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Abstract

Well-being at work is of major public interest, and justice at the workplace can be a key factor contributing to employees and managers feeling well. Research has found direct relationships between organizational justice perceptions and work and health outcomes. With research on the justice–health link still emerging, this thesis examines the moderating and mediating processes for the effects of justice perceptions on work outcomes and especially health outcomes. As little is known about those who enact justice, the antecedents and consequences of justice enactment are also studied. In Study I, the relationships between organizational justice and work and health outcomes were in focus, as the moderating role of job characteristics was investigated utilizing the demand–control(–support) model. Organizational justice and job characteristics were associated with work and health outcomes within and across time. The multiplicative effects showed that the organizational justice effects were stronger when perceived job demands were high, job control was low or social support was low. Study II examined the processes through which justice perceptions translate into health outcomes. Building on the allostatic load model, mental preoccupation with work was found to be a relevant mediator of the justice–health relationship, with locus of control moderating the mediated relationships. Study III focused on the actor perspective. Investigating predictions based on the deontic model of justice and ego-depletion theory, moral regard and justice self-efficacy predicted justice enactment positively, and justice enactment had positive effects on feeling professionally recognized but also negative health consequences for the actors themselves. This thesis contributes to advancing the emergent justice–health research stream by providing insights into the processes underlying these aspects, and by incorporating this stream into the actor perspective.
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People want to be treated fairly. Fairness gives people a sense of control over future outcomes (Adams, 1965; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) and of being valued and respected by members of their social group (Tyler & Blader, 2000; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Many people regard it as important that they live in a world that adheres to rules of justice (Folger, 1998). It is a concept that even children learn early in life (Ambrose, 2002) and that is fundamental to human behavior.

Fairness is also relevant at the workplace (Ambrose, 2002). Employees want to be treated fairly by their supervisors, by other representatives of their organization, and by their colleagues. Managers want to be treated fairly by their superiors and subordinates. Fair treatment at the workplace is essential to effectively working together (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). In contrast, unfair treatment, such as preferential treatment or disrespectful communication, undermines work relationships and the fulfillment of individuals’ psychological needs, and may encourage employees to engage in behavior that is harmful to the organization, such as withdrawal, absenteeism or sabotage (Ambrose, 2002; Cropanzano et al., 2007). The concept of fairness at work is referred to as organizational justice and the terms justice and fairness as well as injustice and unfairness are commonly used interchangeably (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 2010; Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013).

Work can fulfill needs and interests, create a sense of satisfaction, engagement, and meaningfulness, and can foster productivity, well-being, and health (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Jahoda, 1982). On the other hand, work can also be stressful, trigger intentions to leave the organization, and be a potential source of mental and physical illnesses (Greenberg, 2010; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). In fact, stress is ubiquitous in organizations and has far-ranging economical and practical implications. Research examining the results of several large surveys shows that 26% to 40% of the surveyed individuals (depending on the survey) reported their work to be stressful (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1999). In 2005, 46% of the Swedish workforce believed that their employment constituted a risk to their health (European Foundation, 2009). Stress at work has reached epidemic proportion as indicated by the large number of people being affected and the intensity of the adverse consequences (Quick, Cooper, Nelson, Quick, & Gavin, 2003). The World Health Organization (WHO, 1986, 2008) considers workplace stressors to be a major occupational health
concern. Working people typically spend the majority of their waking hours at work. Mental health problems and work-related diseases are considered to be the primary causes for sickness absence, low productivity, and early retirement (see WHO, 2008). Also, reports show that businesses, governments, and society at large spend trillions on work-related diseases and injuries (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 2011), sickness absence (Black & Drost, 2011), mental illnesses (Bloom et al., 2011), and on the consequences of stress (Hoel, Sparks, & Cooper, 2001).

Therefore, understanding and predicting work attitudes and behaviors as well as health outcomes and well-being in general is an important focus of organizational psychology and management research. Studies have provided evidence that positive work attitudes have measurable organizational consequences, such as increased profit and customer loyalty (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Also, good physical health has been found to be related to increased productivity (Donald et al., 2005). A number of researchers have estimated the costs of sickness absence and illnesses due to work stress to be large (see Dewa, Corbiere, Duran, & Hensel, 2012). Many employers have adopted the view that reducing work-related illnesses will ultimately improve their financial performance. There is some empirical evidence supporting this view (Jex & Crossley, 2005). In recent years the view on well-being at work has shifted from regarding work-related stress as a business cost to viewing well-being and employee health as a business benefit (Gibbs & Burnett, 2011).

Research on organizational justice has shown that fairness perceptions at work may affect individuals’ work attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Recent evidence also suggests that fairness perceptions at work may also affect individuals’ private lives and influence their health (Robbins, Ford, & Tetrick, 2012). In light of the effects that organizational justice has been found to have on these outcomes in previous studies, it is important to try to further our understanding of why and under which circumstances organizational justice perceptions predict work and health outcomes. Although a wide span of outcomes are of potential study interest in the area of organizational justice, the main focus in this thesis is on work as well as on non-work outcomes such as mental and physical health. In addition to examining the processes occurring when employees are treated fairly or unfairly at their workplace, it is also important to consider the individuals who act justly. In the area of organizational justice research, little is known about when authority figures such as managers treat employees with a greater or lesser degree of fairness, why they do so, and what the consequences of enacting justice are for themselves.

From work outcomes to health outcomes

The World Health Organization defines health as a “state of complete physical, mental and social well-being” (WHO, 1946, p. 100). The concept of
well-being is considered a multidimensional construct which includes a person’s subjective perception regarding satisfaction in life and other areas, such as work (Diener, 2000). Within organizational psychology, positive work attitudes and work behaviors and mental and physical health form the multidimensional concept of well-being (Jarvis, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2003; Robertson & Cooper, 2011). The spheres of work and health are often interlinked for individuals. Someone who suffers from stress at work is more likely to be dissatisfied at work, may reduce his or her work effort, and may think about leaving the organization (Kern, Waters, Adler, & White, 2014).

Most of the research in the literature on organizational justice has focused on the work-related consequences of employees’ fairness perceptions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a). Empirical research shows that employees who feel fairly treated by their employer tend to be more satisfied with their job, are more engaged in their work, and typically find it easier to identify with their organization. They are inclined to trust the organization they work for, and they receive better performance ratings from their supervisors (Ambrose, 2002; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2013). When employees perceive fairness, levels of involvement and helping behaviors increase (Ambrose, Schminke, & Mayer, 2013). On the other hand, perceptions of unfairness can trigger negative emotions such as anger, contempt, and sadness. Individuals who feel unfairly treated tend to be more absent from work, and have a stronger wish to leave the organization. They may retaliate against the person they regard as being accountable for the unfairness by, for instance, engaging in sabotage or other destructive behaviors (Ambrose, 2002; Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009).

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, an emergent stream of research has considered the role of fairness perceptions at work as a psychosocial predictor of health (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002; Greenberg, 2010). There is increasing evidence that perceptions of fairness at work relate to individuals’ mental and physical health (Robbins et al., 2012). However, the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and health outcomes are not well understood yet. This thesis tries to build on efforts to increase the range of outcomes studied in relation to organizational justice by looking beyond just work outcomes and focusing on other non-work and health outcomes.

Processes of organizational justice effects

Researchers on organizational justice have concluded that the focus on direct relationships between organizational justice perceptions and employees’ work outcomes is receding (Ambrose et al., 2013). Instead, different processes through which organizational justice perceptions are related to work outcomes are of more interest. This view can also be adopted for the new perspective of relating organizational justice perceptions to health and non-work outcomes;
to understand the relationships between justice at work and individuals’ health outcomes the specific processes need to be investigated. Although the literature relating organizational justice perceptions to employees’ non-work and health outcomes has made great advances in the recent years, the circumstances under which it occurs and the reasons why organizational justice perceptions relate to non-work and health outcomes remain largely unknown.

One way to better understand the relationships between fairness perceptions at work and individual consequences is to investigate when the relationships are stronger or weaker by examining the conditions under which the justice perceptions do and do not predict the outcomes. In the justice literature, personality factors such as self-esteem and agreeableness as well as contextual factors such as organizational structure have been investigated as factors that can modify or moderate the relationship between justice perceptions and work outcomes (see Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). However, there are factors at work that differ for individuals within the same organization. One of these is the work environment, which may refer to the physical work environment, including, for example, workstation design and the availability of light and air. It can also refer to the psychological work environment, which is characterized by how employees perceive their work, what is demanded of them, and what is available to them to make the fulfillment of these demands possible (J. V. Johnson & Hall, 1988; Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). The psychological work environment is an important predictor for employees’ workplace attitudes, behaviors, and health outcomes and their well-being in general (de Lange et al., 2009; de Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman, & Bongers, 2003; Häusser, Mojzisch, Niesel, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010; van der Doef & Maes, 1998, 1999). It is therefore important to understand to what extent organizational justice interacts with factors in the work environment in shaping individuals’ work and health outcomes. This can be achieved by examining whether the fairness perceptions of an organization have the same effect on individuals’ well-being regardless of how the work environment is perceived.

Another way to study the processes underlying the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and work and health outcomes is to try to understand what happens “inside” the individual when justice at work is perceived and, in particular, the processes through which this perception transforms into individual reactions. In 1998, Hagedoorn, Buunk, and van de Vliert portrayed the relationship between justice and outcomes as a black box. For understanding the steps between justice perceptions and work-related attitudes and behaviors, research made advancements in opening this black box, but not enough with regard to outcomes outside of work. While there are theories that try to elucidate the intermediate processes in how fairness perceptions increase individuals’ helping behaviors, cooperation, and withdrawal behaviors (see Blader & Tyler, 2005; Moorman & Byrne, 2005), it is less clear how fairness perceptions as a workplace appraisal can affect
individuals’ health outcomes. Different accounts have been proposed (Ford & Huang, 2014; Greenberg, 2010) and the few empirical studies available have looked either at the responsiveness of the organization to the work–family interface of its employees (Judge & Colquitt, 2004) or at sleep as a mediating factor of the justice–health relationship (Elovainio, Kivimäki, Vahtera, Keltikangas-Järvinen, & Virtanen, 2003). More cognitive approaches have been neglected. Furthermore, it seems likely that individuals differ in their appraisals of what happened to them and in their reactions towards perceived (un)fairness. Further research is needed in order to increase our understanding of what transmits justice experiences at work to individuals’ health.

From perceived justice to enacted justice

Most organizational justice research has been on employees’ perceptions of justice at work. What is lacking is an examination of the individuals who are the source of the justice, authority figures such as managers. It may be that people have an inner moral compass that makes them feel good not only when they are treated fairly but also when they effect or enact justice. Conversely, it may be that enacting justice is difficult and costly in certain situations or in regard to certain employees.

Little is known about the individuals who bring about justice perceptions. Recently, researchers have suggested a shift in focus from the “receiver” perspective of organizational justice, which looks at employees’ perceptions of being fairly treated, to an “actor” perspective of justice (Scott, Colquitt, & Paddock, 2009; Scott, Garza, Conlon, & Kim, 2014). By including an examination of the actor, greater insight into the antecedents and consequences of organizational justice is possible. The actor perspective focuses on the motives, reasons, and consequences of justice enactment with regard to the actors, that is, the managers who enact fairness. Fair behavior can be motivated by stable characteristics of the actor such as concern for others or moral obligation (Brebels, De Cremer, Van Dijke, & Van Hiel, 2011; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). The actors may also behave fairly to attain goals, for instance, researchers have looked at cognitive or affective motives that can contribute to applying justice rules or not (Scott et al., 2009; Scott et al., 2014).

According to much of the literature on organizational justice, managers should be encouraged to behave fairly towards their workers as it may benefit the organization to have employees who perceive fair treatment. However, recent evidence suggests that adhering to justice rules may deplete psychological resources (R. E. Johnson, Lanaj, & Barnes, 2014). It is likely that certain managers are more highly motivated and find it easier to engage in just behavior than others. Little is known about whether behaving fairly is good for the managers themselves. The present thesis broadens our knowledge of antecedents and consequences of justice by taking into account the actors who enact justice at the workplace.
General aim

This thesis seeks to contribute to the emerging stream of research on organizational justice, focusing on work, non-work, and health outcomes in a number of ways. First, processes that link organizational justice perceptions to work attitudes, work behaviors, and mental and physical health outcomes are studied. Second, this thesis combines the justice–well-being research stream with the new development of studying justice actors and justice enactment. The overall aim of the thesis is to contribute to a better understanding of the processes of organizational justice in predicting the work and health outcomes of both receivers and actors. This is supported by the three complementing studies of this thesis.

The first aim is to examine factors that modify the strength of the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and individuals’ work and health outcomes. For this, the psychological work environment is considered a moderating factor for the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and individual outcomes. Study I investigates the combined contribution of employees’ organizational justice perceptions and their perceived psychological work environment in predicting work attitudes, work behaviors, and mental and physical health.

The second aim of this thesis is to investigate the processes of the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and non-work outcomes. This involves looking more specifically into the mediating processes that are triggered when perceiving unfairness, while also taking into consideration the fact that individuals differ in their cognitive processes. Accordingly, Study II investigates the cognitive processes of the relationship between employees’ organizational justice perceptions and their mental health.

The third aim of the thesis is to expand our knowledge on the link between organizational justice and outcomes for those who enact justice. For this, the individual consequences that justice enactment may have for the actors themselves are investigated. Therefore, Study III investigates factors that increase the likelihood of enacting fairness and whether behaving fairly is beneficial for the health of the actors.
The nature of organizational justice

In an attempt to define the field of organizational justice research, Byrne and Cropanzano (2001) stated that “at its most general level, organizational justice is an area of psychological inquiry that focuses on perceptions of fairness in the workplace” (p. 4). Early on, justice was studied as a topic within criminological and social psychology until a chapter by Folger and Greenberg in 1985 created a bridge between the studies of justice and organizational settings. The term ‘organizational justice’ was coined by Greenberg (1987) to give a name to the construct of studying justice perceptions at the workplace. Justice perceptions can stem from various sources, such as the employer or organization in general, the supervisor, and colleagues (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001). Also, it can stem from a single event, such as a performance review, or from a broader entity, such as an organization. Although there has been recent debate about the potential conceptual differences between justice and injustice (Cojuharenco & Patient, 2013), and between justice and fairness (Goldman & Cropanzano, 2014), the terms (in)justice and (un)fairness are typically used synonymously in the organizational justice literature (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 2010; Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013). Justice is often considered when studying positive work outcomes, whereas injustice is more often the focus in the emergent body of literature on the health consequences of organizational justice. However, most common is still to refer to the field and the concepts as organizational justice. To describe the nature of organizational justice, it is important to go through the history of how the construct developed. This includes both the traditional facet approach of organizational justice and the newer development of considering overall justice. Furthermore, three aspects regarding why justice is important to people are discussed.

Dimensions of organizational justice

Organizational justice research started with a focus on the fairness of the allocation of outcomes, which is termed distributive justice. Different theories evolved around this concept, the most well-known of which is equity theory (Adams, 1965). The basic tenet of equity theory is that individuals perceive an outcome as fair when it matches the extent of their contributions (in relation to others’ or their own earlier contributions). For instance, when a co-worker
with the same educational background receives more pay than oneself for the same work, one is likely to perceive the situation as unfair. In this example, the equity rule was violated. Other rules for allocations exist, concerning distributing according to need and allocating the same outcomes to all (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976).

Another key facet of justice, procedural justice, was advanced by two research groups around the same time. One research group, led by Thibaut and Walker (1975), showed, in studies on dispute resolution, that when defendants were able to voice their points of view during the decision-making process (i.e., a specific type of process control), they perceived the outcome to be fairer than when their voice was denied. The second research group, led by Leventhal (1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980), suggested that individuals are not only interested in rewards, punishments, and outcomes but also in how the outcomes are arrived at. Even when an outcome is just, individuals can perceive injustice when the outcomes are achieved through an unfair procedure. Leventhal (1980) proposed six rules for a fair process: that decisions are based on accurate information, are correctable, representative of all parties involved, free of bias, and ethical, and that the allocation process is consistent for different individuals and over time.

The next step in the development of the field was the introduction of interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993b). Bies and colleagues asserted that individuals’ fairness perceptions were not only shaped by outcome allocations and decision-making processes but also by their interactions with organizational representatives. Interactional justice can be divided into interpersonal and informational justice, each composed of two justice rules (Greenberg, 1993b). Interpersonal justice is characterized by sincere and respectful treatment with appropriate language, while informational justice depends on receiving truthful, candid information and adequate justifications (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Today, many researchers choose to examine one or more of the justice facets (Colquitt, 2001), but there is also a trend of considering overall justice, which is a global assessment of the fairness of the organization.

**Overall justice**

Several ideas concerning general fairness have been proposed. For instance, Lind (2001a, 2001b) suggested that individuals combine their justice experiences into an overall fairness perception. This is proposed to be an automatic process that uses available justice information to form a heuristic-like fairness impression which then serves as a lens through which events and experiences are understood (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b; Lind, 2001a, 2001b; see also Nicklin, McNall, Cerasoli, Strahan, & Cavanaugh, 2014). Various groups of researchers have argued along similar lines for the importance of considering global assessments of justice as opposed to
particular facets, claiming that individuals form a holistic judgment of fairness (Greenberg, 2001a), that victims of injustice react to the general experience of injustice (Shapiro, 2001), and that individuals apprehend the fairness of an event as a Gestalt (Tornblom & Vermunt, 1999). But this movement only started gaining momentum in 2009 when Ambrose and Schminke developed a measure for overall justice.

In contrast to the different facets of justice, overall justice refers to a global assessment of the fairness of an organization. Just as justice facets can pertain to different sources, such as an organization or a supervisor, overall justice can also pertain to different sources (Rupp, Shao, Jones, & Liao, 2014). However, most often overall justice is considered in relation to the organization. Also, overall justice is most often considered as pertaining to an entity such as an organization. Justice facets may pertain to entities or to specific events, such as whether an organization adheres to justice rules during a layoff process. Essentially, overall justice concerns fairness in terms of the global subjective perception of how an organization allocates its resources and treats its employees, whereas justice dimensions refer to whether an organization adheres to justice rules (Goldman & Cropanzano, 2014).

