

Advance Course in Social Psychology

Lecture 23: Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice

Hello friends, welcome back. Today I am going to start another module that is distributive procedural and interactional justice. The topic that I am going to discuss today is completely based on an individual's perception and feelings and how it influence an individual's attitude and other behavior such as commitment, motivation and satisfaction. When we talk about distributive procedural and interactional justice it is something that deals with equity, deals with morality and deals with ethicality. As a common person when we say or when we talk about justice the first thing that strikes an individual's mind is what is right and what is wrong, what is unfair or what is fairness. So when we are talking about distributive procedural and interactional justice we will also talk about all these issues under a umbrella concept that is organizational justice.

For instance if I say that whatever input we give to any task in terms of our knowledge, skills, abilities and efforts we also expect something in return in proportion to the efforts we have put in to complete a task. If in exchange we are getting salary or reward or recognition in proportion to our input we have given to the task then it gives us a sense of satisfaction and we perceive fairness in the process or when two groups are existing in a social situation may be one group is a majority group and the other is a minority group. But if majority group have negative opinion about the minority groups then definitely there will be a sense of dissatisfaction among members who are who hail from that particular minority groups. This creates a feeling of anxiety and at the same time a feeling of inferiority.

As soon as these feelings are evoked within members this leads to a feeling of injustice or unfairness because sometimes any group who does not receive any fairness in the even in the treatment in terms of respect or recognition then also there is perception of dissatisfaction and injustice in any social situation. Therefore talking about distributive procedural and interactional justice talks about equity based on the efforts we put in to the task based on the resources that are being allocated to every individual or every employee or member in the group to perform the task or to what extent any member has the freedom or right to voice his or her opinion and receive a kind of appreciation and recognition or advancement at workplace or in any group situation then it leads to satisfaction and perception of justice. So let us talk about the umbrella term that is organizational justice. It refers to justice of fairness that an action or decision is morally right which may be defined according to ethics, fairness, equity or law. Just now I mentioned that anything which is morally correct, ethically right, legally correct and is fair is termed as justice.

If it is opposite to it which is not morally correct which is unethical which is full of biasness and which is full of inequality or illegality then it becomes or perceived as injustice or unfairness. This is very natural with every individual that we react to any decision by the member of the organization or the higher authorities when the decisions does not go as per the appropriateness of the input that has been given by the employees to complete a task and this

to a larger extent influences an individual subsequent attitudes and behaviors. The more fairness is perceived the more the person experiences satisfaction, the more the person is motivated, the more the person has higher desire to participate in group and organizational activities. Therefore fairness is of central interest to groups and organizations because it has long term implications and can impact job attitudes and behaviors at work or in any social situation. Greenberg was the first person to coin this term organizational justice with regard to how an employee judges the behavior of the organization and the employees resulting attitude and behavior.

It talks about equity, how much amount of effort has been invested to complete the task and in return or in exchange, how much reward a person has received in proportion to the efforts that is perceived as fairness. It can also relate to the policies and procedures while in the allocation of the resources and rewards to the employees that for instance every employee has an equal opportunity for being selected for higher positions or gender there is gender parity or the organization is following equal employment opportunity for every employer to be inducted or recruited in the workplace. This is also perception of justice or it can be in terms of the treatment we receive from the higher authority in terms of respect, in terms of recognition, in terms of freedom of voicing our own opinion. So, coming to defining organizational justice it is a study of people's perception of fairness in groups and organizations. For example, perception of their salary concerning the efforts they put in their perception of treatment at work including dignity and respect they receive their perception regarding the fairness of performance evaluation so far.

If any performance is being evaluated and the evaluation was unfair then definitely the outcome is in terms of dissatisfaction or increased turnover or absenteeism. But if the more fairness has been adopted by the system by the organizational system the more fairness is perceived by the employees in terms of salary, in terms of efforts, in terms of participation, in terms of policies and procedures, in terms of treatment they receive by the authorities. So, justice in organizations includes issues related to fair pay, equal opportunities for promotion, allocation of resources and personal selection procedures. As I gave you the example equal employment opportunities, gender parity is being maintained, resources are being provided to each and every employee to perform the task efficiently and resources are being used effectively and there is fairness in the selection procedures of employees for further enhancement of the organizational system. The more fairness is there definitely the outcome is also going to be fair.

