing.* Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.

Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Worker's 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.

Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1997). Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18,* 83-98.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin, (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations, 2,* 7-24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6,* 195-207.

Taylor, D. M., Moghaddam, F. M., Gamble, I., & Zellerer, E. (1987). Disadvantaged group responses to perceived inequality: From passive acceptance to collective action. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127,* 259-272.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178-190.

Tepper, B. J, Eisenbach, R. J, Kirby, S. L, & Potter, P. W. (1998). Test of a justice-based model of subordinates' resistance to downward influence attempts. *Group and Organization Management, 23,* 144-160.

Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 789-796.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46,* 97-105.

Terriff, T., & Farrell, T. (2002). Military change in the new millennium. In T. Farrell & T. Terriff (Eds.) *The sources of military change: Culture, politics, technology* (pp. 265-277). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thomas, J. L., Dickson, M. W., & Bilese, P. D. (2001). Values predicting leader performance in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: Evidence for a personality-mediated model. *Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 181-196.

Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The culture of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Turillo, C. J., Folger, R., Lavelle, J. J., Umphress, E. E., & Gee, J. O. (2002). Is virtue its own reward? Self-sacrificial decisions for the sake of fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes, 89,* 839-865.

Tyler, T. R. (1987). Conditions leading to value-expressive effects in judgments of procedural justice: A test of four models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 333-344.

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. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: Interpersonal aspects of procedural justice. In J. S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology in business settings* (pp. 77-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler, T. R., & DeGoey, P. (1995). Collective restraint in social dilemmas: Procedural justice and social identification effects on support for authorities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 482-497.

Tyler, T. R., & DeGoey, P. (1996). Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attributions on willingness to accept decisions. In R. M. 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 matter. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 913-930.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1990). Intrinsic versus community-based justice models: When does group membership matter? *Journal of Social Issues, 46,* 83-94.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 25* (pp. 115-191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Tyler, T. R., Rasinski, K., & Spodick, N. (1985). The influence of voice on satisfaction with leaders: Exploring the meaning of process control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 72-81.

Umphress, E., Labianca, G., Kass, E. E., Scholten, L., & Brass, D. J. (2003). *The role of instrumental and expressive social network ties in organizational justice perceptions.* Unpublished manuscript.

Van den Bos, K. (2001). Uncertainty management: The influence of uncertainty salience on reactions to perceived procedural fairness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 931-941.

Van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2001). The psychology of own versus others' treatment: Self-oriented and other-oriented effects on perceptions of procedural justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1324-1333.

Van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2001). The psychology of procedural justice and distributive justice viewed from the perspective of fairness heuristic theory. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace, Volume 2: From theory to practice* (pp. 49-66). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Van den Bos, K., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1996). The consistency rule and the voice effect: The influence of expectations on procedural fairness judgments and performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26,* 411-428.

Van den Bos, K., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1997). Procedural and distributive justice: What is fair depends more on what comes first than on what comes next. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 95-104.

Van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., & Lind, E. A. (1998). When do we need procedural fairness? The role of trust in authority. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1449-1458.

Walster, E., Bersheid, E., & Walster, G. W. (1973). New directions in equity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25,* 151-176.

War horrors, officer distrust led to poison coffee plot: What led to six soldiers of Delta Company to plot poisoning their commanders in Croatia? A combination of exposure to bloody ethnic killing, distant leaders, too much beer and a fear if dying in the carnage themselves. (2000, June 4). *Calgary Herald*, p. A12.

Wegner, D. M., & Bargh, J. A. (1998). Control and automaticity in social life. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 446-496). New York: McGraw Hill.

Weiner, H. R. (1990). Group-level and individual-level mediators of the relationship between soldier satisfaction with social support and performance motivation. *Military Psychology, 2,* 21-32.

Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 786-794.

West, M. A. (2001). The human team: Basic motivations and innovations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 270-288). London: Sage.

Whitener, E. M. (1997). The impact of human resource activities on employee trust. *Human Resource Management Review*, 7, 389-404.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsegaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 513-530.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17,* 601-617.

