



VALIDATION OF THE ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE FOR THE NIGERIAN CONTEXT

Idowu M. OGUNKUADE¹ and Ochinya O. OJILI.

Nasarawa State University,
Keffi. Nigeria

1. Dr. Idowu M. Ogunkuade is now with the Nigerian Copyright Commission, Abuja as the Director of Nigerian Copyright Institute. All correspondences concerning this article should be addressed to him via: idowukuade@yahoo.com, P.O.Box 3752 Garki, Abuja, or call: 08035959871. The researchers appreciate the comments of the reviewers please.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to validate the organisational justice scale for the purpose of adapting and localising the research instruments for the Nigerian context. The data for the validity test of the instrument consisted of the ratings of suitability of 20 items to measure the concept by fifteen (15) participants (12 males and 3 females) drawn from the population of academia and practitioners in human resource management, located in Abuja and Nasarawa State, Nigeria. While one hundred and eight (108) employees (47 males and 61 females) of some public and private organisations in Abuja, were the participants for the reliability test. Mean ratings of the items, Inter-rater correlations test and split-half reliability test were conducted on the data to obtain the psychometric coefficient of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire respectively. It was found that the instrument has both face and content validity. Likewise, the organisational justice scale with Cronbach Alpha=0.93 was found to be reliable. Consequently, the instrument was recommended for use in Nigerian research environment to study organisational justice.

Keywords: Organisational Justice Scale, Validity Test, Reliability Test, Adaptation, Nigerian Research Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Both public and private organisations have a corporate vision and mission, the purposeful attainment of which would guarantee its survival, growth and acceptability to its stakeholders. Organisations are therefore expected to move strategically towards realising its goals of effectiveness and efficiency. This will be achieved by the preoccupation of these organisations to work towards minimising behaviours which may adversely affect the harmony of the workplace and or cause harm or injury to others, in order to realise these goals (Eze, 1984).

An organisation that seeks to achieve its goals would require satisfied and happy staff in its workforce (Oshagbemi, 2000). This is the reason why the study of organisational behaviours and its related phenomena has retained currency in organisational research. In Nigeria, where formal organisational life is in its infancy, much interest is being directed at understanding how best to stimulate and retain the commitment of employees, which makes the concepts of organisational justice topic of wide interest to both the people who work in organisations and those who study them.

Organisational justice is described as individuals' perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organisation and their behavioural reactions to such perceptions and is said to be the bedrock of employees' behavioural dispositions and organisational effectiveness (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006). Organisational justice is classified into three dimensions in the organisational justice scale (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) as: distributional, procedural and interactional justice. Distributive justice in an organisation focuses primarily on people's perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes they receive; that is, their evaluations of the end state of the allocation process (Cropanzano &



Greenberg, 1997); procedural justice is the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions in the workplace (Greenberg, 1990) while interactional justice deals with the interpersonal side of organisational practices, specifically the interpersonal treatment, communication and interaction between management and employees (Bies & Moag, 1986).

The need for a better understanding of the concept of organisational justice and its measurements cannot be overemphasised and is an ongoing interest for social scientists and managers on the premise that this variable as perceived by the workers in the organisations may make or mar their performance and productivity. Consequently, various researchers in Nigeria including Ajala (2015), Amazue, Nwatu, Ome and Uzuegbu (2016); Okocha and Anyanwu (2016); Oshagbemi (2000), Gabriel and Nwaeke (2014), have shown interest in the study of workers' well-being and performance on one hand and organisational effectiveness on the other hand. However, organisational justice scales, developed in the foreign country, has at one time or the other, been used as research instrument for the measurement of employees' perceptions of organisational justice in the Nigerian workplace by some of these researchers.

To the best of our knowledge, adequate consideration may not have been given to the ecological validity of this research instrument when used in this area of research in Nigeria. This might have led to having spurious findings and also informed taking decisions that were detrimental to the progress of the organisations. Our attempt to embark on validation of this research instrument is to give more credibility to collection of data, and add benefit to the study of the concepts of organisational justice.