But how this term has evolved? We are talking about ethicality, we are talking about laws, we are talking about right and wrong, we are talking about fairness, we are talking about justice. But from where this concept has evolved social psychologists have discussed this term under the roots of equity theory. According to psychologists the idea of organizational justice stems from equity theory which posits that judgments of equity and inequity are derived from comparisons between oneself and others based on inputs and outcomes. That means organizational justice also talks about comparison. If I am putting this much of particular

amount of time and efforts in a particular task and the same amount of time has been also invested by another employee in the same task but one employee receives less reward than the other then it is also termed as unfairness.

So whenever we are talking about organizational justice then we talk about equity theory where equity is not only related to self but it also related to comparing one's own performance with the others. It is about calculating the proportion of input with the outcome and the reward we receive while comparing our own performance with our own performance and comparing with that of others. So this is the root of equity theory when we talk about organizational justice. Now in the same theory of equity theory which was given by Adams he has also talked about two aspects of equity theory that is input and outcomes. It is the most important aspect without input and outcome we cannot talk about fairness and equity.

So input refers to what a person perceives to contribute. It can be one's individual's knowledge skills and abilities. It can be time. It can be knowledge and how and the way you are using your knowledge skills and abilities to perform or complete the task that is the input. Once that input is there the person also expects some outcome.

Outcome is that once you have used all the knowledge skills and abilities to perform the task the outcome is in form of accomplishment of the goal definitely that it has made the performance enhanced and organizational profit has been increased but at the same time what you get in exchange of that input from the authorities or the organizational procedures. Now this can be in form of pay and recognition. You put maximum amount of time and effort to perform the task but in exchange when we do not receive a proportionate reward or recognition then the person as an employee experiences injustice. When we are talking about equity theory then input and outcomes talks about these aspects only. So outcomes are what an individual perceives to get out of an exchange relationship that is pay and recognition.

And this is a very fair relationship in terms of give and take. The organization has hired you based on your knowledge skills and abilities. It can be any group also. When you are performing based on your knowledge skills and abilities then you are giving something back to the organization and again the organization has to give back to the same person in form of pay and recognition. So it is a regular process of give and take in form of input and outcome.

So whenever we are talking about equity theory then input and outcomes are the two important determinants which talks about that how fairness can be achieved in any organizational process. Therefore we can say that comparison points against which these inputs and outcomes are judged may be internal that is to oneself or it can be external that is to other individuals. If we have received we are satisfied with that exchange relationship that input and outcome are in proportion to each other then it gives satisfaction to us. If we try to compare the input and outcome with the other person then definitely it can lead to some kind of dissatisfaction or

perception of unfairness. So this is how equity theory talks about not only about proportionate input and outcome but it also talks about assessment or evaluation of one's own performance with other individuals as well.

So there are two forms of organizational justice outcome favorability and outcome justice. Outcome favorability the extent to which we perceived that the distribution of outcomes are fair every individual has given his own performance has given the maximum input from his own end and the outcome is in terms of rewards. So every individual has received the award in a very fair manner it is being distributed or allocated in a very proportionate manner whatever input an individual has given to the task in reward he or she is getting proportionate reward then it is the favorability of the outcome of an individual's performance. Definitely the profit can go up but at the same time employees also need to have some favorability for their outcome in terms of pay and recognition. These outcomes may be in form of pay, benefits, bonus, proportions, scholarships, subsidies and other tangible outcomes tangible outcomes anything which can be easily perceived at this is what you have received while contributing or inputting something to the task this is outcome favorability.

For instance it can be bonus that if you finish a particular amount or piece of work in a particular period of time then may be your bonus will be increased. Now if that increase bonus is not given to the person then the outcome of favorability is very much low or there is unfavorability because it is not in proportion to an individual's input. So the outcome favorability is that how the authorities have decided to favor you based on your input. So that favor that you receive is the outcome favorability in terms of organizational justice. This can be praise, this can be promotion, this can be scholarship, this can be benefit, this can be pay.

Next is outcome justice this is another form of organizational justice. Outcome justice is based on the moral property the rules of correct moral or social behavior. For instance any what criteria or policy has been adopted to measure the individual's input to the task that is outcome justice that whatever recognition a person has received a pay has received it is very much based on morally correct pattern of behavior. So outcome justice is based on the moral propriety that is the acceptable and morally correct form of behavior. It should not be any kind of favor that a person receives may be the person's conduct is not good but he has received some favor that also leads to unfairness.

So person's performance based on morally conduct behavior is very much proportionate to the award. So this is outcome justice it is based on moral propriety or the rules of correct moral or social behavior that is individuals react to actions and decisions made by organizations every day. For instance as I mentioned I will continue with the same example that may be the person conduct is not appropriate but still he has been rewarded for his performance will definitely go against the perception of the other members of the group. There will be some reactions and there can be some sense of dissatisfaction or decreased commitment to the organizations of the other employees. So morally correct behavior in terms of action and decision refers to the

outcome justice that whether the policy or the pattern of decision making is justified in relation to an individual's performance.

So perceptions of justice influence many key group and organizational outcomes such as motivation, satisfaction and commitment. The more the decision is justified the more the outcome is considered to be justified. At the same time since we are talking about that organization justice can have two forms outcome favorability and outcome justice then it is also expanded in different forms of justice as well. It is a multifaceted concept which is recognized in three forms that is distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice which is further divided into two forms that is interpersonal and informational justice. Distributive justice it is conceptualized as the fairness associated with decision outcomes and the distribution of resources.

This form of justice focus on people's belief that they have received a fair amount of value for work related outcomes in terms of pay and recognition. It can be promotion as well a person has been assigned a very difficult or high profile task to perform based on the performance and accomplishment of the goal maybe the authorities give him a better designation or promotion we can say along with hike in salary. This is actually distributive justice real input is leading to proportionate outcome and this outcome is in form of pay or promotion and people are concerned with the fair share of resources on the job. Any high risk profile job and the person takes a risk to perform the task then how that risk behavior is being rewarded by their higher authority that is actually distributive justice. So, there has to be appropriate proportion between input and outcome.

So, outcome will definitely be in terms of organizational profits, but it has also connotations to the reward that an employee must receive in proportion to the risk he has taken in performing the job. In other words we can say that distributive justice refers to individuals just judgments about whether they are receiving a fair share of available rewards that is it is proportionate to their contributions to the group organizations or any social relationship. That means even in social relationship when reciprocation is not there how much effort you put in maintaining the relationship and we do not get that kind of reciprocation then definitely that social relationship also breaches or it tends to terminate. This is the concept of distributive justice. Procedure justice as the term implies it talks about appropriate procedures policies or fairness in adoption of policies and procedures for the effective functioning of the organization.

Procedure justice is defined as the fairness in the process that lead to outcomes. It is the appropriateness of the allocation process and resources and involves considering how much of various outcomes of an individual receives and the process by which those outcomes are determined. For example, performance management what is the policy and procedures that are being followed to measure the performance of the employees annually. It can be 360 degree at the same time it can be competency mapping. If any of the strategy is being followed then

what is the criteria based on which these policies are being executed to measure the performance.

When we are talking about these policies and procedures this actually relates to procedural justice. How much fairness has been adopted in measuring the performance of the employees. It should not be that one policy is very simple for a particular group of employees and the other policy is very difficult to measure the performance of the other group of employees that creates dissonance that creates dissatisfaction. This is how this leads to dissonance and how organizations make an effort to resume that balance in terms of perception of fairness among employees. It is a judgment concerning the fairness of the procedures used to distribute available rewards among group members.

It particularly connotes appropriate policies and procedures which measures equality which measures fairness in performance. Workers consider such rating fair to the extent that specific procedures were followed. Now these policies and procedures are so critical in nature that according to psychologist if certain points or criteria are not being matched then it can lead to sense of dissatisfaction and reduce commitment among employees. Now what are those six parameters which says that the procedure is fair. It is consistency, it is lack of bias that means there is no partiality and everyone is considered as equal, accuracy or precision, representation of all concerned, correction and ethics.

Now these six main aspects that is consistency that performance is being measured consistently may be after every six months or annually. It can be in terms of lack of biases that there is no partiality, there is no specific favor given to any particular employee or any group of employees. All criteria are equal for each and every employee. Accuracy that to what extent performance is being measured in a very precise and accurate manner. What kind of scales, what kind of criteria are being followed to measure the performance.

Representation of all concerned. Some for instance measuring the performance of assembly line workers. All parameters should be used in such a way that it represents the working conditions of assembly line workers and how the performance of all the employees can be enhanced in a very collective manner. Correction and ethics that if any measurement has been executed, performance measurement technique has been used then how performance can be corrected in future and how practices are being followed in terms of ethicality that is in terms of right and wrong. That which performance management criteria is appropriate for measuring a particular performance. So, these six parameters when are being incorporated within organizational practices then there is perception of organizational justice.

And the other is interactional justice. It is the degree to which the people are affected by the treatment employees receive in terms of dignity and respect. It is about it is about the freedom that employees are being given to voice their opinions. What kind of respect and dignity they

maintain while sharing their opinions and ideas to a certain extent that every information is being shared with the employees and employees feel that they are being important part essential part of the organization. Therefore interactional justice refers to the extent to which people who distribute rewards explain or justify their decisions and show respect and courtesy to those who receive the rewards. So, this is interactional justice where information is being transferred time to time to all the employees and employees perceive a kind of fairness and respect from the higher authorities that they are being considered or they are being part of decision making process.

This enhances their self esteem. At the same time, interactional justice has two components interpersonal and informational justice. Interpersonal justice it refers to perceptions of respect and propriety in one's treatment typically authority figures. What respect or morally correct behavior they treatment they receive from the higher authorities that is interpersonal justice. That appropriate professional language or communication is being followed with the employees All the decisions that are being made by the higher authorities are being circulated among or communicated among all the employees which enhances their self esteem and respect and that connotes interpersonal justice. The other is informational justice this relates to the adequacy of the explanations and information transferred in terms of timeliness specificity and truthfulness.

This actually connotes transparency whatever decision is being has been taken by the organizational authorities they are being conveyed regularly to the subordinates or to the other employees which creates an atmosphere of transparency within organization. So, this is the criteria of interactional justice. At the same time a fundamental explanation of this phenomena is that informational justice prompts feelings of being valued by others in organizations. The more communication is maintained with the employees the more the employees perceive themselves to be a part of the organization and there is more commitment there is more continuous commitment of the employees to be continue as a member of the group or organization. The more they are being ignored the more they become detached from the organization.

So, this kind of feeling is known as the group value explanation of organizational justice that when the group or organization consider you as a valuable part of the organization then this kind of justice is termed as group value explanation of organizational justice. This refers to the idea that people believe that they are essential part of the organization when organization officially takes time to explain thoroughly to them the rationale behind any decision. Organizational justice thus encompasses group interactions when members of high status or majority groups respond when they are concerned about how interactions with members of a lower status or minority group will go. Now if I have discussed about if I go to the previous slide if I talked about interpersonal justice, informational justice and group value explanation of organizational justice then at the same time it has a slightly negative part of interactional justice as well. This refers to more of any social group perception of justice that whenever any

group interaction takes place between high status or majority groups and low status or minority groups then what kind of feelings they exchange between the two.

This leads to existence of meta stereotypes why because members of minority groups have fear of being evaluated by the majority groups and at the same time majority groups also have some apprehensions to evaluate the minority groups and they have some presumed thoughts that what the minority group and based on this some kind of negativity evolves between the two groups. So, this leads to the existence of meta stereotypes which is a belief about once group is viewed by another group that is negative perception is negative and this can create anxiety about such interactions and awkward behavior towards members of the minority groups and they undermine the likelihood of friendship developing between the two groups. Obviously when majority and minority groups are interacting based on negative perceptions about the minority groups then this leads to anxiety and there are very less chances that any kind of coalition of friendship will happen between these two groups that is minority and majority groups. So, people are profoundly sensitive about the evaluations of others as I said that there is fear of being evaluated by the majority group this creates anxiety and group members have the fear of being rejected by the majority groups and this leads to negative emotions or elicitation of negative emotions and awkward social interactions which can also lead to intense conflict between the two groups. So, this is the negative part or side of interaction justice that whenever we are perceiving the other person if the perception becomes negative then the interaction justice is very difficult to experience because there is some fear or apprehension of one group or member to be evaluated negatively.