Overall justice has been studied increasingly because of several theoretical and practical reasons (e.g. Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b; Barclay, Whiteside, & Aquino, 2014; Greenberg, 2001a; Hauenstein, McGonigle, & Flinder, 2001; Holtz & Harold, 2009; Lind, 2001b). Because overall justice pertains to entity judgments, it is considered to be more stable. Also, it has been argued that overall justice reflects more accurately (and parsimoniously) how employees experience fairness at their workplace (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b; Holtz & Harold, 2009). Based on concerns that constructs of similar specificity enhance predictions (Cronbach, 1970; Cronbach & Gleser, 1965), overall justice may allow stronger predictions than specific justice facets when outcome variables are global in nature (e.g., job satisfaction, job performance). Overall justice may better match the level of specificity or generality of usually broad employee outcomes that often are of interest in organizational psychology and management research. It is argued that overall justice provides the most accurate and complete picture of how individuals appraise fairness at their workplace and captures those aspects that are critical in driving behavior (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b; Jones & Martens, 2009; Lind, 2001a, 2001b; Tornblom & Vermunt, 1999). In line with these conceptual arguments, empirical evidence indicates that overall justice is a better predictor of overall job satisfaction than specific justice dimensions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b; Jones & Martens, 2009). Also, scholars claim that a focus on overall justice may be beneficial for accumulating a body of research with comparable results and that it can be measured more economically than the justice facets, which should therefore encourage researchers to integrate it with other domains (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Scott, 2005).
Overall justice may have advantages over justice facets when the goal is to predict broad outcomes. However, for smaller organizations with flatter managerial hierarchies, facets of justice may also be important to consider for specific outcome variables and when the finer mechanisms of who does what are of interest. Fairness heuristics theory (Lind, 2001a; Lind & van den Bos, 2002) postulates that general impressions of justice are relatively stable and may only change when justice-relevant information is drastically inconsistent with the general impression. It has also been shown that entity justice and event justice may interact in shaping outcomes (Choi, 2008). Both approaches have their merits and this thesis takes advantage of them. Overall justice is preferred to predict broad outcomes such as health. Accordingly, employees were asked to directly indicate their overall impression of the fairness of their employer. By also asking the actors about what behaviors they engaged in, justice facets were taken into account as well.

Importance of organizational justice

There are multiple accounts for why justice at work matters to individuals (Ambrose, 2002; Crawshaw, Cropanzano, Bell, & Nadiscic, 2013; Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001; Greenberg, 2001a). The literature distinguishes between three aspects concerning justice motives: instrumental, relational, and deontic (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001; Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, & Schminke, 2001; Fortin, 2008). These three aspects (also called content theories, Cropanzano et al., 2001a) are not exclusive of one another; some argue, in fact, that individuals are interested in receiving justice from instrumental, relational, and deontic considerations (Cropanzano, Rupp, et al., 2001).

Instrumental models propose that individuals care about fairness for reasons of self-interest. Fairness is considered to be a means to an end, an end in the form of personal, economic gains or losses (Cropanzano, Rupp, et al., 2001). Thibaut and Walker (1975) suggest that controlling part of the process creates the perception of a fair process, which is valued because it increases the likelihood of attaining desired outcomes. Accordingly, employees may, for example, prefer organizations that fairly distribute promotions, pay, and resources – since they would want to receive these benefits in the future.

Relational models postulate that individuals are interested in fairness because of identity concerns. Individuals derive dignity and self-esteem from receiving fairness from a group of colleagues or an organization, which satisfies their need for inclusion and belonging (Blader & Tyler, 2005; Cropanzano, Rupp, et al., 2001). Relational models emphasize that individuals want to be appreciated, respected, and included in valued social groups. Fairness perceptions, and procedural justice in particular, help individuals interpret their standing and respect in a group.
Deontic models propose that justice is a fundamental need and drive of people to respect human worth and dignity. Deontic models suggest that individuals have an intrinsic desire to live in an ethical social system. The moral virtues model of Folger (1998, 2001) suggests that individuals care about fairness because it is the right thing to do. When confronted with injustice, individuals are not only motivated to act out of instrumental and relational concerns but also out of deontic concerns. For instance, deontic models suggest that experiencing an injustice, such as witnessing a colleague getting harassed, would trigger strongly felt emotions such as moral outrage, or “deontic anger,” that would in turn prompt behaviors such as retaliating against the organization.

Although each of these justice motives emphasizes a different aspect of justice, they all presume that justice is important to individuals in general and at work. Justice matters to individuals because it fulfills some kind of need that is explicated in these motives (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001). Most likely, several of these explanations add important information on why justice matters, but their relative importance may depend on the person and context (e.g., see De Cremer & Alberts, 2004; De Cremer, van Knippenberg, van Dijke, & Bos, 2004; van Prooijen, 2009). Justice theories that explain how individuals form justice perceptions and how justice affects individuals’ subsequent attitudes and behavior can pertain to more than one of these aspects. Today, these three aspects of why justice matters to individuals are mainly used in order to describe into what category a specific justice theory falls. Lately, these aspects have also been used to derive predictions of the moderators of justice effects (for instance, see De Cremer & Alberts, 2004; De Cremer et al., 2004; van Prooijen, 2009) and the antecedents of justice enactment (Scott et al., 2009).
Consequences of organizational justice

In the previous chapter, the focus was on defining organizational justice and clarifying why it is important. This chapter focuses on the consequences of organizational justice perceptions. Most of the research in the literature on organizational justice has focused on the work-related consequences of employees’ fairness perceptions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a; Crawshaw et al., 2013). Other consequences, such as health outcomes, are increasingly being studied (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002). This chapter aims at providing an overview of both the theory and empirical evidence regarding organizational justice effects, with a focus on work-related and health-related outcomes. Theories on work and health outcomes will be discussed separately. The theories most directly concern work outcomes but can also be adopted to explain health outcomes since there is no consensus on a single theory (Fortin, 2008), the chapter focuses on several major theories in the justice area. Some of the theories primarily relate to a specific justice facet, and most of the empirical studies investigate justice facets. Where possible, theoretical accounts and evidence from empirical studies on overall justice are mentioned. The theories on justice effects are also explained in relation to the three justice motives introduced in the previous chapter wherever possible.

Theories on the effects of organizational justice on work

Organizational justice perceptions have been related to a broad variety of work-related attitudes and behaviors. There are multiple theories that assert that organizational justice perceptions have consequences, and most of them make direct predictions for work-related outcomes. These theories (also called process theories, Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001) may also be useful for explaining other consequences of organizational justice, such as health outcomes. Before going into how these theories may be informative for the justice–health link, the most important justice theories are reviewed below.

Social exchange theories provide the most widely accepted explanation of justice effects (Colquitt et al., 2013). These theories (in particular Blau, 1964) emphasize the reciprocal relationship between, for instance, employee and employer in their exchange of resources. Perceived fairness from the employer gives rise to feelings of trust, commitment, and obligation towards the
employer, which leads to the perceived fairness being reciprocated through, for example, better job performance, helping behaviors, and positive work attitudes (Colquitt et al., 2005). According to social exchange theories, and particularly the theory by Blau (1964), which is most often referred to in this area, justice affects individuals largely because of reasons of self-interest, as it is presumed that they increase their efforts in the belief that the reciprocation will increase the likelihood of receiving fair treatment in the future. In theory, perceived justice from the employer can be based on procedures, attention, or interpersonal treatment, but social exchange theories often focus on the allocation of pay, bonuses, or promotions (i.e., distributive justice).

In contrast to social exchange theories, with their focus on an instrumental interest in justice, other theories highlight the relational aspect when explaining fairness reactions, postulating that employees engage in positive work behaviors because it supports the welfare of the group and reinforces their own relative status within the group they identify with (see Moorman & Byrne, 2005). The group value model (Tyler, 1989), the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992), and the group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2003) all build on one another. According to these theories, fair treatment (particularly procedural treatment) communicates to individuals that they are considered valued members of their organization, which leads to respect towards and pride in the organization, and strong identification with it. Individuals are intrinsically motivated to see the organization excel as the organization is part of their own self-concept. Therefore, the success of the organization can contribute to a positive social identity (Blader & Tyler, 2005). As a consequence, it is suggested that individuals work harder for the success of the organization and engage in extra-role behaviors (e.g., volunteering, working extra hours).

In contrast to the theories mentioned so far, fairness heuristics theory (Lind, 2001a) and its successor, the uncertainty management model (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002), do not focus on specific justice facets but instead on general justice perceptions. The basis of fairness heuristics theory (Lind, 2001a) is that employees in an organization experience a social dilemma over whether they can trust that their employer will not exploit them, for example, with regard to being compensated for their work efforts or being accepted as a member of a working group. The uncertainty management model (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002) posits that the uncertainty of not knowing whether to trust someone is unsettling to individuals and motivates them to search for information to overcome that uncertainty. One way to remove the uncertainty involved in the social dilemma is through seeking input about fairness, which can serve as a heuristic device for deciding not only whether to trust the organization and its representatives but also what behaviors to expect from them. It has been postulated that overall perceptions of fairness are used as a surrogate for interpersonal trust (Lind, 2001a). It is argued that in uncertain circumstances, individuals look for available justice information in order to form an
impression of whether they can trust their counterpart, for instance, their organization (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). When the impression is positive, according to the uncertainty management model, the trust in the employer’s fairness will have positive effects in the form of positive affective reactions to procedures, and greater receptiveness to organizational changes (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Fairness heuristics theory and the uncertainty management model also contribute to the discussion on how justice perceptions are formed. Specifically, these theories suggest that justice perceptions are formed through relatively automatic processes. While for instance equity theory assumes a justice perception is formed by carefully weighing comparable inputs and outputs against each other (Adams, 1965), fairness heuristics theory assumes that once developed, fairness perceptions are relatively stable heuristics that guide behavior.

Whereas the previously reviewed theories build on either the instrumental or relational aspects of why individuals care about justice, these cannot account for the fact that some individuals accept negative outcomes for themselves in order to correct injustices that have happened to others (Turillo, Folger, Lavelle, Umphress, & Gee, 2002). This can be explained by the moral virtues or deontic model proposed by Folger (1998, 2001). The deontic model posits that individuals want to be part of an organization that they regard as respecting their moral beliefs. Conversely, they are inclined to disassociate themselves from an organization that does not demonstrate a concern for the issues that are central to their sense of morality. When they perceive the organization to be unfair, they are likely to engage in withdrawal, absenteeism or retaliatory behavior against the organization. Similarly, fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001) also focuses on unfair events and evaluations of injustice. When individuals detect an unfair event that threatens a person’s well-being, they make a determination about who is accountable for it. As a result of perceiving injustice at the workplace, for instance, an employee may not only get angry but is also more likely to engage in uncooperative and retaliatory behavior. These two theories pertaining to the deontic aspect of justice motives do not make predictions concerning specific justice facets but about general impressions of fairness.

In an effort to explain why organizational justice would stimulate cooperation, Blader and Tyler (2005), after reviewing these (and other) major justice theories, asked: “Which one is right?” (p. 345). Some of these theories and models are more explicit in giving precise arguments for justice effects than others, and almost all theories make predictions about very specific work outcomes. Blader and Tyler (2005) concluded that “little work has been done to date on integrating these theories” (p. 346). Some researchers say that in order to explain how justice perceptions shape work attitudes and work behaviors, these theories can be utilized together, with explanations from one theory coexisting with those from another (Blader & Tyler, 2005). Others, however, argue that different justice theories have fundamental differences in
how the justice formation process works and differ fundamentally in what fairness means (Lind, 2001b). Still others argue that whether a specific theory is more suitable than another may depend on boundary conditions and the context being studied (Fortin, 2008). Social exchange theories are very broad and allow making predictions that organizational justice perceptions may affect very different work attitudes and behaviors. This may be the reason why it is seen as the predominant theoretical account (Colquitt et al., 2013). However, the other theories are specifically formulated around justice. Fairness heuristics theory and the uncertainty model presume that justice affects outcomes through trusting the employer and are therefore sufficiently general to account for a variety of different outcomes.

Theories on the effects of organizational justice on health

The concept that justice perceptions at work would also influence non-work outcomes such as health outcomes is not recent but is still in its early stages. In equity theory, Adams (1965) claimed that those who believe they are paid less in comparison to comparable workers feel angry and distressed. These ideas were not taken further until Vermunt and Steensma (2001) suggested that perceptions of not being treated fairly (injustice) is a stressor that undermines individuals’ psychological and physical functioning, as it constitutes a threat to the coping capacities of individuals. Most scholars who investigate the health outcomes of organizational justice focus on the lack of perceived justice and argue that injustice is a stressor (Robbins et al., 2012). Apart from Vermunt and Steensma (2001), the theories that relate organizational justice to work-related consequences can also partly be drawn upon to explain its relationship with health outcomes (Ford & Huang, 2014; Greenberg, 2010).

Drawing upon theories of social exchange (Blau, 1964; Colquitt et al., 2013) and fairness heuristics and the uncertainty management model (Lind, 2001a; van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002), it can be argued that injustice decreases trust in management and gives employees the apprehension that the future behavior of organizational representatives will be unpredictable, since justice principles are not followed. Conversely, based on social exchange theories, positive organizational justice perceptions may generate trust and an impression of predictability about organizational representatives’ future behaviors. Similarly, based on fairness heuristics theory and the uncertainty management model, one may argue that having positive organizational justice perceptions indicates that an employee has trust in the organization and its future endeavors. This may motivate employees to stay with their current employer, which conserves energy and resources.
By using relational models (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Tyler & Lind, 1992), it may be argued that injustice indicates to employees that they are not valued by their organization, which decreases employees’ self-worth and self-esteem. Conversely, feeling a sense of belonging to a working group or to an organization that appreciates its employees may elicit positive emotions at work which may spill over into private life and enhance life satisfaction.

Furthermore, the deontic model (Folger, 1998, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 2010) can also be used to explain how perceptions of immoral acts by the employer or supervisor may be stressful to employees. Injustice can elicit “moral emotions” like anger, disgust or contempt, which may elicit a physical overactivation and impaired recovery, while disgust and contempt in particular may trigger withdrawal behavior (see Ford & Huang, 2014). Positive organizational justice perceptions, instead, may trigger positive emotions, and working for an organization that shares the same values as the employee may even help fulfill the need for meaningful existence (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001), which may in turn also affect individuals’ health.

There have also been some attempts to relate organizational justice to health outcomes by turning to theories that are not often applied in the organizational justice field. Colquitt et al. (2013) suggested looking more into the literature on emotion when relating organizational justice to outcomes other than work-related outcomes. Greenberg (2010) and Robbins et al. (2012) both made use of stress and health theories to explain the effects of organizational justice on health. Ford and Huang (2014) conclude, “To make the case that injustice is truly the cause of correlated health problems, we must explain why injustice would lead to health problems and, more importantly, why reducing organizational injustice would improve employee health“ (p. 37). While the justice–health link is an emerging perspective, more theoretical accounts are needed to better understand the pathways between organizational justice and non-work outcomes such as health. But before turning to the specific processes that link organizational justice to outcomes such as health, the empirical evidence on justice effects is reviewed.

Empirical evidence for the effects of organizational justice on work and health

The reviewed theories assert that employees’ organizational justice perceptions may be related to their work attitudes and behaviors as well as to non-work and health outcomes. Several meta-analyses on the work-related consequences of organizational justice reveal that organizational justice is related to a number of relevant work attitudes and behaviors (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2013; Fassina, Jones, & Uggerslev, 2008; Hauenstein et al., 2001; Rupp
et al., 2014; Skitka, Winquist, & Hutchinson, 2003; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002). The recent meta-analysis by Colquitt and colleagues (2013) reviewed a total of 493 independent samples from studies that appeared between 1999 and 2010. According to the typology of effect sizes for relationships by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), a correlation of .10 can be interpreted as weak, .30 as moderate, and .50 as strong. Using this typology, Colquitt et al. (2013) found the different justice facets to be strongly intercorrelated. Further, on average, justice perceptions had a strong association with organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and the quality of the relationship between supervisor and employee. Organizational justice had moderately strong associations with organizational citizenship behaviors, and counterproductive work behaviors and weak to moderately strong associations with task performance. The results also revealed that organizational justice had a moderately strong association with positive affect and negative affect.

In an earlier meta-analysis from 2001, Colquitt and colleagues reviewed 183 studies that appeared between 1975 and 1999 and summarized the effects of justice on different types of outcomes. The results show that the dimensions of justice have strong associations with job satisfaction and withdrawal behavior such as absenteeism and turnover. In a recent meta-analysis (Rupp et al., 2014), it was revealed that compared to the individual predictability of the various justice facets, the combination of them had stronger associations with outcomes such as job satisfaction, affective commitment to the organization, and perceived organizational support.

In the only meta-analysis available that summarizes the empirical relationships between the various facets of organizational justice and health outcomes, Robbins et al. (2012) reviewed 83 studies that appeared between 1991 and 2009. Organizational injustice was found to have moderately strong associations with burnout, negative emotional states, and perceived stress; weak to moderately strong associations with mental health; and weak associations with health problems and absenteeism. The association between unfairness and health behaviors was the weakest. The authors noted that including all justice facets consistently improved predictions as compared to predictions based only on one justice dimension. It may be that overall justice is a better predictor of health than individual justice dimensions, as would be predicted based on concerns that constructs of similar generality enhance predictions (see Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b).

Overall, there is an ample amount of evidence showing that organizational justice perceptions are related to relevant work attitudes and behaviors. However, most of the current research on work-related outcomes has investigated the relationships in a cross-sectional manner. One of the exceptions is the study by Hausknecht, Sturman, and Roberson (2011), which showed that over the course of one year an improvement in justice perceptions was related to more favorable employee attitudes concerning job satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay. Other longitudinal studies (often based on small sample sizes) have found less consistent evidence for the relationship
between fairness perceptions and work attitudes, which suggests that the effects of organizational justice may depend on the time lag between the measurement of organizational justice and the outcomes, with effects being stronger for shorter time periods (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003; Michel, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2010). In contrast to research focusing on work outcomes, most of the studies that link justice to health-related outcomes are longitudinal. A recent review focused on prospective studies conducted between 1990 and 2010 that explored the relationship between organizational justice and mental health (Ndjaboué, Brisson, & Vézina, 2012). Most of these studies were based either on the Whitehall data on British civil servants or on hospital staff data from Finland. The majority of the studies showed that organizational justice was related to mental health over time even when taking into consideration other job stressors. While most longitudinal studies have provided support for the hypothesized causal precedence of organizational justice on outcomes, there are a few exceptions (e.g., Lang et al., 2011; Ybema & van den Bos, 2010).