Organisational Justice Scale (OJS), constructed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), is a 20-item scale measuring the perception of organisational justice in organisations. Three dimensions of organisational justice are measured by this scale. These include: distributive justice (5 items), procedural justice (6 items), and interactional justice (9 items). The scale has reliability coefficient alpha of 0.91 (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Study Phase 1

Validity Test of Organisational Justice Scale

BACKGROUND

As noted above, Some Nigerian researchers like Okocha and Anyanwu (2016), Gabriel and Nwaeke (2014); and Amazue, et al (2016), who carried out research in the area of organisational justice, may not have given adequate consideration to the ecological validity of the research instrument in their work. They might have relied solely on the efficacy of psychometric properties of the foreign authors, which may lead to spurious results in view of the research environment where the instrument is used. In psychometric terms' validity is when the research instrument is measuring the property they are purported to measure. To our knowledge, the questionnaire under study, which was designed in foreign country, may not have been validated locally or to be modest, validation exercise of this instrument was not seen to have been done in recent time in our local Nigerian literature. This present validation exercise is expected to fill the existing knowledge gap in this respect and the outcome of the validity test will serve as a point of reference to researchers in this area of study. The major objective of this exercise is to conduct a validity test in order to ascertain or otherwise that the research instrument under review is suitable for the purpose that is meant, i.e. measuring the



construct that is purported to measure within Nigerian research environment. Both face and content validity of the research instrument were simultaneously considered in this exercise. It was assumed that the instrument under consideration will be statistically valid in the final analysis.

METHOD

Participants

Fifteen (15) participants were drawn from the population of the academia and human resources practitioners in some public and private sectors outside educational institutions located in Abuja and Nasarawa State, Nigeria. These participants with knowledge in the area of the study provided the data used to meet the objective of this phase of the study. The participants included three (3) females and twelve (12) males with age range from 46years to 65years ($M = 55.5$), with minimum qualification of a postgraduate degree in relevant disciplines and minimum working experience of thirteen (13) years. All the practitioners engaged for the validity test are seasoned administrators, with vast experience in human resources management. Due to the technical nature of the assignment, a specific and predefined group of experts was engaged to assess the instrument. Consequently, a purposive sampling method (expert sampling), a non-probability sampling technique was used to select the participants that validated the questionnaire. Table 1 represents the demographic and occupational characteristics of participants for the validity test exercise.

Table 1: Demographic/Occupational Characteristics of Participants for Validity Test

Demography/Occupation		No. of Participants	Percentage	Total No. of Participants
Sex	Male	12	80%	15
	Female	3	20%	
Age	46-65yrs	15	100%	
	$M = 55.5$ yrs			
Highest Qualification	PhD	6	40%	
	MSc/MBA/MMP	9	60%	
Employment	Academia	7	46.7%	
	Non-Academia	8	53.3%	
Years of Experience	13-33yrs	15	100%	
	$M = 23$ yrs			

Instrument

The instrument of the study was the original questionnaire of organisational justice scale. The questionnaire was designed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The instruction of the original questionnaire was changed by the researcher to meet the need of the study. The instruction reads "This scale is designed to measure perception of justice in



organisations. Please review each question in the instruments and make your sincere assessment of whether the question describes the construct (organisational justice) that is being measured by circling your level of agreement using likert scale in the box provided. Feel free to make relevant comments or adjustments on the question where necessary". The assessors were given specific instruction to assess and review each item in the questionnaire based on their level of agreement that the item or question is measuring the concept that is meant to measure, using a Likert Scale (1-7), ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Refer to appendix 1 for the validation instrument.