Williams, J. H., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The effects of organizational practices on sexual harassment and individual outcomes in the military. *Military Psychology, 11,* 303-328.

Youngjohn, R. M. (2000). Is leadership trait theory fact or fiction? A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between individual differences and leader effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 4285,* US: Univ Microfilms International.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zaccaro, S. J. (1996). *Models and theories of executive leadership: A conceptual /empirical review and integration.* Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Model reproduced in Zaccaro, 1999.

Zaccaro, S. J. (1999). Social complexity and the competencies required for effective military leadership. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Out-of-the-box leadership: Transforming the twenty-first-century army and other top-performing organizations* (pp. 131- 151). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Zaccaro, S. J. & Dobbins, G. H. (1989). Contrasting group and organizational commitment: Evidence for differences among multilevel attachments. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10,* 267-273.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 1068–1076.

Appendix A

Cognitive Models of Fairness Judgements

Fairness Heuristic Theory

Fairness heuristic theory (FHT: Lind, 2001; Van den Bos et al., 2001) is premised on the notion that individuals are regularly confronted with a fundamental social dilemma: Contributing effort and personal resources to a social entity (e.g., a work group or organization) results in personal gain, including tangible rewards and an enhanced self-identity, yet sacrificing one's self to a group leaves one vulnerable to exploitation and threats to self-identity (Lind, 2001). For this reason, people are motivated to determine whether authorities and other social entities are trustworthy, especially under conditions of uncertainty (see Van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Constantly determining whether or not to trust people during social interaction would consume too many of one's cognitive resources; thus, individuals construct cognitive shortcuts, or heuristics, about fairness to determine whether or not to trust and cooperate with social entities.

FHT states that people construct fairness heuristics rapidly, using whatever information is available, during a "judgement phase". In particular, heuristics are constructed when individuals have little information about trust (Van den Bos, 2001) or when they are in the early stages of relationship formation (Lind, 2001). Once a fairness heuristic is formed, an individual moves quickly into a "use phase" in which the heuristic anchors the interpretation of subsequent information (Lind et al., 2001; Van den Bos et al., 1997). Thus, fairness heuristics remain relatively stable over time and typically bias subsequent information processing in the direction suggested by the heuristic. A "phase-shifting event", however, can cause an individual to shift from heuristic processing to a more thoughtful re-evaluation of available information. Phase-shifting events include situations in which one's expectations for fair treatment are violated by an

incident of perceived unfairness, a relationship is perceived as changing, or an issue is deemed very important (Lind, 2001). As a result of the re-evaluation of available information, an individual may reject the new information and maintain the heuristic or construct a new one before moving quickly back to the "use phase". Many of predictions from FHT are supported by experimental studies (e.g., Jones & Skarlicki, 2002; Van den Bos et al., 1997; Van den Bos, Wilke, & Lind, 1998; Van den Bos, 2001; Lind et al., 2001), as well as research conducted in the field (Colquitt et al., 2003).

Fairness Theory

In contrast to FHT's focus on perceptions of fair and unfair treatment over time, fairness theory (FT: Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) focuses on how individuals determine whether or not an event is aversive and whether an agent (e.g., a manager or the organization) is accountable for a moral violation. FT proposes that upon encountering a potentially aversive event, an individual engages in counterfactual thinking (i.e., the event is compared to imagined alternative events) concerning three questions: (1) What *would* the event have felt like if it were different (i.e., event aversiveness)? (2) *Could* an agent have acted differently (i.e., attributions of intentionality)?, and (3) *Should* an agent have acted differently (i.e., beliefs about normative and moral responsibility)? An individual perceives injustice to the extent that he or she believes that an imagined alternative event *would* have felt better than the actual event, and that the event *could* and *should* have happened differently.