Organizational justice research has reached a point where there is enough evidence to strongly suggest that fairness is important to individuals at work (Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003). Furthermore, there is an emerging body of research providing evidence that organizational justice may have more far-reaching consequences for non-work outcomes such as health and well-being. The reviewed justice theories may to some extent also be useful for understanding health outcomes since organizational justice brings about satisfaction via trust, positive emotions, and a sense of group belonging and of meaningfulness at work, which are outcomes that may strengthen employees’ well-being. However, research on the justice–health link is still emerging and not much is known about what exactly it is that causes these paths from justice to health (or work outcomes). More theoretical understanding and empirical evidence is needed to shed more light on the mechanisms behind why and in what ways organizational justice may affect work attitudes and work behaviors as well as well-being and health. In order to take a closer look at the finer mechanisms, it is relevant to focus on the specific aspects that may be involved in linking organizational justice to its outcomes.
From the previous chapters it has become evident that employees’ justice perceptions are important for their work attitudes, work behaviors, well-being, and health. Both theoretical accounts and empirical studies were reviewed that indicate that employees who feel fairly treated also tend to feel more satisfied at work, are more engaged, and have better health. The current focus of the research is less on the direct relationships between organizational justice perceptions and employee outcomes (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Ambrose et al., 2013) and more on the different processes by which organizational justice perceptions are related to work and health outcomes. As the attention to justice–health relationships is still emerging, less is known about its specific processes than is known about the processes behind justice–work relationships.

Individuals possess different characteristics that could influence how they perceive justice information and how much it influences them in their attitudes and behaviors at work. Along with individual differences, situational factors may also serve as boundary conditions or amplifying factors for justice effects. Employees’ jobs have specific characteristics as they work within the specific environment of their organization. The characteristics of the environment may influence the effects of justice perceptions. Therefore, one way to study processes is to investigate the conditions under which justice perceptions have stronger or weaker effects, i.e., the moderating factors.

Another way to shed light on the processes underlying organizational justice perceptions is by investigating how individuals react to such justice perceptions. This approach examines the mediating factors in order to open the black box containing the mechanisms linking justice perceptions and outcomes (Hagedoorn, Buunk, & Van de Vliert, 1998). While it has been noted that social exchange theories are most often drawn upon for predicting and explaining justice effects (Colquitt et al., 2013), Colquitt (2008) concludes, “it does seem clear that an expansion of mediators for justice effects would be useful” (p. 19). It may be that more specific mechanisms need to be studied in order to delineate the steps between organizational justice perceptions and specific work and health outcomes.
Moderators of justice effects

A great deal of the attention of organizational justice scholars has been directed towards showing that the various justice facets interact with one another. One of the most well-known findings in the organizational justice literature is the fair process effect, which holds that individuals are more satisfied with a decision or outcome when they perceive that it is a product of a fair procedure (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkran, 1979; Van Den Bos, Wilke, Lind, & Vermunt, 1998). Procedural justice has stronger effects on employee outcomes such as performance and commitment when distributive justice is low. People also judge a process as less fair when the outcome is unfavorable (fair outcome effect) and a procedure that led to an unfavorable outcome as more fair when an adequate explanation was provided (Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Fortin, 2008). Building on the idea that justice facets interact with one another, Cropanzano et al. (2001) suggested investigating other moderators, besides justice facets, in order to better understand justice effects.

In the meta-analyses on the consequences of organizational justice perceptions on work and health outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001; Robbins et al., 2012), substantial differences between individual studies were found, which suggests that there seems to be other factors moderating the relationships between organizational justice and outcomes. These factors could perhaps relate to the individuals under study, insofar as concerning their individual differences such as their personality, or relate to the circumstances in which justice operates, a perspective that highlights the situation (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). This is in line with the interactional psychology perspective, in which behavior is determined by both individual differences and situational factors (Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006; Mischel, 1973). All in all, there are indications that the moderating factors between organizational justice perceptions and outcomes can relate to personal and situational characteristics.

Situational moderators

Considering that situational variables may be relevant for justice effects, these effects may depend on particular circumstances in an organization, since organizations can differ in their culture and structure as well as in the level of perceived job insecurity and identification with the organization among employees. A number of studies have shown that factors such as organizational culture (Erdogan, Liden, & Kraimer, 2006) and structure (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003), identification with the organization (De Cremer, 2005), and job insecurity (Kausto, Elo, Lipponen, & Elovainio, 2005) moderate justice effects. For instance, Ambrose and Schminke (2003) showed that procedural justice had a stronger impact on organizational support in
traditional organizations with high levels of hierarchy and bureaucracy, whereas interactional justice was more important for predicting supervisory trust in decentralized organizations with flat hierarchies. In one of the few studies to predict health outcomes of employees, Kausto et al. (2005) reported that organizational justice had stronger effects on emotional exhaustion and stress reactions when job uncertainty was perceived. Apart from situational factors that are on the organizational level, the interactions and relationships between employees and their supervisors and workgroups also shape the strength of justice–outcome relationships. When an employee is unsure about the trustworthiness of the supervisor, perceiving fairness at work has been found to have a greater impact on, for example, commitment and willingness to stay in the organization (Jones & Martens, 2009). Similarly, research has found that the increased turnover intentions that often result from perceiving unfair treatment can be buffered if employees have an established trust in their supervisors (Bal, de Lange, Ybema, Jansen, & van der Velde, 2011). Scholars have also looked into leader prototypicality (Lipponen, Koivisto, & Olkkonen, 2005) and status (Aquino, Galperin, & Bennett, 2004; Diekmann, Sondak, & Barsness, 2007).

Most research on the situational factors that affect justice–outcome relationships has been done on work outcomes. Scholars have also shown impressive results on the predictability of psychological health by organizational justice (Ndjaboué et al., 2012), which led to the conclusion that justice is a “new psychosocial predictor of health” (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002, p. 105). Situational factors such as the work environment have often been studied as predictors of employee health and well-being (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Therefore, it might be relevant to investigate the combination of the work environment with organizational justice.

**Job characteristics as moderators**

One of the most widely studied theories for predicting employee psychological health is the demand–control–support (DCS) model by Karasek and colleagues (J. V. Johnson & Hall, 1988; J. V. Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989; Karasek & Theorell, 1990), which states that the work environment is a fundamental factor for predicting employees’ well-being. It has been suggested that the work environment may have a moderating effect on the associations between justice appraisals and work and health outcomes (e.g., Fujishiro & Heaney, 2009; Haar & Spell, 2009). Scholars have looked at the impact of the work environment on the effects of organizational justice on work and health with a particular focus on the role of job control (Haar & Spell, 2009; Rousseau, Salek, Aubé, & Morin, 2009). Job control is an integral part of the psychological work environment that has been formalized in the DCS model. This model has emerged from the demand–control model by Karasek and Theorell (Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). According to the demand–control model, the psychological work environment can be
characterized by job demands and job control. Job demands include work overload, time pressure, and difficult tasks. Job control relates to one’s degree of autonomy regarding task performance methods and work time management as well as to the opportunities to apply one’s skills.

Generally, high levels of job demands are predicted to influence well-being negatively as it requires effort to meet demands, which subsequently creates a higher need for recovery (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). When job demands are high, it may be difficult for individuals to meet desired outcomes, manage the demands in time, and produce adequate quality (Fernet, Austin, Trépanier, & Dussault, 2013). Job control is theorized to have positive effects on work and health, as having autonomy over one’s job facilitates achievement and stimulates developing skills at work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Social support at work is also argued to have positive effects on work and health, as it refers to, for instance, receiving help with work tasks or having someone that listens to one’s problems (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000). Research has indicated that certain job characteristics affect well-being over time, as job demands have been found to be negatively related to work, well-being, and health outcomes, and job control and social support positively related to these outcomes (de Jonge & Kompier, 1997; Häusser et al., 2010; van der Doef & Maes, 1999). However, the combined effect of job control buffering the negative effects of high job demands has not received much support (Häusser et al., 2010), especially in longitudinal and high-quality studies (de Lange et al., 2003).

There are multiple reasons why the work environment and, more specifically, job characteristics may be important moderators of organizational justice effects. Both organizational justice and certain job characteristics (job demands, job control, and social support) are important for individuals’ well-being, and both facilitate fulfilling basic psychological needs (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008). Not being able to manage high job demands may threaten the fulfillment of competency needs; job control may satisfy individuals’ needs for autonomy by enabling self-organization and individual decision-making; and social support can also be argued to relate to a fundamental need, the need to belong and affiliate (Deci & Ryan, 2000). A lack of job control can mean that individuals do not know what will happen from day to day because the planning is done elsewhere. Also, it may make individuals uncertain about whether organizational representatives believe that they can do the job on their own. A lack of social support may also be threatening and create feelings of uncertainty about one’s standing in the social group of the organization. In a work situation characterized by such uncertainties, according to the uncertainty management model (van den Bos & Lind, 2002), justice perceptions would have stronger effects than in a work situation that is less uncertain.
There are a small number of studies that have integrated organizational justice with the DCS model. Most of the studies looking at interactions between organizational justice and DCS components have investigated procedural and interactional justice facets, the control component of the DCS model, and have studied either work attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention or mental and physical health outcomes such as psychological distress and sickness absence. For instance, Haar and Spell (2009) showed that the impact of justice perceptions on job satisfaction and turnover intentions was stronger for those perceiving low job control. Moreover, Elovainio et al. (2005) reported that uncertainty conditions, such as low work time control and negative changes at the workplace, aggravated the effects of low procedural and interactional justice perceptions on sickness absence (for women). Rousseau et al. (2009) found that the justice effects on psychological distress were stronger when social support was low. One study reported that the predicted positive effects of justice perceptions on reduced work–family conflict could not be found when job demands were perceived as high (Heponiemi, Elovainio, Pekkarinen, Sinervo, & Kouvonen, 2008). However, there are also a number of studies which did not find interactive effects (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Helkama, 2001; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Heponiemi et al., 2008; Rousseau et al., 2009) or whose findings were dissimilar to those of other studies (Chen, Zhang, Leung, & Zhou, 2010).

Previous investigations on the combined role of organizational justice and job characteristics have looked at specific justice facets. But as suggested earlier, overall justice has a number of advantages over specific justice facets. Results may be more conclusive when the breadth of the justice construct is matched with the generality of outcomes. Another aspect is the type of outcome variable being investigated. Studies have thus far investigated either work or health outcomes, not both at the same time. Including both would be advantageous by enabling a better understanding of the moderating effects of individual and situational factors on both the traditionally studied work outcomes as well as the health outcomes that have been gaining interest. Also, most of the previous studies have looked at the interaction effects in a cross-sectional manner, which limits the conclusions that can be made about potential effects over time.

Personality moderators

Individuals differ in how treatment by organizational representatives is perceived, how justice judgments are construed as the basis of these perceptions, and in their affective, behavioral, and cognitive reactions to these justice judgments (Colquitt et al., 2006). Individual differences can, for example, concern sensitivity for justice concerns, deliberate rumination about justice information or the likelihood of behavioral reactions, and having these
characteristics could increase the effects of organizational justice on, for instance, behavioral reactions such as performance or retaliatory actions (Colquitt et al., 2006). In a study by Schmitt and Dörfel (1999), for those with a high degree of sensitivity to seeing things unfairly, psychosomatic well-being was more strongly impaired by perceived unfairness at work than for people with less sensitivity to justice (Schmitt & Dörfel, 1999). Others have also shown that justice-specific individual characteristics regarding justice sensitivity (Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005), risk aversion (Colquitt et al., 2006), value orientation (van Olffen & de Cremer, 2007; van Prooijen et al., 2008), and moral identity (Greenbaum, Mawritz, Mayer, & Priesemuth, 2013; see also Scott & Colquitt, 2007) affect justice effects. However, the degree to which individuals perceive fairness or unfairness and their likelihood of reacting to it can depend on other personality characteristics, such as agreeableness (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999) and self-esteem (Wiesenfeld, Swann, Brockner, & Bartel, 2007). These more general personality traits may be relevant because inter-individual differences also influence how situations are appraised. One individual difference phenomenon that influences how a stressor is appraised is locus of control, which may be a relevant factor for justice effects.

**Locus of control as moderator**

Locus of control refers to individuals’ beliefs about whether they control events and happenings or if it is in the hands of fate or luck (Rotter, 1966). Internals, that is, people with an internal locus of control, attribute events to their skills, effort, perseverance, and other internal factors, whereas externals attribute events to fate, chance or luck (Aubé, Rousseau, & Morin, 2007; Spector, 1982). Having an internal locus of control has been shown to be positively related to better problem-solving behavior, more initiation of social contact, and better job-related mental and physical well-being (Fusilier, Ganster, & Mayes, 1987; Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006; Spector, 1982). Employees with an internal locus of control generally are more proactive in problematic situations, appraise stressors as more manageable, and feel more often in control (Ng et al., 2006). Internals also are more likely to attribute negative organizational events to their own actions rather than to the untrustworthiness of their organizational representatives (Aubé et al., 2007). As a result, internals may react less strongly to injustice, thanks to their inward-turning cognition, while externals will react more strongly as they already feel less powerful. Externals, on the other hand, feel more often out of control, which is likely to increase the stressful nature of a situation (Spector & O'Connell, 1994). Also, it is suggested that externals are more socially-oriented and more prone to anxiety (Spector, 1982). An early study on procedural justice investigated the trait locus of control but did not test for its moderating effects on attitudes or behaviors (Sweeney, McFarlin, & Cotton,
Therefore, in terms of personality variables, locus of control may be of interest to study in relation to justice–outcome relationships.

Mediators of justice effects

Alongside a moderation framework that sets up the conditions under which organizational justice may have stronger or weaker effects, it is also conceivable that organizational justice may influence a number of factors related to the work situation or to the individual at work, and these factors in turn influence the outcomes, which may explain how organizational justice has an effect on the outcomes.

Multiple justice theories propose several potential mediators for the relationship between organizational justice and work attitudes and behaviors. Social exchange theories (Blau, 1964) suggest that positive justice perceptions at work create trust towards management, which is argued to increase effort and work performance. Consistent with this, Aryee et al. (2002) showed that trust partly mediated the relationships between organizational justice facets and work outcomes regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and job performance.

Also, the uncertainty management model (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002) proposes that trust may be a mediator of justice effects but makes a different argument. According to social exchange theories, trust facilitates mutual obligation and deepens the connection with the other person in the exchange relationship, whereas, in the uncertainty management model, trust conveys a sense of comfort against all kinds of uncertainty. An interesting study was conducted by Colquitt and colleagues (2012) where they tested which trust perspective best explained the nature of the mediator in the relationship between organizational justice and job performance. For this, they differentiated between cognition-based trust, a kind of confidence in the credibility, reputation, and professionalism of the counterpart, and affect-based trust, including how much care, concern, and understanding supervisor and employee have for each other. The results showed that the impact of organizational justice facets on job performance was mediated by trust, with cognition-based trust having an impact on uncertainty, and affect-based trust having an impact on perceiving obligations.

The group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2003) posits that the experiencing of positive procedural justice can inform employees’ identity by imparting a sense of being valued and included, which is theorized to create stronger identification and engagement with the organization. This was also supported in a study by Blader and Tyler (2009) which showed that social identities mediated the relationship between procedural justice and employees’ extra-role behaviors.
Fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), a theory pertaining to the deontic approach, suggests that strong emotions may be elicited by perceiving injustice at work, which subsequently translates into retaliatory behavior such as sabotage. Barclay et al. and other scholars (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Murphy & Tyler, 2008; Spencer & Rupp, 2009) found that anger and hostility that individuals experienced during a layoff mediated the relationship between interactionally unfair treatment and retaliation for example, in the form of legal action.

This shows that there is some knowledge of the potential mechanisms linking organizational justice perceptions to different work outcomes. In sum, there are several justice theories that propose different mediators for the effects of organizational justice, including trust, identity-related factors, and emotions. There is also some evidence that these factors play a mediating role in the relationship between justice and work outcomes.

In contrast to the theoretical approaches and empirical evidence available regarding the mechanisms of justice and work-related outcomes, when it comes to non-work outcomes, there is little theory to guide the search for mediators. It may be that mediators linking organizational justice to commitment and performance can also play a role in predicting well-being and health. For such outcomes, one typically investigates injustice as a stressor (Vermunt & Steensma, 2001), which can make it useful to turn to theories outside of the organizational justice field when searching for mediators. Consistent with justice theories, Ford and Huang (2014) suggest that threat appraisals, threats to self-esteem, and unpleasant moral emotions translate organizational unfairness into impaired employee health and well-being. The authors did not make use of justice theories in their arguments but the three mediators they propose can easily be mapped onto justice theories (uncertainty management model, group engagement model, and deontic models). Robbins et al. (2012) built a conceptual model based on their meta-analysis of justice–health findings which asserts that perceived stress, health behaviors, and immune functioning are mediating factors between justice and absence due to health problems. They utilized the effort–reward imbalance model (Siegrist, 1996), which suggests that strain results when level of effort is not compensated by appropriate rewards, as well as the hedonic treadmill theory (Brickman & Campbell, 1971), which holds that individuals have lower well-being when they perceive that the rewards and treatment they receive are not as good as those of their counterparts. For healthy behaviors, the authors rely on the tension reduction hypothesis (Conger, 1956), which suggests that individuals engage in unhealthy behaviors as a way to cope with stressors. For physiological symptoms that appear due to injustice, they argue that injustice creates stress which impedes immune functioning. Taking into account the mediators proposed based on justice theories and the mediators with a more physiological focus, Greenberg (2010) suggested that negative emotions and
unhealthy behaviors mediate the relationship between justice and mental and physical illnesses.

In terms of empirical evidence, studies aimed at testing mediators in the justice–health link are rare. Further, they do not always directly build on the mediators mentioned above. Elovainio and colleagues (Elovainio et al., 2003) tested whether indicators of prolonged negative states that are elicited by perceiving injustice at work would mediate the relationships between organizational justice facets and health. They found that employees who perceived procedural and interactional injustice at work had more sleep problems, which in turn had a negative impact on their health. The authors also tested the mediating role of unhealthy behaviors but were not able to support it. Judge and Colquitt (2004) argued, based on equity theory (Adams, 1965) and the uncertainty management model, that injustice at work would be stressful, and that fair organizations would be more responsive to work–family issues. In the subsequent mediation analysis, they showed that employees who perceived their organization to be (procedurally and interpersonally) fair had less interference between work and family demands, which was related to lower perceived stress. Whiteside and Barclay (2013) were the first to study a process through which overall justice relates to well-being. Specifically, they argued that a lack of overall justice constitutes a risk for the fulfillment of the psychological needs for control and meaningfulness (see Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001). Based on two stress theories, the conservation of resources model (Hobfoll, 1989) and job demands–resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), the authors suggested that as a result of a lack of psychological need fulfillment, employees may have feelings of resignation and uselessness, which may trigger behaviors for dealing with these feelings and conserving energy. Unfortunately, Whiteside and Barclay (2013) did not test need fulfillment directly. However, they were able to confirm their predictions that a lack of overall justice was related to employees feeling that their views were not heard and to their not coming forward with ideas, suggestions or critique, which was positively related to emotional exhaustion and psychological and physical withdrawal.