Procedure

The questionnaires were sent to a carefully selected sample of experts from the academia and practitioners with reasonable knowledge of theoretical background of the construct under study. They were expected to read the instructions on the questionnaire and were made to review each question or statement in the instrument. Thereafter, they were required to make their sincere assessment of whether the question or statement reflects or describes the construct that is being measured. They were also implored to feel free to make relevant comments or adjustments on the questions (items) where necessary with the intention to either retain, reframe or reject any of the item. To be sure that the participants understood the task, the researcher explained to the assessors what was expected from them without any attempt to either pre-empt the assessment or pre-determine their judgment.

The experts made adjustments and modifications on some of the items where necessary, and indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each item on a seven (7)-point Likert Scale, ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7(Strongly agree). Scoring system was interpreted as higher scores reflect higher perception of valid statement or question or item and lower scores reflect lower perception of valid statement or question or item. Any item that has a score lower than five (5) is assumed not to be valid.

Data Analysis

The level of agreement or disagreement was arrived at by calculating the mean score and standard deviation of all the assessors on item by item basis in the questionnaire. Thereafter, the mean of the overall score was determined. Furthermore, inter-rater reliability test was conducted through the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), to determine the level of agreement between the ratings of the assessors. All these analyses and computations are presented as below.



RESULTS

Table 2- Summary table of mean scores and standard deviation of experts' assessment of validity of questions (items) on the Organisational Justice Scale (OJS).

List of Items	Experts' Assessment Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	No. of Raters	Remarks
1.	6.7	0.61	15	Valid – Accepted
2.	6.5	0.83	15	Valid – Accepted
3.	6.5	0.74	15	Valid – Accepted
4.	6.9	0.35	15	Valid – Accepted
5.	6.3	1.29	15	Valid – Accepted
6.	6.6	0.82	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
7.	6.6	1.06	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
8.	6.7	0.48	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
9.	6.6	0.83	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
10.	6.7	0.59	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
11.	6.5	1.13	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
12.	6.8	0.41	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
13.	6.8	0.41	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
14.	6.5	1.06	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
15.	6.7	0.62	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
16.	6.6	1.06	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
17.	6.3	1.29	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
18.	6.3	1.05	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
19.	6.7	0.79	15	Valid – Accepted with modification
20.	6.8	0.56	15	Valid – Accepted
Total%	M= 6.6 = 94.25%		15	Accepted as Valid

As can be seen in Table 2, the mean ratings of suitability of the items by the raters (experts) ranged from 6.3 to 6.8 implying that all the items were judged to be very

suitable subject to modification made in some of the items. For example the word 'the' was replaced with the word 'my' in items 6, 12, 13, 14, 15,16,17,18 and 19 to personalise the word 'manager'. The words 'boss' and 'supervisor' were added to complement the word 'manager' in items 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 to give more coverage to the meaning. The word 'jobs' was modified to 'job' in item 10. However, none of the items was rejected by the raters. Note that the rating scales used by the experts ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Furthermore, the standard deviations computed to complement the mean ratings of the items were generally very low: of these 20 items, 13 items had standard deviation of less than one (0.35-0.83), whereas, only seven items had standard deviations up to one (1.05-1.29). This implies that there was a general agreement among the experts in their ratings of the items. In calculating the inter-rater reliability test with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Cronbach's alpha value of 0.96 was generated as indicated in Table 3. The Cronbach's alpha value shows that the ratings done by the participants have significant internal consistency i.e. the ratings are in agreement and reliable. On the basis of these results, all the 20 items in the scale were adjudged to be valid and accordingly adopted for use in the next phase of the exercise i.e. the conduct of reliability test.

Table 3 – Summary table of Inter-Rater Correlations Statistics of OJS Ratings : SPSS

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.964	.968	20

The above Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.96 shows that the ratings done by the participants have significant internal consistency i.e. the ratings is reliable

Summary and Conclusion

The participants in their assessment unanimously agreed that the research instrument was valid subject to some modifications. Please refer to Table 2 for the raters' mean scores, standard deviations and remarks for the instrument; and appendix 2 for the validated organisational justice scale.