This tendency that evolves is the tendency of meta stereotypes of belief to consider the minority groups as negative. Next comes anti-seism of perceptions of justice this connotes that what conditions will foster organizational justice at workplace. So social psychologists and OB professionals have identified three major antecedents to organizational justice. The first is employee participation the extent to which employees feel that they are involved in decision making and they have the opportunity to participate in decision making and improve individual perceptions of procedural and interpersonal justice. The more they become part of decision making procedures the more they perceive justice because they have voiced their opinion and enhance organizational procedures and practices and relationship with higher authority.

So such circumstances will lead to perception of justice. The other is communication it is in the form of sharing information and voicing one's own opinion and is related to interpersonal and informational justice perceptions. The more opinion is being shared the more justice is being perceived by the employees. The quality of communication by organization or manager can improve justice perceptions by improving employee managers of trustworthiness and also by reducing feelings of uncertainty. The more communication is open and transparent the more it fosters trustworthiness and there is more reduced feeling of uncertainty because when there is openness and transparency between higher authority and the employees the more people are certain about decision making and how they can be benefited in long run.

So such situations in form of open communication leads to perception of justice at workplace and providing accurate timely and useful information fosters justice perceptions to be positive. And the third factor is justice climate. Now this kind of factor is something which is very much created by the higher authorities within the organizations. That means when employees work with the team within a team or group they share their perceptions about the organizations with one another which can lead to shared interpretation to the fairness of events. Any event has occurred what decision has been taken when the decision is being evaluated shared and interpreted by the group members itself then there is a sort of commonality or sort of common interpretation about a particular decision and that particular decision when it is shared at the group level by every member then it creates a justice climate, a climate of justice.

The more the interpretations and perceptions are justified the more it is being shared in a positive manner this creates a climate of justice within organizations. And in group level perception of justice can be conceptualized as an antecedent to individuals justice perceptions. So, when individuals justice perceptions are being shared at group level then a common environment is been created in form of justice climate which prevails in the whole organization that what kind of environment an individual is working in. So participation, communication and justice climate are the three most important factors which can foster perception of justice within organizations. When these factors are dominant then they tend to foster positive perceptions and not and reduce negative perceptions of justice at workplace.

The other is outcomes of justice perceptions if these factors if I just go to the previous slide participation, communication, justice climate are being perceived by the employees definitely it has some positive outcomes such as it fosters trust, it increases job satisfaction and commitment because the more the justice is perceived by the employees the more they become attached to the organization the more they have desired to continue to serve the organization they are emotionally attached to the organization and become highly committed to the organization. There is fostering of organization citizenship behaviors these are the discretization behaviors which are not duly rewarded by the organizational formal organizational system but people tend to engage in these positive behaviors because of justice perceptions and they tend to assist and help and cooperate other members in completing their task. Reduce counterproductive work behavior such as aggression it can be bully, it can be verbal or physical aggression, it can be cyber loafing but all these tendencies can be reduced when equal opportunities are being given to every employee and they tend to engage in positive productive behaviors rather than engaging in counterproductive work behaviors. There is reduced absenteeism and withdrawal the more justice perception is there the more just justice climate is prevailing in the organizations then the more the person tends to enjoy their work and they are more in into the work that means they are more happy at work and they become more productive workers. So that means we can say that a happy worker is a productive worker only when justice is being perceived within organizations they become they participate in the organizational activities rather than withdrawing from organizational activities.

There is reduced emotional exhaustion when they receive respect and dignity from the authorities in return what they do for the organization there is reduced emotional exhaustion rather there is more emotional attachment to the organization which makes them highly committed workers. Improve mental health there is better mental health or improve mental health there is the employees experience well-being because they are being well accepted by the higher authorities they experience certain authority and mastery in the environment to take their own decisions and voice their own opinions. There is reduced turnover in tensions the more they become the part of the organizations the more transparency is being maintained the more it leads to reduced turnover in tension in terms of continuing with the organization and there is more conflict management the more transparency is there in the system in terms of procedures in terms of reward system in terms of promotions in terms of interaction with employees the more the conflicts are reduced to the minimum level and there is more prevailing of justice climate. So this was about distributive procedural and interactional justice which has been discussed under the umbrella term organizational justice. So that is all for this module thank you so much I will start the next module in the next lecture thank you so much. Thank you.