Considerable support exists for the cognitions proposed by FT. The notion that an individual compares a potentially aversive event to a referent standard to determine the magnitude of an injury (i.e., a *would* judgement) is long-standing and widely-studied (e.g., Kahenman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982). Research on referent cognitions theory (Folger, 1986,

1993) supports the contention that *would* and *could* judgements work together to predict resentment (see Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). The importance of perceived intentionality (i.e., *could* judgements) is also supported by theory and research showing that the ease of assigning blame is a critical factor in the retributive motivation (e.g., Aquino et al., 2001; Aquino et al., 1999; Bies & Tripp, 1996, 2001; Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). Concerning *should* judgements, Folger's (2001) deontological model posits that the importance of justice reflects a basic concern for human dignity and respect, and recent research supports the notion that fair treatment is viewed as a moral obligation (Rupp, 2003; Turillo, Folger, Lavelle, Umphress, & Gee, 2003).

Toward an Integrated Model

Jones and Skarlicki (2003) proposed an integration of FHT and FT that provides a more complete picture of fairness cognitions as they exist and change over time than either theory accomplishes in isolation. Central to their framework is the notion that different fairness cognitions can be placed on an information processing continuum ranging from more automatic to more controlled (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Wegner & Bargh, 1998). Jones and Skarlicki reviewed evidence from organizational justice and social-cognitive research (e.g., Olson, Roese, & Zanna, 1996) to propose that heuristic processing occurs until an individual encounters an unexpected and potentially aversive event. This type of "phase-shifting event" (Lind, 2001), triggers the counterfactual thinking proposed by FT (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), which can lead to the construction of a new heuristic. Thus, fairness cognitions are conceptualized as the ongoing cognitive process of shifting between automatic (heuristic) and more controlled (counterfactual) processing, while continuously evaluating information that is consistent and inconsistent with one's expectations. This cyclical process is proposed to occur throughout an individual's ongoing efforts to make sense of, and navigate through, his or her social world.

Appendix B

Justice as a Social Construction

In exploring the way in which people make fairness judgements, organizational justice researchers have tended to focus on individuals' personal experiences with the outcomes they receive (Adams, 1965), the procedures that determine those outcomes (Leventhal, 1980; Lind & Tyler, 1988), and their interpersonal treatment from authority figures (Bies & Moag, 1986). Theory and research suggest, however, that fairness judgements might also be influenced by social information, such as overhearing peers conversing about their experiences.

Social information processing (SIP) theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) proposes that employees' attitudes are affected by information from their coworkers. SIP theory suggests that collective sense-making provides meaning to ambiguous events, which is one reason why coworkers develop similar attitudes (e.g., Schneider & Reichers, 1983). Researchers have suggested that, in particular, employees are motivated to engage in collective sense-making to clarify fairness issues because they are often ambiguous (DeGoey, 2000; Lamertz, 2002; Umphress, Labianca, Kass, Scholten, & Brass, 2003). Moreover, collective experiences of justice provide a greater number of events to consider than one's personal experiences alone (Lind et al., 1998). Despite the prevalence of such arguments, the social construction of justice is under-researched (Lind et al., 1998).

Research on equity (Adams, 1965) and social comparison (Grienberger et al., 1997; Van den Bos & Lind, 2001) has shown that comparing other people's outcomes and procedural treatment to one's own experience can influence fairness evaluations. This research, however, has not focused on interactions among peers. Justice perceptions, for example, can become polarized as a result of group discussion (Lind et al., 1998), and fairness perceptions might be

influenced by hearing the diagnostic opinions of one's peers (Folger & Kass, 2000). People might also respond negatively upon hearing about a coworker's experience of unfairness out of a basic concern for human dignity and worth (Folger, 1998).

Research has also shown that group-level justice effects account for variance in outcomes (e.g., satisfaction and team performance) above and beyond individual-level justice perceptions (Colquitt et al., 2002; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Naumann, 2001). Although invoked as a mechanism for these climate effects (Naumann & Bennett, 2000), the influence of one's peers was not directly tested in these studies.

Other researchers have more directly examined the social construction of justice. People in organizations talk with other organizational members about their experiences of fair and unfair treatment (Jones, 2002), and research suggests that such conversation may play a significant role in people's interpretations of events relating to fairness. Information from one's peers can create expectations for future treatment (Jones & Skarlciki, 2002), can facilitate social comparisons (Folger & Kass, 2000) and counterfactual thinking (Folger, 1986; Grienberger et al., 1997). Furthermore, confirmatory information from peers can cause one's belief about fairness or unfairness to become more extreme (e.g., Lind et al., 1998; Steil, 1983). Research has shown that coworkers who conversed together had similar justice perceptions (Lamertz, 2002), as did coworkers who interacted in the same social networks (Umphress et al., 2003). These findings are supported by research demonstrating that information from peers causally influences one's fairness perceptions (Folger et al., 1979; Lind et al., 1998; Steil, 1983). Moreover, hearing information from peers has been shown to causally influence subsequent processing of fairness information, as well as retaliatory protest (Jones & Skaricki, 2002). Taken together, these studies demonstrate that peers exert a pervasive influence on people's fairness perceptions.

Appendix C

Explanations for Why People are Concerned with Fairness

Self-interest

Self-interested views of fairness have a long history in organizational justice research (e.g., Greenberg, 2001; Tyler, 1987). Explanations that focus on self-interest assert that one reason people care about the fairness of procedures is that unfair procedures are a threat to the outcomes one receives and fair procedures will result in more favourable outcomes in the long run (Folger, 1993; Folger et al., 1979; Shapiro, 1993; Thibault & Walker, 1975; Tyler, 1987, 1990).

Group Standing

Tyler and Lind's (1992) relational model of authority in groups (a revised version of the group-value model, Lind & Tyler, 1988) suggests that people's identity and self-esteem are affected by the extent to which they feel valued by the organization to which they belong. People desire good standing within groups because groups allow people to potentially gain benefits (money, esteem, social status, friendship, personal growth, self-esteem, and dignity). In short, fair treatment is indicative of an individual's standing within a group and, hence, affects one's self-esteem. Evidence for this theory is reviewed in Section 2a of our paper.

Moral Obligation

Folger's (1998, 2001) deontological model posits that the importance of justice reflects a basic concern for human dignity and respect. Moreover, fair treatment is perceived as an end in itself (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001; Folger & Bies, 1989; Tyler et al., 1985), and people respond to procedural and interactional justice regardless of the outcomes they receive (e.g., Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990; Lind et al., 1990).

Carefully controlled laboratory studies that rule out self-interest and social comparison explanations have shown that people are willing to receive lower outcomes in order to prevent a known perpetrator of injustice to others from receiving favourable outcomes (Turillo et al., 2002; Rupp, 2003).

Dealing with Uncertainty

Researchers (Lind, 2001; Van den Bos et al., 2001) argue that people are motivated to determine whether authorities and other social entities are trustworthy, especially under conditions of uncertainty (see Van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Constantly determining whether or not to trust people during social interaction would consume too many cognitive resources; thus, individuals construct heuristics (i.e., decision rules or cognitive shortcuts) about fairness to determine whether or not to trust and cooperate with a social entity. Evidence for the uncertainty management model (Van den Bos & Lind, 2002) includes studies showing that fairness is a more ubiquitous concern under conditions of uncertainty (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2003; Van den Bos, 2001) and during times of change (e.g., Greenberg, 2001; Lind, 2001; Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001).

Belief in a Just World

Social psychologists have studied the human motivation to maintain a belief in a just world (Lerner, 1980); that is, the belief that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get. Thus, people care about justice because to the extent that justice occurs to good people, it maintains their belief in a just world. Skarlicki, Ellard, and Kelln (1998) examined third-party fairness perceptions of a layoff, and found that participants more readily derogated layoff victims when procedures were seen as more fair, ostensibly to maintain their beliefs in a just world.