In conclusion, it was found that the instrument is measuring the properties that are purported to measure. Consequently, the research instrument was used for the next phase of this study i.e. conduct of reliability test of the research instrument.

Study Phase 2

Conduct of Reliability Test of Organisational Justice Scale

BACKGROUND

In view of the fact that the contents of the original questionnaire was tampered with during the process of the validity test which may have affected the reliability of the original instrument, further steps were taken to conduct reliability test on the new version of the instrument as validated in this study. This is to be sure of the extent to which the validated instrument is producing the same results (internal consistency), with reference to Nigerian respondents. Reliability has to do with quality of measurement. According to William (2006), reliability is the consistency or repeatability of your measure. A measure is considered reliable if it would give us the same result over and over again.

As reported earlier on, Organisational Justice Scale, constructed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), had reliability coefficient alpha of 0.91. The reliability test exercise in



this study was designed to fill an existing knowledge gap in research and to give empirical support to the use of this instrument in Nigeria. It would also serve as reference for further research in this area of study. Consequently, the objective of this study was to determine the level of the internal consistency of the research instrument that was validated in this study. That is, whether the instruments will provide the same results overtime. It was assumed that the instrument under consideration will be statistically reliable.

METHOD

Research Design and Sampling Method

Survey research method was employed to gather necessary information for the reliability test. Simple random sampling was used to select participants who responded to the questionnaire. This was achieved by preparing list of member of employees in each and every organisations where the research was carried out in a manner where each name is marked with specific number in separate piece of paper. These pieces of paper were folded and mixed into a box. Thereafter, samples were taken randomly from the box by choosing folded pieces of papers in a random manner. This is to ensure that all the workers in the various organisations where the research was conducted had equal opportunity of participating in the study

Participants

The participants were 108 employees drawn from the population of workers in some public and private sector organisations in Abuja, Nigeria. The participants included 41 males and 67 females workers randomly drawn from the Federal Ministry of Science and Technology, National Orientation Agency, National Institute for Cultural Orientation, Christobell Blind Mission International, Better Life for Rural Women and M & E Global Limited, all situated in Abuja, Nigeria. Their ages ranged from 18years to 60years ($M=39$), with a minimum qualification of secondary school certificate and a minimum working experience of one year. Table 4 presents the distribution of participants along various demographic and occupational groups.

**Table 4: Summary of Demographic/Occupational Characteristics of the Participants**

Independent Variables	Level of Treatments	No. of Participants In Each Category	Percentage (%)
Organisational Affiliation	Public Organisation	70	64.8%
	Private Organisation	38	35.2%
Gender	Male Workers	47	45.3%
	Female Workers	61	56.5%
Length of Service (LS)	Short (LS) (1-5yrs)	46	42.6%
	Medium (LS) (6-10yrs)	28	25.9%
	Long (LS) (11yrs & above)	34	31.5%
Age	18-25yrs:M = 21.5	11	10.2%
	26-40yrs:M = 33	60	55.6%
	40-60yrs:M = 50	37	34.3%
Highest Qualification	O/L Cert	8	0.9%
	OND/NCE	15	13.9%
	HND/BSc/BA	63	58.3%
	MSc/MA/PhD	22	20.4%

Instrument

The instrument used in the conduct of this exercise was the validated Organisational Justice Scale (Refer to appendix 2). The instrument was designed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The instrument was validated by the researcher in this study as reported above. The Organisational Justice Scale is a 20-item questionnaire measuring the perception of organisational justice in organisations.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered in the offices where the participants were working. The organisational justice scale was clearly labeled and presented to the respondents after the researcher introduced himself and the purpose of the study. They were encouraged to read the instructions pertaining to each section before responding to it. The respondents read the instructions on the questionnaire and responded to each question and made their sincere assessment of whether the statements agreed with present situation or practices in their various organisations or otherwise. They circled their level of agreement using the Likert Scale (1-7) from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7(Strongly agree)for organisational justice scale. The participants were given the assurance that the information provided will be treated strictly confidentially and will only be used for the purpose of this study. They were thanked for accepting to participate in the study at the end of the exercise. Scoring system was interpreted as higher scores reflect higher perceived level of organisational justice and lower scores reflect lower perceived level of organisational justice.