This short review of the theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence for the justice–outcome link, and especially the justice–health link, shows that different theories have been used to propose a variety of different mediators, and that evidence on the intermediate processes is still limited. The range of suggested mediators include cognitive mediators such as threat appraisals and the need for control; identity-related mediators such as threats to self-esteem and the need for meaningfulness; emotional mediators; and biological mediators such as stress, immune functioning, healthy behaviors, and sleep problems. The mechanism put forward by Judge and Colquitt (2004), work–family conflict, may relate more to a contextual mediator than a process elicited within an individual. In order to better understand what mechanisms mediate the justice–health link, further theoretical accounts as well as
empirical studies are needed that also take into consideration time intervals, since mediators related to the immune system, for instance, may have an influence that does not emerge after some time, whereas emotional mediators may be prompted more immediately.

An interesting perspective on potential mediators was suggested by Colquitt et al. (2005). They speculate that mediators between justice perceptions and employee outcomes may differ depending on the kind of justice judgments under consideration. When perceptions of justice are based on a discrete event, such as a performance review or a lay-off process, emotional mediators such as affective states and emotions may constitute mechanisms that lead to specific outcomes. For instance, an unfair performance appraisal may elicit anger which is followed by verbal retaliation. However, when perceptions of justice relate to the whole organization, across various situations, cognitive mediators may be more relevant. For instance, the perception of working for an unfair organization may trigger more monitoring and suspicious thinking, which can lead to voluntary turnover. This perspective that the relevance of cognitive and emotional mediators depends on the type of justice focused on as well as on whether long-term or short-term outcomes are being investigated may guide future theory and empirical investigations on the mediators between justice and its outcomes. Following this approach, when it comes to overall justice, cognitive mediators may be of more relevance than emotional mediators, particularly when the prediction of long-term outcomes is in focus.

Mental preoccupation as a mediator

When considering the role of cognitive mediators in the justice–health link in both the short- and long-term, the allostatic load model can be useful. This model provides an interesting framework for studying cognitive mediators in the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and health outcomes. The allostatic load model (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Seeman, 1999) has emerged as the predominate theoretical perspective regarding the mechanisms behind how stressors can lead to strain; this model bridges the gap between biomedical models of stress and stress theories typically found in psychology or management research (see Ganster & Rosen, 2013; Ganzel, Morris, & Wethington, 2010). The allostatic load model posits that social stress, for example, injustice at work, elicits various bodily functions in order to adapt to the stressor. However, dealing with stressors takes a toll (‘wear and tear’) on the body, particularly when exposure to a stressor is prolonged, repeated or chronic (McEwen, 2008). This can result in allostatic load which constitutes a risk for negative health consequences (Juster, McEwen, & Lupien, 2010) in terms of changes in immune functioning and blood pressure as well as in emotional systems in the brain which are associated with mental health disorders such as depression (see Ganzel et al., 2010). The model
argues that it is not exposure to a stressor per se that constitutes a health risk but the cognitive processes involved that prolong the mental representation of a stressor (Brosschot, Pieper, & Thayer, 2005; Geurts & Sonnentag, 2006). Accordingly, it is the cognitive processes that mediate the relationship between stressors and strain.

Mental preoccupation with work is a cognitive state characterized by ongoing thoughts about work, and it prolongs the physiological activation of a stressor, which, in turn, leads to allostatic load. Empirical studies have found that mental preoccupation with work impairs sleep and recovery (Kudielka, Von Känel, Gander, & Fischer, 2004; von Thiele Schwarz, 2011) and is related to indicators of cardiovascular diseases (Vrijkotte, van Dooren, & de Geus, 2004). Injustice is likely to be one of the stressors that can mentally occupy an employee (Siegrist, 1996; von Thiele Schwarz, 2011). Evidence suggests (Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Gilliland, 2008) that injustice experiences tend to remain on the minds of individuals for a long time, which prolongs its role as a stressor. For those who have overall injustice perceptions, the continued experiences of unfair treatment will constitute an ongoing stressor. Results of several studies indicate that organizational justice may affect health due to its prolonged nature and repeated exposure (Elovainio et al., 2010; Elovainio, Leino-Arjas, Vahtera, & Kivimäki, 2006). The allostatic load model would help to explain why cognitive mediators and, particularly, mental preoccupation with work may constitute a mechanism through which organizational justice perceptions translate into employee health.

When investigating overall justice as a general fairness perception that the employee has towards his/her organization across situations and time, it has been suggested that cognitive mediators might be useful. In terms of cognitive mediators of the relationship between organizational justice and non-work outcomes regarding, for example, health, the allostatic load model can be used to make predictions specifically for the potential cognitive mediator of mental preoccupation at work. Also, this model posits that individual differences may play a role in the mechanisms, a perspective that has not been advanced sufficiently in relation to studying the justice–outcome link. It is possible that mediating processes of justice–outcome relationships may differ among individuals. Therefore, to better understand the processes underlying the relationship between organizational justice and outcomes regarding work and health, studies should utilize a combination of moderators and mediators.

Concluding remarks

In conclusion, many different moderators, pertaining to an individual or situational perspective, of the effects of organizational justice perceptions on
a variety of different work and health outcomes have been proposed and investigated. In this thesis, job characteristics are investigated as moderators of the effects of organizational justice perceptions on work attitudes, work behaviors, and mental and physical health. Besides moderating processes, the role of mediators in explaining how justice perceptions shape various employee outcomes is also examined. Various mechanisms have been proposed that are derived from justice theories or from theories related to stress and health. Multiple types of mediators, including work- and health-related as well as cognitive and emotional, can be found in the literature but many have received little empirical attention. While building on past research, this thesis focuses on a single mechanism, investigating mental preoccupation with work as a mediator of health-related outcomes. Furthermore, although moderators and mediators are presented separately, a better understanding of the processes underlying the effects of organizational justice perceptions is more likely to be reached when both types of processes, moderating and mediating, are considered. It may well be that the mediating roles of some factors for the effects of organizational justice depend on personality and situational variables. This thesis adopts the approach of combining the mediator of mental preoccupation with work and the personality concept of locus of control in a moderated mediation model.
Justice enactment

Justice research has made much advancement in understanding the perspective of employees. The literature has most often been concerned with how employees form justice perceptions and how these perceptions, in turn, shape their work attitudes and behaviors (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a; Fortin, 2008). When employees perceive fair treatment by their supervisor and other organizational representatives, they report less stress, greater satisfaction with their work, and better health and well-being in general (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Vermunt & Steensma, 2003). It has also been shown that the justice perceptions that supervisors form based on the treatment they receive from higher-level managers affect the justice perceptions and work attitudes and behaviors of the employees (Ambrose et al., 2013). In an intervention study, it was found that training managers in organizational justice principles increased the fairness perceptions of subordinates and also increased their voluntary helping behaviors (see also Greenberg, 2006; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996). This shows that fairness is positive for many reasons, for employees and the organization. Also, it reveals that it is possible to train managers in justice principles and that this has measurable positive effects on employees.

Therefore, managers should be advised to treat employees fairly. However, some of the central players in this process, the authority figures who enact fairness, also called actors, are often overlooked (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a; Scott et al., 2009). It is important to know what motivates fair behavior by managers, as it may be shaped by certain individual characteristics or by more external factors in the environment (see Masterson, Byrne, & Mao, 2005). Recently, the actor perspective (Scott et al., 2009; Scott et al., 2014) has emerged, which is concerned with the justice behaviors of authority figures. Research using this approach has focused on the antecedents of justice enactment. However, there is a huge gap in knowledge about whether behaving fairly is good for the actors themselves. Indeed, there is some indication that the consequences of behaving according to justice principles may even be negative for actors (R. E. Johnson et al., 2014), which may undermine the value of recommending fair behavior to managers.
Nature of justice enactment

In line with traditional justice research, the conceptualization of justice enactment comprises justice facets, such that actors can behave according to distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice rules (Colquitt, 2001; Scott et al., 2009). The justice rules form the basis of the justice dimensions (Adams, 1965; Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993b; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Behaving according to justice rules can include allocating pay and rewards according to employees’ input (distributive justice), providing all employees with opportunities to voice their opinions (procedural justice), treating employees with sincerity and respect (interpersonal justice), and providing accurate and adequate explanations for decisions and procedures (informational justice) (Colquitt, 2001; Scott et al., 2009). Conceptually, ‘overall justice enactment’ may also exist but it has not yet received any research attention.

The challenge involved in behaving fairly may not be obvious at first. After all, people are intrinsically motivated to be fair (Lerner, 1980, 1981). Enacting some of the justice rules is common behavior, such as not making improper remarks about employees, although even this type of behavior happens at workplaces (Bies & Moag, 1986). In a downsizing process, for example, it may be difficult to treat everyone fairly. Even in a regular work situation, employees may have different expectations or needs. Such varying demands from employees are a challenge even for managers who try hard to treat everyone alike or with equal dignity.

There is evidence that other professionals have difficulties adhering to justice rules. One aspect of behaving procedurally fairly is to be consistent over time and when applying rules to different people. It has been found that judges in the US sentenced transgressors who committed morally severe acts more harshly after the 9/11 terror attacks than before (Stein, Steinley, & Cropanzano, 2011). Others have noted that people’s motivation to behave fairly is less likely to extend to those not considered part of their group, and individuals develop self-serving biases which distort their justice and deservingness judgments (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2001). All this suggests that behaving fairly may not be easy. When it comes to being a manager, there are a variety of reasons why behaving fairly can be difficult.

In one of the first theoretical articles to explain why managers do not behave fairly despite the obvious benefits of doing so, Folger and Skarlicki (2001) list a number of difficulties that managers may encounter that limit their capacity and willingness to behave fairly. This includes the threats of being criticized, of being the one to blame, and of embarrassing oneself, which may be especially important for managers who are insecure about their legitimacy (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998, 2001). Communicating bad news or making tough decisions may worsen managers’ mood, may put a strain on the quality of relationships with employees, is likely to affect evaluations negatively, and may threaten the conceptions that managers have of
themselves as caring and moral individuals (Patient & Skarlicki, 2005). All this may instill a wish to avoid and escape from the situation, making it more likely that managers will not communicate with interpersonal sensitivity (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998). Relatedly, managers may have a short-sighted vision, where they only see the adversity of the task and not the negative effects of behaving unfairly in the long run. To be able to communicate negative news with interpersonal sensitivity requires both skill and effort from managers (Molinsky & Margolis, 2005). The task of informing employees about negative developments, for instance, may be psychologically taxing, which decreases the capacity of the manager to focus on the employee (Molinsky & Margolis, 2005). Therefore, the internal reactions to the task of behaving fairly may influence a manager’s motivation and ability to adhere to justice principles.

In highly hierarchical organizations, a manager may not have much discretion over how to allocate resources or which decision-making processes are enforced (Scott et al., 2009). However, in flat organizations, and particularly in small enterprises, managers may have more leeway to decide not only how to act in their interactions with employees but also which rules are set into place. That is, while a manager may almost always have the discretion to adhere to, or violate, rules of interactional justice, rules of allocation and process require a high level of discretion that not all managers may possess (Scott et al., 2009). Other challenges are whether the efforts of a manager are recognized and whether the views on justice behavior are shared by employee and manager. But, even for the actor him/herself, behaving fairly may entail difficulties.

Antecedents of justice enactment

Considering the potential difficulty involved in justice enactment, it is understandable that, compared to others, some managers may be more likely to behave according to justice principles and may find it easier to follow justice rules. For predicting justice enactment behavior, it is important to differentiate between individual factors and situational factors (Masterson et al., 2005). Regarding situational characteristics as antecedents of justice enactment, organizational factors, managerial factors, and subordinate factors can be differentiated (Masterson et al., 2005). In terms of organizational factors, the organizational structure and climate (justice climate, team or individual orientation) and organizational size have been proposed to impact the justice enactment of authority figures (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a; Masterson et al., 2005). For instance, it has been suggested that due to the higher levels of bureaucracy and politics in larger organizations, managers may have fewer personal communication options that guarantee timely and individualized explanations and, instead, may have to rely more on regulations and formal
procedures, which may hinder employees from having a positive interactional justice experience (Schminke, Ambrose, & Cropanzano, 2000). Regarding managerial factors, it has been argued that the social position of the manager matters for justice enactment. Blader and Chen (2012) reasoned that high status leaders, those with high prestige and respect in the eyes of others, focus on the needs of their followers to maintain their high status and, as a result, behave more fairly. High power leaders, those with a high degree of control over critical resources, however, aim to maintain their rank and are less likely to be other-oriented and behave fairly. Related to this, Scott et al. (2009) proposed that cognitive and affective motives influence managers’ justice enactment behavior. They argued that a manager may behave according to justice rules, for example, to establish compliance or to create and maintain a desired identity of being a fair or tough manager. Also, they reason that managers high in positive affect would act more prosocial and other-oriented, whereas being high in negative affect would increase their likelihood of being self-focused and engaged in discriminatory acts. In regard to subordinate factors that may influence the justice enactment of managers, many scholars have looked at employee characteristics. Empirical studies show that fairness enactment is stimulated by subordinate assertiveness (Korsgaard, Roberson, & Rymph, 1998), employee charisma (Scott, Colquitt, & Zapata-Phelan, 2007), and through employees expressing certain psychological needs such as the need to belong or control processes as perceived by the supervisor (Cornelis, Van Hiel, & De Cremer, 2012; Cornelis, Van Hiel, De Cremer, & Mayer, 2013; Hoogervorst, De Cremer, & van Dijke, 2013).

With regard to the stable individual factors of actors that influence justice enactment, most research on the prediction of who will behave according to justice principles and under what circumstances has utilized morality-related concepts. In terms of managerial characteristics, according to the deontic model of justice (Folger, 1998, 2001), individuals who place importance on being moral should be more likely to behave fairly. Behaving unfairly would violate standards of moral behavior, which includes principles of fair treatment (Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). Individuals differ in the extent to which moral values represent a core aspect of their being (Aquino & Reed, 2002). For people with a high moral regard, justice is an end in itself and is dominant in guiding behavior. The individual differences of managers regarding morality-related concepts have been investigated by justice scholars and include moral identity (Brebels et al., 2011) and moral development (Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). Also, it has been suggested that those with a high degree of empathy extend their moral concern to others more freely, at least to those who they think deserve fairness (Folger & Skarlicki, 2001; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). Studies confirm that empathy also serves as an antecedent of fair behavior by managers (Blader & Chen, 2012; Cornelis et al., 2013; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010).

In a conceptual model of fair behavior in organizations (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a), it is proposed that managers who are sensitive to justice
issues around them may be more apt to promote fairness at the workplace. Also, managers who put a greater emphasis on being fair than on other competing goals may be more likely to enact justice. Even when they have the intention to behave according to justice principles, actors need the will and perseverance to enact it. It is likely that people with higher moral regard are more attentive to justice issues, and as it is a part of their self-concept, it may be more salient and influential in shaping behavior. It has been maintained that the morality trait may capture an individual’s willingness to behave fairly (Colquitt et al., 2006). For all these reasons, moral regard is likely to be an important individual characteristic in predicting justice enactment.

Apart from being aware of justice aspects in specific situations and being willing to behave fairly, there is another vital component to behaving fairly: the belief that one is capable of doing so, which Ambrose and Schminke (2009a) term justice self-efficacy. Justice self-efficacy reflects individuals’ beliefs that they can act upon their intentions to behave fairly. It is suggested that individuals who are confident and believe in their competence are more likely to act upon their fairness intentions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a). It has been shown that individuals develop self-efficacy beliefs about very specific tasks (Bandura, 1977). Perceived efficacy influences the choice of behaviors, such that individuals get involved in activities that they judge themselves capable of performing (Bandura, 1977). Ambrose and Schminke (2009a) note that empirical research has yet to examine the concept of justice self-efficacy. They draw on intervention studies showing that managers may behave more fairly after justice training (Greenberg, 2006; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996), and suggest that one reason for these effects may have been that the managers became more confident in their ability to behave fairly. This confidence may also facilitate justice enactment by encouraging managers to fairly deal with difficult situations that they might have otherwise avoided (Folger & Skarlicki, 2001).

Based on the deontic model of justice (Folger, 1998, 2001), when managers have a moral regard towards their employees, it is more likely that justice principles will guide their behavior when interacting with them. As justice enactment may be depleting to managers’ energies (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998; R. E. Johnson et al., 2014), individuals with a high level of justice self-efficacy may regard justice enactment as an easier task than individuals with lower levels of justice self-efficacy.

Consequences of justice enactment

While there are many advantages when subordinates perceive being fairly treated, the question is whether justice enactment is also positive for the actors themselves. The deontic model of justice (Folger, 1998, 2001) posits that fairness is a moral virtue and enacting it a moral obligation. Abiding by socially-shared moral obligations, in turn, should increase actors’ standing in
society, positive interactions with people, and positive emotions (e.g., pride). Also, in positive psychology, acting according to moral virtues is seen as contributing to happiness and well-being (Martin, 2007). Therefore, according to the deontic model, justice enactment should have positive consequences for the actors themselves.

However, justice enactment may not always be easy, as managers have to not only suppress their biases in order to not favor some employees over others but also monitor and regulate their emotions and actions in interpersonal contexts. Enacting justice, in other words, may require effort, which depletes the energies of managers. Ego-depletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998; Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007) assumes there is a limited pool of regulatory resources for controlling oneself, which can get depleted. Individuals have a certain amount of resources for inhibiting, modifying or overriding impulses, emotions, and motivational processes. Controlling and regulating oneself, entails costs on the individual, which can manifest itself as exhaustion and a state of ego depletion (Hagger, Wood, Stiff, & Chatzisarantis, 2010). Ego-depleted individuals have difficulties with self-control tasks such as vigilance tasks or refraining from eating unhealthy food, smoking, drinking alcohol or gambling (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). As a result, managers may engage in more unhealthy and less healthy behaviors. Therefore, justice enactment may have negative health-related consequences for the actors.

The only empirical article on the consequences of justice enactment for actors (R. E. Johnson et al., 2014) made use of ego-depletion theory. In their study, Johnson et al. (2014) investigated procedural justice and interpersonal justice. Procedural justice enactment was argued to exert depleting effects because following rules and norms drains regulatory resources (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998). Also, it was argued that managers innately like power and authority but in order to act according to procedural justice rules, they have to relinquish some of their power to provide subordinates with more control and autonomy. With interpersonal justice, more behavior control is needed when communicating with less-liked subordinates than with more-liked subordinates when it revolves around respect and propriety. Also, behaving according to interpersonal justice rules, such as showing respect, is very common and should therefore be more natural to apply. Furthermore, Johnson et al. (2014) argued that interpersonal justice may trigger positive affect in subordinates, which elicits positive emotions in actors and fosters positive social interactions. Also, Johnson et al. (2014) argued based on Bies (2001) that interpersonal justice elicits stronger emotions than other facets of justice. Therefore, the authors argued that the depleting effect of interpersonal justice enactment is less than that of procedural justice enactment. Johnson et al. (2014) confirmed their predictions that procedural justice was positively related to resource depletion and that interpersonal justice enactment was negatively related to resource depletion. The resource depletion, in turn, was negatively related to the organizational citizenship behavior of managers, as fewer resources were
available to help others. The authors noted in their discussion that informational justice enactment may also bring about depleting effects similar to those of procedural justice, as informational justice enactment involves explaining and justifying unpopular decisions.

While the study by R. E. Johnson et al. (2014) is interesting, more studies are needed in order to better understand the consequences of justice enactment for the actors themselves. The difficulties of behaving in an informationally fair manner have been discussed in previous studies (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998, 2001), and ego-depletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998; Baumeister et al., 2007) provides an interesting perspective by proposing that justice enactment has depleting effects. Ego-depleted individuals have difficulties controlling themselves, particularly in terms of maintaining healthy behavior (Baumeister et al., 2007). Therefore, justice enactment should have negative health effects for actors. Also, not being able to control oneself emotionally may also be negative for the reputation and recognition of actors.

The deontic model of justice (Folger, 1998, 2001), on the other hand, predicts positive consequences. From a deontic perspective, enacting justice entails displaying legitimate and socially justified behaviors. Displaying morally sound behavior will lead to positive social recognition (Folger & Cropanzano, 2010). Also, as not behaving according to socially-shared standards of behavior would likely produce negative emotions within an actor, actors may be intrinsically motivated to behave according to justice principles. This may be a conscious choice or reflexive behavior (Cropanzano, Goldman, & Benson, 2005). Therefore, justice enactment should have positive consequences for the health and professional recognition of actors.

While ego depletion and deontic justice both make predictions about justice enactment, albeit opposing ones, it may be that the benefits of enacting interpersonal justice in terms of instilling positive emotions in subordinates and receiving positive feedback are greater than the drawbacks of the depleting effects. The depleting effects of interpersonal justice may be small as the rules of interpersonal justice, including refraining from improper remarks and showing respect, come naturally to most individuals. For informational justice enactment, however, this may be different. While showing adequate behavior will likely increase one’s reputation and recognition, the depleting effects of informational justice are likely to be greater. Providing adequate explanations adapted to target individuals involves more effort (Patient & Skarlicki, 2005), especially in situations where informational justice is more important, such as in uncertain times or when irregularities appear. Also, the contagion effect of positive emotions and positive feedback may be smaller. Therefore, informational justice enactment may have more depleting effects and impact the health of actors negatively.
Concluding remarks

Research on the actor perspective is just emerging, and little knowledge is available regarding which personality characteristics of managers predict justice enactment and for whom it is easier to adhere to justice principles. Moral regard and justice self-efficacy may be important antecedents. There is also very limited knowledge on the consequences of justice enactment for the actors. Ego-depletion theory and deontic justice can be applied to make predictions. While ego-depletion theory can be used to predict negative effects of justice enactment on well-being, deontic justice theory can be used to predict positive consequences. The relative strength of these effects may depend on the justice enactment facet and type of outcome being studied. Testing this is important, because if justice enactment has mostly negative outcomes for actors, it is morally questionable to recommend managers to behave fairly and to recommend that managers should be trained to do so. If it is the case that behaving fairly has negative consequences for actors, more research is needed in order to find out how to limit the potential negative consequences of justice enactment.
Summary of studies

After reviewing the relevant literature, including theories and empirical evidence, the studies that comprise this thesis are presented below. For each study, the background, details concerning the data, measures, and analytical techniques are provided, followed by a summary of the results.

Study I

The interaction between organizational justice and job characteristics: Associations with work attitudes and employee health cross-sectionally and over time

Background

Organizational justice researchers have called for a more thorough examination of the conditions under which organizational justice has stronger or weaker associations with relevant work and health-related outcomes (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Ambrose et al., 2013). Moderators that reflect a focus on individual or organizational characteristics have been proposed (cf. Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). Job characteristics, which have often been the focus in research on how the work environment shapes employee health and well-being (de Lange et al., 2003; Häusser et al., 2010), may also be relevant as boundary conditions for the effects of organizational justice. Job demands, job control, and social support can foster or undermine the fulfillment of psychological needs (Van den Broeck et al., 2008). In the interplay with organizational justice, it may be that the positive effects of organizational justice on outcomes are reinforced by positive job characteristics such as job control or social support. Similarly, it is possible that the negative effects of a lack of organizational justice can be compensated for. While some studies have already been conducted (Chen et al., 2010; Haar & Spell, 2009; Heponiemi et al., 2008; Rousseau et al., 2009), this study contributes to the justice literature by focusing on three aims.
Aim and hypotheses

The first aim of the study was to test the main and interactive effects of overall justice perceptions and job characteristics (job demands, job control, and social support) for employees. The second aim was to examine these effects for the prediction of work and health outcomes (organizational commitment, intention to stay, mental health, and somatic health), while the third aim was to study the main and interactive effects within and over time.

The study tested several hypotheses. In terms of main effects, it was hypothesized that organizational justice would be positively associated with the work and health outcomes. When controlling for organizational justice, job demands were hypothesized to be negatively related to work and health outcomes, while job control and social support were predicted to positively associate with work and health outcomes. In addition to the main effects, it was also predicted that job characteristics would moderate the effects of organizational justice on work and health outcomes. Specifically, it was predicted that the association between organizational justice and outcomes would be weaker when job demands are high. Regarding the interaction effects between organizational justice and job control and social support, competing hypotheses were made. First, it was predicted that when job control or social support is high, the association between justice and outcomes would be stronger. In contrast, it was also predicted that a high degree of job control or a high degree of social support would compensate for the negative effects of low organizational justice.

Data

Data were collected in a research project designed to analyze the antecedents and outcomes of job-related uncertainties (Näswall et al., 2010). Questionnaires were sent out to employees at an accounting firm specializing in providing organizations with financial consulting and advice. The head office is located in a large Swedish city and other offices are found across Sweden. Access was given to all employees in the organization. Two cover letters, one from the organization and one from the research group, were included. The latter contained a description of the objectives of the study, instructions on how to fill out the questionnaire, and information about confidentiality and data treatment. A reminder postcard was sent out to those who had not replied after approximately two weeks, and a second reminder with a new copy of the questionnaire was sent out after one month. The first wave of the data collection (T1) started in September 2008 and was concluded in late October 2008. The second data collection wave (T2) started in August 2009 and was completed in November 2009, resulting in a time lag of around 12 months between the two waves of the data collection. At the initiative of the company the questionnaires were accompanied by a voucher for a paperback book at T1 and a scratch ticket at T2. At T1, the sample consisted
of 782 employees from whom 567 usable responses were received (73%). At T2, the sample consisted of 806 employees from whom 579 usable responses were received (72%). Of those who responded at T1, 429 subjects had complete data at T2, yielding a longitudinal response rate of 76%. Women constituted the majority of the sample (59%); the age ranged from 23 to 68 years \((M = 42, SD = 11)\); 71% had a university or college degree; 56% were parents with children under the age of 12 years; 82% worked full time; and the average tenure was 7 years \((SD = 7)\). Study I included these 429 employees.

Measures

Overall justice, job characteristics, outcome variables, and covariates were measured as scales or single items. All scales were validated and tested in Swedish in a Swedish context. Table 1 provides an overview of all of the measures for Study I, including their origin, reliability, scaling, and example items.

Analysis

Hierarchical moderated regression analyses were conducted. For each outcome variable, a separate regression was conducted, within time (T1 outcome variables) and over time (T2 outcome variables). Covariates were entered first into the model, followed by organizational justice, and then one of the job characteristics. In the next step, the two-way interaction between organizational justice and the job characteristic was entered into the model. The interaction terms were created with the cross-product of the standardized variables. Following McClelland and Judd (1993), the interactions were tested using a significance threshold of 10% due to the difficulty of discovering interaction effects in field studies.

Results and conclusions

In terms of main effects, with the exception of job demands on work outcomes, overall justice and the other job characteristics had significant effects in the predicted directions on work attitudes, work behaviors, mental health, and somatic health, both cross-sectionally and over time. Job demands had no significant main effect on T1 organizational commitment and T2 intention to stay, thereby not supporting the predictions. Also, job demands had a positive effect on T2 organizational commitment, which likely indicates a suppression effect. In general, main effects of overall justice and job characteristics were found.
Table 1. Overview of measures for Study I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Scale range</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Example item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall justice</td>
<td>van der Vliet and Hellgren (2002), based on Lind (2001a)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I feel that my employer treats me fairly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“It fairly often happens that I have to work under a heavy time pressure”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job control</td>
<td>Sverke and Sjöberg (1994), based on Hackman and Oldham (1975) and Walsh, Taber, and Beehr (1980)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“There is scope for me to take initiative in my work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau (1975)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I always receive the help I need from my co-workers when difficulties in my work arise”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>Allen and Meyer (1990)</td>
<td>T1 .78</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention to stay</th>
<th>Sjöberg and Sverke (2000)</th>
<th>T1 .85</th>
<th>T2 .83</th>
<th>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>“I am actively looking for other jobs” (reverse coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Goldberg (1979)</td>
<td>T1 .85</td>
<td>T2 .84</td>
<td>1 (always) to 4 (never)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Over the past two weeks, have you felt constantly under strain?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic health</td>
<td>Hellgren, Sverke, and Isaksson (1999), based on Andersson (1986)</td>
<td>T1 .74</td>
<td>T2 .76</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“In the past 12 months, have you suffered from back pain?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>In years</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (man) 1 (woman)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (lower education) 1 (university or college degree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* “-“ = not applicable.
Besides the main effects of overall justice and job characteristics, interactive effects were also found within and over time. Slightly fewer than half of the possible interaction effects were significant. With job demands, the interaction effects were negative, such that the high job demands slope was steeper than the low job demands slope. For instance, the effects of organizational justice on intention to stay and somatic health were stronger for individuals perceiving high job demands, such that the negative effects of low organizational justice were aggravated by high job demands (and nearly compensated for by lower levels of job demands). With job control and social support, the interaction effects were negative, such that the low job control / social support slopes were steeper than the high job control / social support slopes. This means that the effects of organizational justice on, for instance, intention to stay and somatic health were stronger for employees reporting lower levels of job control or social support, such that the negative effects of low organizational justice were more negative for employees reporting low levels of job control or social support (and less negative with higher levels of job control or social support). In general, overall justice had stronger effects on intentions to stay and on somatic health for employees perceiving high job demands, low job control or low social support. Therefore, the predictions that the negative effects from a lack of overall justice perceptions would be attenuated by favorable job characteristics were supported, while the predictions that positive job characteristics would reinforce the positive effects of overall justice were mostly not supported.

Most of the research on the boundary conditions of justice effects has been done on work outcomes. This study shows that job characteristics may shape relationships between justice perceptions and both work and health outcomes. The nature of the interactions indicates that when a work environment potentially leaves employees vulnerable, because they are faced with high job demands or with low job control or social support, the effects of organizational justice are likely to be stronger. This is in part in line with the theorizing of Lind and van den Bos (Lind, 2001a; van den Bos, 2001), in that justice effects are stronger when uncertainty is perceived. One may conclude that both organizational justice and job characteristics contribute to the fulfillment of employees’ psychological needs (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001; Deci & Ryan, 2000). For a healthy work environment, organizations need to work on both the fair treatment of employees and the job characteristics.
Study II

*Don’t let it get to you!: A moderated mediated approach to the (in)justice–health relationship*

**Background**

The health outcomes of organizational justice are increasingly being studied (see Robbins et al., 2012), but the underlying psychological mechanisms have yet to be specified sufficiently. While it has been suggested that traditional justice theories can also apply to processes regarding the justice–health link (Ford & Huang, 2014; Greenberg, 2010), it has also been proposed that mechanisms derived from health theories may be relevant as well (Greenberg, 2010; Robbins et al., 2012). Further, for justice pertaining to entities, such as overall justice, it has been suggested that cognitive mediators are more appropriate than emotional mediators (Colquitt et al., 2005). Empirical studies have highlighted the mediating role of organizations’ responsiveness to work–family issues, sleep problems, and lack of psychological need fulfillment (Elovainio et al., 2003; Judge & Colquitt, 2004; Whiteside & Barclay, 2013). In line with the allostatic load model (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Seeman, 1999), it is also plausible that mental preoccupation with work (Siegrist, 1996; von Thiele Schwarz, 2011) plays a mediating role for the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and non-work outcomes such as health.

**Aim and hypotheses**

The aim of this study was to specifically examine one of the cognitive processes that link the experiencing of injustice to stress-related consequences such as health consequences. In so doing, a moderated mediation model was utilized. Using the allostatic load model (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Seeman, 1999), Study II hypothesized that mental preoccupation with work (Siegrist, 1996; von Thiele Schwarz, 2011) would be a relevant mediator. For this, building on Judge and Colquitt (2004), mental health and work–family conflict were chosen as dependent variables. Further, locus of control as a personality concept was predicted to have a moderating role.

For this study, it was predicted that overall justice perceptions would be positively associated with mental health and negatively associated with work–family conflict. Mental preoccupation with work was hypothesized to mediate the relationships between overall justice and both mental health and work–family conflict. Furthermore, it was predicted that locus of control would
moderate the relationship between overall justice and mental preoccupation with work.

Data
Data for this study was drawn from the same project as for Study I. In Study II, those with less than one year of organizational tenure were excluded, which resulted in a longitudinal sample size of 412 persons.

Measures
The variables of overall justice, locus of control, mental preoccupation, work–family conflict, and mental health and the covariates were measured using scales that had been validated for a Swedish population. Table 2 provides an overview of the measures.

Analysis
A structural equation modeling technique was applied. A two-step protocol as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was followed, in which a measurement model is tested before performing the structural model analysis.

Model fit was evaluated using the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Values greater than or equal to .90 were considered to indicate an acceptable fit for the CFI and the TLI. The RMSEA assesses model misfit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993) and values less than .08 for RMSEA suggest a reasonable model fit. Utilizing multiple indices provides a more complete and reliable assessment of model fit (Browne, MacCallum, Kim, Andersen, & Glaser, 2002). The analyses were performed in Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012).

Multiple confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to investigate the adequacy of our measurement model. For this, the chi-square difference was tested for nested models. When the difference in chi-square is not significant, the more parsimonious model is considered appropriate. When the difference is significant, the model indicating a lower chi-square is to be preferred. A parceling technique was used for reducing the 12 items of the mental health measure to 3 parcels and the 8 items of the locus of control measure to 4 parcels. Parceling involves averaging together two or more items of a scale to reduce the number of indicators and is a common technique. It is argued to create more reliable indicators that come closer to a normal distribution, which increases the stability of the model (Bandalos & Finney, 2001; Little, 2013; Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002). Prior levels of dependent variables were controlled for and the residuals of corresponding indicators were correlated over time (Little, Preacher, Selig, & Card, 2007).
The significance of the mediation effects were assessed by the significance of the indirect effect and the bias-corrected confidence intervals of the indirect effects generated by bootstrap procedures based on 5,000 samples. In order to test for the predicted interaction between overall justice and locus of control, the latent moderated structural (LMS) approach by Klein and Moosbrugger (Klein & Moosbrugger, 2000; Little, Bovaird, & Widaman, 2006) that is implemented in Mplus was used. When testing latent interactions in Mplus, the sample-size adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) was calculated for the model including the latent interaction and for the model excluding it, and these were compared to assess the adequacy of the model including the interaction. The significance of the interaction was determined by examining the significance of the interaction effect and the generated confidence intervals based on a bias-corrected bootstrap procedure.

Results and conclusions
In accordance with predictions, mental preoccupation with work, a state characterized by ongoing work-related thoughts, mediated the relationships between overall justice perceptions and both mental health and work–family conflict. When examining the individual difference variable of locus of control, the results revealed that the association between overall justice and mental preoccupation with work was stronger for those with a higher degree of external locus of control. Thus, the indirect effects of overall justice on mental health and work–family conflict via mental preoccupation with work were significant for externals but not for internals.

Understanding the specific aspects underpinning the relationship between organizational justice and health is important for the emerging research stream on organizational justice as a health predictor (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002; Greenberg, 2010). This study helps to open up the black box (Hagedoorn et al., 1998) that is shrouding the intervening mechanisms of this relationship. The allostatic load model, as a solid theoretical framework stemming from biological sciences, is well-suited for predicting the effects of the cognitive mediator of mental preoccupation with work. Further, this study showed that locus of control may be a relevant individual difference variable for justice effects, as the indirect effects were only confirmed for externals. Therefore, the specific aspects that mediate the relationships between organizational justice and stress-related outcomes, such as the health of internals, remain unclear for now.
Table 2. Overview of measures for Study II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Scale range</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Example item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall justice</td>
<td>van der Vliet and Hellgren (2002), based on Lind (2001a)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I feel that my employer treats me fairly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>Levenson (1974)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“My life is determined by my own actions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental preoccupation with work</td>
<td>Adapted from Siegrist et al. (2004)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“As soon as I get up in the morning I start thinking about work problems”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work–family conflict</td>
<td>Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 .89 to T2 .88 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“The demands in my work interfere with my home and family life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Goldberg (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 .85 to T2 .84 (never)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Over the past two weeks, have you felt constantly under strain?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>In years</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (man) 1 (woman)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (lower education)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (university or college degree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* “-“ = not applicable.
Study III

*Justice enactment and well-being: A test among SME owner-managers*

**Background**

The recent focus on managers as actors (Scott et al., 2009) complements traditional justice research on employees’ fairness perceptions at work. The actor perspective has mainly been utilized to investigate individual differences such as moral regard as antecedents of justice enactment (Brebels et al., 2011; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). Researchers have also asserted that justice self-efficacy should positively influence justice enactment (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a). A recent study showed that procedural justice enactment may be deleterious for actors’ health (R. E. Johnson et al., 2014) and, based on ego-depletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998; Baumeister et al., 2007), it suggested that informational justice enactment may function similarly. However, interpersonal justice enactment was shown to have replenishing effects. This effect can also be explained by the deontic model (Folger, 1998, 2001).

**Aim and hypotheses**

The aim was to test a model of antecedents and consequences of justice enactment based on predictions from ego-depletion theory and the deontic model of justice. Study III investigated moral regard and justice self-efficacy as antecedents of justice enactment as well as the consequences that interpersonal and informational justice enactment have on well-being. Specifically, self-reported health, sleep quality, and professional recognition were selected as indicators of well-being.

Regarding the predictions, it was hypothesized that justice self-efficacy is positively related to interpersonal and informational justice enactment. Moral regard was predicted to be positively related to interpersonal and informational justice enactment. Interpersonal justice enactment was predicted to positively relate to self-reported health, sleep quality, and professional recognition. Informational justice enactment was predicted to negatively associate with self-reported health and sleep quality but positively associate with professional recognition.

**Data**

For this study, owner-managers of small to medium-sized enterprises (SME; less than 250 employees) located in France were sampled. Data were collected
by a research team from the Amarok observatory. Amarok aims to study the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors of French small business owners and is partnered with different networks of SME in order to connect with owner-managers. A total of 7973 business owners were found eligible for the target group. From this list, a total of 426 business owners were recruited for participation and they entered a panel study. As this type of population is particularly non-responsive to email and postal surveys, they were contacted directly by telephone. The phone interviews lasted on average 15 minutes. The respondents were contacted between December and March for Time 1 data collection and again two months later for Time 2 data collection. 349 owner-managers provided Time 1 data. Of these, 293 respondents participated at T2 (56 people dropped out). Complete data were available for T1 and T2 measures of 252 owner-managers. Participants were on average 43 years old and 22% of them were women. They controlled an average of 64% of their business shares and the average size of the workforce of the companies was 18 (with a minimum of one employee).

Measures

The variables of justice enactment, the antecedents moral regard and justice self-efficacy, and the consequences and covariates were measured with scales for a French population. Except for scales for which an already validated French translation existed, all measures were translated into French, and then back-translated into English for verification. The translated scales were pretested with a small group of entrepreneurs to assess their face validity. Table 3 provides an overview of the measures.

Analysis

As in Study II, a structural equation modeling technique was applied in Study III. A two-step protocol as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was followed, in which the measurement model was tested prior to the structural model. Model fit was evaluated using the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The same criteria were used for the model fit indices as in Study II. The analyses were performed in AMOS (Arbuckle, 2006).

Results and conclusions

Regarding the antecedents, moral regard positively predicted interpersonal justice enactment but not informational justice enactment. Justice self-efficacy was positively related to both interpersonal and informational justice enactment, as predicted. Thus, having a high moral regard for employees and feeling capable of behaving fairly stimulated justice enactment.
Regarding the consequences of interpersonal justice enactment, interpersonal justice enactment had a marginally significant positive impact on self-rated health when baseline self-rated health, and other covariates, were taken into account. The relations to sleep quality and professional recognition were not significant.

Regarding the predictions for the consequences of informational justice enactment, the results indicated that informational justice enactment predicted self-rated health and sleep quality negatively when controlling for baseline levels and other covariates. Regarding the relation to professional recognition, the results revealed that informational justice enactment positively related to professional recognition. In sum, interpersonal justice enactment had a positive health effect, while informational justice enactment had a negative health effect but also a positive effect on feeling recognized.

The predictions in Study III were based on a justice theory, the deontic model, as well as on a stress-related theory, the ego-depletion theory. According to the results, the suitability of each theory depended on the facet of justice enactment and the type of outcome variable under study. As there is limited knowledge on the actor perspective (Scott et al. 2009), this study is an important extension of the work by R. E. Johnson and colleagues (2014) who were the first to study the consequences of justice enactment for the actors themselves. Also, justice self-efficacy (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a) and moral regard (Reed & Aquino, 2003) are established as antecedents. Although scholars have concluded that the organizational justice literature has matured (Colquitt et al., 2013), particularly with regard to the actor perspective and justice enactment, many gaps still exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Scale range</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Example item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal justice enactment</td>
<td>Adapted from Hansen, Byrne, and Kiersch (2013) of the Colquitt scale of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1 (I did not do that at all) to 4 (I did that a lot)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I treated people with extra respect”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational justice enactment</td>
<td>Adapted from Hansen et al. (2013) of the Colquitt scale of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001)</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1 (I did not do that at all) to 4 (I did that a lot)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I took the time to explain my reasoning or the rules in details”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice self-efficacy</td>
<td>Based on Ambrose and Schminke (2009a)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>0 (I cannot do that at all) to 100 (I am highly certain I can do that)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“I believe I can behave fairly in a consistent manner, when I have to inform my employees of a difficult situation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral regard</td>
<td>Reed and Aquino (2003)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (absolutely no obligation) to 7 (very strong obligation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Do you feel a moral or ethical obligation to show concern for the welfare and interests of employees?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental preoccupation with work</td>
<td>Siegrist et al. (2004)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“As soon as I get up in the morning I start thinking about work problems”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (never) to 5 (almost daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the past month, how often have you felt your work was being recognized”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Idler and Benyamini (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (bad) to 5 (excellent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the last month, how would you rate your physical health?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (bad) to 5 (excellent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“During the past month, how would you rate your sleep quality?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative business results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (not intense emotions) to 5 (highly intense emotions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the last month, what was the emotional intensity that you felt due to negative business results?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (none), 2 (one), 3 (two or three times a month), 4 (more than 1 day per week), 5 (the full month or close to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the last month, how often have you taken vacation?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: “-“ = not applicable.*
Discussion

This thesis sought to contribute to a better understanding of the processes of organizational justice in predicting the work and health outcomes of both receivers and actors. While most of the literature on organizational justice concerns the direct relationships between justice perceptions and work outcomes, this thesis contributes to this literature not only by taking into consideration both work outcomes and health outcomes, but also by investigating moderating and mediating processes in the relationships between organizational justice and its outcomes, as well as the perspectives of both the recipients and actors. Specifically, the first aim was to examine factors that modify the strength of the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and individuals’ work and health outcomes. The second aim of this thesis was to investigate the processes underlying the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and health. The third aim was to shed more light on the links between organizational justice and outcomes for those who enact justice. These aims were addressed in three empirical studies, using data reflecting both the receiver and actor perspective. In this chapter, the findings of the three studies of this thesis are first discussed before they are integrated in order to provide a broader theoretical account of organizational justice for both receivers and actors. This is followed by further theory-related suggestions as well as suggestions for future research and practice.

Discussion of the findings

Using data collected from one organization in Sweden, the first two studies focused on recipients’ justice perceptions. The third study focused on actors and its data were collected from owner-managers in France.

Job characteristics as moderators of organizational justice effects

The first aim of the thesis was to investigate potential moderating factors for the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and work and health outcomes. In Study I, the focus was on the main and interactive effects of overall justice and characteristics of the work environment (job demands, job control, and social support, see J. V. Johnson & Hall, 1988; Karasek &
Theorell, 1990) on work outcomes (organizational commitment and intention to stay) and health outcomes (mental and physical health). These relations were studied both cross-sectionally and over time.

Regarding the main effects of justice perceptions and job characteristics, Study I found that overall justice significantly contributed to explaining work and health outcomes. Also, job characteristics were generally found to be significantly associated with work and health outcomes even after the effect of overall justice had been taken into account. In previous studies, it has been found that justice perceptions had effects on work and health outcomes after taking the effects of job characteristics into account (Kivimäki, Vahtera, Elovainio, Virtanen, & Siegrist, 2007; Lawson, Noblet, & Rodwell, 2009; Ndjaboué et al., 2012). These findings from Study I suggest that justice perceptions and characteristics of the work environment may have main effects. Regarding practice, the results suggest that in order to create workplaces where employees are engaged and healthy, organizations may want to employ strategies that ensure favorable justice perceptions and job characteristics.

In addition, in accordance with predictions, Study I found evidence for an interactive pattern in that the justice effects were stronger when job characteristics were unfavorable, that is, with high job demands, low job control, or low social support. It may be that individuals’ fulfillment of psychological needs is at risk when perceiving a lack of organizational justice (Cropanzano, Byrne, et al., 2001; Deci & Ryan, 2000), which then can be offset by job characteristics, which in themselves can be need fulfilling (Fernet et al., 2013; Van den Broeck et al., 2008). As these are interactive effects, one may also state that it may be that when work conditions are poor, psychological needs are met through alternative means. Feeling fairly treated, according to the group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2003), makes people feel valued and confirms their standing within the group – which compensates for some of the consequences associated with the negative working environment. This is similar to the pattern other studies have found (Elovainio et al., 2005; Haar & Spell, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2009). The fact that this pattern was found across the three different job characteristics, across different outcomes, and across time indicates a consistency that is needed to inform practice. The fact that the previous research results in studies taking into account justice facets were confirmed by the present results taking into account overall justice, suggests that overall justice is a legitimate measure for use in future studies. The overall justice measure has the advantage that it is less complicated and shorter than assessing the (four) justice facets and may be better at predicting health (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b).

Previous research regarding job control is more common than research on any of the other job characteristics and results in line with the interactive pattern just described have mainly been consistent (Elovainio et al., 2005; Haar & Spell, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2009). The interactive pattern that Study I showed was also found in a previous study on social support (Rousseau et
al., 2009). However, for job demands, very few studies are available, and Heponiemi et al. (2008) reported the opposite finding, where justice had stronger effects on work–family conflict when job demands were low. The authors argued that high job demands would create problems with balancing work and private life, even when fair treatment is perceived. This pattern, different than the one in the current study, may be related to the type of outcome they studied, and such results underscore the need for further research in order to better understand the combined influence of justice perceptions and job demands on different outcome variables.

Study I also hypothesized that the positive effects of justice perceptions are increased by favorable job characteristics. However, there was no support for this in Study I in contrast to the findings of a previous study (Chen et al., 2010). This could be explained by the potential existence of ceiling effects, such that the levels of positive justice perceptions were relatively high, making it difficult to enhance the positive effects of justice perceptions even more.

In Study I, most of the interaction effects between overall justice and job characteristics were related to intention to stay and physical health. Previous studies have found significant interaction effects on work outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, and on health outcomes such as psychological distress and sickness absence (Elovainio et al., 2005; Haar & Spell, 2009; Heponiemi et al., 2008; Rousseau et al., 2009). However, non-significant findings have also been found for counterproductive work behavior and psychological distress/strain (Elovainio et al., 2001; Fox et al., 2001). Investigations of different kinds of outcomes, relating to health, satisfaction, engagement, and negative behaviors are needed to fully understand the relationships between justice perceptions and characteristics of the work environment. In sum, Study I showed that while organizational justice appears to have beneficial effects on both work and health outcomes, these effects are conditional upon situational factors such as job characteristics. The moderating effects of job characteristics were found to be similar for work and health outcomes, with regard to cross-sectional and over time predictions.

The importance of mental preoccupation with work and locus of control for the justice–health process

The relationships between organizational justice and non-work outcomes, such as health, as well as their underlying processes were the focus of Study II. Specifically, the second aim of the thesis was to propose and test a process that links justice perceptions to health. Based on the allostatic load model (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Seeman, 1999), which has developed into one of the main theories for relating stressors to ill-health (Ganster & Rosen, 2013), it was argued that the perception of unfairness triggers a state of mental preoccupation with work (Siegrist et al., 2004; von Thiele Schwarz, 2011) which undermines employee health. In accordance with predictions, Study II
found that mental preoccupation with work was a relevant mechanism in the relationship between overall justice and mental health. While mental preoccupation with work was proposed to be triggered by injustice experiences, it may also be elicited by other stressors at work which elicit strong emotions, such as emotional labor or incivility from customers (Rupp & Spencer, 2006; Walker, van Jaarsveld, & Skarlicki, 2014). Study II adds to the emergent literature on justice as a health predictor (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002; Ndjaboué et al., 2012; Robbins et al., 2012) by investigating the process of this relationship more specifically. This is important because if justice has negative health effects, research needs to point out what the precise mechanisms are in order to be able to develop practical countermeasures. Also, this study follows requests by other scholars to investigate such processes and open the black box of how justice perceptions transmit into outcomes such as health (Ford & Huang, 2014; Greenberg, 2010; Hagedoorn et al., 1998).

In a previous study on the relationship between organizational justice and stress, work–family conflict was suggested to be a mediating factor (Judge & Colquitt, 2004). In the present study, however, there was no support for work–family conflict acting as a mediating factor for the relationship between overall justice and mental health. Rather, as hypothesized, mental preoccupation with work was found to mediate the relationship between overall justice and work–family conflict, as justice perceptions were found to be negatively related to mental preoccupation with work, which, in turn, was positively associated with work–family conflict. Compared to Judge and Colquitt (2004), who examined a US population, Study II was based on a Swedish population, where the situation around work–family issues is substantially different. It is also possible that the work-generated conflicts that spill over to the home environment extend the duration of these work stressors, which, according to the allostatic load model, could generate negative health effects. Other studies are needed to investigate under what circumstances work–family conflict and mental preoccupation with work function as mediators of the relationships between justice perceptions and strain outcomes related to stress or health and, also, to examine to what extent these two mediators may be related.

Further, it was also taken into consideration that individuals differ in their cognitive processes. In particular, locus of control was expected to play a moderating role in the elicitation of mental preoccupation with work. Accordingly, Study II tested locus of control as a personality variable that affects the mediated relationships. The results revealed that the mediated relationships were stronger for individuals with an external locus of control. The results showed that mental preoccupation with work was a mediator of justice effects on mental health (and work–family conflict) for externals only. Therefore, individuals with an internal locus of control may have different strategies for dealing with injustice at work. They are likely to be more proactive (Spector, 1982) and may also be more assertive (Korsgaard et al.,
Antecedents and consequences of justice enactment

The first two studies of this thesis showed that there are many advantages when employees perceive receiving fair treatment from the organization and its representatives. Central players in enacting justice are authority figures such as managers. It is relevant to investigate when and why they adhere to justice principles and also what the consequences of these behaviors are. Adhering to justice principles may be difficult, as it involves following rules and suppressing biases and preferences, especially when difficult situations arise (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998; R. E. Johnson et al., 2014). Since the actor-focused model of justice has only recently appeared (Scott et al., 2009), findings are limited, particularly when it comes to identifying what the health consequences of justice enactment are for the actors themselves. The third aim of this thesis was to increase our understanding of organizational justice and its effects on well-being and health by incorporating the perspective of justice enactment.

Most of the research on justice enactment has been done on the antecedents (Brebels et al., 2011; Cornelis et al., 2012; Cornelis et al., 2013; Hoogervorst et al., 2013; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). Study III adds to this by showing that moral regard predicted interpersonal justice enactment. This is consistent with predictions that the likelihood for moral disengagement (Bandura, 1986; Detert, Treviño, & Sweitzer, 2008) is smaller when individuals regard a specific group or other individuals as part of their inner moral circle (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Moral disengagement has been proposed to be a mechanism through which individuals become detached from sanctioning their own immoral behavior. Actors with high moral regard towards their employees may therefore feel a moral obligation which guides their behavior. However, moral regard did not predict informational justice enactment. This may indicate that informational justice enactment is not purely a behavior based on moral concerns (Leventhal, 1976; Turillo et al., 2002) but may also be used as a political technique to shape employee opinion through individualized information sharing, which therefore should not be predicted by moral regard. Also, informational justice enactment might be determined less by managerial volition and more by the regulatory context of labor laws. In France, labor laws are highly prescriptive regarding the information rights of employees. It may also be that moral regard predicts informational justice enactment when...
the number of employees is smaller, as the risk for moral disengagement would be decreased. In sum, it may be that contextual and situational factors play a greater role in predicting informational justice enactment than individual differences of managers, a proposition already suggested by Masterson et al. (2005).

Further, Study III adds to what is known about the antecedents of justice enactment by being the first to measure and empirically study the influence of justice self-efficacy (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a) as an antecedent of justice enactment. The results indicate that justice self-efficacy may be a relevant antecedent of justice enactment. More research is needed to better understand whether justice self-efficacy can be learned through experience, whether it has correlates with other important personality constructs, and whether (and for whom) training justice self-efficacy has measurable effects on manager behavior.

The predictions in Study III were based on the deontic model (Folger, 1998, 2001) and ego-depletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998; Baumeister et al., 2007). Based on ego-depletion theory, justice enactment can be construed as having depleting attributes. Justice enactment involves controlling one’s emotions, impulses, and behaviors. According to this theory, individuals only have limited resources for acting in these ways, and once they are exhausted, a state of ego-depletion is reached, which undermines further options for regulating behavior. This may undermine a healthy lifestyle and interacting positively with people. The deontic model of justice, on the other hand, would predict positive consequences from justice enactment. According to the deontic view on justice, individuals may behave in line with justice principles because they have an internalized moral standard for how others should be treated and consider following it to be a moral obligation. Following socially accepted rules of conduct should lead to a sense of satisfaction and a feeling of being one with the world. Study III shows that these two explanations are valid but the relative strength of the deontic or depleting effect depends on the facet of justice enactment and the type of outcome variable.

In terms of the consequences, it was expected in the case of interpersonal justice enactment that the positive effects of the deontic response would be stronger than the negative depleting effects. Results confirmed that enacting interpersonal justice was positively related to the self-rated health of actors. Informational justice enactment was negatively related to self-rated health and sleep quality but positively related to professional recognition. While informational justice enactment may be depleting, as indicated by the negative effects on health, the owners may perceive that their reputation is improving. In contrast to interpersonal justice, which refers mainly to the affective level of communication, informational justice enactment is on the content level (Masterson et al., 2005). Therefore, in a country like France, with high power distance (i.e., the extent to which power inequalities are accepted; Hofstede, 1984, 2001), it is more likely that the content level of communication will build up reputation rather than the affective level. This may also be an
explanation for why interpersonal justice enactment was not positively related to professional recognition. Also, interpersonal justice enactment was not significantly related to sleep quality. This may be related to the fact that the study had a two-month time lag, suggesting that future studies should investigate other time lags to detect sleep effects.

While much is known about the employee perspective of justice perceptions, to fully understand the interplay between employees and employers and to guide practice, research needs to also focus on the managers who enact justice. With Study III being one of only a few studies on justice enactment, future research should focus more on justice enactment and how it relates to a variety of different consequences, such as the mental health indicators of owner-managers, preferably with multi-item scales. Future research is needed to test if the factors shaping owner-managers behavior are also relevant for other authority figures, such as managers. Owner-managers have more discretion in their jobs than managers and employee behavior may also be more important to owner-managers. So far, the majority of research on organizational justice has focused on employees’ perceptions of justice or on reactions of observers to injustice. The actor perspective investigates which personal and situational factors may predict fair behavior, and what the consequences are for actors, employees, and observers. Studies on justice enactment can fill several gaps in the literature (Colquitt, 2012; Scott et al., 2009; Scott et al., 2014). For instance, the reasons, deontic or instrumental, why actors behave according to justice principles may influence employees’ justice perceptions and their subsequent impact on employee behavior. Also, as indicated by the differential positive and negative effects of justice enactment, justice enactment may be an area in which different justice theories can be integrated, which has rarely been done (Fortin, 2008).

Methodological considerations

The three studies that comprise this thesis involve a number of methodological aspects that need to be mentioned. Concerns about generalizability with regard to context and culture, self-report data, and causality claims are important to discuss, as these aspects potentially may have impacted the validity of the results.

Data from Study I and Study II were obtained from a single accounting business, with offices all across Sweden. However, the results were in accordance with theory and also with earlier findings. Also, white-collar and office work is a large part of employment in Sweden and other industrialized countries across the world, so the findings should at least be generalizable to comparable work and organizational settings.

The studies that comprise this thesis are based on data from France and Sweden. In general, the majority of research on justice has been conducted in the US (Greenberg, 2001c). Although some of the larger datasets for justice–
health studies come from Finland and the UK (Greenberg, 2010), among the studies reviewed in Robbins et al. (2012), 50% of the data from such studies were from the US. The pattern of results suggested that the association between justice and health was stronger in US than in non-US samples. Therefore, although the findings of the three studies of this thesis may not be fully comparable to US findings due to the European origin of the data, they add to the pool of research done outside of the US. Also, data from Study III were obtained from owner-managers of small to medium-sized enterprises in France. European Commission information reveals that 99.8% of all enterprises in the European Union are small or medium in size, accounting for 66.9% of the employment and 58.4% of the value added creation. Therefore, data in this thesis add not only to more European evidence on justice but also stem from a sample that is of high economic value.

In terms of context and culture, Sweden and France both have their unique differences in comparison to other countries regarding aspects such as employment laws, social security and welfare systems, the role of unions. Also, both Sweden and France have their unique cultural values which may have shaped results. Cultures can differ not only in regard to the importance of the concept of justice but also in regard to what justice norms and rules form the justice construct and which rules are more adequate in certain situations. Moreover, how justice judgments are formed, the relative importance of justice facets, and the strength of the effects justice has on outcomes can also differ (Colquitt et al., 2005; Greenberg, 2001b). Hofstede (1984, 2001) proposed a number of cultural dimensions along which different countries can vary. In a meta-analysis on the impact of cultural dimensions on the relationships between justice perceptions and various employee outcomes, justice effects were found to be stronger in individualistic cultures, such as France and Sweden (Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2013). The three studies of this thesis have not taken culture into consideration, so further research will be needed to expand our knowledge on how cultural differences matter for how organizational justice works. Although the studies comprising this thesis are based on two cultures, the findings are mainly congruous with what was expected, which may indicate that cultural differences did not substantially affect their generalizability. Justice scholars have called for further investigations of culture and other context variables in order to get a broader conception of how justice functions (Fortin, 2008; Greenberg, 2001c). This may also help clarify whether and how justice perceptions and justice enactment may differ depending on cultural or economic backgrounds.

One potential limitation that applies to all three studies is the use of self-reported data based on questionnaires. This carries with it a risk for common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Spector, 1994, 2006). It has been suggested that associations between variables measured with the same method are distorted. However, self-reports are considered to be adequate for measuring aspects such as preferences, motives, and perceptions, which applies to the concepts studied in this thesis. Further, it has
been noted that moderation effects, which are examined in Study I and II, are unlikely to be artifacts of common method variance (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2009). As has been shown in Study 1, when the measurement of justice perceptions and work and health outcomes was separated by time (one year), the associations were still about as strong, which indicates that the threat of common method bias was marginal. Nevertheless, in order to reduce the potential risk of common method variance, suggestions from Podsakoff et al. (2003) were followed: participants were informed that there were no right or wrong answers, response formats were varied in the questionnaire, and confidentiality was guaranteed. To further reduce concerns regarding this, other sources should be incorporated in the study design when possible. For instance, some employee work and health outcomes could be measured by asking colleagues or the occupational physician, and the work and health outcomes of business owners could be measured by asking associates or other employees. Another option is to measure health objectively by referring to registered data (e.g., regarding medical visits, medication usage or sickness absence). Both options, using other sources and objective data on health, have been used in previous studies (Elovainio et al., 2013; Hjarsbech et al., 2014; Judge & Colquitt, 2004), which suggests that the findings in this thesis may not have been consequentially limited by self-report methodology.

Another potential limitation concerns the possibility of drawing inferences on causality. Although the relationships were theorized to follow a causal flow, and the results mostly supported these relationships, the true causes of the result patterns may not have been measured (Little, Card, Bovaird, Preacher, & Crandall, 2007). However, all three studies made use of some kind of longitudinal design although only two data waves were used in the studies. Study II and III predicted the dependent variables at Time 2 while controlling for Time 1 dependent variables. Tests of reversed causality, regarding health symptoms predicting levels of perceived organizational justice over time, have so far produced inconclusive findings. For instance, Ybema and van den Bos (2010) found support for the hypothesis that distributive and procedural justice would have an effect on subsequent depressive symptoms and sickness absence. They also found a small reversed causal effect of sickness absence on subsequent distributive justice. They did not find a reversed causal effect of depressive symptoms on justice perceptions. Lang et al. (2011) found only the reversed causal effect that depressive symptoms predicted organizational justice facets but not the expected causal effect of justice perceptions predicting depressive symptoms. These inconclusive findings on causality warrant future investigations. It may be that to some extent both justice perceptions and health indicators may reinforce each other, leading to spiral effects. More research is needed that makes use of at least three data points or of experimental data to better draw causal inferences about the associations (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 1982). However, as longitudinal research in the organizational justice area is not prevalent yet, little is known about what time lags would be most useful.
While some anecdotic evidence exists which suggests violations of justice rules pervade the memories of individuals and have lasting consequences (Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Gilliland, 2008), it is likely that the characteristics of the event, the circumstances, and the personality of the individual interact in determining how long-lasting the effects of justice are. Although justice perceptions are traditionally held to be relatively stable, the dynamic nature of justice perceptions has received more research attention lately (Jones & Skarlicki, 2013). Fortin, Cojuharenco, Patient, and German (2014) reviewed evidence on the effects of time for justice research and noted that there is some evidence that justice events may affect certain outcomes, such as performance, in a delayed fashion, thereby providing conceptual reasons for the importance of including a time component in the study of justice. Apart from the conceptual reasons, the advantages of longitudinal designs pertain to causality, the validity of study results, and ruling out alternative explanations (Roe, 2014; Zapf, Dormann, & Frese, 1996).

Theoretical implications and future research

Despite these potential limitations, the results of the studies that comprise this thesis have a number of theoretical implications. In this section, gaps that future research can fill are also discussed.

Justice in relation to work and health outcomes

This thesis builds on theoretical and empirical research proposing that organizational justice is related to work and health outcomes. The three studies of this thesis confirmed that both justice perceptions and justice enactment have consequences, even over time, for various work and health outcomes of employees and owner-managers. In Study I, organizational justice perceptions were found to be related to levels of organizational commitment and intentions to stay. Established justice theories such as social exchange theories (Blau, 1964; Colquitt et al., 2013), fairness heuristic theory (Lind, 2001a), relational theories (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Tyler & Lind, 1992), and deontic theories (Folger, 1998, 2001) can be used to explain these relationships. Study I and Study II also showed associations between organizational justice perceptions and health outcomes. Existing justice theories may also be used to understand the connection, although the theoretical connection is less direct. Justice perceptions may generate trust (Lind, 2001a), a sense of belonging (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Tyler & Lind, 1992), and positive emotions (Folger, 1998, 2001), which may all be beneficial for the health and well-being of individuals. However, a more direct connection was proposed in Study II with the introduction of the allostatic load model to further understand the justice–health relationship and its processes.
With the growing interest of epidemiologists and health scholars in justice as a predictor of health (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002; Ndjaboué et al., 2012; Robbins et al., 2012), there is increasing evidence that justice perceptions are indeed relevant for predicting the health status of employees. Study I and Study II contribute to this stream of research by showing that overall justice is related to mental and physical health. Regarding the generality of predictors and outcomes (bandwidth-fidelity, see Ambrose & Schminke, 2009b), overall justice is expected to better predict general outcomes regarding health than justice facets. The focus on overall justice instead of justice facets in research on predicting health, as in Study I and Study II, is therefore justified.

Apart from the emergent stream on justice and health (Cornelis et al., 2013), there is a newly emerging stream in the justice literature that focuses on actors (Scott et al., 2009). Study III combined these two streams and investigated the relationship between justice enactment and the health of those who enact justice. As justice enactment refers to specific behaviors, it is conceptualized as pertaining to the four justice facets (Colquitt, 2001), distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice (see Scott et al., 2009). Study III focused on interpersonal and informational justice enactment and found that interpersonal justice enactment was positively related to self-rated health and that informational justice enactment was negatively related to self-rated health and sleep quality. There are two noteworthy things about these findings. First, there seems to be a difference between facets of justice enactment in respect to the health consequences for actors. Second, informational justice enactment was negatively related to indicators of health. In a previous study on the consequences of procedural and interpersonal justice enactment, R. E. Johnson et al. (2014) found that procedural justice enactment was positively related to the depletion of resources. Therefore, this suggests that the results of Study III may not be incidental but indicative of a consistent pattern. These results indicate that the justice–health relationship is not fully understood, particularly with regard to the actor perspective. Predictions based on resource models such as ego-depletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998; Baumeister et al., 2007) may be helpful for understanding the negative association between justice enactment and health. Although much more is known regarding work outcomes than health and well-being outcomes within justice research, knowledge of the consequences of justice enactment is still limited. Further research is needed to investigate a broader range of outcomes of justice enactment, such as work, health, and well-being outcomes.

Moderators of the effects of organizational justice

Traditionally, justice scholars have mainly been interested in how organizational justice predicts various work behaviors, for example, citizenship behaviors or performance (Colquitt et al., 2013). Increasingly, the
relations between justice perceptions and work outcomes are being studied with regard to the moderating factors that influence the strength of the relationships (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003, 2009b). All of the previous meta-analyses in this area have hinted that there is considerable variance in the relations between justice perceptions and work outcomes that moderators may account for. In a recent meta-analysis (Colquitt et al., 2013), the authors tested various moderators for the relationships between justice and outcomes. Specifically, they tested the moderating effects of entity and event justice, of organizational and supervisory level, and of the context of the data collection in the organization in terms of being positive or negative and whether many or few employees were affected; however, none of these were shown to be relevant moderators. In fact, the authors concluded that situational and personality moderators, as suggested by Nowakowski and Conlon (2005), are more likely to matter for justice effects.

This is, in effect, what this thesis has relied upon. Study I tested the situational factor of job characteristics and confirmed its moderating role for the effects of justice perceptions. The study contributes to lessening the gap of knowledge on moderators by showing the impact of the job characteristics not only on work outcomes but also on health outcomes. Also, interactions were shown across time, confirming findings based on cross-sectional study designs. Study II tested the moderating role of a personality concept, locus of control, and found that it impacts the process behind organizational justice perceptions affecting health. Future research on the justice–health relationship should further study the impact of individual and situational moderating factors.

In the meta-analysis of Colquitt et al. (2013), it was suggested that future research could benefit from including personality concepts such as how sensitive people are to justice issues (Liao & Rupp, 2005) and how sensitive people are to receiving or observing injustice or gaining from injustice inflicted on others (Schmitt, Neumann, & Montada, 1995). With the emerging focus of research on authority figures enacting justice, adapting concepts such as sensitivity to justice issues to managers may be fruitful when investigating moderators.

Mediators of the justice–health relationship

Despite considerable accumulated research, there is still little consensus about which mediating factors are relevant for which outcomes or under which circumstances as well as little agreement on which theory is most viable. Thus, Study II aimed at opening the black box (Hagedoorn et al., 1998) of the justice–health relationship by studying the process through which the overall justice perceptions of employees may impact mental health. Colquitt et al. (2005) suggested that cognitive types of mediators may transmit the effects of entity justice whereas emotional types of mediators may be more relevant for the effects of event justice. Following this suggestion, Study II proposed that
mental preoccupation with work is a cognitive mediator of the relationship between organizational justice perceptions such as entity justice and non-work outcomes such as health outcomes. The results suggest that mental preoccupation with work may prolong the mental representation of unfairness perceptions, which is associated with decreased mental health, particularly for externals. An important future avenue of investigation would be to explore what individuals think about when they worry and ruminate about work.

There is some evidence, although not based on justice research, that individuals may engage in affective rumination similar to the intrusive ongoing thoughts measured in Study II, but individuals may also engage in problem-solving thought patterns (Cropley, Michalianou, Pravettoni, & Millward, 2012; Querstret & Cropley, 2012) that have been shown to be positively related to sleep quality and decreased fatigue (Querstret & Cropley, 2012). The allostatic load model (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Seeman, 1999) would suggest that prolonging a stressor, even for problem-solving purposes, carries with it negative health consequences. This perspective assumes that injustice is a stressor which triggers either the positive or negative kind of mental preoccupation with work. The focus on negatively laden affective rumination versus positively laden problem-solving rumination is similar in research investigating challenge and hindrance stressors (LePine, LePine, & Jackson, 2004). This stream of research has shown that while both challenge and hindrance stressors exhaust the resources of individuals, challenge stressors are positively related to motivation and performance and hindrance stressors are negatively related to motivation and performance (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Similarly, perceptions of injustice may trigger positive and negative reactions. Positive reactions may include thinking about what can be done and how to solve issues, which should be particularly strong among individuals with an internal locus of control. Negative reactions may involve negative emotions such as anger, anxiety, hostility, and negative self- or other-directed behavior. Injustice perceptions may have a direct negative effect on exhaustion, fatigue, and negative emotions, but also a positive indirect effect on creativity, performance, and engagement triggering active problem-solving activities (see also Rodell & Judge, 2009). Therefore, it may be that injustice perceptions can also have positive consequences by triggering activities that help solve problems. These positive aspects are likely to be stronger for internals. Future research is needed to substantiate this claim.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to study further what employees do exactly when they perceive injustice due to single or multiple events involving their supervisor or organization. Deontic justice (Folger, 1998, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 2010) predicts that perceiving or receiving injustice triggers negative emotions such as anger, hostility, or moral outrage. It is likely that these negative emotions will be followed by taking action; that is, individuals will likely want to take revenge and punish someone. If injustice does not stem from a source that it can easily be attributed to (e.g., in large organizations it may be unclear who is responsible for a specific HR policy), or if reacting
with sabotage, stealing, etc. (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002) is outside of the moral convictions of employees, the injustice may turn out to be particularly harmful for employees as it may increase their rumination and worry. Therefore, to better understand how individuals react just and unjust events as well as the potential long-term effects on the well-being of individuals, questions concerning on attribution may also be relevant. This is related to discussions on the context of justice (i.e., entity versus event justice) and on the source of justice (i.e., HR manager or formal organization) (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005).

Study II investigated a cognitive mediator, but several justice theories, including the fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), and models for justice and health (Ford & Huang, 2014; Greenberg, 2010) proposed that emotions may also have an important role in understanding the effects of justice (see for a review Cropanzano, Stein, & Nadisic, 2011). Although several theories on justice propose that justice elicits emotions, Cropanzano et al. (2011) concluded in their review that research has not yet fully uncovered how this process works. Further, they conclude that the affective state of individuals colors fairness perceptions. The current mood individuals are in may influence responses when being asked to indicate the fairness of the organization. Therefore, justice perceptions do not only trigger emotions and moods but emotions and moods also influence justice perceptions. Current moods and emotions also influence cognitive mediators. When employees are in a negative mood, they may ruminate and worry even more when an unjust event happens. Therefore, cognitive and emotional aspects may interact in predicting how justice perceptions shape non-work outcomes.

Although unhealthy behaviors were not found to act as a mediator in a previous study on the justice–health relationship (Elovainio et al., 2003), it is likely that individuals engage in different coping strategies that may interfere with a healthy lifestyle. To fully uncover the processes behind the relationships between organizational justice perceptions and health outcomes, it may be useful to integrate justice theories with stress and health theories. In conclusion, it might not be possible to pin down one mediating factor for the relationship between justice perceptions and health; the importance of various potential cognitive, emotional, identity-related, and biological mediating factors may depend on the type of justice, type of work or context, type of individual, type of time lag, and type of outcome.

Justice enactment

This thesis was also concerned with the justice enactment of business owners. Justice enactment was proposed to be an ego-depleting activity (see R. E. Johnson et al., 2014). However, individuals may nevertheless decide to engage in actions consistent with justice principles as a type of deontic response. A deontic response, in this sense, is a self-sacrificial act that is made in order to balance an observed injustice (Cropanzano et al., 2005). Justice enactment
may also function as a deontic response. Enacting justice may trigger pride in one’s actions and stimulate positive emotions from subordinates, which, through emotional contagion processes, elicit positive emotions in managers as well (R. E. Johnson et al., 2014). Also, managers may decide to enact justice because they anticipate that they would experience negative emotions, such as shame or guilt, otherwise.

While individual differences, regarding, for example, moral regard and justice self-efficacy, have presently been found to be associated with justice enactment, in the one previous study that investigated consequences of justice enactment, R. E. Johnson et al. (2014) reported that half of the variance in justice enactment was attributable to within-person variation over time. Whether justice enactment leads to positive or negative consequences may depend on why the justice is enacted. It may be that acting justly is a managerial strategy that is applied in certain situations, for instance, when handling conflicts at work. It is likely that individual differences and situational factors interact in the prediction of when and why a manager enacts justice (see Scott et al., 2009). For instance, in a study on the antecedents of moral behavior, it was shown that individuals’ implicit assumptions about the legitimacy and ethicality of business interacted with environmental cues regarding the ethical and competitive qualities of their organization to shape their moral behavior regarding adequately reporting insurance claims (Reynolds, Leavitt, & DeCelles, 2010).

Study III investigated small business owner-managers who employ others. In contrast, there are also self-employed individuals who do not employ others, sometimes referred to as independents (Prottas & Thompson, 2006). It has been shown that small business owners with employees differ from employees and independents in regard to their work characteristics as well as their well-being and health (Chay, 1993; Parslow et al., 2004; Prottas & Thompson, 2006; Stephan & Roesler, 2010). Also, there are differences between entrepreneurs and managers, and between different kinds of entrepreneurs (founders, heirs, etc.), in terms of, for instance, their personality and level of motivation, which can influence justice enactment (Schjoedt, 2013; Stewart & Roth, 2007). Future research should take into account the type of entrepreneur and, also, study justice enactment in various contexts where the managers have differing levels of managerial discretion.

When it comes to the factors that influence justice behavior, research on middle managers has focused on trickle-down effects, finding that middle managers’ justice perceptions of top management influence their actions regarding their subordinates (Ambrose et al., 2013; Masterson, 2001). It has been shown that middle managers receiving unjust treatment in turn act unfairly towards their subordinates in most but certainly not all cases (van Houwelingen, van Dijke, & De Cremer, 2014). The same study suggested that managers who receive unfairness from upper management are less likely to pass this unfairness on to their own subordinates when they construe their self as independent from their supervisor (relational-interdependent self-
construal). It is an open question whether the justice that small business owners receive from their stakeholders may also influence their own justice actions.

There is some evidence that subordinates also have an influence on the behavior of managers. For instance, it has been reported that assertive subordinates receive more interactional fairness (Korsgaard et al., 1998). Also, when managers knew the needs of subordinates, they adapted their fairness behavior (Cornelis et al., 2012; Hoogervorst et al., 2013). It may be that subordinates’ expression of the traits that endow them with attentiveness to their surroundings and the behavior of managers prompts increased justice enactment from managers. In a study on abusive supervision, it was found that deviant behavior from employees (e.g., coming in late, stealing or sabotage) that triggered hostile behavior from the manager was stronger in effect than the hostile behavior from the manager which triggered employees’ deviant behavior (Huiwen, Ferris, Morrison, & Brown, 2014). Similarly, one could test the temporal influence employees and supervisors have on the development of the justice perception–justice enactment cycle.

Interestingly, there is little knowledge about whether justice enactment influences the justice perceptions of employees. Justice scholars assume that this is the case, and it is also safe to assume that there is a positive relationship. One reason for the potential discrepancy between what supervisors perceive they do and what employees perceive supervisors do in terms of justice may be related to their preferences or perceptions of situational appropriateness of specific justice rules over others (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a). Differing sets of justice rule preferences between employee and manager may even lead to a situation where a supervisor perceives something as fair while the subordinate perceives the same as unfair. In these situations, besides factors such as perspective-taking, empathy, and similarity between actor and recipient, informational justice in terms of providing explanations and adequate justifications for actions may diminish this discrepancy (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009a). When a discrepancy exists between what the managers perceive they are doing and what employees perceive the managers are doing, it may be particularly harmful to an organization’s climate, performance, and turnover as well as to the satisfaction and health of employees and managers. In sum, besides further substantiating research on justice actors, justice theory may profit from integrating the actor and the receiver perspectives.

Nature of justice
Two of the three studies of this thesis focused on overall justice as a type of entity justice regarding the organization. Study III, instead, made use of the justice rules and examined two justice facets. The advantages of focusing on overall justice have been outlined in the introduction. An advantage of justice facets is that there are justice rules associated with each facet. It is less clear, however, how overall justice perceptions are formed. Fairness heuristics
theory (Lind, 2001a) proposes a process by which available justice information is used to form a general impression of the fairness of the organization, which serves as a heuristic for whether to trust the employer. Ambrose and Schminke (2009b) show that overall justice is predicted by justice facets. In a qualitative study, Hollensbe, Khazanchi, and Masterson (2008) found that overall justice is not only predicted by organizations or supervisors applying justice rules but also by factors such as organizational support, co-workers experiences and the general tenure of the employees. In a context characterized by change, it has also been shown that overall justice guides justice facets in an anticipatory way, such that once an overall justice impression is formed, it will guide expectations about the organization’s future behavior (Rodell & Colquitt, 2009). While this thesis did not focus on the antecedents of justice perceptions, it is of conceptual relevance to investigate the antecedents of overall justice as well as interactions with justice facets (Choi, 2008) and anticipatory justice facets in predicting work and health outcomes.

As has been common until recently in the justice literature, the studies that comprise this thesis view justice as an overarching concept that encompasses both justice and injustice. Because interest in the potential differences between justice and injustice has gained momentum lately, it is important to reflect upon the conceptualization and measurement of justice and injustice.

Some scholars have argued that injustice is the key driver in shaping attitudes and behaviors, whereas justice is the normal state that is only noticed when something goes wrong (Cropanzano et al., 2011; Harlos & Pinder, 1999). This would imply that the effects of injustice on work, health, and well-being outcomes are stronger than the effects of justice. However, it seems to be more complicated than this. In one study, it has been shown that justice had stronger predictive power than injustice on outcomes regarding self-esteem, performance, and citizenship behavior, while injustice had more predictive power than justice for outcomes regarding hostility and counterproductive work behavior (Colquitt, Long, Rodell, & Halvorsen-Ganepola, 2014). In predicting when justice or injustice would have stronger effects on outcomes, the authors of this study relied on the concepts of promotion and prevention focus (Higgins, 1997). They maintained that just treatment from organizational representatives instills employees with a sense of safety, which may lead them to be more concerned with behaving according to their ideal by seeking to aspire and grow, as indicated by performance and self-esteem. Injustice experiences, on the other hand, leave employees feeling unsafe, which triggers cognitive preoccupation with the treatment and an emotional and behavioral tendency to act against this treatment, as manifested in hostility and counterproductive behavior. With respect to the impact on health, this could mean that whether justice or injustice has stronger effects depends on the kind of indicators of health and well-being being studied. For instance, sickness absence may be more strongly predicted by injustice than justice,
whereas psychological need fulfillment and psychological well-being is more strongly predicted by justice than injustice.

It also seems that individuals focus on different justice aspects depending on whether they are recalling fair or unfair events (Cojuharenco & Patient, 2013). One study has found that when individuals recall fair experiences, they mainly focus on outcome allocations (distributive justice), whereas when recalling unfair experiences, generally more information regarding different justice aspects is provided, especially with regard to interactional justice aspects. The authors of this study speculate that this may have something to do with individuals scrutinizing unfair events more closely and thus having a more thorough picture than for fair experiences. As most individuals expect fair treatment from their organizations (see also Jones & Skarlicki, 2013), employees may ruminate and think about unjust experiences much longer than they would otherwise value just experiences, which is consistent with the principles of negativity bias and bad-is-more-predictive-than-good (Bies, 2001; Gilliland, 2008). Therefore, the mediating role of mental preoccupation with work (part of Study II) should be stronger for injustice experiences than for justice experiences.

While some suggest that justice and injustice may not be on the same continuum (Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013), others argue that justice and injustice facets are at two opposing ends of a continuum (Colquitt et al., 2014). However, Colquitt et al. (2014) suggested that overall justice and overall injustice may be two independent concepts, such that an organization can be fair in some respects, for instance, by mostly allocating resources fairly, and unfair in others, for instance, by chronically disrespecting its employees. The independence of justice and injustice might also mean that a lack of injustice may not be as good as justice or lack of justice (see Gilliland, 2008). These few empirical studies show that future research on justice is needed to understand whether it is indeed better to conceptualize justice and injustice as different concepts or as different states of the same concept as well as to determine to what extent it may depend on the outcome studied.

Organizational justice from a stress perspective

In this thesis, injustice has often been considered a stressor (Vermunt & Steensma, 2001) that provokes stress responses, and stress theories have been pointed out as being important for the study of the relationship between justice and health (Elovainio, Kivimäki, & Vahtera, 2002; Robbins et al., 2012). Vermunt and Steensma (2001) suggested in their injustice–stress theory that injustice is a stressor, and Cropanzano et al. (2005) concluded that injustice should be added to the list of workplace stressors. Considering injustice as a stressor has interesting implications. Stress theories may shed some light on the nature of injustice as a stressor.

Study I applied the demand–control(–support) model (J. V. Johnson & Hall, 1988; Karasek & Theorell, 1990) in which job demands are clearly
defined as overload, role conflict or role ambiguity. It conceptualizes job demands and job control as being tied to the work tasks themselves rather than to the organization. In such an approach, organizational justice cannot be considered as a kind of job demand or job control. However, from the perspective of the job demands–resources model of Bakker and Demerouti (2007), organizational justice can be conceptualized in relation to demands and resources. In the job demands–resources model, emotional, mental, and physical job demands are differentiated from job resources. Job demands refers to various aspects of the job that exhaust the mental and physical energies of individuals, which leads to depletion and health problems. For instance, high work pressure, emotionally demanding interactions, and unfavorable physical environments exert a toll on individuals. Job resources – which help in the fulfillment of work-related goals, reduce the costs of job demands, and stimulate growth and learning – lead to increased motivation, engagement, and extra-role behavior. They include pay, job security, support, participation in decision-making, role clarity, task significance, and performance feedback. In their theory, Bakker and Demerouti suggest that job demands trigger a health impairment process and that job resources trigger a motivating process. Justice theories such as the group engagement model, social exchange theory, and fairness heuristics theory (Blau, 1964; Lind, 2001a; Tyler & Blader, 2003) predict that perceiving justice will have a motivational impact on employees. Therefore, one could construe organizational justice as a kind of job resources. The justice–stress theory (Vermunt & Steensma, 2001) along with evidence from studies on injustice as health risk factor (Elovainio, Kivimäki, Eccles, & Sinervo, 2002) would suggest that a health impairment process takes place. On the basis of this perspective, one could construe organizational injustice or lack of justice as a kind of job demand. The application of the demands–resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) to organizational justice seems to point in conflicting directions regarding whether justice should be regarded as a job demand or a job resource. However, taking into consideration the potential differences between justice and injustice, as two different concepts, may reconcile the issue. It may be that justice triggers a stronger motivational process whereas injustice elicits a stronger health impairment process. Further, Bakker and Demerouti suggest that demands and resources may interact, such that job resources may buffer job demands and, also, that job resources are more salient when job demands are high. Applying this to justice and injustice, given that they can be conceptualized and measured as separate concepts, would suggest that justice and injustice may also interact with one another.

There is another prominent stress theory that has not been used in the three studies comprising this thesis but which could be relevant when differentiating between justice and injustice. The conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) describes psychological stress as an individual’s reaction to his/her environment when losing or fearing a loss of resources or when a gain in resources was expected but did not happen. The theory proposes that only
resources need to be taken into account. Different types of resources, such as valued conditions, personal characteristics, and energies, are differentiated. Valued conditions, such as tenure or seniority, can have salutary effects, for instance, on creating strong interpersonal relationships when the conditions are positive for the individual. Personal characteristics, also called general resistance resources, refer to personal orientations toward the world, and can buffer against stress. Energies refer to resources that aid in the acquisition of other resources, such as money and knowledge. Instrumental models of justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) advance that individuals are vested in justice because it promotes influence and control and also guarantees valued resources, including promotions, benefits, and rewards. Justice may therefore also be a resource or, in Hobfoll’s categorization, an energy. More generally, justice perceptions may have a role in the stress process. When facing a potential work stressor, individuals who are treated fairly by their organization are more likely to assume that they will be able to call on organizational resources for support, as justice perceptions are used to interpret one’s standing in the organization (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Employees may also feel more confident about receiving compensation when they are coping with a work stressor for the organization’s sake. As a result, justice perception may also be a fundamental moderator of the relationships among resources, threats, and stress reactions. According to conservation of resources theory, individuals need to gather resources to avoid a resource loss spiral. In the case of injustice, it may be that individuals turn towards other sources, such as the supervisor, to retain and protect their self-worth, sense of belonging, sense of control, and trust in their organization. However, Hobfoll would perhaps regard justice and injustice as the same concept although on opposite ends of the scale, as only resources and not demands are critical for understanding stress (Hobfoll, 1989).

In conclusion, incorporating stress frameworks into the area of organizational justice raises questions about whether justice and injustice constitute job demands or job resources, and, if the latter, which type of resource it is, and how it can shape stressor–strain relations. These will be interesting questions to pursue after the conceptual differences and measurement issues have been clarified for the concepts of justice and injustice.

Practical implications

This thesis highlights the role that justice plays in promoting positive work outcomes and health for both employees and business owner-managers. Several practical guidelines have been given (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Greenberg, 2004) on what to be aware of in order to shape employees’ justice perceptions positively. Results of the studies comprising this thesis provide additional insights. The results of Study I revealed that justice perceptions and
job characteristics have main effects, which shows that organizations should focus both on promoting perceptions of fairness and on job design efforts to create good working conditions. The negative effects that perceiving less justice had on work attitudes and well-being were aggravated by high demands, low control, and low support, respectively. Therefore, organizations should not regard matters of fairness lightly, even when employees have favorable job characteristics.

The results of Study II suggest that in order to ensure that employees have enough resources and energy left over to commit themselves to taking on new challenges and work, it may be worthwhile to create options for employees that are designed to lessen or combat stress and its physiological reactions. This may include on-the-job and off-the-job options for recovery, including time for physical exercise, hobbies, family, and friends (Oerlemans, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2014; Zijlstra & Sonnentag, 2006). Also, workplaces could offer greater work-scheduling autonomy in order to provide employees with time to spend on non-work activities. These activities may counter the elicitation of mental preoccupation with work when injustice is perceived at work (Zijlstra, Cropley, & Rydstedt, 2014). It was shown that an internal locus of control was able to buffer being mentally preoccupied with work when perceiving injustice. Therefore, it may be valuable to aim at fostering certain individual characteristics, such as locus of control, through cognitive-behavioral therapy (Vincent, Walsh, & Lewycky, 2010). In general, organizations may want to invest in interventions aimed at reducing mental preoccupation with work in relation to injustice and increasing recovery experiences in order to improve employee well-being (see also Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Geurts & Sonnentag, 2006).

The results of Study III suggest that justice enactment may lead to positive or negative consequences for owner-managers depending on which facet of justice is enacted. Behaving in an interpersonally fair manner was positively related to the health of actors. Also, adhering to informational justice rules had positive consequences on feeling professionally recognized. Selection and formal training opportunities are often limited for business owners. Therefore, learning to identify others who can serve as role models might be a useful skill for business owners who want to manage their employees in line with justice principles. These role models may be able to exhibit how to apply various justice rules to promote fairness in various situations. For managers in organizations, apart from mentoring and role modeling programs, selection procedures and training options for promoting fairness may be very useful (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Also, efficacy beliefs, which were found to have a key role in enacting justice, could be incorporated into or given more emphasis in training programs. Although evidence is lacking, it is likely that justice self-efficacy can be trained through role playing and case studies (Frayne & Latham, 1987; Schutte, 2014). As the number and socio-economic significance of small and medium-sized enterprises is enormous, interventions to protect and enhance the health and well-being of business owners are of
paramount importance. The costs associated with ill-health are extremely high for both employees and managers. Justice has been shown to be an important factor for the well-being of employees as well as owner-managers. The next step is for research and practice to work even more closely together to design programs and interventions that foster justice at the workplace (Greenberg, 2006; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996).

Conclusions

Justice is important to people – especially when there is not enough of it. This is also true at the workplace. Everyone can relate this, either by having experienced it firsthand or through knowing somebody who was treated unfairly at their job. Going to a workplace every day where injustice rules is difficult. In fact, many people who experience unfairness at the workplace are demotivated, dissatisfied, unhappy, sick, ready to leave, and even ready to take revenge. With this as a starting point, this thesis set out to investigate the relationships between organizational justice and work and health outcomes in more detail. In the chapters of this thesis, it was pointed out that there is a large body of research on the direct impact of organizational justice perceptions on employees’ affective states, cognitions, and behaviors. Nevertheless, justice scholars still have more evidence to uncover, especially when it comes to the moderating and mediating processes. This thesis expands upon the extant literature by (i) investigating moderating factors for the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and work and health outcomes, (ii) exploring mental preoccupation with work as a mediating process by which organizational justice perceptions translate into health outcomes, and by (iii) putting the focus on the enactors of justice principles and looking at the well-being outcomes of actors.

The results revealed that employees who perceive overall fair treatment from their organization and its representatives are not only more likely to be engaged at work, feel more secure, worry less, and to stay with the organization, but are also more likely to be mentally and physically healthy. These positive effects were found to persist over time. Therefore, promoting fairness at the workplace is likely to lead to better performing organizations.

This thesis contributes to the literature by demonstrating that justice perceptions have positive effects on work and health outcomes. These effects were stronger for employees with high job demands, low control over their work, or low social support from their colleagues. Future research investigating the relationship between justice and health should therefore consider the work environment.

Compared to research on the relationships between justice perceptions and work outcomes, the justice–health research strand is relatively new. The underlying processes are not well understood and constituted the focus of this thesis. The allostatic load model was used as a core theoretical framework to
guide predictions. When employees feel unfairly treated by their organization and its representatives, their mental preoccupation with work may increase. This is especially the case for individuals with an external locus of control, i.e., people who believe they have little control over their fate. Mental preoccupation with work, which can express itself in worrying and ruminating about work-related issues outside of work, was found to be associated with decreased mental health over time.

In order to expand the scope of justice research, it is important to study not only employees but also authority figures. In this thesis, a particularly numerous and economically relevant population was studied: small business owner-managers. When considering such a population, it is not the receiver of justice who is the center of attention, as with the traditional perspective in justice research. Rather, the focus is on the enactor of justice, a recently emerging trend in justice research. It was found that owner-managers are more likely to enact justice when they feel a moral obligation towards their employees, and when they believe they are capable of behaving justly, i.e., when they have high justice self-efficacy beliefs. Enacting justice is not an easy task; it requires self-regulation and self-control, and may trigger negative health effects. The results showed that enacting informational justice was related to impaired self-rated health and sleep quality and improved professional recognition. Interpersonal justice enactment was found to be positively related to self-rated health. Considering that justice enactment and justice perceptions are intertwined through trickle-down effects, establishing the consequences of justice enactment for authority figures may provide the basis for a new approach to developing fairness in the workplace. Indeed, in addition to enacting fairness for the benefit of their employees and organizations, managers may be encouraged to exhibit fair behavior for their own benefit.

In 1993, Greenberg suggested that organizational justice research was in a state of ‘intellectual adolescence,’ characterized by an absence of theory, a lack of central questions that define the area, and measurement issues. With the meta-analyses (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001) on the consequences of justice, and the publication of a measure that is still the most widely used (Colquitt, 2001), researchers ushered the field into a more mature state. In 2013, Colquitt and colleagues concluded that the literature has matured in that the definitions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational justice (perceptions) are agreed upon. This thesis contributes to the advancement of the field by providing three inter-related approaches to the study of organizational justice and well-being. It provides insights into the moderating and mediating processes of justice perceptions and justice enactment for employees and business owners.
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