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Men and women are said to perceive justice differently, with women proposed to be more concerned with relational issues and men focused more on material issues. In this study, the potential for differential effects of justice on performance by gender was analyzed across the four contemporary types of justice. Respondents were 265 male and 113 female occupationally diverse employees in a single organization. The results show significant differences in how men and women respond to the four justice types with only one – informational justice – acting similarly by gender. Women were more interested in maintaining social harmony than men. The results appear to strongly support the use of the justice judgment model over the group-value model as a means of explaining the gender differences. Implications for management include the importance of informational justice both generally and within the performance appraisal process.

Introduction

The impact of justice on workplace performance is important and implicit in modern management, especially due to the prevalence of human resource management practices such as performance appraisals. Many performance appraisals are not as successful as desired and often have unintended negative consequences (e.g., Kerr 2003, Beer, Cannon, Baron, Dailey and et al. 2004). The problems associated with the inconsistency of performance appraisals is further exacerbated by research finding that employees’ perceptions of the fairness and justice of these human resource practices can affect key employee outcomes such as commitment (Ogilvie 1986, Agarwala 2003).

Many of the models summarizing the impact of organizational justice are reflected in the differences between the group-value model and the justice judgment model. The group-value model (GVM) (Lind and Tyler 1988) emphasises procedural justice where employees have moderate social standing, but emphasises distributive justice where employees do not feel they have strong social standing. In contrast, the justice judgment model (Leventhal 1980) suggests that procedural justice is emphasized when the aim is to maintain social harmony but that distributive justice is emphasized when the aim is to maximize performance.

The impact of both models is further complicated by the proposition that women tend to be more interested in social harmony than men (e.g., Gilligan 1977). Further, recent advances in research on organizational justice note that “procedural justice has been much better represented in studies of satisfaction and commitment... and relatively underrepresented in studies of performance, OCBs and trust.... and that interpersonal and interactional justice have received less attention than distributive and procedural justice - probably as a result of their more recent appearance in the literature” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 438). Consequently, this paper aims to test which of the models better explains performance when analyzed separately by gender and all four justice types. The investigation of the four justice types by gender represents a substantial contribution to the justice literature, which has often assumed that men and women emphasise the same forms of justice. The investigation is one of few studies to examine the potential for differential relationships between justice and performance by gender.
The paper presents an overview of the two models, the research on the differences in the impact of justice by gender and the contemporary four justice types. The review then discusses the links between justice and key employee outcomes.

**Group-Value Model**

The idea that justice is not only about the relative value of the outcome but also how an individual is seen within a group is the group-value model (GVM) (Lind, et al. 1988). The model incorporates how individuals value being part of a group and seek to establish and maintain the social links that exist within social groups. The GVM demonstrates how an individual who feels their opinion is properly heard gains information on their status or standing in the relevant group. The GVM suggests that justice is a demonstration of how the organization values the employee and helps explain why some individuals place importance on expressing their voice during decision-making processes even when that expression is not linked to the ultimate outcome of the decision (Tyler 1987, 1989).

**Justice Judgment Model**

The justice judgment model proposes that people believe the maintenance of social harmony is promoted through the use of equal reward allocations (Leventhal 1976, 1980) and explores the conditions under which people apply justice norms. When determining the underlying motivations behind the justice assessment, two possible outcomes are considered – either social harmony or performance. The justice judgment model proposes that social harmony is promoted through the use of equal reward allocations while maximizing performance is promoted through equitable reward allocations (Deutsch 1975, Leventhal 1976, Deutsch 1985). Some research has suggested that the motivation of social harmony is more likely to apply to women, while men may be more likely to be motivated to maintain performance.

**Gender differences: Women and social harmony**

Many studies have investigated the role of gender in the allocation and evaluation of rewards (for reviews, see Kahn, O'Leary, Krulewitz and Lamm 1980, Major and Deaux 1982). Women are often seen to be more concerned with relational issues than men are (Gilligan, 1977), perhaps because women are more socialized to value and maximize interpersonal elements of relationships whereas men have been socialized to value material outcomes (Kulik, Lind, Ambrose and MacCoun 1996). With respect to distinctions in how men and women view different types of justice, women have been found to have a tendency to place emphasis on procedural justice and be more equality-focused while men are more likely to emphasise distributive justice and be equity-focused (Sweeney and McFarlin 1997). Men and women were found to differ in the value they place on distributive justice (Major 1987) and to differ significantly in their reliance on both fair procedures and fair outcomes (Sweeney, et al. 1997).

**Distinguishing Justice Types**

Distributive justice refers to judgments of fair distribution (Leventhal, 1980) and tends to focus on outcomes. Distributive justice is judged by evaluating the extent to which outcomes match expectations (Blau 1964) and whether perceptions of ratios of outcomes to inputs match those of others (Adams 1965). Procedural justice theory developed from observing reactions to dispute resolution procedures (Friedland, Thibaut and Walker 1973, Thibaut, Friedland and Walker 1974, Thibaut and Walker 1975). Participants with stronger influence over process control felt the outcome was fairer and accepted it better than those with less process control. Thus, procedural justice refers to the evaluator’s consideration of the procedures leading to the outcome decision (Leventhal 1980) and tends to distinguish process control from outcome control. Distributive and
procedural justices are now seen as the most established and main types of a wider gamut of organizational justice.

Beyond distributive and procedural justice, a third justice factor, interactional justice, has been identified (Bies and Moag 1986, Niehoff and Moorman 1993, Skarlicki and Folger 1997, Kickul, Lester and Finkl 2002). The role of the person who made the allocations has been highlighted (Reis 1986) with interactional justice seen as the effect of the interpersonal communication between the parties. However, the interpersonal elements of interactional justice have been proposed to be only part of the interactional justice domain. The second form of interactional justice now gaining research attention is informational justice. Informational justice focuses on explanations of the procedural actions of an allocation decision making process.

Recent research has found the best fit for perceptions of justice was a four factor model of procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational dimensions (Colquitt 2001). The impact of justice evaluations has been documented in meta-analyses (Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001, Colquitt, et al. 2001), reviews (Conlon, Meyer and Nowakowski 2005) and studies targeting effects on particular outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman and Byrne 2005). However, the exact relationships between different aspects of justice and performance has had mixed results, is sometimes confused and sometimes contradictory (see Colquitt, 2001).

**Organizational Justice and Performance**

Employee performance is the evaluation of what people do at work (Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit 1997). Employee performance is not the unidimensional delivery of a job description but is multidimensional and complex (Smith, Organ and Near 1983, Borman and Motowidlo 1993, Murphy and Shiarella 1997, Organ 1997). The multidimensional nature of an employee’s contribution enables different behaviors to be categorized separately (Motowidlo, et al. 1997). The two performance categories of in-role and extra-role behavior have been widely recognized with the two categories often having different antecedents (Williams and Anderson 1991). In-role behavior is that behavior that directly relates to executing or servicing and maintaining the technical core of the organization (Motowidlo and Van Scotter 1994).

A widely accepted definition of extra-role behavior is behavior that is “discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ 1988). These extra-role behaviors are also known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). The effect of broadly defined justice on OCB has been studied extensively (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ 1990, Moorman and Niehoff 1993, Niehoff, et al. 1993, Konovsky and Organ 1996). It is suggested that OCBs may be the “currency of reciprocity” (Lambert 2000) that result when employees perceive an organization to be just. Procedural justice has been found to impact on OCB (Moorman, et al. 1993) and the relationship between justice and OCB is said to be “relatively robust” with relationships ranging from .2 to .4 (Moorman, et al. 2005). For example, pay inequity relative to others doing the same job in the same organization has a clear association with OCB frequency (Scholl, Cooper and McKenna 1987). In contrast, other research proposed that of all the justices, only interactional justice was significantly related to OCB (Moorman 1991). Although mixed, the overall message appears to be that justice impacts on performance.

However, justice has been found to impact on other employee outcomes also related to performance. Organizational justice has been found to be an antecedent of commitment, satisfaction and OCBs (Moorman, et al. 1993). Procedural justice has been found to increase job satisfaction, organization commitment and OCBs (Konovsky 2000). Therefore to clarify the
differential impact of justice on in-role behaviours and OCBs, other key variables that may be closely related, such as satisfaction and commitment, also need to be examined.

**Satisfaction and Commitment**

Employee attitudes have been found to have robust relationships with the components of performance, including OCBs. The most frequently examined correlate of OCB is job satisfaction (e.g., Bateman and Organ 1983). Studies have found that job satisfaction has a stronger relationship with OCB than with in-role behavior (Organ 1988, George and Brief 1992, Organ and Ryan 1995). Meta-analyses of the relationship between job satisfaction and performance found a mean correlation of .30 (Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton 2001). In contrast, affective commitment was found to correlate positively with performance, while job satisfaction did not correlate significantly with performance ratings (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin and Jackson 1989). Similarly, a later meta-analysis found the corrected mean correlation between attitudinal organizational commitment and extra-role performance was stronger than the correlation with in-role performance (Riketta 2002). Few studies have included both job satisfaction and commitment in OCB studies, even though the known relationship between satisfaction and commitment requires both be included (Williams, et al. 1991).

**Aims of this study**

Due to the recent advances on the structural components of organizational justice confidence is building that a four factor justice model provides more information than a two or three factor model (Colquitt 2001). It is timely, then, to re-visit important assumptions that have been made about employee performance responses to perceptions of organizational justice using the revised four factor model.

This study positions the four factor model of organizational justice as a driver of employee performance. Employee performance is conceived as both in-role and extra-role performance. The study seeks to determine the similarities and differences in employee performance by gender. The male and female responses to the four factor justice model could be expected to differ, given Gilligan’s hypothesis that women are more interested in social harmony than men. We would anticipate females to have a stronger response to procedural justice and males to have a stronger response to distributive justice. Using the group-value model explanation we would expect women would be keen to increase their social standing and will have a stronger response to distributive justice than procedural justice. Using the justice judgment model theory, however, we expect women’s response to be to maintain social harmony and thereby demonstrate a stronger response to procedural justice. The aim of the study is to which of the four factors of organizational justice drive both in-role and extra-role performance in men and women. The hypotheses are:

To establish the influence of group value theory:

**H1:** Females will demonstrate stronger relationships between distributive justice and performance than males (H1).

**H2:** Females will demonstrate stronger relationships between distributive justice and performance than the relationship between procedural justice and performance (H2).

To establish the influence of the justice judgment model:

**H3:** Females will demonstrate stronger relationships between procedural justice and performance than males (H3)

**H4:** Females will demonstrate stronger relationships between procedural justice and performance than between distributive justice and performance (H4).

To establish the influence of gender on the multiple dimensions of interactional justice:

**H5:** That males and females will have different responses to perceptions of interpersonal justice (H5), and

---

H6: That males and females will have different responses to perceptions of informational justice (H6).

**Method**

**Sample and measures**

A local government council in Australia participated in an employee survey as part of a wider study. There were 378 usable responses from 539 surveys distributed. There were 265 male and 113 female responses after removing responses with missing data and outliers. Employees were from a diverse range of indoor and outdoor occupations in departments such as finance, sewage, libraries, and childcare. Average age for men and women was 43 and 39 years respectively. Average tenure for men and women was 10.6 and 6.3 years respectively.

**Organizational justice**

The twenty items from Colquitt (2001) were used to assess employees' perceptions of the four justice types. The stems of the procedural and distributive justice scales referred to the "fairness of the procedures used for your pay and procedures" and the interpersonal and informational justice scales stems referred to "your business unit manager". Consistent with the origin of the scale, a five point Likert scale from *Not at all* (1) to *To a great extent* (5) was used.

**Job satisfaction**

The three positively-worded items from the Job Diagnostics Survey (JDS, Hackman and Oldham 1975) assessed general job satisfaction. A seven point Likert response scale from *Disagree strongly* (1) to *Agree strongly* (7) was used.

**Organizational commitment**

The eight items from Allen and Meyer (1990) were used to assess affective organizational commitment. A seven point Likert response scale from *Disagree strongly* (1) to *Agree strongly* (7) was used.

**Performance**

The in-role behavior, OCB individual (OCBI) and OCB organizational (OCBO) items from Williams and Anderson (1991) were adapted and used. The in-role behavior (IRB) scale consisted of five items measuring employee behaviors that form part of the employee's role. The OCBI and OCBO scales each contain seven items. The OCBI items examined behavior directed at a specific individual that has an immediate benefit and that indirectly contributes to the organization (Williams, et al. 1991). The OCBO scale measures the employee's perceptions of behaviors that are directed toward the organization, such as advance notice and adhering to rules. All performance scales were scored on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 =Disagree strongly to 7 =Agree strongly.

**Results**

The scale means, standard deviations, Cronbach alphas and correlations are presented in Table 1. All measures demonstrate acceptable internal reliabilities. All further analyses were conducted using AMOS 7.0.0 (Arkbuckle 2006). The model was tested with the male data and had a $\chi^2$(df) of 22.815(12), $p = .029$. The modification indices and standardized residuals suggested the addition of a path from distributive justice to OCBO. The resulting model had a $\chi^2$(df) of 17.29(11), $p = ns$, a difference of $\Delta\chi^2$(Delta df) = 5.525(1), $p < .01$, indicating a significantly improved model. The various indicators suggested no further additions to the model and subsequently the non-significant paths were removed. The resulting final model for the males, shown in Figure 1, has a $\chi^2$(df) of 23.841(18), $p = ns$, a difference of $\Delta\chi^2$(Delta df) = 6.379(7), $p = ns$. The goodness of fit statistics for the final model for the male sample include: Standardized root mean square residual (RMR) = .033.
Goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.982, adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) = 0.931, CFI = 0.989, and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.058.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations (SD), Cronbach alphas and correlations by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Procedural jstc</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>7.19 (.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>6.88 (.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distributive jstc</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>4.69 .736a</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>4.80 .937a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal jstc</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>4.01 .605a</td>
<td>.538a</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>4.06 .904a</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Informational jstc</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>5.02 .644a</td>
<td>.608a</td>
<td>.784a</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>5.50 .462a</td>
<td>.479a</td>
<td>.776a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In-role behavior</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>2.60 .039</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>2.60 .039</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Cronbach alphas are given in brackets on the diagonals. a: p<.01, b: p<.05.

The model was also tested with the female data and had a \( \chi^2 \) (df) of 9.921(12), \( p = ns \). The modification indices and standardized residuals indicated that the path from procedural justice to OCB be added. The resulting model had a \( \chi^2 \) (df) of 4.705(11), \( p = ns \), a difference of \( \Delta \chi^2 (\Delta df) = 5.216(1) \), \( p < .05 \), indicating a significantly improved model. No further additions to the model were indicated by the residuals or modification indices and subsequently the non-significant paths were removed. The resulting final model, shown in Figure 1, has a \( \chi^2 \) (df) of 15.227(21), \( p = ns \), a difference of \( \Delta \chi^2 (\Delta df) = 10.522(10) \), \( p = ns \). The goodness of fit statistics for the final model for the female sample include: Standardized RMR = .0665, GFI = 0.972, AGFI = 0.939, CFI = 1.000, and RMSEA = 0.000.

![Figure 1. The resulting predictive model for males (on left) and females (on right)](image)

Discussion

The first and second hypotheses to establish the influence of the group-value theory and the third and fourth hypotheses to establish the influence of the justice judgment model were examined first. The first two hypotheses that sought a strong relationship between distributive justice and

performance for women, were not supported. Support was shown for the justice judgment model with the female respondents’ relationships between procedural justice and OCB. The justice judgment model explains more of the behaviors in this study – female responses to procedural justice and male responses to distributive justice – than the group-value model. That is, the results align more with the justice judgment model approach that maximising performance is promoted by systems that allocate outcomes equitably, in proportion to relative performance (Deutsch 1975, Leventhal 1976, Deutsch 1985). The results appear to strongly support the use of the justice judgment model over the group value theory as a means of explaining gender differences.

The proposition made by Gilligan (1977) appears to be supported in this organizational context. Women appear to be more interested in maintaining social harmony than men. Our results support the contention that women are more concerned with relational issues than men (Gilligan, 1977) by demonstrating how men and women react differentially to distributive and procedural justice. For men, distributive justice acts as a driver for both OCB directed at organizations and job satisfaction but for women, distributive justice plays no role in any outcome variables. In contrast, procedural justice plays no role in any outcome variables for men while acting as a driver for women’s OCB directed towards individuals. Women’s use of procedural but not distributive justice extends and supports the finding that women rely more on formal processes than men (Cannings, et al. 1991) and that women are more equality than equity focused than men (Sweeney, et al. 1997).

The response to interpersonal justice but not distributive justice lends even more support for Gilligan’s (1977) position. Interpersonal justice did not predict any variables in the model for male respondents but did predict organizational commitment for female respondents.

The fifth and sixth hypotheses set out to establish the influence of gender on the multiple dimensions of interactional justice. The results demonstrate significant differences in how men and women respond to the four organizational justice factors. Of the four justice types, only one – informational justice – was responded to similarly for men and women. The only other way in which the male and female responses to the factors are similar was job satisfaction predicting organizational commitment for both men (.41) and women (.35).

There were a large number of gender differences. As expected, distributive and procedural justice were responded to differently by male and female respondents. For men, distributive justice predicted job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational OCB. For female respondents, however, distributive justice did not predict any variables in the model. This is an important result, as distributive justice is seen as one of two pillars of organizational justice and almost always paired with procedural justice. Yet our results show that the contribution of distributive justice disappears for women when all four justice types, especially informational justice, are included in the model.

Procedural justice also behaves substantially differently for men and women. Procedural justice did not predict any variables in the model for male respondents. For female respondents, however, procedural justice significantly and negatively predicted individual OCB. The degree to which women perceive that the organization’s procedures are fair will contribute towards determining the degree to which they perform helping behaviors directed at individual others in the organization.

These differences between how the four justice factors differ for men and women contribute substantially to our understanding of organizational justice and confirms the utility of the four factor model (Colquitt, 2001) over earlier two and three factor models. By demonstrating the differential relationships of each of the justice factors with the various attitudes and performance
variables by gender the results of this study prompt future researchers to consider including all four factors when investigating organizational justice. The differential relationships between the four types of justice and the various outcomes, by gender, may also go some way to explaining why the exact relationships between different aspects of justice and performance have often appeared to be confused and sometimes contradictory (see Colquitt, 2001).

When the analysis shifts to the components of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, further important outcomes are evident. Job satisfaction for both men and women is predicted by informational justice, but for men the prediction of job satisfaction is incrementally increased over informational justice only by distributive justice. Surprisingly, neither procedural nor interpersonal justice predicted job satisfaction for either men or women. There were no common paths between the organizational justice factors and organizational commitment in either the male or female models. A further surprising finding is that procedural justice did not predict commitment for either gender, in contrast to the propositions of Bies and Moag (1986) and the findings of Masterson et al. (2000). When predicting organizational commitment, only the path from distributive justice was significant for men and only the path from interpersonal justice was significant for women.

The next set of implications focus on how employee performance was predicted by the four justice factors. In-role behavior was not directly significantly predicted by any of the justice factors for either men or women, implying that employees do not adjust their in-role performance according to how fair they perceive workplace relationships to be. This result may attest to the integrity of the workforce as they maintain their in-role contribution level or may refer to the tighter bounds placed on IRB, where the core tasks of the job must be performed in order to keep the job. Indirectly, however, in-role behavior was predicted by distributive and informational justice through both job satisfaction and organizational commitment but only for men. For women, in-role behavior was not significantly predicted by any variables in the model – none of the justices and neither job satisfaction nor organizational commitment predicted in-role behavior.

Organizational citizenship behavior is the second component of employee performance and the final outcome of this study. Again, there are no significant paths to OCB that are duplicated between male and female respondents thereby justifying the importance of investigating justice relationships separately by gender. For men, both individual and organizational OCB are predicted only by job satisfaction. In contrast, women’s individual and organizational OCB are predicted only by organizational commitment. The distinction between the important role played by job satisfaction for men and commitment for women is of vital significance. Further, the clear separation of the roles played by satisfaction and commitment by gender may mean that many prior studies of satisfaction and commitment which have often been used as touchstones in the literature (e.g., Meyer, et al. 1989), usually tested on a combined sample of males and females, would benefit by reevaluation and possibly re-analysis.

Overall, the results indicate there are only two paths in common between the genders, and none of the performance (IRB, OCBI and OCBO) paths are common. Females appear to respond to perceptions of procedural injustice by withdrawing individually-targeted OCBs.

A parallel result for men is that distributive justice negatively predicts organizational OCB. Men appear to withdraw their organizational, or non-personal citizenship behaviors according to their perception of distributive justice. This result is a little unusual and may be a reaction to uncertainty. For example, this negative relationship could reflect a degree of winding-down OCBOs when “feeling safe” in the organization, and going the extra yard when the outcomes distributed by the organization are less sure - perhaps as insurance against a bad outcome or as developmental work
to build up one's curriculum vitae before leaving the organization. The results presented here indicate that, for males, this predictability may lead to direct decrements in OCBO, with indirect improvements in IRB and both forms of OCB via the moderators of satisfaction, in particular, and commitment.

The way in which interpersonal justice predicts organizational commitment only for women supports the contention that women are more likely than men to be relationship rather than results oriented. Conversely, the way in which distributive justice predicts both job satisfaction and organizational commitment for men is consistent with the literature which suggests that men are more likely to be results rather than relationship-oriented (Sweeney, et al. 1997).

Job satisfaction is an important mediating variable for men, and less so for women. The male model shows all of the performance variables being predicted by job satisfaction compared with none of the women's performance variables being predicted by job satisfaction. For men, as job satisfaction varies, so too does men's in-role and extra-role performance. Men's performance may be more volatile and changeable than for women, for whom job satisfaction does not impact in-role or extra-role performance. Given the low performance variance explained by the model it is probably not appropriate to over-speculate, but explanations for the substantial relationships between job satisfaction and performance may be related to the traditional bread-winner or major income producing role of the man in this environment. Women, however, appear to maintain levels of in-role behavior irrespective of justice perceptions and only vary their extra-role behaviors in response to how committed they feel to their organization.

Implications

The practical implications of these results relate to their utility regarding performance appraisals. The results of the current study indicate that higher quality information shared at the performance appraisal will improve both job satisfaction and extra-role performance for both men and women. Further, the stereotypical use of performance appraisal would seem to be more effective for males for whom, according to our results, both in-role and extra-role performance is impacted by the employee's level of job satisfaction, which is impacted by both distributive and informational justice. For men, the opportunity to share the information in the performance appraisal discussion or interview appears to have a direct effect on job satisfaction and a consequent indirect effect on both types of performance. The performance response for men is not simply a result of distributive fairness but also a more complex incorporation of informational justice and job satisfaction.

The role of informational justice leads to additional implications for managers in organizations. For managers to improve the quality of the information they share on the fairness or justice implications for employees is a relatively cost effective way of setting an environment for improved performance.

More broadly, management would be well advised to ensure that all four justice domains are addressed in key employee reward issues. Not only should the outcomes be fairly distributed (distributive justice), but the process by which those decisions are made should be of highest quality (procedural justice), the way in which the decision is communicated is respectful of the employees (interpersonal justice) but the information about how the decisions were made should also be communicated in an appropriate manner (informational justice).

Limitations

Some limitations apply to the results of the present study. First, the study employed a cross-sectional design and therefore the results may be limited to the situation when the participants were
surveyed. The second limitation relates to the reliance on the subjective views of the participants and the subsequent concern this raises about common method variance. However, some reassurance is gained from research showing support for the use of self-report measures of the outcome variables, especially commitment (Goffin and Gellatly 2001).

In conclusion, the inconsistency of results currently present in the justice literature, especially regarding the GVT relative to the justice judgment model, could be due to differences in sample composition by gender. Future researchers may wish to consider these results in designing their studies. More specifically, the inclusion of the full four factor measures of organizational justice can assist in providing a richer understanding of justice in the workplace (as called for by Colquitt, 2001) and its consequences (as called for by Greenberg, 1990).

Our results may also highlight the different mechanisms through which justice operates in the organizational context. For example, our results contrast to those of Kulik et al (1996) and a possible explanation may be that they focused on litigants, whereas this study focused on employees. This proposition is further borne out by our results agreeing to a fair extent with those of Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) - one of the few other studies of justice by gender in an organizational setting, where both studies found that women and men weight procedural and distributive justice differently. Notably, Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) used 1980 data. More than 25 years later the results still hold up and yet the clear separation of how justice is applied by gender has not affected analyses on any widespread basis in the meantime.
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