Data Analysis

For the purpose of this exercise, Split-Half statistical method was used to analyse the data. Split half reliability is simply the correlations between the two sets of items (even and odd numbers) of the same instrument. The Cronbach's Alpha is mathematically equivalent to the average of all possible split half correlations. In effect, the reliability of the instruments were judged by estimating how well the items that reflect the same construct yield similar results i.e. how consistent the results are for different items for the same construct within the measure. The data were analysed with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)software.

RESULTS

Organisational Justice Scale Split-Half Reliability Test: Using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Table 5: Summary Table of Reliability

Statistics of OJS Responses: SPSS

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items	N of Items
.930	.933	20

The Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.93 shows that the reliability coefficient is statistically significant.

Summary and Conclusion

In order to determine the level of the internal consistency of the research instrument, whether the instruments provided the same results overtime, the researcher, through the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS,) calculated split-half reliability test of the respondents' responses for the instrument i.e. Organisational Justice Scale. It was found that the research instrument is reliable and can be used for substantive study. From Table 5, the Reliability Coefficient Alpha for the Organisational Justice Scale (split-half reliability test) is 0.93, as against the original Coefficient Alpha of 0.91 as reported by the original author of the instrument. Consequently, there is a high level of internal



consistency of the instrument among Nigerian respondents within Nigerian research environment.

In conclusion, it was found that the instrument is reliable and suitable for the study of issues relating to organisational justice in Nigeria.

Overall Implication of the Study

The validation of research instruments carried out in this study, which to our knowledge has not been done in recent times, will aid local researchers interested in this area of study. The study has confirmed that the validated organisational justice scale which was originally constructed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), in the foreign country is valid and reliable for use in Nigeria research environment. This implies that the use of this validated instrument will add more credibility to information gathering in the study of organisational justice in Nigeria. Consequently, this will bring about better results and findings and improve decision making process in the organisations. This study will serve as a reference material to the academia, researchers and students, and assist them in future studies. It is hoped that there will be greater expansion of interest in this area.



REFERENCES

- Ajala, E.M. (2017). A relationship study between organisational justice and job satisfaction among industrial employees in Ogun State, Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues*, 2 (2), 26-42.
- Amazue, L.O., Nwatu, O.H., Ome, B.N. & Uzuegbu, C.N. (2016). Relationships between perceived leadership style, organisational justice and work alienation among Nigerian University employees. *Journal of Mathematics*, 12(2), 137-146.
- Bies, R.J. & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organisations*, 1, 43-55.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organisational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In, C. L. Cooper., & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 12, 317- 372. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eze, L.N. (1984). Organisational effectiveness in Nigeria: *An industrial-organisational psychological monograph*: Lagos, Nigeria: Department of Psychology, University of Lagos, Nigeria.
- Fernandes, C. & Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management Research News*, 29, (11), 701-712.
- Gabriel, J.M.O. & Nwaeke, L.I. (2014). An empirical critique of the association of organisational justice and lecturers' quality of work life in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 3(10), 774-787.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organisational justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management Development*, 16(2): 399-432.
- Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Managerial Journal*, 36 (3): 527-556.
- Okocha, B.F. & Anyanwu, S.A. (2016). Organisational justice and employee satisfaction: a study of selected banks in Port-Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research/Social & Management*, 2(9), 1-12.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Is length of service related to the level of job satisfaction? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27, 213-226.
- William, M.T.K (2006). Research methods: Knowledge base. Retrieved from www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb on 22/8/2016.



Appendices

Appendix 1: Validation Instrument

Dear Sir/Madam,

Validation of Research Instrument

The attached research instrument, Organisational Justice Scale, developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), is designed to measure construct that is assumed to influence organisational activities that are related to private and public sector organisations and how this, in consequence, affects the performance of employees and productivity.

