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The paper examines dimensions of organizational justice construct in a public sector context, utilizing an organizational justice measure developed and validated by Colquitt (2001). The present study substantiates the existing claims about the independence of interactional justice and the division of interactional justice into interpersonal and informational justice. The present investigation also contributes to the justice literature by providing evidence of a new factor, which is called procedural-voice justice to reflect the possible association with the concept of voice effect. Although voice has been examined extensively in the justice research as an antecedent of procedural justice, little is known about if and how voice might integrate into procedural justice construct. The study proposes that future justice research further investigate dimensionality of organisational justice and aspire to developing a common measure of the justice construct.
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Introduction
The proliferation of research involving perceptions of fairness in the organization, termed organizational justice (Greenberg, 1987), has generally resulted in an improved understanding about the role of fairness in the workplace. However, there is confusion, particularly in terms of how dimensions of organizational justice are defined and operationalized (Nowakowski and Conlon, 2005). Given that studies have found unique relationships between different types of justice and different organizational outcomes (e.g., Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001), clarifying the distinction between justice dimensions has important theoretical and practical implications. Although the use of a multidimensional measure may help researchers obtain a consensus about the dimensionality of the justice construct (Gilliland et al., 2001), such measures are relatively new, and further research is needed to validate their structure (Judge and Colquitt, 2004).

The dimensionality debate initially contrasted distributive justice, defined as the perceived fairness of outcome distributions such as pay and promotions (Homans, 1961, Adams, 1965), and procedural justice, defined as the perceived fairness of the decision-making process to achieve outcome distributions (Leventhal, 1980, Thibaut and Walker, 1975). There is general agreement that the two justice dimensions are conceptually distinct and could be operationalized and measured independently (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005). The debate was renewed with the introduction of interactional justice, defined as the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment employees receive during the implementation of procedures to achieve outcome distributions (Bies and Moag, 1986, Bies and Shapiro, 1987). The overlap between interactional and procedural justice has raised doubts if interactional justice is a distinct form of the organizational justice construct (Colquitt et al., 2005). Debate regarding justice dimensionality was complicated further by the proposal to separate interactional justice into interpersonal justice, the perceived fairness of treatments
employees receive, and *informational justice*, the perceived fairness of information sharing to people concerned (Greenberg, 1993).

Although researchers currently favor the view that organizational justice is multidimensional, there is uncertainty regarding the most appropriate dimensions. For example, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) and Colquitt and colleagues (2001) reviewed many of the same articles in their meta-analyses, but the former opted for the three-dimensional approach while the latter used the four-dimensional model to conceptualize justice. A more recent study goes further to propose six dimensions, dividing both procedural and interpersonal justice into two forms each (Nabatchi et al., 2007).

**A Multidimensional Measure of Organizational Justice**

The lack of clarity about conceptual distinction between various forms of justice has led to fragmentation in the literature regarding the operationalization of justice. In previous research many measures were developed specifically for certain studies, often with the aim of measuring dimensions of justice separately (Greenberg, 1990, Lind and Tyler, 1988). Differences in the research context also mean that direct comparisons between studies are a challenge. Consequently, justice scholars have called for the use of a standardized measure, thereby enabling comparisons of results across studies (Gilliland et al., 2001).

The multi-dimensional organizational justice scale designed by Colquitt (2001) to be applicable to a variety of contexts may be an appropriate measure to clarify different justice dimensions (Ambrose et al., 2007). Colquitt (2001) used a broad approach based on the novel conceptualization of each construct to generate items. Four justice dimensions (procedural-distributive-interpersonal-informational) were found to constitute the organizational justice construct. Although Colquitt urges future researchers to further verify the structure of the justice measure (2001), only a handful of subsequent published studies utilized the complete Colquitt justice measure. Fewer numbers of studies focused on examining the dimensionality of the overall scale. Most studies that factor-analyzed the full measure found the four dimensions of justice reported by Colquitt (e.g., Andersson-Straberg et al., 2007, Sutherland and Cooper, 1990). On the other hand, some studies have found that the three-dimensional structure collapsing interpersonal and informational provides a better fit to their data (e.g., Spell and Arnold, 2007). Blakely, Andrews and Moorman (2005) found the four dimensions too highly correlated and conceptualized justice as a monistic construct. More studies replicating past research are clearly needed to resolve these findings. Consequently, the overall aim of the present study is to investigate the dimensionality of organizational fairness using Colquitt’s four-dimensional measure. The key question is: what is the dimensionality of organizational justice?

**Methods**

**Sample**

Data was collected using self-reported questionnaires. The respondents were 616 Australian police officers, approximately a 35% response rate. A large majority of respondents were male (81%), worked full-time (93%) and had been with the organization for 10 years or longer (84%). Almost half (48%) were at the middle-rank level (Leading Senior / Senior Constable). More than half (60%) were middle aged (40 years old or higher).

**Measures**

The three measures relevant to this study are:
Demographic characteristics
The respondents were asked a range of questions including gender, age, length of service, time spent in current position, education level, and position.

Organizational justice
The construct was measured using the organizational justice scale developed by Colquitt (2001). The scale comprises 20 items dividing into seven procedural justice items, five distributive justice items, four interpersonal justice items, and five informational justice items (see Table 1). Following the author’s recommendation (Colquitt, 2001), some wording located in the parentheses was altered to suit the present study’s context. The five-point Likert scale was retained.

Outcome variables
The organizational justice measure’s factor structure was assessed by examining the relationship of the factor solution with job satisfaction and affective commitment variables. Job satisfaction was measured by the three positively-worded items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman and Oldham, 1975). Affective commitment was measured using the eight-item Affective Commitment Scale (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

Results
Exploratory factor analysis with principal axis factoring extraction of the organizational justice items was carried out using SPSS 15.0. Initially, two-, three- and four-factor models were tested to reflect the common conceptualization of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001). The five-factor model was subsequently tested after a new component emerged. The first five components generated from the 20-item scale had the eigenvalues of 8.76, 2.40, 1.47, 1.02 and .96, explaining 43.78%, 11.99%, 7.33%, 5.07% and 4.78% of the variance respectively. The two-, three-, and four-factor solutions were further subject to oblimin rotation for comparison and a clearer interpretation of the factors. The loading of each of the fairness items in each model was shown to be strong on relevant components, with item 6 having the weakest loadings in every model tested (see Table 1).

The results reveal that interpersonal and informational justice items loaded strongly on the same component in the two- and three-factor models, while distributive justice split from procedural justice in the three-factor model. The four-factor model contradicts the findings from past studies utilizing the same measure (e.g., Bell et al., 2006) in two key areas. First, interpersonal and informational justice items did not separate into two components. Second, procedural justice items split into two components. The first component (items 3, 4, 5 and 7) is called procedural-core justice and the second component (items 1, 2 and 6) is called procedural-voice justice in this study. The four dimensions of justice found in past studies utilizing the same justice measure (e.g., Streicher et al., 2007) were revealed in a five-factor solution, given that an additional dimension, procedural-voice justice, was also part of the model. The four-factor and five-factor models brought the cumulative variance explained to 68.17% and 72.95% respectively.

The three- and four-factor models were re-examined after removing items 1, 2 and 6 (see Table 2). The results had strong and unambiguous loadings on the respective number of factors, presenting a simple structure (Thurstone, 1947). The percentage of total variance explained increased from 63.09% in the three-factor model with 20 items to 69.18% in the three-factor model with 17 items. Similarly, the total variance explained in the four-factor model increased from 68.17% when all of the items were present, to 74.77% when the three nuisance items were dropped. The four-factor model with 17 items also accounted for more variance than the five-factor model with 20 items, thus explaining the highest amount of variance in all models tested.
Table 1. Factor Loadings of 20 Organization Fairness Items (N = 616)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice Item</th>
<th>2-factor</th>
<th>3-factor</th>
<th>4-factor</th>
<th>5-factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15 .50</td>
<td>-.03 .07</td>
<td>.04 .06</td>
<td>.13 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07 .60</td>
<td>-.10 .09</td>
<td>-.07 .03</td>
<td>.06 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20 .60</td>
<td>.00 .03</td>
<td>-.07 .06</td>
<td>.06 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.31 .57</td>
<td>.11 .02</td>
<td>.02 .07</td>
<td>.04 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.32 .54</td>
<td>.12 .00</td>
<td>.04 .05</td>
<td>.01 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.19 .36</td>
<td>.10 .11</td>
<td>.12 .06</td>
<td>-.13 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.45 .38</td>
<td>.27 -.06</td>
<td>.20 -.02</td>
<td>.00 -.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.16 .84</td>
<td>-.08 .80</td>
<td>-.08 .81</td>
<td>-.03 .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.09 .83</td>
<td>.02 .85</td>
<td>.01 .85</td>
<td>.08 .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.11 .86</td>
<td>-.01 .85</td>
<td>-.03 .86</td>
<td>-.00 .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.06 .63</td>
<td>.08 .78</td>
<td>.08 .78</td>
<td>-.01 .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.83 -.04</td>
<td>.85 .06</td>
<td>.85 .05</td>
<td>-.00 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.90 -.02</td>
<td>.87 -.02</td>
<td>.86 -.04</td>
<td>.12 -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.89 -.01</td>
<td>.86 -.02</td>
<td>.85 -.03</td>
<td>.20 -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.72 -.19</td>
<td>.79 .06</td>
<td>.79 .05</td>
<td>.10 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.78 .05</td>
<td>.73 -.04</td>
<td>.71 -.40</td>
<td>.71 -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.79 .05</td>
<td>.76 .02</td>
<td>.76 .01</td>
<td>.66 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.74 .16</td>
<td>.68 -.23</td>
<td>.65 -.05</td>
<td>.64 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.72 .12</td>
<td>.66 .21</td>
<td>.64 .01</td>
<td>.82 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.64 .14</td>
<td>.59 -.19</td>
<td>.57 -.14</td>
<td>.89 .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Underlined values indicate the loading that is the highest for each item.

Three better-fitting models from the present study (a four-factor model with 20 items, a five-factor model with 20 items, and a four-factor model with 17 items), and the model of best fit recommended in previous studies (e.g., Colquitt, 2001), were further subject to confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 7.0 (see Table 3). The third (procedural (core)-procedural (voice)-distributive-interpersonal-informational) and fourth (procedural (core)-distributive-interpersonal-informational) model fitted significantly better to the hypothesized factor structure, with lower chi-square values, better chi-square to degree of freedom ratios, and better fit indices. Due to the presence of a nuisance component and a lack of gain in the amount of explained variance, the third model was ruled out as the best fitting for the current sample. As a result, the model of best fit in the present study was a four-factor model found when specific items, collectively called procedural-voice justice, were removed from Colquitt's organizational justice measure.
Table 2. Factor Loadings of 17 Organization Fairness Items (N =616)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice item</th>
<th>3-factor</th>
<th>4-factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Underlined values indicate the loading that is the highest for each item.

Three better-fitting models from the present study (a four-factor model with 20 items, a five-factor model with 20 items, and a four-factor model with 17 items), and the model of best fit recommended in previous studies (e.g., Colquitt, 2001), were further subject to confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 7.0 (see Table 3). The third (procedural (core)—procedural (voice)—distributive—interpersonal—informational) and fourth (procedural (core)—distributive—interpersonal—informational) model fitted significantly better to the hypothesized factor structure, with lower chi-square values, better chi-square to degree of freedom ratios, and better fit indices. Due to the presence of a nuisance component and a lack of gain in the amount of explained variance, the third model was ruled out as the best fitting for the current sample. As a result, the model of best fit in the present study was a four-factor model found when specific items, collectively called procedural-voice justice, were removed from Colquitt’s organizational justice measure.

Correlations among all subscales of the measure and between subscales and outcome variables were also explored (see Table 4). Regardless of the presence of the nuisance items (items 1, 2 and 6), the justice subscales correlated significantly. Note also that correlations of aggregated procedural justice, procedural-core justice and procedural-voice justice with other justice types reduced in strength successively. Except for the correlation with distributive justice, the correlations of procedural-core justice were almost as strong as those of aggregated procedural justice. Procedural-core justice correlating less strongly with distributive justice may be beneficial, as the separation between the decisions and how well the procedures of allocation decisions were applied was made more distinct.
Table 3. Fit Indices for Organizational Justice Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA confidence interval</th>
<th>$\chi^2_{diff}$</th>
<th>ΔIFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-item measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Four-factor*</td>
<td>1378.92</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>(.100, .111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Four-factor**</td>
<td>719.64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>(.069, .080)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Model 2 and Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>559.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Five-factor†</td>
<td>546.70</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>(.057, .068)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Model 3 and Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-item measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Four-factor‡‡</td>
<td>416.23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>(.059, .073)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Model 4 and Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Model 4 and Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All $\chi^2$ values are significant at $p < .001$. IFI = incremental fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation.

*procedural (core) – procedural (voice) – distributive – interactional (interpersonal subsuming informational).
**procedural – distributive – interpersonal – informational.
† procedural (core) – procedural (voice) – distributive – interpersonal – informational
‡‡ procedural (core) – distributive – interpersonal – informational

Table 4. Correlations of Organizational Justice Dimensions and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice dimension</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated procedural justice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural-core justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural-voice justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reliabilities (alpha) are on the diagonal. All correlations are significant at 0.01 level.

Discussion

The removal of procedural-voice justice items (items 1, 2 and 6) have resulted in the clear distinction between procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice dimensions as past research predicted. Dropping these items is also appropriate because the items did not form a satisfactory subscale ($\alpha =0.66$) and their correlations added little value to the overall scale. In fact, without procedural-voice justice items, the reliability of the procedural justice subscale was improved. If future research finds procedural-voice justice appropriate as a distinct justice type and aims to preserve it in the measure, the reliability of the new subscale should be improved, possibly by adding more items to it. On the other hand, procedural-voice justice could be discarded altogether if it is found to be an artifactual nuisance factor.

Current findings support the initial conceptualization (Bies and Moag, 1986) and conclusion from subsequent theoretical and empirical studies (e.g., Blader and Tyler, 2003, Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001) that interactional justice is a distinct justice form. Given that nuisance items are removed, current findings also support the conceptual proposal (Greenberg, 1993) and empirical...
findings from past research utilizing the same measure (e.g., Judge and Colquitt, 2004) that interactional justice could be conceptually separated into interpersonal and informational justice. If the nuisance items are retained, future research may benefit more from following a common practice of combining interpersonal and informational justice forms into interactional justice when investigating about the effects of various forms of justice on outcomes (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2006).

The revised, 17-item organizational justice measure also led to the closer examination of an additional form of procedural justice labeled ‘procedural-voice justice’ to reflect the apparent connection with the concept of voice effect (Folger, 1977). Voice was based on the concept of process control (having a say in the organizational decision-making procedures), which is different from decision control (the actual opportunity to control the decision outcomes) that managers usually have (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). The notion that employees could express their views is similar to the concept of voice, which has been found to be an antecedent to procedural justice (Folger, 1977). In the present study, allocation procedures as applied by others are shown to be distinct from voice applied by the employees onto those procedures. The sample being drawn from a highly unionized public sector in which employees’ opinions are regarded more collectively may also aid voice to become more evident. Moreover, of the seven procedural justice items in Colquitt’s measure, only item 1 was conceptualized to represent the concept of process control (Colquitt, 2001). However, items 1, 2 and 6 (the procedural-voice justice items) were worded to ask the respondents directly (‘Have you...?’), compared to the rest of the items which ask about the allocation procedures in general (‘Have those procedures...?’). Respondents may regard procedural-voice justice items as questions about their own personal experience with fairness of decision-making procedures at work, while procedural-core justice items are not specifically about individuals’ experience.

The current study has two important implications for future organizational justice research. First, future research can further explore procedural-voice justice with the aim of finding out if the dimension is a result of measurement artifacts of the item wording, or could actually be regarded as a distinct type of organizational justice. The presence of procedural-voice may be a result of the unionized sample, therefore future research should sample more widely. Second, if procedural-voice justice is supported as a distinct dimension, more research examining voice and its relationships with various justice types may also add breath to the well-documented literature on voice. Further studies could expand the number of items for voice and examine the degree to which employees want voice in different cultural settings (Brockner et al., 2001). Studies about the extent to which sincerity and respect from authorities affect voice (Shapiro and Brett, 1993, Tyler, 1987) may also reveal some insight about the relationship between interactional and procedural-voice justice.

Conclusion
The results of the current investigation have provided more important insights into the dimensionality of organizational justice by examining a multidimensional justice measure in an industry context. Past studies utilizing the measure found four dimensions of justice: distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational. From a statistical point of view, the distinction between the four dimensions is confirmed once the nuisance items we have called procedural-voice justice were removed.

The present study is not without limitations. First, it is beyond the scope of the study to verify the construct and criteria validity of the justice factors. The interpretability of justice dimensions should be studied further with a focus on distinct relationships between each justice dimension and its correlates. A better understanding about relationships between different types of justice and their

outcomes could lead to better interventions, resulting in improved individual and organizational effectiveness. Second, procedural-voice justice which is a new factor has not reached satisfactory reliability in the present study. Although the factor has a possible connection to voice, future research is needed to develop a more robust measure of the construct. Similarly, testing the measures in diverse samples could highlight valuable context effects (Caught et al., 2000).

We believe that, by providing fresh evidence about the theoretical dimensionality of fairness and proposing new foci for future justice research, the present study has succeeded in contributing to substantiate existing proposals and advance anew, integrative conceptualization.
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