Appendix D

Theoretical Explanations for the Effects of Justice on Attitudes and Behaviour

Equity Theory

Equity theory (Adams, 1963, 1965) states that people determine whether an outcome is equitable by comparing their own ratio of inputs (e.g., contributions to the organization) to outcomes (e.g., rewards) to the same ratio of a referent other (e.g., a coworker, or a past job). When the ratios are perceived as inequitable, individuals are motivated to reduce the resulting cognitive dissonance-like tension (Festinger, 1957) through equity restoration (e.g., by raising or lowering one's inputs or outcomes). Reviews of equity theory (e.g., Adams & Freedman, 1976; Walster, Bersheid, & Walster, 1973) illustrate the considerable support found for some of its predictions, but it has also been the subject of considerable criticism (see Donovan, 2001; Greenberg, 1982). Nonetheless, equity theory addresses the notion that individuals can restore equity by reducing inputs (e.g., withdrawal behaviours, reduced OCB, withdrawal of effort) or by increasing outcomes (e.g., theft).

Social Exchange and the Norm of Reciprocity

Behavioural responses to justice have been explained using social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), both of which posit that people tend to reciprocate the benefits they receive. Social exchange relationships are characterized by unspecified expectations for reciprocation of favours or beneficial acts, and such relationships are fundamentally different from economic exchange relationships characterized by explicit exchanges of tangible materials (Blau, 1964). Thus, from a social exchange perspective, an employee's tendency to engage in OCB, for example, is thought to be a reciprocal response to experiencing fair treatment and satisfactory working conditions (e.g., Organ, 1988a). People also

tend to respond to negative actions with correspondingly negative actions of their own (e.g., Organ, 1988a). Thus people might respond to fair treatment through greater effort leading to better performance or more frequent citizenship behaviour, and to unfair treatment through retaliation, absenteeism, or turnover.

The Agent-System Model of Justice

Organizational justice scholars have drawn upon social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) to propose an agent-system model (e.g., Masterson et al., 2000). The agent-system model predicts that individuals react to perceived justice by directing their responses toward the source of the fairness. Masterson et al. (2000) argued that the source of procedural justice is typically the organization (i.e., the system), whereas the source of interactional justice is typically a supervisor or manager (i.e., the agent). Thus, responses to procedural and interactional justice should be directed predominantly toward the organization and its managers, respectively. Several studies have shown support for the agent-system model on a variety of attitudes and behaviours (e.g., Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002; Masterson & Taylor, 1996; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; for an exception, see Barling & Phillips, 1993), as have meta-analyses (Colquitt et al., 2001; Fassina et al., 2002).

The Retributive Motive

Organizational justice theorists have argued that employees who perceive managerial treatment, processes, and/or outcomes as unfair often experience feelings of anger, which elicits a desire for some type of retribution (e.g., Greenberg, 1990; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) suggested that injustice is perceived as a loss of what people believe they deserve; thus, people seek retribution to restore fairness, and the desire to retaliate is a powerful motivator of behaviour (Bies & Tripp, 1995, 1996, 2001). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) argued

that perceptions of injustice often result from an intentional offense against social mores and disregard for the interests of others (i.e., no explanation is given when one was expected), which can lead to retaliation of other responses that disregard norms for appropriate behaviour, namely, retaliation.

Theory suggests that interactional justice is an important predictor of retaliation because attributions of intent play a major role in the relationship between perceptions of fairness and retaliation (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). If, for example, an individual interprets a manager's unfair treatment as intentional, then the treatment could and should have been avoided. The importance of attributions of harmful intent is supported by theory and research showing that the ease of assigning blame is a critical factor in the retributive motivation (e.g., Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001; Bies & Tripp, 1996, 2001; Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). Attributions of intent influence when someone will become angry and act upon their anger (e.g., Bies & Tripp, 1995). It has been suggested that attributions of intent follow more easily from unfair treatment by an authority than from unfair procedures (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998); thus, interactional justice might be a stronger predictor of retaliation than procedural justice.

Justice as a Cause of Responses

There is little question about whether perceptions of justice exert a causal influence on behavioural and attitudinal reactions. Although other mechanisms explaining justice-response covariance likely operate to some extent in many circumstances, there is overwhelming evidence showing that perceptions of justice cause behavioural and cognitive reactions. There are many well-controlled experiments in which fairness is manipulated and theoretically-driven causal links are determined. The general findings generated and replicated through experimentation are also demonstrated in cross-sectional, longitudinal, and quasi-experimental field research.