Despite the established psychometric properties of this instrument as reported by the authors, the researchers, for purpose of adaptability, are conducting a validity test of this instrument within the Nigerian research environment. This is to be sure of the level of confidence that this instrument can be used in Nigeria context, and that the instrument is measuring the properties is purported to measure, with reference to Nigerian respondents. The successful completion of this validation exercise will determine if this instrument will be suitable for measurement of organisational justice perception in Nigerian organisations.

For the purpose of the validity test, Organisational Justice is defined as individual's perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organisation and their behavioural reactions to such perceptions and is said to be the bedrock of employees' behavioural dispositions and organisational effectiveness (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006). Kindly note, Organisational Justice is viewed in three dimensions in the questionnaire as; distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Distributive justice in organisation focuses primarily on people's perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes they receive, that is, their evaluations of the end state of the allocation process (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997); Procedural Justice is the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions in the workplace (Greenberg, 1990) and; Interactional Justice deals with the interpersonal side of organisational practices, specifically the interpersonal treatment, communication and interaction between management and employees (Bies & Moag, 1986).

We would be grateful if you can please review each question or item in the instrument and make your sincere assessment of whether the questions or items reflect or describe the construct that is being measured by circling [O] your level of agreement using the Likert scale (1-7) ranging from 'Strongly Disagree', 'Neutral' and 'Strongly Agree' in the box provided. Please feel free to make relevant comments, modifications or adjustments on the questions or items where necessary.

Thank you for your support.

ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE

This Scale is designed to measure perception of justice in organisations. Please review each item/question in the instrument and make your sincere assessment of whether the question or item describes the construct (Organisational Justice) that is being measured by circling [O] your level of agreement using the Likert scale in the box provided. Feel free to make relevant modification or adjustment on any of the item or question as you deem it fit.

Strongly Disagree
Neutral
Strongly Agree

Employees' perceptions towards distributive justice.

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. My work schedule is fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. I think that my level of pay is fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. I consider my work load to be quite fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. I feel that my job responsibilities are fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Employees' perception towards procedural justice.**

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Job decisions are made by the manager in a biased manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | My manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | To make job decisions, my manager collects accurate and complete information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | All jobs decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Employees' perception towards interactional justice.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and consideration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with respect and dignity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | When decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | When decisions are made about my job, the manager deals with me in a truthful manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | When decisions are made about my job, the manager shows concern for my right as an employee. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. | Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses with me the implications of the decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | The manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | When making decisions about my job, the manager offers explanations that make sense with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | My manager explains very clearly any decisions made about my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Appendix 2: Sample of Validated Organisational Justice Scale**ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE**

This scale aims to measure your perception of the practices employed in your organisation. Please circle [O] on the scale to what extent you agree with the following statements describing the Organisational Justice practices in your Organisation.

Strongly Disagree**Neutral****Strongly Agree****Employees' perceptions towards distributive justice.**

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | My work schedule is fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | I think that my level of pay is fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | I consider my work load to be quite fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | I feel that my job responsibilities are fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Employees' perceptions towards procedural justice.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Job decisions are made by my manager/boss/supervisor in a biased manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | My manager/boss/supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | To make job decisions, my manager/boss/supervisor collects accurate and complete information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |



- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | My manager/boss/supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | All job decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers/bosses/supervisor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Employees' perceptions towards interactional justice. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | When decisions are made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | When decisions are made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor treats me with respect and dignity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | When decisions are made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor is sensitive to my personal needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | When decisions are made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | When decisions are made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor shows concern for my right as an employee. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. | Concerning decisions made about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor discusses with me the implications of the decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | My manager/boss/supervisor offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | When making decisions about my job, my manager/boss/supervisor offers explanations that make sense to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | My manager explains very clearly any decisions made about my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |