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CHAPTER ONE

Background of the Study

Organizations of all types have changed in recent years due to advancements in technology, e-commerce, global economics, voicemail, email, etc. Yet the individuals who make up the organizations are still the key. There needs to be that one-on-one interaction between organizational members to make decisions, set the organization’s course, resolve conflicts, motivate, and reward. Without a trusting, open relationship, productivity falters, motivation drops, performance suffers, and neither the individuals, nor the organization, will be as successful as they could be. Technology will change, methods will change, processes will change, but the need for people to interact effectively with others in order to make the system work will not. Almost everyone has experience in an employer-employee relationship. This type of interaction is significant to us as human beings because what happens to people at work carries over into everything else they do.

The foundations for a successful interactive relationship between the employees and their supervisors are trust and fairness. Employees must believe there is a high level of justice in the organization; but, more importantly, a high level of justice in the individual interactions with their immediate supervisor. When employees perceive fair treatment, they are more willing to accept organizational decisions, more satisfied with procedures, and more inclined to abide by organizational rules and regulations (Tyler,
Furthermore, when employees believe they are treated fairly, they are more likely to think positively of their work, the outcomes of their efforts, and their supervisor (Moorman, 1991). Therefore, in this context, justice refers to one’s perception of fairness.

Perceptions of justice are critically important as they relate to the employees’ level of commitment to the organization and loyalty to a supervisor. Highly committed individuals are more likely to positively identify with their organization; and positively identifying with an organization reduces absenteeism and work-related errors. Positive identification also improves motivation, organizational culture by promoting citizenship within the organization, and simply allows employees to feel good about where they work.

Another important link is the connection between employees’ perceptions of justice and a more cooperative style of behavior and managing supervisor/subordinate conflict. More cooperative conflict management styles generally lead to more constructive conflict management processes as well as improvements in organizational effectiveness (Rahim, Magner, & Shapiro, 2000). Understanding the effects of organizational justice is also important in the employee selection process (Gilliland, 1994) and the performance appraisal process (Holbrook, 1999).

As important as it is for individuals to believe they are being treated fairly, it is also important for people to believe they are perceived as treating others fairly. Fairness can be considered a desired social identity (Wayne & Green, 1993). Greenberg (1988, 1990b), found managers were more concerned with appearing to treat people fairly than
they were about actually treating people fairly. Outwardly, individuals want to appear to treat people fairly and equitably. Inwardly, the reason people want to be treated fairly can be explained by social exchange theory and Adams’ (1965) equity theory.

Adams posited that an individual evaluates justice as a ratio of inputs and outcomes. Inputs are the investments an individual brings to the organization. Investments are one’s intelligence, education, training, skills, experience, seniority, effort level, motivation, and past performance. Investments are anything of value brought to the organization by the employee. It is important to understand the “value” of the investment is defined by the employee. In other words, the investment is an input with a perceived “value” from the employee’s perspective.

Outcomes (receipts) are rewards based on the employee’s investments. The outcomes must have a perceived value and be relevant to the recipient. This point cannot be over-emphasized. In order for an exchange to be considered a reward, it must be valued as such by the recipient (Tata, 2000). When a supervisor offers a reward to a subordinate that is not perceived as valuable, its meaning is not only lost, but can be considered an insult by the recipient. Perhaps the best way to avoid a negative response to a supervisor’s reward is through clear, open communication between the parties.

Positive rewards may be intrinsic satisfaction, pleasing the supervisor, high-profile assignments, exposure, high status, high levels of trust, and increased pay. Outcomes can also be perceived as negative by the employees. These might be poor work conditions, job uncertainty (threat of layoff or transfer), monotony, job stagnation,
obscure assignments, lack of supervisor support, lack of recognition, and low levels of trust in the supervisor or organization.

When employees believe an injustice exists due to an inequity of inputs to outcomes, they will work to balance that ratio. The feeling of injustice is in response to a discrepancy between what is perceived to be and what is perceived should be. Inequities are weighted and the level of tension experienced by employees is proportional to the magnitude of the inequity. The resulting tension motivates employees to improve the situation. It is important to note that the inequity is most often considered as benefiting the organization and detrimental to employees; however, an injustice could also be the opposite (e.g., overtime pay for time not worked or receiving an individual award for a group accomplishment). Employees could benefit from the injustice. In this case, the outcome is perceived as being more valuable than the input. A feeling of guilt may be associated with this situation.

Consequences of inequities are varied. Employees might increase or decrease their input to bring the equity equation into balance. Employees might attempt to alter the outcome by requesting a pay increase or asking to be considered for higher profile assignments. Employees might alter the importance of the input or outcome to increase or decrease their investment. Employees might also change their point of reference by comparing their investment or outcome to a different standard. Furthermore, employees might become angry or resentful, resulting in such behaviors as absenteeism, theft or dissent (Greenberg, J. (1990a). Elovainio, Kivimäki, and Vahtera (2002) reported absenteeism was 1.2-1.9 times higher, and poor health and minor psychological disorders
were 1.7-2.4 times higher with low levels of perceived justice. In other words, low levels of perceived justice may be detrimental to employees’ health. Finally, when the motivation is great enough, and no other strategy is effective, employees may choose to leave the organization (skarlicki & Folger, 1997; VanYperen, Hagedoorn, & Zweers, 2000).

Social exchange theory is rooted in the trust one entity (in this case, employees) has that allows them to exchange products or services with another entity without a specified outcome or reward associated with it. This type of activity creates an obligation to reciprocate in the future.

Unlike economic exchange, which is commonly known as a paycheck and, thus, protected by law, social exchange relies on the trust that there will be an unspecific future return for one’s specific input. When efforts are fairly rewarded, employees are more willing to continue the social exchange relationship by participating in activities that go beyond the contractual obligations of the job. Employees would prefer to define their relationship with their employer as social exchanges rather than economic exchanges (Janssen, 2000). The development of the concept of social exchange began in the early 1960s with the work of Homans (1961). Homans identified the social interactions taking place that were elementary to the functioning of the workplace. Many of the interactions were distinct and separate from the employees’ professional role-related behaviors. Interactions went beyond the role-conforming behaviors that were institutionalized, so Homans termed these behaviors as “subinstitutional.”
While Homans’ work was primarily microsocial and “subinstitutional,” Blau (1964) advanced Homans’ theory in two areas: 1) Blau believed that social exchange went beyond the microsocial and “subinstitutional” level to the macro level. He discussed the concepts of social integration, group formation, and cohesion. He also introduced the concept of power into social exchange. Blau began to discuss issues of conflict and opposition as components of social exchange. 2) Blau developed an economic analogy as a way to explain social exchange. As entities (people, groups, and organizations) attach an economic value to a product or service, entities also attach an emotional or justice value to a product or service (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992).

Social exchange theory is critical to the understanding of the dynamics at work in an organization. Justice perceptions are rooted in these exchange relationships. Exchange theory begins with the individual-to-individual dyad and progresses to group-to-group, organization-to-organization, and so on. When employees perceive the exchange as positive, and, therefore, the perception of justice is positive, they are more likely to participate in behaviors that benefit the organization (Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002). Furthermore, an organization must understand that it cannot rely solely on the work/pay contract between itself and its employees. Successful organizations are successful, in part, due to the social exchange relationships, and the citizenship behaviors of the employees in the organization.

Statement of the Problem

Communication takes place between individuals in an organization on many different levels. While bilateral communication between coworkers and peers is
important, the focus of this work is on supervisor/subordinate interactions. In this type of relationship, effective communication regarding task and role clarification contributes to employees’ sense of satisfaction. Employees assess communication in terms of normal or expected behavior. Communication satisfaction occurs when normative expectations are met and an understanding exists (Hecht, 1978a). A greater sense of satisfaction can result from the interpersonal communication and one’s sense of inclusion. Furthermore, poor communication can lead to high levels of uncertainty. Poor communication can also lead to high levels of stress and self-doubt. Therefore, the value of an accurate communication assessment, and degree of communication satisfaction, lies in the need to create an understanding of the current organizational communication effectiveness, determine organizational communication strengths and weaknesses, and develop communication strategies that enhance supervisor/subordinate working relationships. The result of effective communication is a common understanding of information between sender and receiver.

There are many strong links between interactional justice and communication satisfaction. The core issues for both constructs are trust, truthfulness, courtesy, respect, and justification of decisions with regard to employees’ direct supervisor. However, one of the strongest connections between interactional justice and communication satisfaction are employees’ perceptions of having a voice (Holbrook, 1999). It is important for employees to believe they have direct input into decisions and the decision-making process regarding issues that affect them. Issues pertaining to jobs, performance evaluation, and organizational change all need to be shared. When employees are given
relevant information regarding these important issues, they experience higher levels of self-efficacy. Higher levels of efficacy promote more positive interactions and attitudes toward their supervisor. Perceptions of fair treatment also communicate information regarding the degree to which employees are respected within the organization. Fair treatment indicates that employees hold a respected, valued position in the organization. Employees who believe they are respected take pride in their work and their organization (Lipponen, Olkkonen, & Myyry, 2004). Employees are sensitive to the efforts of others to control their environment. One means of regaining some measure of control is through voice. Employees want their beliefs to be known even when they understand that their argument might have little, if any, influence with decision-makers (Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 1996). There is a positive correlation between employees’ perceived level of communication satisfaction and their performance (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Pincus, 1986). Perhaps the performance gain is based on specific, task related informational communication as opposed to a combination of informational and relational communication between a supervisor and subordinate.

Research on organizational justice and fairness has exploded within the last 30 years (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005; Greenberg, 1987; Janssen, 2000; Lee, 2001; Leventhal, 1980; Moorman, 1991; Tan & Tan, 2000; Tata, 2000; Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 2000; Van den Bos, Lind, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997; Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002). Furthermore, there is extensive research on the influence of communication satisfaction in the workplace (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Gray & Laidlaw, 2004; Gregson, 1990; Hecht, 1978a; Neuliep & Grohskopf, 2000; Pincus, 1986; Varona, 1996). There is a
tremendous amount of research on the construct of organizational citizenship behavior (Becker & Randall, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Moorman & Harland, 2002; Moorman & Podsakoff, 1992; Organ, 1988, 1990, 1997; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). Much of this research links employee perceptions of communication satisfaction directly with organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. However, no research could be found which links organizational communication satisfaction directly with a specific construct of interactional justice. Therefore, four research questions were developed.

RQ1: Do Ohio University staff members participate in organizational citizenship behaviors?

RQ2: Are Ohio University staff members satisfied with the communication practices of the organization?

RQ3: What are Ohio University staff member perceptions of the interactional justice they experience?

RQ4: Are levels of interactional justice and levels of communication satisfaction predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors?

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between employees’ perceived level of interactional justice (IJ) and their perceived level of communication satisfaction. Additionally, organizational performance is affected by employees’ perceived level of interactional justice and level of communication satisfaction. Therefore, this study also determined the relationship between employees’ perceived level of interactional justice and employees’ organizational citizenship
behaviors as well as the relationship between employees’ level of communication satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Significance**

When employees’ communication needs are satisfied, they develop better working relationships and their work environment improves. Furthermore, poor communication can lead to high levels of uncertainty with respect to others, uncertainty with organizational goals and values, and uncertainty about the future. Poor communication can also lead to high levels of stress and self-doubt. None of these conditions promote a healthy work environment or high levels of performance. The values of studying organizational communication processes are many. By merely going through the process, the awareness of communication in the organization is raised. The results of the study can provide a framework for the organization to improve its communication processes, environment, and productivity.

**Definition of Terms**

**Trust**

Trust in organization and trust in supervisor are related, but distinct. Trust in organization refers to employees’ confidence that the organization will act to the benefit of the employees. Trust in supervisor or interpersonal trust, refers to employees’ confidence that the supervisor will act in their benefit, or at least, not to their detriment. Behaviors associated with trust include integrity, loyalty, availability, consistency, competence, openness, discreetness, and fairness (Deluga, 1994). In both definitions,
trust addresses the level to which employees are willing/able to allow themselves to become vulnerable to the actions of another person or organization over which they has no control (Tan & Tan, 2000).

Justice

Justice is defined, as in Equity Theory, as a comparison of employees’ input/output to the inputs/outputs of others. People regard an outcome as being fair when their input/output ratio is equal to that of others (Adams, 1965; Van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., Vermont, & Wilke, 1997). Lipponen, Olkkonen, and Myyry (2004) argued that there is also a moral values component to consider when determining fairness. Outcomes and procedures are considered fair when they are consistent with the perceiver’s moral values, and unfair when the outcomes and procedures are not consistent with those values.

Justice is comprised of three distinct areas: distributive, procedural, and interactional. These three areas will be discussed in greater detail; however, the emphasis will be on interactional justice.

Socialization

Socialization begins moments after birth. Cultural and social norms are taught based on gender, sex, race, nationality, education, and socio-economic status. Employees’ socialization begins long before they enters an organization. Potential employees begins the socialization process by discussing work-related topics at home, with family, friends, classmates, or instructors. This process begins by determining a fit between the individual and the employer. The socialization becomes more focused with occupation-related education (e.g., learning terminology, general working environment, and employment
interviews). Typically, new employees become involved in an orientation program and specific training which socializes them to the organization and job specifics. Employees also are exposed to more informal socialization processes where information is exchanged in an attempt to reduce uncertainty. Reduced levels of uncertainty result in higher levels of predictability. This socialization process, which begins early in one’s life, determines, to some degree, not only what employees brings to the organization, but also how they interpret the dynamics within the organization (Jablin, 2001).
This research drew from four interrelated constructs: organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, leader-member exchange, and communication satisfaction. These four constructs are related in that the employees’ perceived level of justice, which is critical to the success of an organization, is affected by the supervisor/subordinate relationship. One output of the superior/subordinate relationship is the level of organizational citizenship behavior exhibited by employees.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), which is rooted in social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961), can be defined as behaviors that employees exhibit that go beyond those which are required by the job. These are the voluntary, discretionary contributions that employees makes to the organization that are neither enforceable within the formal job description nor come with any guarantee of immediate compensation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Feather & Rauter, 2004; Organ, 1988). Blau (1964) developed an economic analogy as a way to explain social exchange. As entities (people, groups, and organizations) attach an economic value to a product or service, entities also attach an emotional or justice value to a product or service (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992). Those who feel they get paid strictly for the time put in (i.e., by the hour) and not for the value added during that hour subscribe to this strict economic exchange. In contrast to an economic exchange, where there is a contractual arrangement, social exchange activities are based on trust between the parties. Social exchange
relationships are typically considered long-term payback relationships lacking specificity of return (Schminke, Cropanzano, & Rupp, 2002). We’re taught as children to share and help others. When we share with others we expect others to share with us. This concept of social exchange carries over to the workplace in the form of citizenship behavior. When employees perform citizenship-type behaviors, they view it as acting in concert with organizational beliefs and expect that this type of performance will be appreciated by the organization. One measure of employees’ satisfaction is when the expected outcomes are realized. Satisfied employees are more likely to participate in citizenship behaviors than dissatisfied employees (Organ, 1990). The study of OCB is important because oftentimes managers will take some sort of citizenship behavior into account when evaluating the overall performance of employees (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). It is clear that organizations rely on citizenship behaviors from their employees (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Therefore, it is important to understand the antecedents of OCB.

Social exchange theory is critical to the understanding of the dynamics at work in an organization. Employees’ perceptions of justice are rooted in these exchange relationships. Exchange theory begins with the individual-to-individual dyad and progresses to group-to-group, and organization-to-organization relationships. When employees perceive the exchange as positive and the perception of justice is positive, employees are more likely to participate in behaviors that benefit the organization (Moorman & Harland, 2002; Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002). Furthermore, an employer must understand that the success of an organization cannot rely solely on the
work/pay contract between the organization and its employees. There is an informal contract between employees and the organization with an understanding that the organization will reward employees some time in the future. Organizational citizenship behaviors will take place only when employees trust that the organization will hold up its end of the bargain (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Successful organizations are successful, in part, due to the social exchange relationships and the citizenship behaviors of the employees in the organization (Moorman & Harland, 2002).

Organ (1988) posited that OCB is comprised of five basic attributes. The first attribute is altruism. Altruism is a tendency for employees to be concerned about the welfare of others, to exhibit concern for the well-being of others, and act in ways that benefit others. Altruistic behaviors include being helpful to others. Employees behaving in an altruistic manner may feel a sense of satisfaction simply by being helpful (Van Emmerik, Jawahar, & Stone, 2005). This behavior is intentional and directly intended to help co-workers, supervisor, or other clients (Becker & Randall, 1994; Neuman & Kickul, 1998). These behaviors are voluntary, discretionary, and contribute to the effectiveness of the organization, but are typically excluded from the job description. Vey and Campbell (2004) defined examples of altruistic behaviors as covering for others if they need a day or certain hours off; helping others with heavy workloads; helping train new employees; sharing personal property with others; willingly giving time to help others with work-related issues; taking colleagues’ appointments so they can attend classes; and being someone who others turn to for help on the job. These behaviors are at
times subtle and often contribute more to the performance of a coworker than one’s own performance (Smith et al., 1983).

A second attribute related to OCB is a general compliance or conscientious behavior. This type of behavior is less interpersonal than altruism. Behaviors that do not provide direct assistance to others and are considered personal characteristics such as punctuality, attendance, following of policies, self-discipline, dependability, perseverance, hard-working, work dedication, good time-management skills, and effective use of resources, are considered conscientious (Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, & Borman, 1998; Miller, Griffin, & Hart, 1999). Further results of the study by Miller et al. (1999) showed that individuals with higher levels of conscientiousness might improve the overall health of the organization. In order for these behaviors to be considered OCB, they must go beyond the expected. For example, punctuality refers to arriving at work early, not right at the expected “clock-in” time. Attendance would refer to going to work on regularly scheduled days off such as on weekends or holidays. Following organizational policies that are not critical to the operation or that most employees do not follow would also be considered conscientious behavior. Altruistic behavior refers to one employee working to help another, whereas, conscientiousness behavior refers to one employee working to help the organization as a whole (Neuman & Kickul, 1998; Organ, 1990). Conscientiousness is positively related to altruism and is a significant predictor of citizenship behavior (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001). Furthermore, conscientiousness is more closely related to citizenship behavior than it is to task performance. Perhaps the importance of conscientiousness, as it relates to citizenship
behavior, can be summarized by the research conducted by Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, and Borman, (1998). According to Hogan et al., conscientiousness was the best predictor of citizenship behavior for employees in jobs with little potential for promotion. Ambition was the best predictor of citizenship behavior for employees in jobs where promotion was likely.

A third attribute of OCB is courtesy. Courtesy refers to the work-related behaviors of checking with others before taking action. Other behaviors identified as courteous are informing others about work-related issues and offering advanced notice to facilitate work flow or meetings (Organ 1988).Courtesy differs from altruism in that courtesy keeps others informed and prepared so as to avoid overloading others, and thus, eliminate the need for altruistic behavior. Once again, courtesy, as it relates to OCB, includes the behaviors that go beyond any minimum organizational standards as they may appear in a job description.

Thus far, the focus of organizational citizenship behavior has been on the behaviors that employees participate in to positively influence other employees and/or the organization. There are also behaviors that employees choose not to participate in that benefit the organization as well. Sportsmanship behaviors refer to the tolerating of small inconveniences; working under less than ideal conditions or circumstances; refraining from “making mountains out of molehills.” Dealing with the occasional inconvenient situation without grievances, threats, and complaints, work to make supervisors’ jobs less burdensome (Organ, 1988).
The fifth, and final, attribute Organ (1988) associated with organizational citizenship behavior is civic virtue. These are behaviors that put the goals, objectives, and interests of the organization ahead of self. This is much easier to accomplish when the interests of the organization are in concert with the interests of employees. Examples of civic virtue are when employees “look out for” the organization, getting involved in organizational issues, keeping current on new developments within the organization, and becoming involved in the governance of the organization (Becker & Kernan, 2003; Organ, 1988). Employees who act proactively to prevent a negative situation from affecting the organization display civic virtue.

Organizational citizenship behavior as an output is important to understand because the relative success of any organization is linked the level of OCB exhibited by its employees. A number of studies (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996) show that citizenship behaviors enhance organizational effectiveness. Helping (altruism) new employees “learn the ropes” assists in the learning process and, therefore, increases the productivity of the organization. This helping activity also works to reduce uncertainty between new co-workers, thus, reducing stress within the organization. Furthermore, helping co-workers with work-related problems (courtesy and sportsmanship) permits the supervisor to concentrate on leadership functions rather than spending time problem-solving or on crisis management activities. Additionally, courteous employees can help the supervisor to avoid problems that would eventually require attention.
When experienced employees assist in the training and orientation of new staff members, bonds are developed more quickly, uncertainty is reduced, and fewer organizational resources are required. This is important because the more organizational resources that can be allocated to productive activities, the more productive the organization can be. Additionally, acceptable productivity levels can be maintained when employees are cross-trained and can perform the duties of others in their absence.

Citizenship behaviors may lead to performance improvements due to the sense of teamwork that can be developed. OCB can also improve morale, commitment to the organization, and to each other. Furthermore, strong morale, teamwork, attitude, and commitment to the organization help to reduce absenteeism and turnover, as well as attract the best employees.

Employees who exhibit civic behaviors such as attending meetings, being an involved organizational citizen, and considers the best interests of the organization demonstrates a willingness to develop new skills and knowledge. These new skills help the organization adapt to changing business climates and environmental changes within the organization.

There is an issue not addressed by Organ (1988) in his explanation of OCB. If citizenship behavior is based on extra-role behaviors as opposed to in-role behaviors, who defines in-role and extra-role behaviors? According to Morrison (1994), employees and supervisors may have differing definitions of in-role and extra-role behaviors. The motivation for helping other employees is important because, if the helper views the behavior as “part of the job,” then it is not considered an extra-role behavior and,
therefore, not OCB. Employee who define a behavior as in-role will be more likely to perform the behavior than employees who define the same behavior as extra-role. Problems can arise when a supervisors views employees’ behavior as in-role when the employees consider the behavior extra-role. Morrison (1994) also found that the more broadly employees defined their job description, the more likely they would include citizenship-type behaviors as in-role behaviors and, therefore, be more likely to perform accordingly. Furthermore, employees were more likely to follow a broad in-role job description when they experienced high levels of job satisfaction, commitment, and were generally in a good mood (Organ, 1990; Smith et al., 1983). Unfortunately, confounding definitions of in-role and extra-role behavior between supervisors and employees makes measuring/observing OCB very difficult. Clear communication, trust, and role definition are critical in order for both parties to recognize citizenship behavior as extra-role behavior and rewarded as such.

To summarize, organizational citizenship behaviors contribute to organizational success by assisting in the orientation and training of new employees; avoiding the creation of work-related problems, permitting supervisors’ efforts to be spent planning and leading rather than on crisis management activities; developing new skills and knowledge to successfully transition and adapt to change; maintaining high levels of organizational performance by cross-training and assisting coworkers when the need arises; and developing a sense of teamwork, positive morale, and organizational commitment. Organizational citizenship behaviors are necessary for organizational success and the attraction and retention of the best and brightest employees. A high-
quality, interpersonal relationship with their supervisor, which includes a trusting, empowering, safe environment is essential if employees are to be motivated to perform citizenship-type behaviors (Wat & Shaffer, 2005). It is important to recognize the perspectives of the employees and so that the supervisor can communicate clearly defined in-role and extra-role behaviors.

Organizational citizenship behaviors benefit the organization in many ways. OCB shortens the learning curve of new employees when an experienced coworker voluntarily helps the new person “learn the ropes.” When experienced employees help train new employees, fewer resources are needed for a formal training/orientation program. A result of OCB is higher levels of team-spirit, morale, cohesiveness, and reduced absenteeism. When employees help each other the supervisor can spend more time on supervisory-type activities in order to keep organizational quality high and productivity at optimum levels (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

There is a large amount of empirical evidence that supports the notion that when employees believe they are treated fairly, employees are more likely to engage in prosocial, organizational citizenship behavior (Barling & Phillips, 1992; Janssen, 2000; Orpen, 2001; Paterson & Cary, 2002). Organizational citizenship research and organizational justice research originated not from the study of organizations, but rather in social and judicial research. Adam’s (1965) equity theory and social exchange theory posited by Homans (1961) and advanced by Blau (1964), were originally developed to describe social behaviors that have been applied to organizational behaviors (Greenberg, 1987). Central to both these theories is the perception of fairness (Deluga, 1994). Perhaps
the term “justice,” used throughout the literature synonymously with “fairness,” is due to the original research in the judicial arena. Justice is a socially constructed concept that must follow established rules, morals, and values, not the self-interest of any individual (Tyler, 2000).

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is comprised of three main constructs. The first to be discussed is distributive justice, followed by procedural justice, and most importantly for this research, interactional justice.

Distributive Justice

In his seminal work regarding organizational justice, Greenberg (1987) created a distinction between reactive content theory, proactive content theory, reactive process theory, and proactive process theory. Both content theories are associated with the concept of distributive justice. Reactive content theory examines how individuals react to perceptions of unfair treatment. Proactive content theory examines how individuals react to perceptions of fair and unfair distribution of outcomes. A second focus of proactive content theory is how individuals attempt to create fair outcome distributions. Content theories focusing on fairness and the resulting distribution of outcomes, are closely associated with equity theory and are the basis for distributive justice. Reactive process theory and proactive process theory are rooted in formal legal proceedings. Reactive process theory states that litigants (employees in an organizational setting) are more likely to perceive a decision (made by a supervisor in an organizational setting) as fair when they have some control over the process. Proactive process theory is associated
with individuals’ ability and authority to determine which procedures will be used to achieve justice. Therefore, reactive process and proactive process theories focus on procedural justice, which addresses the fairness level of process control, and the processes used to achieve fairness.

Distributive justice suggests that employees judge the ratio of their perceived inputs to the perceived output from the organization in the form of rewards. Inputs take the form of education, experience, effort, and citizenship behaviors that employees bring to and offer the organization. Outputs from the organization in the form of rewards are anything that employees perceive as rewarding. Rewards are typically considered pay, time off, positive recognition, and inclusion. When employees perceive the rewards they receive from the organization are equal to the inputs provided to the organization, employees are more likely to consider the distribution of outcomes as “just.” This is a form of economic exchange that does not take into account the relationship of the individuals involved. In the distributive justice construct, employees are looking strictly for a balance between inputs and outputs (Tyler, 2000). From a systemic perspective, this would create equilibrium. When an imbalance exists in favor of employees, they may attempt to increase inputs in the form of accepting additional responsibilities, working more hours, or participating in additional citizenship-type behaviors. When an imbalance exists in favor of the organization, when employees perceives their input to be greater than the organization’s output, employees may lower their input to balance the input/output ratio. Once again, returning to a systemic state of equilibrium. When the imbalance persists, employees may resort to more extreme retaliatory behaviors such as
frequent absenteeism, decreased effort, theft, sabotage, or leave the organization altogether (skarlicki & Folger, 1997; VanYperen, Hagedoorn, & Zweers, 2000).

**Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice refers to employees’ perceptions of the fairness associated with organizational procedures and the process by which an organization arrives at a decision. Procedural justice is important as it offers employees a sense of belonging to the organization. Perceived procedural justice creates an environment where employees can feel a greater sense of self-worth and contribute more to the organization. Fair procedures on the part of the organization can be characterized by consistency of procedural implementation, impartiality, understanding and using all available information, providing a mechanism to correct decisions, offering employees a “voice” in the decision-making process (a sense of process control), and remaining consistent with current moral and ethical standards. In fact, employees want to believe they have been heard even when their argument has little effect on the outcome (Bos, Lind, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997; Leventhal, 1980; Patterson, Green, & Cary, 2002; Tyler, DeGoey, & Smith, 1996). Organizational citizens are more likely to accept policies and the distribution of resources when they believe the policies employed during the decision-making process were fair (Tyler, 2000).

Research supports the claim that procedural justice perceptions are important in the development of social exchange relationships (Schminke, Cropanzano, & Rupp, 2002). High levels of procedural justice encourage employees to voluntarily cooperate with, (De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002) as well as promote loyalty and commitment
to, the organization. While both distributive and procedural justices are antecedents of employees’ attitudes regarding pay, promotion, and other rewards, procedural justice more closely predicts employees’ attitudes regarding turnover, the legitimacy of the leadership, and the organization in general. Furthermore, determining distributive justice is difficult when one employee is not aware of the outcomes given to another employee. In situations such as this, employees rely more on perceived procedural justice (Bos, Lind, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997). Employees are more inclined to want the organization to succeed, and therefore, engage in citizenship-type behaviors when they perceive high levels of procedural justice. Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff (1998) suggested that procedural justice predicts organizational citizenship behavior because high levels of perceived justice validate employees and leads to a reciprocal relationship resulting in citizenship-type behaviors. They posited that as citizenship behaviors are voluntary actions so are the procedures chosen by an organization, and the proper procedures show that the organization actually cares about its employees. Barling and Phillips (1992) contend that procedural justice more significantly predicted organizational attitudes with regard to the number of outcomes and trust in management.

Having the ability to express one’s opinion is what is referred to as having “voice.” Employees feel more fairly treated when they are permitted to express an opinion. As a matter of fact, having the opportunity to voice an opinion during the decision-making process may be more important to employees than the decision itself (Barling & Phillips, 1992).
The decision-makers must be viewed by employees as neutral. It is important during any decision-making process that all people involved believe that the decision-maker is open to all opinions, viewpoints, and information. Furthermore, all involved must believe that all information will be considered during the process and that the procedures used to reach a decision are designed to take all information into consideration. Personal self-interest should be avoided. Decisions should be consistent across employees and over time.

Employees will only value the opportunity for expression and provide necessary information when they trust that the information provided will be truly considered during the decision-making process. Trustworthiness is developed over time and expressed during the presentation of the decision. The decision-maker must make it clear to employees that he or she has indeed considered all the information and explain what was involved in making the decision. All parties involved should be open and honest in their communication.

Employees’ perceptions of the fairness of a third-party’s decision-making process will assist in determining the employees’ satisfaction with the outcomes. When third-party decisions are perceived as being arrived at by employing a fair decision-making process employees are more willing to accept the outcome voluntarily (Tyler, 2000).

An integral part of the procedural justice process is the gathering of information. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) identified four methods of gathering work performance information on employees: observation/inspection of work, reading written reports, self-reporting, and secondary reports. Information gathered using fair procedures is critical to
the performance appraisal process. Performance monitoring can effectively improve performance or work to reduce it. When work performance monitoring is communicated properly, the supervisor shows an interest in the employees, the work being done, the accomplishments gained, and the problems being encountered. The supervisor is perceived as someone who is interested, concerned, and wants to be involved. Furthermore, the information gained by using a variety of monitoring methods can work to reduce bias, improve accuracy in evaluating performance, and reduce the likelihood of conflict during the performance appraisal process. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) supported the notion that when employees perceive there to be frequent supervisor engagement, employees are more likely to perceive higher levels of both distributive and procedural justice.

However, when employees perceive the performance monitoring as task-oriented, thus emphasizing in-role behaviors, they would more likely focus on in-role behaviors and choose not to perform extra-role behaviors (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviors). Furthermore, employees may find the performance monitoring to be intrusive and perceive the supervisor as lacking in trust, thus having a negative impact on performance.

There are four primary factors that guide employees in their determination of fair procedures: voice, neutrality, trustworthiness, and the level of respect and dignity received (Leventhal, 1980; Tyler, 2000; Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 1996). Voice, neutrality, and trustworthiness can be secured, to some degree, by developing organizational procedures that require a supervisor to safeguard these factors. However, it
is somewhat difficult to legislate respect and dignity in the supervisor/subordinate relationship. Distributive justice addresses the fairness of organizational outcomes; procedural justice addresses the organizational processes developed to achieve fair outcomes.

**Interactional Justice**

The main focus of interactional justice begins where distributive justice and procedural justice end: the interpersonal relationship between the supervisor and the employee. Employees, regardless of the decision, want to be treated with respect and dignity (Tyler, 2000). Rudeness and aggressive behavior should be avoided. Employees treated with a lack of respect or dignity might have no bearing on a current decision; however, it might have a great deal of bearing on whether the employees trust that their opinions are valued and may refrain from offering opinions in the future. The decision-making process should be consistent with the moral and ethical standards of the day. A supervisor should feel a sense of moral obligation for proper treatment of the employees who report to him or her. Supervisors can fulfill their interactional justice obligations by acting in a respectful manner (Rahim, Magner, & Shapiro, 2000).

Interpersonal communication is perhaps the most important behavior that can take place in an organization. Organizational members are acutely aware of the quality of the interpersonal treatment they receive during interactions with an organization. Organizational members are also aware of the treatment they receive during the decision-making process. In addition to perceptions of justice regarding outcomes and procedures, employees are also concerned with the communication of outcomes and procedural
processes. The perceptions of fairness of communication in social exchange situations such as accuracy of information, honesty, immediacy of feedback, respect, courtesy, and professionalism are more relevant than perceptions of procedural and distributive justice (Sousa & Vala, 2002). The processes and procedures are important; however, employees may feel they have been treated unfairly even though they would consider the decision-making process and outcomes as “just” (Bies & Moag, 1986). Research indicates that employees are less likely to report unhappiness in an organization based on pay or promotion. More important are the perceptions of fair or unfair treatment in the interpersonal interactions (Tyler, 2000). Barling and Phillips (1992) found that interactional justice influenced many organizational citizenship-type behaviors such as organizational commitment, withdrawal, and trust in management. Furthermore, interactional justice may play a greater role in organizational citizenship behavior than fair procedures. Interactional justice perceptions, or injustice, cut at the very fiber of one’s professional existence. It is one’s very self-worth that is being attacked. Those feelings run deep and can be very painful. The “self” is considered sacred, and when violated, employees may feel an injustice has occurred.

Interactional justice is also important in mitigating organizational conflict. Bies, Shapiro, and Cummings (1988) found a supervisors’ causal accounts for refusing subordinates’ requests worked to either reduce the likelihood of conflict or increase it. In order to reduce or avoid conflict, subordinates must perceive the supervisors’ explanation to be both understandable and warranted. Subordinates’ acceptance of the supervisors’ causal account can reduce subordinates’ disapproval of the supervisor, the decision-
making process (i.e., procedural justice), and the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Employees’ perceived interactional justice during the causal account is based on three key factors. Employees will first work to understand the decision; determine the adequacy of the decision; and the perceived sincerity of the supervisor. The supervisor must explain the decision in a way employees can understand. Employees will then work to determine the adequacy of the decision. The supervisor must provide employees with a clear rationale for the decision. The rationale is important because employees will look at the decision and decision-making process with detective-like goggles on. In fact, Bies et al. (1988) discovered that employees’ evaluations of the causal account were more important than the decision itself. The third key factor, used by employees when determining perceived interactional justice is, the perceived supervisor’s sincerity when communicating the causal account. Mitigating claims frequently used by a supervisor when offering a causal account were: subordinate’s behavior, budget constraints, upper management, no reason given, political environment, formal company policy, and organizational norms. Organizational norms and budget constraints were the two causal accounts that carried the least perceived adequacy.

The effects of high levels of interactional justice can not be understated. Naumann, Bennett, Bies, and Martin (1998) found that, even during the layoff process, there was a negative relationship between perceived interactional justice and negative employee reactions. In other words, when employees are affected by a layoff, it is critically important to conduct the process professionally, treat the employees with respect, dignity, compassion, provide adequate explanation, and provide all the support
necessary. In many cases, employees who are loosing their job will remain in the organization for a period of time. During that time, the organization seeks to remain productive and avoid detrimental retaliation. Naumann et al., (1998) found that organizational commitment was both positively and significantly correlated with employee perceptions of interactional justice during the layoff process. They posited that organizational commitment is negatively correlated to anti-organizational activity. A manager should be aware of the impact of interactional justice during the layoff process because the organization has much at stake during this unpleasant time, but also to remain in good standing with good employees who might consider returning to the organization when possible. Paterson and Cary (2002) offered further support for the importance of procedural and interactional justice during a workplace transition. Interactional justice is the most important form of justice regarding change management because of the high levels of employee anxiety. It is through interactional justice that high quality change communication takes place. Employees appraise the changing environment. How will they be affected by the changes taking place and how real is the threat? Employees can only accurately assess the changing environment in the presence of effective change communication. Characteristics of effective change communication are helpfulness, support, timeliness of information, accuracy of information, and completeness of information. All of which are characteristics of high interactional justice. Employees need an explanation of the changes, and what benefits the changes will bring. This information is delivered to employees from the organization, through the supervisor. Peterson and Cary’s (2002) findings support the notion that effective change
communication leads to high levels of perceived interactional justice, thus, leading to higher levels of trust in management. The results of effective change communication are higher levels of perceived justice, greater acceptance of the changes, and lower levels of work anxiety with regard to the future. It is important to note that employees tend to view the actions of the supervisor or other agent of the organization as the organization itself (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Schminke et al., 2002; Sousa & Vala, 2002). Although perceptions of procedural and distributive justice are important, only interactional justice offers a level of support to employees during times of change.

The concept of justice is difficult to define. Justice means different things to different people. Feather (1994) posited that justice is, in part, defined by individual values. He defined values as:

… organized summaries of experience that capture the focal, abstract qualities of past encounters, that have a normative or oughtness quality about them, and that function as criteria or frameworks against which present experience can be tested … But they are not affectively neutral abstract structures. They are tied to our feelings and can function as general motives. (p. 130)

Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) added to the definition of values by suggesting that they are beliefs about desired outcomes or behaviors that transcend any specific situation, but guide the evaluation of behaviors and events in an ordered, prioritized manner.
Values move objective events to the subjective based on past experience. Values are also employed by organizational members when determining what is “just” and what constitutes a fair resolution to moral dilemmas. Values and justice are socially constructed and vary from individual to individual. Furthermore, fairness judgments are also situational. Individual decisions regarding fairness can change based on whether the person is in a competitive or cooperative situation, whether the person is receiving the resources or not, whether the person is involved with the distribution of the resources or no personal involvement what so ever, and whether the person is responding out of sympathy, empathy, or self-interest. When co-workers offer support to other employees regarding unfair treatment, that support confirms/validates the unfairness to the offended employee. Confirmation can play an important role in the decision of the offended employee to pursue further action (Leung, Chiu, & Au, 1993).

Fuller and Hester (2001) determined that interactional justice related more closely to perceptions of organizational support in a union setting than perceptions of procedural fairness. Organizational agents should be dedicated to improving the perceptions of organizational justice in order to improve cooperation and reduce organizational conflict.

The fundamental question, which still exists, is whether or not interactional justice can stand alone as its own construct or is it a social component of procedural justice? Moorman (1991) found that there was a causal relationship between perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice. When the three constructs of organizational justice were analyzed, Moorman (1991) found that only interactional justice was significantly related to OCB. In other words, employees who
thought they were treated fairly by their supervisor were more likely to participate in citizenship-type behaviors. It is interactional justice that focuses on the supervisor’s specific actions. The perceptions regarding the fairness of procedures may be directly linked to the manner with which the procedures were enacted. Interactional justice is more consistent with relational models dealing with trust, respect, and caring; whereas, procedural justice is more consistent with instrumental concerns. Perhaps the most compelling distinction between interactional and procedural justice comes from Fuller and Hester (2001) and supports the notion that a supervisor might have very little discretion to control organizational procedures. Yet, a supervisor is viewed as having a great deal of discretion regarding how procedures are enacted. The supervisor is seen as making a conscious decision regarding how he or she treats direct reports. Furthermore, Greenberg (1988) found that a manager considers being fair and looking fair as two distinct concepts. Looking fair (e.g., open/honest communication, appearing above board) was more important than actually being fair. Greenberg (1990a) further found that, when adequate explanation was given for a negative outcome (e.g., pay reduction), negative citizenship behaviors (e.g., theft and voluntarily leaving a position) were reduced. Barling and Phillips (1993) studied the impact on organizational outcomes of distributive, procedural, and interactional justices. Their results showed that interactional justice influenced withdrawal behaviors, trust in management, and organizational commitment. Procedural justice influenced only trust in management, and distributive justice influenced none of them. The distinct construct of interactional justice is warranted when one considers that interactional justice refers to one’s concern for the quality of
interpersonal treatment received during the execution of organizational procedures. Put another way, interactional justice refers to the exchange between employees and their supervisor, where procedural justice refers to the exchange between employees and their organization. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) conducted a meta-analytic review of 183 organizational justice studies and determined that, although there is by no means a consensus, there is a sizable body of empirical evidence supporting the distinction between procedural and interactional justices. This is based on the research that suggests the two constructs have different correlates. Furthermore, Colquitt et al. (2001) found that procedural justice affected perceptions of organizational support, whereas interactional justice affected perceptions of leader-member exchange.

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**

With all the information regarding leadership in the literature today, why is it so difficult to define it? Perhaps, the difficulty lies in the fact that leadership is such a broad over-reaching taxonomy. Organizations, groups, dyads, leaders, followers, and relationships are all different leadership domains. Each domain defines leadership differently. Leader-member exchange theory focuses on the relationship domain of leadership. The majority of early leadership theories assumed that an investigator could gather data from employees within a group regarding their supervisor. The investigator could then analyze the data to determine an average response. The average responses were used to determine the average leadership style (ALS) of the supervisor (Allinson, Armstrong, & Hayes, 2001; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Early leadership theorist focused their research on the individual differences of supervisors. Within this traditional view,
all group members were treated fairly and equally. The focus of the ALS model was clearly the group as a whole, therefore, any work-related problems that may develop between the supervisor and subordinate must be caused by the subordinate. However, Dansereau (1995) observed that there are some employees who developed strong work relationships with the supervisor, while other employees did not. Dansereau further observed that, contrary to the theories of the day, a supervisor may actually discriminate among his or her direct reports. According to Dansereau (1995), not all group members were treated equally and the discrimination against a subordinate was not necessarily the fault of the subordinate. He understood that this discrimination, in the form of leader bias, was a determining factor as employees were being further classified as in-group or out-group members. This gave rise to the notion that the supervisor grouped employees independently and the relationships within groups were strictly dyadic. This independent relationship approach was called the Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) model (Liden & Graen, 1980). Due to time constraints and workload, many supervisors are not able to do all the work for which they are responsible. As such, each supervisor must delegate roles and responsibilities to his or her direct reports. The delegation of roles and responsibilities takes place within the VDL model. The VDL model posited that a supervisor creates comparisons among his or her employees and develops leadership relationships with a few key subordinate (in-group) members and formal, professional relationships with other subordinates (out-group). In-group members receive more flexibility, greater professional freedom, better job assignments, more opportunities to work with the leader, greater support, more influence during the decision-making
process, greater visibility, higher performance evaluations, and lower turnover. In-group members also enjoy greater trust, higher job satisfaction, greater congruency between present and desired work roles, greater opportunities for career development, and promotion (Ashkanasy & O’Connor, 1997; Boyd & Taylor; 1998; Dienesch & Liden; 1986; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden & Graen, 1980; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1991; Rosse & Kraut, 1983; Wayne & Liden, 1994). Supervisors also reported spending more time managing and performing liaison-type duties. Organizations with high level LMXs develop an inclusive culture and offer a variety of opportunities to its members. Conversely, organizations with low level LMXs develop a culture of difference and offer few such opportunities (Fairhurst, 2001).

Reciprocity is an important component of the exchange relationship of LMX. Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2003) found that the importance of equivalence and immediacy were negatively related to high LMX relationships. In other words, in high LMX relationships immediacy and equivalency were low, and concern for mutual interests was high. High LMX relationships also yielded higher levels of perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship-type behaviors. Conversely, employees in low LMX relationships proved less likely to participate in organizational citizenship-type behaviors such as altruism. These same employees perceive lower levels of organizational support and score lower on performance evaluations (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick; 2002). High LMX members are thought to reciprocate by providing increased time and energy, a greater willingness to contribute to the organization, displaying loyalty to the supervisor and organization, accepting greater
responsibility, and being allowed to take greater risks. In general, in-group members participated in more organizational citizenship behaviors. Out-group members were reported as less likely to volunteer for special assignments, perform extra work outside of their formal job description, lesser involvement in the decision-making process, and receive lower overall performance appraisals than their in-group counterparts (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). An important point to understand is that in order to form subgroups (in-groups and out-groups) using the VDL model, there must first be a group of people reporting to the same leader so as to facilitate comparisons. This need not be the case with the current LMX model.

The VDL model classifies people as in-group or out-group members by comparing one employee to another. Dansereau (1995) developed the individual leadership approach as a purely dyadic approach where employees are not compared to each other. Rather, each employee is viewed as unique and treated independently of others by the leader. In the individual leadership approach, the supervisor could discriminate on an individual basis instead of discriminating against an entire group. The underlying principle behind the individual leadership approach is the level of support or lack of support given by the supervisor for the self-worth of each employee. The development of the individual leadership approach was an attempt to show that the supervisor/subordinate relationship exists on multiple levels and is more complex than simply herding employees into an in-group or out-group corral as in the VDL model or that all employees are treated equally as in the ALS model.
The determination regarding employees’ status as in-group or out-group members develops early in the supervisor/subordinate relationship. Liden et al., (1991) revealed that there is an initial testing period within the first two weeks of the relationship during which the supervisor evaluates the subordinate based on the roles the subordinate is willing and able to accept. The supervisor further evaluates the tasks performed by the employee. The initial interaction period can be different if the employee is new to the supervisor/subordinate dyad or a newcomer to the organization. In the case of a newcomer to the organization, the employee is actively engaged in two interrelated processes, the initial development of LMX with the supervisor and assimilation into the organization. Other determinants of LMX are the degree to which the expectations of future work-related competence of both the supervisor and subordinate exists, the perceived similarities between the two individuals, and the degree to which the two individuals like each other (Ashkanasy & O’Connor, 1997; Murphy & Ensher, 1999). As a matter of fact, the degree to which the two individuals like each other was the dominant predictor of in-group membership. The perceived similarity or liking bias can work to the detriment of the subordinate in relationships with different sex, race, or educational background. Role ambiguity was lower, trust was higher, performance ratings were higher, and effectiveness ratings were higher in same-sex LMX relationships (Murphy & Ensher, 1999; Wayne & Liden, 1994). Note that expectations, similarities, and liking are non-performance variables, which supports the notion that LMX is not only a multi-level taxonomy, but is multi-dimensional as well (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). These results were replicated at the six week period and six month period, lending support to the notion
that in-group/out-group classifications happen very early in the supervisor/subordinate relationship and remain consistent over time. It is the early classification of members that influences the quality of future superior/subordinate interactions. Furthermore, members entering the supervisor/subordinate relationship with low levels of self-efficacy would actually increase the level of self-efficacy when treated as an in-group member by the supervisor (Murphy & Ensher, 1999). Productivity levels also increase as levels of LMX improve by adding leadership training. An important point to understand is that, in the end, the classification of an employee as an in-group member or out-group member is based on the salient and non-salient attributes of the employee and is subject to systematic biases and the personal biases of the supervisor. Classification also results from perceptions of the effort put forth by the leader and employee. Maslyn and Uhl-Bien (2001) studied the impact of perceived effort on the part of both members of the dyad. They determined that high amounts of effort by both dyad partners would result in high LMX. Whereas, perceptions of high amounts of effort by one partner and not the other resulted in low LMX. This classification is important because it is quite stable. Once an employee is classified as low LMX, that employee tends to becomes less motivated to invest in any relationship development activities with the leader. This result suggests that the leader may need to initiate relationship development in an attempt to convert a low LMX member into a high LMX member. It should be noted that the decision to offer relationship development and accept the efforts of the member rests with the leader. Conversely, interactional justice determinations are based on the perceptions of the employee.
There are also contextual considerations in the LMX development process. When a supervisor has a full complement of in-group members or little organizational power, the likelihood of a new member entering the in-group is reduced. Individual classification may result more from the leader biases and the context in which the new member enters the organization than the effort of the individual (Dienesch & Liden, 1986).

Sparrowe and Liden (1997) advanced the theory of LMX by examining relationships through a social network perspective. They posited that, in the initial relationship development phase, LMX is influenced by the common contacts shared by the leader and member. When the leader and member like or dislike the common contact, higher LMX is predicted to develop. When the leader and member have opposing feelings regarding the common contact, lower LMX is predicted to develop. Furthermore, in high LMX relationships, a leader is more likely to incorporate the member into his or her social network of contacts beyond the immediate work group. The member in this situation also benefits as he or she is more likely to be perceived as possessing similar attributes to those of the leader. More opportunities may be presented to the members of the leader’s social network based upon their association with the leader.

Leader-member exchange, like interactional justice, influences employees’ participation in organizational citizenship behaviors. Both leader-member exchange and interactional justice are leadership models that focus on the dyadic relationship between the leader and supporter. They both are moderated by trust, respect, loyalty, and mutual obligations. Both taxonomies rely heavily on exchange theory (social and economic).
Many of the concepts discussed so far can be applied to both constructs; however, there are two major differences 1) perspective, and 2) measurement instruments.

It is clear from the literature that there is a reciprocal interaction within the LMX approach, but, the decision as to whether a member enjoys high LMX (in-group) benefits rests with the leader. A member may perceive that he or she is doing everything possible to satisfy the leader, but due to leader bias and/or discrimination, the member may not reach a high LMX relationship with the leader.

Employees’ perceptions of the quality of LMX affect the employees’ perceptions of organizational justice. Lee (2001) found that employees who perceived high LMX also perceived higher levels of distributive and procedural justice than employees who perceived low LMX. These findings are not surprising as one could expect that high levels of interaction, voice, trust, respect, and loyalty (high LMX) would correspond with high levels of perceived justice. Members in low LMX relationships are more likely to have higher perceptions of unfairness and are less likely to participate in cooperative communication.

**Communication Satisfaction**

Satisfaction has been defined as an affective response to expectation-type standards. Hecht (1978a, 1978b, 1978c) suggested that communication satisfaction, as an outcome variable, could be used to assess communication behaviors. The investigation of communication satisfaction as an outcome can assist people in understanding the expectations and emotional responses to communication that is both sent and received. The investigation of communication satisfaction can be directly applied to the
development of, and improvement to, the quality of communication skills. In an organizational setting, communication satisfaction refers to an individual’s satisfaction with the communication in interpersonal, group, and organizational contexts (Mueller & Lee, 2002). Downs and Hazen (1977) determined that communication satisfaction is a multidimensional construct. In fact, there are seven key dimensions: 1) Communication climate, this dimension reflect how communication is perceived within the organization. Does the communication stimulate and motivate the employee? Are the attitudes toward communication generally healthy? Communication climate reflects the extent to which the supervisor understands the problems facing the employee and whether the employee understands how he or she is being evaluated; 2) Satisfaction with superiors, this dimension is bidirectional and reflects the extent to which the supervisor actually listens to the employee’s concerns, pays attention to the employee so as not to seem preoccupied or distracted, and offers job-related problem solving suggestions; 3) Satisfaction with organizational integration, this dimension reflects the human relations-type communication. This includes communication regarding organizational policies and procedures, personnel news, and job descriptions; 4) Satisfaction with media quality, this dimension reflects the appropriate amount of communication that exists within the organization. This includes whether organizational publications are helpful, meetings are well planned, and if directives are clearly written; 5) Satisfaction with horizontal informal communication, this dimension reflects the use of the “grapevine” as a communication tool. The focus of this dimension is on the extent to which the horizontal communication and the informal communication are free-flowing and accurate; 6) Satisfaction with
general organizational perspectives, this dimension reflects the information related to the overall function of the organization. The focus of this dimension is on the extent to which organizational goals, financial information, and other external forces acting on the organization are communicated; 7) Satisfaction with communication with subordinates, this dimension, as with satisfaction with superior, is bidirectional. Items reflected in this dimension are the extent to which subordinates are receptive to downward communication, the extent to which the subordinate feels responsible for supplying information to the supervisor, and the amount of information supplied to the supervisor; and 8) Personal feedback, this dimension is concerned with the information an individual needs to know regarding how he or she is to be judged and how his or her performance will be appraised.

The Downs and Hazen (1977) study is important because it strengthens the argument that communication satisfaction is multidimensional. Furthermore, two of the dimensions focus on the information communicated, while five of the dimensions focus on the relationships between the communicators. Communication climate accounted for the greatest variance of all seven dimensions. This may suggest that people think more about the climate when answering general organizational communication questions. Another key finding was that the three dimensions that correlated the highest with communication satisfaction were communication climate, personal feedback, and relationship with supervisor. These three dimensions correspond directly to the outcomes resulting from interpersonal interactions and, therefore, have the greatest effect on an employee’s perceptions of interactional justice.
Communication satisfaction, as reported by Mueller and Lee (2002), is affected by numerous variables such as communication style, communication traits (e.g., argumentativeness, and verbal aggressiveness) (Anderson & Martin, 1999), perceived quality of communication and understanding (Downs, 1990), communication motive, openness, communication norms, frequency, formality, biological sex (Lamude, Daniels, & Graham, 1988), high/low LMX, interpersonal perceptions of safety, and uncertainty. The interactional patterns between supervisor and subordinate in high LMX situations are similar to those with high levels of perceived interactional justice. Both are considered to have open, bidirectional communication exchanges consisting of high levels of trust, respect, professionalism, and support. Individuals in these situations are likely to experience high levels of communication satisfaction. Conversely, the interactional patterns between supervisor and subordinate in low LMX situations are similar to those with low levels of perceived interactional justice. These situations are defined by closed communication systems that are formal, lacking trust, and limited to task details. Individuals in these situations are likely to experience low communication satisfaction.

Mueller and Lee (2002) supported the conclusion that employees in high LMX relationships report the highest amounts of satisfaction with personal feedback and supervisor communication. The same study also supported the conclusion that employees in high LMX relationships reported high co-worker communication, organizational integration, corporate communication, and corporate climate. Perhaps the most interesting result, however, as it relates to this study, is that the quality of LMX affected communication satisfaction most with regard to interpersonal relationships followed by
group and organizational relationships. Lee (2001) was successful in supporting the
notion that levels of LMX correlate positively with levels of perceived distributive and
procedural justice. This same study also supported the notion that levels of LMX
positively correlate to reported levels of cooperative communication. The results show
that employees’ level of satisfaction is linked to the communication with their supervisor.
Clearly, it is one’s preference to interact with a supervisor who tries to understand their
point of view and has well-developed communication skills.

It should be the goal of every supervisor to develop a high-performing
organization. Such an organization can only exist when the members of the organization
perform activities that go beyond the in-role responsibilities outlined in their job
description. Organ (1988) defined the extra-role behaviors of altruism, conscientiousness,
sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

This research draws from four interrelated constructs: organizational citizenship
behavior, organizational justice, leader-member exchange, and communication
satisfaction. These four constructs are related in that an employee’s perceived level of
justice is affected by the supervisor/subordinate relationship. One input that is critical to
the success of an organizational is the supervisor/subordinate relationship. One output of
this relationship is the level of organizational citizenship behavior exhibited by the
employee.

It has been shown in this brief literature review that perceptions of organizational
justice (e.g., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice), high leader-
member exchange relationships, and high communication satisfaction are positively
related to performing citizenship-type behaviors. The literature shows the positive
correlation between communication satisfaction and leader-member exchange, which
suggests a likelihood of performing OCB. Unfortunately, the leader-member exchange
literature makes it very clear that the final decision as to whether employees are members
of the high LMX group rests with the supervisor. It is by virtue of belonging to the high
LMX group that employees might characterize their relationship with their supervisor as
being interactionally just. The literature does not bring forth any empirical data
confirming a positive correlation between communication satisfaction and perceptions of
interactional fairness.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Case Study Research

The debate over the value of case study methodology has existed since the early 1930s. Case study research is defined as a detailed empirical study of a specific situation or situations. Case study methods include qualitative, quantitative, or a combination of both forms of data analysis. At the heart of the case study debate is its generalizability. Proponents argue that generalizability should be applied to theory rather than population and through replication rather than sampling. Case study research does not rely on creating an environment in which to conduct a study. There is no artificially developed situation. Case study research examines an existing, real-life situation in a context that exists naturally. Influencing factors are not created, but exist within the context of the personal, professional, and historical experiences of the sample studied. Case study research is a very practical approach to the study of a particular situation to challenge theory, replicate results, or challenge generalizations based on populations. With this type of research, it is the responsibility of the researcher to provide sufficient contextual information to illustrate the case and identify the unique features involved (Zikmund, 1991). When sufficient contextual information is given, the reader can determine generalizability. Researcher bias and subjectivity are sometimes questioned when case studies are used. Subjectivity is a concern with both qualitative and quantitative research methods (David, 2007; Foster, Gomm, & Hammersley, 2000; Kyburz-Graber, 2004;
Ruddin, 2006; Smith, 1990). This research involved the examination of a single case (Ohio University) with data collected and analyzed quantitatively.

**The Case**

During the 2003-2004 calendar year, Ohio University conducted a search for a new president. In 2004, that new president was hired and the administrators occupying upper leadership positions began to change. Within a year, the local newspapers were reporting the upper administration had eliminated 17 administrative or staff positions, threatened more layoffs, and postponed raises for faculty and staff to offset a $12 million budget shortfall (Claussen, 2005). On January 12, 2006, the *Athens News* printed an article stating that Ohio University was projecting a $9.3 million deficit for years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. University officials attributed the deficit to rising costs and falling revenues and would not rule out hiring freezes or layoffs (Claussen 2006a). Four days later the *Athens News* reported the University planned to cut $18.6 million from its budget in 2006-2007. The president of Ohio University, Dr. Roderick McDavis, explained that the planned cuts were larger than necessary, but would eliminate the risk of further cuts in the future. The larger than necessary cuts would solve the budget deficit and also fund a new strategic plan titled Vision Ohio. Another cost-saving measure discussed was an early-retirement program to reduce personnel (Claussen, 2006b).

Articles such as these became routine over the next 18 months. In a September 17, 2007 article, a letter from a group of Ohio University faculty to the Board of Trustees was printed (“Letter,” 2007). The title of the article was “Letter: OU lets health and safety slide while catering to overpaid administration.” Chris McCauley, author of the
letter wrote “Many of us are still loyal and feel sorrow about the administration’s incompetence, but now we also feel anger and disgust, especially about the inept handling of the budget, and resulting layoffs and elimination of 32 jobs to reduce a projected $2 million deficit.” It appeared that the $18.6 million cuts of 2006-2007 were not the last of the cuts as President McDavis had stated. During the same time period, the University’s student newspaper, The Post, was also reporting budget cuts, hiring freezes, layoffs, buy-outs, and the elimination of athletic programs (Rouan, 2006; Rouan, 2007; Coleman, 2007).

Beginning with the uncertainty of a new university administration, followed by three years of reporting financial difficulties, speculation regarding lay-offs, budget cuts, realignments, and program elimination created an environment in which change was an everyday occurrence. An environment existed in which employees were concerned for their jobs. An environment in which employees believed if they voiced an opinion opposite the views of the upper administration, they would be targeted for dismissal. This type of environment could be detrimental to organizational productivity and make it simply an unpleasant place to work.

Just as some employees embrace change as an opportunity to develop new skills, new relationships, and acquire new responsibilities, other employees react negatively to change. Certainly, the direction set forth by a new president and upper administration led to a number of changes throughout the organization. As discussed in chapters one and two, a key dynamic is the social exchange relationships that employees develop with supervisors and the organization (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). With organizational change,
these relationships can change as well. Understanding that social exchange relationships are founded on trust between the parties, when organizational change forces a relationship change, trust will need to be redeveloped. Therefore, whenever organizational change occurs, not only are there trust issues regarding the change itself, but trust issues also develop regarding the exchange relationships within the organization. An individual’s perception of justice is rooted in these exchange relationships. Exchange theory begins with individual-to-individual dyadic relationships. When an individual perceives the exchange as positive and, therefore, the perception of justice is positive, he or she is more likely to participate in behaviors that benefit the organization (Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002). Furthermore, an employee may perceive organizational change to be a threat to his or her identity, status, and even livelihood (Callan, Gallois, Mayhew, Grice, Tluchowska, & Boyce, 2007). Additionally, the more the threat from change (e.g., displacement), the greater an employee is dependent upon interactional justice (Paterson, Green, & Cary, 2002). Therefore, perceptions of communication and organizational justice, specifically, interactional justice, are critically important to the success of an organization during times of change.

Participants

The sample for this research was drawn from the pool of Administrative staff, Bargaining Classified, Non-Bargaining Classified, full and part-time staff of Ohio University (including the Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine). Ohio University faculty were not included in this sample. According to a database provided by Ohio University in May, 2007, the University employed 2,655 full and part-time
Administrative and Classified staff. Further analysis revealed a Non-Bargaining unit Classified staff and Bargaining unit staff of 1,270 (48%) employees, and an Administrative staff of 1,385 (52%).

Procedure

An electronic questionnaire was developed using a commercial, online survey generator. The location of the survey was emailed to Administrative, Non-Bargaining Classified, and Bargaining Classified Ohio University staff members on May 28, 2007 (3:22 PM). Respondent anonymity was important. This was a self-administered questionnaire; therefore, the instructions for completing the questionnaire were included in the initial email sent to the sample and again at the beginning of the online questionnaire. No Ohio University personnel whose sole responsibility was as a faculty member were included in the sample. The body of the email contained a letter of introduction (see Appendix A for all email messages), which addressed the purpose of the study, an assurance of confidentiality, a link for the online questionnaire, and instructions for completing the survey. Due to the immediacy of an email and an assumption that most recipients would respond quickly upon receiving the questionnaire, reminder emails were sent to the staff members on June 3, 2007, and June 10, 2007. An online survey offers a number of advantages: 1) instrument distribution and collection are more efficient and cost effective; 2) instrument completion and submission are more convenient; and 3) respondent data are easier to organize and download into SPSS for analysis.
Instrument

Data were collected using a 71-item questionnaire developed by combining elements of the Organizational Citizenship Intention Scale developed by Williams and Shiaw (2002), the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Downs and Hazen (1971), and a modified version of an instrument developed by Folger and Konovsky (1989), using only the items associated with interactional justice. Sixteen-items addressed organizational citizenship behaviors (1-16), 21 items addressed communication satisfaction (20-41), 12 items focused on interactional justice perceptions (45-57), and the final section contained 8 demographic items (see Appendix B for the research instrument).

Organizational Citizenship Scale

Organ (1988) noted, as did Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994), that operationalizing organizational citizenship behavior is quite elusive. The definitions of in-role and extra-role behaviors are difficult as they vary from individual to individual and are influenced by personal bias. Van Dyne et al. (1994) developed a broader operationalization of OCB to address inconsistencies in role behaviors. One advantage of the Van Dyne et al. (1994) instrument is that it allows for either supervisor evaluation of subordinate OCB or subordinate self-assessment of OCB. Supervisors were reported to have much broader definitions of in-role behaviors and lower ratings of OCB than subordinates reported. Role definition is one explanation for different ratings of OCB between supervisors and subordinates. Furthermore, Vandenberg, Lance, and Taylor (2005) found that self-raters interpreted items using a frame of reference more consistent
with theoretical foundations. Unfortunately, Van Dyne et al. (1994) did not include behaviors identified as altruistic. Vanden-berg, Lance, and Taylor (2005) developed an instrument (see appendix C for the original instrument) that included the original five-dimensions of OCB, but operationalized it as more inclusive with statements that require some degree of personal knowledge as opposed to occasional behavioral observation, thus, appropriate for self-assessment. The 24-item instrument uses a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*). Through further factor analysis, the 24-item instrument was reduced to 16 items. It is the 16-item instrument, modified to anchor the 16-items using a 7-point Likert-type scale which was used in this research.

*Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire*

The original Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Downs & Hazen, 1977) was not introduced in its entirety until 1988. The original 88-item instrument was administered to 225 employees from a variety of organizations. Factor analysis reduced the CSQ to its present 51-item, eight-dimension version. The shorter instrument was pilot tested on four organizations and reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .94 (Greenbaum, Clampitt, & Willihnganz, 1988).

The original CSQ employed a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *very satisfied*, 7 = *very dissatisfied*); however, the CSQ was modified to employ an 11-point scale (0 = *no satisfaction*, 5 = *average satisfaction*, 10 = *maximum satisfaction*) in 1988. For consistency purposes this research adopted the modified original 7-point scale version (see Appendix D for the original instrument).
The eight-dimensions of communication satisfaction are: 1) Communication climate, which reflects how communication is perceived within the organization. Does the communication stimulate and motivate the employee? Are the attitudes toward communication generally healthy? Communication climate reflects the extent to which the supervisor understands the problems facing the employee and whether the employee understands how he or she is being evaluated. 2) Satisfaction with superiors, which is bidirectional and reflects the extent to which the supervisor actually listens to the employee’s concerns, pays attention to the employee so as not to seem preoccupied or distracted, and offers job-related problem solving suggestions. 3) Satisfaction with organizational integration, which reflects the human relations-type communication. This includes communication regarding organizational policies and procedures, personnel-type news, and job descriptions. 4) Satisfaction with media, which reflects the appropriate amount of communication that exists within the organization, including whether organizational publications are helpful, meetings are well planned, and directives are clearly written. 5) Satisfaction with horizontal informal communication, which reflects the use of the “grapevine” as a communication tool. The focus of this dimension is on the extent to which the horizontal communication and the informal communication are free-flowing and accurate. 6) Satisfaction with general organizational perspectives, which reflects the information related to the overall function of the organization. The focus of this dimension is on the extent to which organizational goals, financial information, and other external forces acting on the organization are communicated. 7) Satisfaction with communication with subordinates, as with satisfaction with superior, is bidirectional.
Items include the extent to which subordinates are receptive to downward communication, the extent to which the subordinate feels responsible for supplying information to the supervisor, and the amount of information supplied to the supervisor. And, 8) Personal feedback, which is concerned with the information an individual needs to know regarding how he or she is to be judged and how their performance will be appraised.

In developing the research instrument for this study, it became clear that redundancies occurred. In order to eliminate duplication, reduce instrument length, and remove dimensional contamination, a number of items were deleted from the original instrument (Appendix E)

**Interactional Justice**

Justice, as reviewed in the literature, has three dimensions: distributive, procedural, and interactional. The focus of distributive justice is on equity. In the case of procedural justice, the focus is on process control, decision control, consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. Interactional justice, however, focuses on respect, propriety of input, justification, and truthfulness.

Folger and Konovsky’s (1989) procedural/interactional justice instrument was the foundation for the interactional justice section used in this research (see Appendix F for original instrument). The original, 26-item instrument was factor-analyzed to reduce it to four factors: feedback, planning, recourse, and observation. The original instrument was modified to remove dimensional contamination (i.e., measuring procedural justice perceptions within an interactional justice instrument) and to reduce the length of the
instrument (see Appendix G for deleted items). The multi-item scale reliability measured .86 (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Data were collected using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 7 = always).

Analysis of the Research Questions

The first three research questions seek to establish baseline levels for organizational citizenship behavior, communication satisfaction, and interactional justice.

RQ1: Do Ohio University staff members participate in organizational citizenship behaviors?

RQ2: Are Ohio University staff members satisfied with the communication practices of the organization?

RQ3: What are Ohio University staff members’ perceptions of the interactional justice they experience?

The link between interactional justice and communication satisfaction has been clearly identified (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Holbrook, 1999; Lippinen, Oikkonen, & Myyry, 2004). Therefore, research question four examines the relationships among interactional justice, communication satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (outcomes).

RQ4: Are levels of perceived interactional justice and levels of communication satisfaction predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors?

RQ1 addresses the overall level of organizational citizenship behavior participated in by the staff and is an average of the sum of questions 1-16. RQ2 addresses the overall level of communication satisfaction of the staff and is an average of the sum
of questions 20-41. RQ3 addresses the overall perception of interactional justice held by the staff and is an average of the sum of questions 45-57. Descriptive statistics were also employed for RQ1-RQ3. As RQ4 examines the relationships between communication satisfaction, interactional justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior respectively, multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the strength and direction of the relationships.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Measured by questions</th>
<th>Analyzed using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>20-41</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>45-57</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ4</td>
<td>1-16, 45-57</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the data collected using the methodology described in chapter three. The data analysis is organized by response rate and demographics, descriptive analysis addressing each research question, and the research results.

Response Rate and Reliability

An electronic questionnaire was created as described in chapter three (see Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire). An introductory email described the study (see Appendix A) and contained a hotlink to the electronic questionnaire generated using SurveyMonkey, a commercial web-based survey generation tool.

Prior to the introductory email, a notification email was sent to potential participants informing them that a link to an electronic questionnaire was forthcoming and issued an invitation to complete it. Approximately five minutes later, another email was sent to potential participants introducing the study, the purpose of the study, completion instructions, statement of anonymity, and the link to the questionnaire. Two follow-up reminder emails were sent at one-week intervals. A total of 2,655 Ohio University employees received each email message. There were 1,385 (52%) Administrative staff and 1,270 (48%) Classified staff (Non-Bargaining Unit and Bargaining Unit combined) who received emails. The database supplied by Ohio University differentiated between Administrative staff and Classified staff, but did not
further differentiate between Bargaining Unit Classified staff and Non-Bargaining Unit Classified staff. The respondents were categorized by the demographic section of their responses. There were 549 questionnaires completed for an overall response rate of 21%. A total of 324 (59%) Administrative staff and 118 (21.5%) Non-Bargaining Classified (NBC), and 28 (5.1%) Bargaining Classified (BC) staff participated. There were 79 (14.4%) participants who did not identify their current position (see Table 2).

Table 2
Response Rates by Current Position Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Administrator</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bargaining Classified</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Classified</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability was checked for each construct. The reliability value using Cronbach’s Alpha for the Organizational Citizenship Behavior section of the instrument (questions 1-18) was .86. The original study conducted by Vandenberg et al. (2005) did not report instrument reliability; however, a review of literature revealed reliability values ranging from .68 to .97 (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman & Harland, 2001; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Williams & Shiaw, 1999).

The reliability value for the Communication Satisfaction section (questions 20-43) of the current instrument was .92. The original Downs and Hazen (1997) instrument, from which the current instrument was adapted, reported a reliability of .94. A brief
review of literature revealed instrument reliability values ranging from .84 to .97 (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Downs, 1990; Greenbaum, Clampitt, & Willihnganz, 1988).

The reliability value for the Procedural Justice section (questions 45-51) of the current instrument was .68. The original Folger and Konovsky (1989) instrument, from which the current instrument was adapted was .67.

The reliability value for the Interactional Justice section (questions 52-63) of the current instrument was .96. The original Folger and Konovsky (1989) instrument, from which the current instrument was adapted, reported a reliability of .86. As with the organizational citizenship behavior and communication satisfaction constructs mentioned earlier, a brief literature review revealed interactional justice reliabilities ranging from .82 to .97 (Bies, Shapiro & Cummings, 1988; Fuller & Hester, 2001; Janssen, 2000; Leung, Tong & Sui-Ying Ho, 2004; Paterson & Cary, 2002).

Descriptive statistics were analyzed for research questions 1-3. Results for each construct are represented in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics by Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5554</td>
<td>.75671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommSat</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>4.1882</td>
<td>.98610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.5668</td>
<td>.73130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0876</td>
<td>1.42009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0876</td>
<td>1.42009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question One

Do Ohio University staff members participate in organizational citizenship behaviors?

Overall Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was the average of the sum of scores for questions 1-16 with a test reliability of .87. The level of participation in organizational citizenship behaviors by Ohio University administrative staff was a mean of 5.55 based on a seven-point, Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Indifferent, 5 = Somewhat agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree). Overall, the respondents “Somewhat agree” (m=5.55, sd=.76) that they participate in citizenship-type behaviors. The data were banded, based on the distribution of responses, in order to perform Chi-square tests (see Table 4).

Table 4

OCB Data Banding for Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Value</th>
<th>Banded Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=3.9</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=5.0</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ1 was analyzed using the variables sex, current position, and length of time in current position. Results indicated that 81.4% of respondents “Agree” that they participate in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, 16.5% were reported as “Indifferent,” and 2.1% as “Disagree” (see Table 5). Further analysis revealed that 66.8%
of respondents who “Agree” were female and 33.2% were male. Sex was statistically significant ($x^2=1.36, df=2, N=473, p<.05, \text{Cramer’s } V=.05$).

Table 5

OCB (Banded) Participation by Sex Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Sex:</th>
<th>% within NewOCB (Banded)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within NewOCB (Banded)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within NewOCB (Banded)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of OCB by Current Position revealed that 84.8% of Administrative staff respondents, 72.4% of Non-Bargaining Classified (NBC) staff, and 78.6% of Bargaining Classified (BC) staff “Agree” to have participated in OCB. The percentage of “Agree” responses was much higher than the percentages of “Indifferent” or “Disagree” responses reported for all Current Positions (see Table 6). Current Position was not statistically significant ($x^2=9.25, df=4, N=467, p<.05, \text{Cramer’s } V=.10$).
Table 6

OCB (Banded) by Current Position Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position:</th>
<th>New OCB (Banded)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bargaining Classified Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Classified Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of OCB by Length of Time in Current Position revealed that the period reporting the highest percentage of “Agree” responses was the “1-4 year” period (86.7%). The period reporting the lowest percentage of “Frequent” responses was the “9-12 year” period (77.6%) (see Figure 1). Length of Time in Current Position was not statistically significant ($x^2=8.59, df=12, N=474, p<.05, Cramer’s V=.09$).
Table 7

OCB (Banded) by Length of Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in current position</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Length of time in current position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Respondent OCB by Length of Time in Current Position. Respondent percentages that “Agree” to have participated in OCB remain between 75%-87% over time. Respondent percentages that were “Indifferent” or “Disagree” were much lower, yet remained consistent over time.

Research Question Two

Are Ohio University staff members satisfied with the communication practices of the organization?

Communication satisfaction was determined by the average sum of scores for questions 20-41 with a test reliability of .92. The mean score for level of communication satisfaction was 4.19 based on a seven-point, Likert-type scale (1 = Very dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied, 4 = Indifferent, 5 = Somewhat satisfied, 6 =
Satisfied, 7 = Very Satisfied). Overall, respondents were “Indifferent” to the communication practices of the organization (m=4.19, sd=.99). The data were banded prior to performing Chi-Square tests (see Table 8).

Table 8

CommSat Data Banding for Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Value</th>
<th>Banded Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=3.9</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=5.0</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 was analyzed using the variables sex, current position, and length of time in current position. Overall, respondents indicated that they are “Indifferent” (m=4.19, sd=.99) regarding the communication practices of the organization. Results indicated that of the 476 responses to this section, 314 (66%) were female, 162 (34%) were male. There were 116 (24.4%) “Satisfied” responses, 191 (40.1%) “Indifferent” responses, and 169 (35.5%) “Dissatisfied” responses (see Table 9). Of the 314 female responses, 83 (26.4%) were “Satisfied,” 126 (40.1%) were “Indifferent,” and 105 (33.4%) were “Dissatisfied.” Of the 162 male responses, 33 (20.3%) were “Satisfied,” 65 (40.1%) were “Indifferent,” and 64 (39.5%) were “Dissatisfied.” Sex was statistically significant (x²=2.720, df=2, N=476, p<.05, Cramer’s V=.076).
Table 9

CommSat (Banded) by Sex Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex: Female</th>
<th>Sex: Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewCommSat (Banded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of CommSat by Current Position (see Table 10) revealed there were 324 Administrator responses, 79 (24.4%) were “Satisfied,” 142 (43.8%) were “Indifferent,” and 103 (31.8%) were “Dissatisfied.” Of the 118 Non-Bargaining Classified responses, 28 (23.7%) were “Satisfied,” 35 (29.7%) were “Indifferent,” and 55 (46.6%) were “Dissatisfied.” There were 28 Bargaining Classified responses, 4 (14.4%) were “Satisfied,” 14 (50.0%) were “Indifferent,” and 10 (35.7%) were “Dissatisfied” with the communication practices of the organization (see Figure 2). Overall, 111 (23.6%) of respondents were “Satisfied,” 191 (40.6%) were “Indifferent,” and 168 (35.7%) were “Dissatisfied.” Current Position was not statistically significant ($x^2=11.342$, df=4, N=470, p<.05, Cramer’s V=.110).
Table 10

CommSat (Banded) by Current Position Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position:</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Non-Bargaining Classified</th>
<th>Bargaining Classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>103 142 79</td>
<td>31.8% 43.8% 24.4%</td>
<td>55 35 28</td>
<td>46.6% 29.7% 23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>10 14 4</td>
<td>35.7% 50.0% 14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168 191 111</td>
<td>35.7% 40.6% 23.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Results of CommSat by Current Position

Results of Figure 2 show a higher percentage of “Dissatisfied” responses than “Satisfied” responses for Administrator, Non-Bargaining Classified (NBC), and
Bargaining Classified (BC) positions. Only NBC percentages decreases for each category.

Analysis of CommSat by Length of Time in Current Position (see Table 11) revealed that the percentage of “Satisfied” responses peaked (35.0%) during the “Less than 1 year” period and declined through the “9-12 year” period, then increased over time. The percentage of “Dissatisfied” responses increased until the “5-8 year” period, leveled off, then decreased during the “16-19 year” period (see Figure 3). Length of Time in Current Position was not statistically significant ($x^2=27.141$, df=12, N=477, p<.05, Cramer’s V=.169).

Table 11

CommSat (Banded) by Length of Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in current position:</th>
<th>Count (Dissatisfied)</th>
<th>Count (Indifferent)</th>
<th>Count (Satisfied)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage of “Satisfied” responses decreases from the initial <1 year point to a leveling off between the “5-8 year” and “16-19 year” periods. The percentage of “Dissatisfied” responses rose dramatically from the initial “<1 year” point before leveling off at the 5-8 year mark.

**Research Question Three**

*What are Ohio University staff member perceptions of the interactional justice they experience?*

The Ohio University staff member perceptions of interactional justice were determined by the average sum of the scores for questions 51-63 with a test reliability of .96. The staff perceptions of interactional justice had a mean of 5.09 (sd=.99) based on a
seven-point, Likert-type scale (1 = never, 2 = almost never, 3 = rarely, 4 = indifferent, 5 = sometimes, 6 = almost always, 7 = always). This indicates that the interactions between the supervisor and respondent were perceived as “fair” “Sometimes.” The original Folger and Konovsky (1989) study produced a mean score of 5.34 (sd=1.35). The data were banded prior to performing the Chi-Square test (see Table 12).

Table 12

Interactional Justice Banding for Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Value</th>
<th>Banded Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 3.9</td>
<td>Unjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5.0</td>
<td>Just</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ3 was analyzed using the variables sex, current position, and length of time in current position. Overall, 303 (64.1%) responses were “Just.” There were 311 female respondents, 202 (65%) were “Just,” 50 (16.1%) were “Indifferent,” and 59 (19%) were “Unjust.” There were 162 male responses, 101 (62.3%) were “Just,” 20 (12.3%) were “Indifferent,” and 41 (25.3%) were “Unjust” (see Table 13). It appears that a higher percentage of females perceived their interactions with supervisors to be “Just.” Whereas, a higher percentage of male responses perceived their interactions with supervisors to be “Unjust.” Sex was statistically significant (p<.05, x²=3.139, df=2, N=473, Cramer’s V=.081).
Table 13

Interactional Justice (Banded) by Sex Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NewInteractional (Banded)</th>
<th>Unjust</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Just</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex:</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Interactional Justice by Current Position revealed that there were 211 (65.7%) Administrator “Just” responses, 52 (16.2%) were “Indifferent,” and 58 (18.1%) were “Unjust.” Of the 118 Non-Bargaining Classified responses, 68 (57.6%) were “Just,” 16 (13.6%) were “Indifferent,” and 34 (28.8%) were “Unjust.” There were 28 Bargaining Classified responses, 18 (64.3%) were “Just,” 4 (14.3%) were “Indifferent,” and 6 (21.4%) were “Unjust” (see Table 14). The perceptions of interactional justice across current position appear relatively close. Current Position was not statistically significant ($x^2=6.058$, df=4, N=467, p<.05, Cramer’s V=.081)

Table 14

Interactional Justice (Banded) by Current Position Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position:</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Non-Bargaining Classified</th>
<th>Bargaining Classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewInteractional (Banded)</td>
<td>Unjust</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bargaining Classified</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Classified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current position:</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Interactional Justice by Length of Time in Current Position revealed that of the 60 responses from the “Less than 1 year” Length in Current Position category, 51 (85%) were “Just.” The lowest percentage of “Just” responses (55.3%) occurred during the “5-8 year” period (see Table 15) Respondents reported a drop in “Just” perceptions from “Less than 1 year” through the “5-8 year” period before leveling off. There was an increase in “Unjust” perceptions during the same time period (see Figure 4). Length of Time in Current Position was not statistically significant (p<.05, x²=19.174, df=12, N=474, Cramer’s V=.142).

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in current position:</th>
<th>NewInteractional (Banded)</th>
<th>Unjust</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Just</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Length of time in current position:</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Respondent Interactional Justice over Length of Time in Current Position. “Just” responses drop after the “<1 year” period and offer little movement from that point forward. Both percentages of “Indifferent” and “Unjust” responses are low during the “<1 year” period, increase, then show little movement over time.

Research Question Four

Are levels of perceived interactional justice and levels of communication satisfaction predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors?

Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the predictability of perceptions of Interactional Justice and Communication Satisfaction (inputs) on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (outputs) using unbanded data. The full regression model (containing Interactional Justice and Communication Satisfaction) results indicated there
was a positive correlation between the level of perceived Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. There is also a positive correlation between Communication Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, which was stronger than the Interactional Justice/OCB relationship (see Table 16). Perceived levels of Interactional Justice and Communication Satisfaction explained a statistically significant proportion of variance in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors ($R^2=.041$, $F(1,472)=10.056$, $p<.001$). Although Interactional Justice predicted Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Communication Satisfaction was the significant predictor of OCB (see Table 17).

Table 16

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>CommSat</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommSat</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommSat</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommSat</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Interactional Justice/Communication Satisfaction Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommSat</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>2.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were two cases that could have been considered OCB outliers (see Table 18 and Figure 5). The two cases were not potential outliers for any of the other constructs. Upon analysis, the cases were considered non-influential data points (Mahalanobis Distance=17.42, Cook’s Distance=.135).

Table 18

Assumptions Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>-6.020</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>5.8630</td>
<td>-4.55048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>-4.964</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5.3143</td>
<td>-3.75180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. OCB Histogram Showing Normality Potential Outliers.

The potential outliers had a minimal affect on the normal distribution of the data. The data points were not considered influential.
Additional Data Analysis

A regression analysis was run with Interactional Justice and Procedural Justice to determine the strength of the correlation and predictability of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Results showed that the Interactional Justice correlation with OCB was stronger than the Procedural Justice correlation (see Table 19). In the absence of Communication Satisfaction, Interactional Justice was the significant predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (see Table 20).

Table 19

Interactional Justice/Procedural Justice Correlation with OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Interactional</th>
<th>Procedural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

Interactional Justice/Procedural Justice Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.991</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>22.259</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>2.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion of the Constructs

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

This research placed the constructs of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Communication Satisfaction, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice within a clearly defined context, through the case study method. A basic tenet of this research was that an organization’s greatest resources are its human resources. The performance of virtually any organization is only as good as the performance of each member. It is common to hear employees say “I get paid $x.xx per hour,” when referring to why they work for an organization. This study is consistent with the seminal social exchange work done by Homans (1961), and advanced by Blau (1964) and Janssen (2000), who determined that there are other factors that motivate employees. Homans identified interactions in the workplace which are distinct and separate from employees’ in-role behaviors. Janssen (2000) posited that employees would prefer to define their relationship with the employer as social exchanges rather than the economic exchange (pay for services).

The social exchange relationships are important antecedents of citizenship-type behaviors. When employees perceive the exchange as negative, they are less likely to participate in behaviors that benefit the organization (Moorman & Harland, 2002; Williams, Pitre & Zainuba, 2002). Applying social exchange theory to this research would suggest that employees would be less likely to participate in organizational citizenship behaviors, including responding to this research, when they believe their
responses will not lead to positive change or their responses are irrelevant. Furthermore, employees will be less likely to participate when they lack sufficient trust in the organization necessary to believe that their responses will not somehow be used in retaliation (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

The key element in effective social exchange relationships is trust. When employees willingly invest their education, training, skills, experience, and intelligence, they do so with an understanding that those investments will be valued, and one day, rewarded (Tata, 2000). The timeframe for the exchange of reward for investment is not defined. Trusting that the employer will reward the behavior in the relatively near future is critical.

Outcomes (receipts) are rewards based on employees’ investments. The outcomes must have a perceived value and be relevant to the recipients. This point cannot be over-emphasized. In order for an exchange to be considered a reward, it must be valued as such by the recipients (Tata, 2000). When a supervisor offers something to a subordinate that is not perceived as valuable, its meaning is not only lost, but might be considered an insult. Perhaps the best way to avoid a negative response to a supervisor’s reward is through clear, open communication between the parties.

Positive rewards may be intrinsic satisfaction, pleasing the supervisor, high-profile assignments, exposure, high status, high levels of trust, and increased pay. Outcomes may also be perceived by employees as negative. These may be poor work conditions, job uncertainty (threat of layoff or transfer), monotony, job stagnation,
obscure assignments, lack of supervisor support, lack of recognition, and low levels of trust in the supervisor or organization.

When employees believe an injustice exists due to an inequity of inputs to outcomes, they will work to balance that ratio. The feeling of injustice is in response to a discrepancy between what is perceived to be, and what is perceived should be. Inequities are weighted and the level of tension experienced by employees is proportional to the magnitude of the inequity. The resulting tension motivates employees to improve the situation.

Consequences of inequities are varied. Employees may increase or decrease their input to bring the equity equation into balance. Employees may attempt to alter the outcome by requesting a pay increase or asking to be considered for higher profile assignments. Employees may alter the importance of the input or outcome to increase or decrease their investment. Furthermore, an employee may become angry or resentful, resulting in such behaviors as absenteeism or dissent. Elovaino, Kivimäki, and Vahtera (2002) found that absenteeism was 1.2-1.9 times higher, and poor health and minor psychological disorders were 1.7-2.4 times higher when low levels of perceived justice exist. In other words, low levels of perceived justice are detrimental to an employees’ health. Finally, when the motivation is great enough and no other strategy is effective, employees may choose to leave the organization (skarlicki, & Folger, 1997; VanYperen, Hagedoorn, & Zweers, 2000).

Given the current environment outlined in this case study, with prolonged periods of layoffs, threats of layoffs, budget reductions, and disagreements regarding the
reallocation of resources, one could easily understand how employees might feel pressure to do more work. Employees might feel an internal pressure to produce more work in an attempt to show management how valuable they are. Employees might also feel external pressure from their supervisor to be more productive so as to compensate for losses due to workforce reduction. Such anxiety can be linked to psychological distress and burnout. Other negative employee outcomes could be higher levels of absenteeism, lower levels of morale, trust, motivation, loyalty, and productivity (Paterson & Cary, 2002).

Furthermore, when these work conditions are examined through the lens of exchange theory, one could expect that as employees are asked to increase their investments (time, effort, experience, and skills), with no apparent increase in rewards, employees would seek to regain a balance, thus, decreasing their level of investment. At some point the employees are driven more and more toward an economic exchange situation. Given these conditions, one could expect citizenship behavior to drop.

The current research indicates that 81.4% of Ohio University Administrative, Non-Bargaining Classified, and Bargaining Classified staff responding to the questionnaire “Somewhat agree” that they participate in organizational citizenship behaviors. Spitzmüller, Glenn, Sutton, Barr, and Rogelberg (2007) revealed that participants who completed a questionnaire were participating in citizenship-type behaviors. They argued that the act of completing an organizational questionnaire was an act of conscientiousness and civic virtue.
Communication Satisfaction

Ohio University administrators and staff were asked to respond to questions regarding their level of satisfaction with the communication practices of the organization. The results show that 76.4% of respondents were either “Dissatisfied” with, or “Indifferent” to the communication practices of the organization. Participant responses to the open-ended questions revealed a lack of trust in the accuracy of the communication and a frustration with the timeliness and relevance of the communication. The dissatisfaction was directed more at the upper administration of the organization than toward respondents’ immediate supervisor. Pincus (1986) posited that the communication practices of top management influence employees’ job satisfaction and job performance. The effect of this is clear, when employees’ perceptions of satisfaction with the communication practices of the organization are low, their job satisfaction and performance suffer. The results of the current research are similar to Pincus’. When participants were asked whether their job satisfaction had “gone up,” “stayed the “same” or “gone down” during the last six months, 46% reported that their level of job satisfaction had “gone down.” Furthermore, 15% of respondents reported that their level of job productivity had “gone down” in the last six months.

High levels of uncertainty exist when employees are unable to predict the behaviors of others or, in this case, the organization. When employees are unable to predict organizational behaviors, they expect increased levels of communication (Neuliep & Grohskopf, 2000). Responses to the open-ended questions were directed, in part, to the lack of timely and consistent communication. The employees’ perceptions contributed to
a sense of heightened uncertainty and were another indication of communication dissatisfaction.

Communication (both practice and content) is especially important during periods of organizational change. Employees may experience heightened levels of uncertainty during this time. Timely, change-appropriate communication can better equip employees to prepare for, and cope with, the changes facing them. Appropriate communication practices can also reduce the role ambiguity that is commonly associated with organizational change (Bordia, Hobman, Gallois & Callan, 2004). Extra effort should be taken during periods of transition to develop communication practices that provide employees with timely, appropriate communication through the proper communication channels.

A key research finding and possible explanation for the reported level of communication satisfaction directly relates to the apparent communication practices adopted by the Ohio University upper administration. Typical communication practices allow information to flow up and/or down through the “chain of command.” The information consists of the day-to-day task information as well as information regarding the organization’s direction. The task information is important to the employees’ jobs. The organizational direction is important to the employees’ futures. Ohio University appears to have adopted a practice of communicating the organization’s operational information directly, bypassing the “chain of command.” This practice increases uncertainty in employees when communication does not follow expected channels. This communication practice also works to undermine the supervisor. Employees look to their
supervisor for information to reduce uncertainty. The supervisors’ roles are reduced when they are not able to transmit information. In this situation, not only are the employees trying to work through role ambiguity, the supervisors are as well. This communication practice essentially compresses the organization such that the mid-level managers are no more informed, and have little more authority than the employees they are charged with supervising. This lack of information reduced the effectiveness of the supervisor (see Figure 6).

In order to completely understand the employees’ participation in organizational citizenship behavior, one must also understand the employees’ organizational environment, and the communication structure and practices used by the organization. One of the key values of the current research was that it investigated interactional justice and the supervisor/subordinate relationship within the communication context of the organization. The focus of the majority of the available literature is directed at the supervisor/subordinate dyad without regard for the effects of the organization on such relationships.
Figure 6. Simplified Ohio University Organizational Charts

The top diagram is a simplified diagram of the current Ohio University organizational structure. The solid line between positions represents the line of authority. The dashed line represents the typical communication flow (process) throughout the organization. Day-to-day task information and operational information flow through the same, expected channels. The lower diagram represents the effects of the current
communication practices of the Ohio University upper administration. In this situation, the day-to-day task information flows through the expected channel, but the operational information flows from the upper administration to the managers and staff at the same time, thus, compressing the organization.

The “grapevine” is often used to remind organizational member of the group’s values and norms. It is also used to enforce conformity within an organization. The “grapevine” may be active on either the individual or group level and is typically used to advance positive information about allies and negative information about rivals. When advancing positive information (e.g., organizational and/or individual successes), the “grapevine” may be viewed as citizenship-type behavior (Kniffin & Wilson, 2005; McAndrew, Bell, & Garcia, 2007). Extent to which the “grapevine” is active at my University (item number 34) (m=3.88, sd=1.46) would indicate that respondents did not perceive a free-flowing channel of communication. One might expect that in an organizational environment reporting low levels of communication satisfaction, the use of a “grapevine” would be more active. A possible explanation might be response bias where respondents associated “grapevine” (i.e., “rumor-mill” or “gossip”) as a negative, and, therefore, did not accurately report. Another explanation might be that employees did not want to be labeled a “gossip” for fear of losing their jobs, and therefore, refrained. A third explanation might be that the survey respondents simply did not actively participate with a “grapevine” as a communication channel.

The interactional justice literature supports the significance of interactional justice as a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. The current research found that
interactional justice was a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. The current research investigated further to reveal that in the presence of communication satisfaction, interactional justice was no longer significant. Communication satisfaction accounted for more of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors than did interactional justice. This finding is important when developing programs to improve organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Organizational Justice**

Organizational members’ performance is influenced by their perceptions of “just” or fair treatment. Organizational justice is comprised of the three fundamental constructs of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. This study paid specific attention to the interactional justice construct. The level of communication which takes place in an organization is greatest with the interactions of its employees. Specifically, interactional justice addresses the interactions of the supervisor/subordinate dyad. The primary focus of interactional justice is on the accuracy of information, and on the honesty, trustworthiness, immediacy of feedback, respect, courtesy, and professionalism in the supervisor/subordinate relationship. The basis for interactional justice is the communication that takes place within the dyad. The value of studying interactional justice is based on the argument that employees’ perceived levels of interactional justice are significantly related to employees’ willingness to participate in organizational citizenship behaviors. This research found a positive correlation between respondents’ perception of interactional justice and their level of organizational citizenship behavior.
Paterson and Cary (2002) offered further support for the importance of interactional justice during workplace transition. Interactional justice is the most important form of justice regarding change management because of the high levels of employee anxiety. It is through interactional justice that high quality change communication takes place. Employees appraise the changing environment and ask how will they be affected by the changes taking place and how real is the threat? Employees can only accurately assess the changing environment in the presence of effective communication regarding the change. Characteristics of effective change communication are helpfulness, support, timeliness of information, accuracy of information, and completeness of information, which are similar to the characteristics of high interactional justice. Peterson and Cary (2002), support the notion that effective change communication leads to high levels of perceived interactional justice, leading to higher levels of trust in management. This research identified the communication practices adopted by the Ohio University upper management as a potential contributor to the level of communication satisfaction and interactional justice perceptions reported by respondents.

Niehoff and Moorman (1993) identify four methods of gathering work performance information on an employee: observation/inspection of work; reading written reports; self-reporting; and secondary reports. Information gathered using fair procedures is critical to the performance appraisal process. Performance monitoring can effectively improve performance or work to reduce it. When work performance monitoring is communicated properly, the supervisor shows an interest in the employees,
the work being done, the accomplishments gained, and the problems being encountered. The supervisor is perceived as someone who is interested, concerned, and wants to be involved. Furthermore, the information gained by using a variety of monitoring methods can work to reduce bias, improve accuracy in evaluating performance, and reduce the likelihood of conflict during the performance appraisal process. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) study support the notion that when employees perceive there to be frequent supervisor engagement, they are more likely to perceive higher levels of organizational justice. Item 62 (Observes my performance, m=4.42, sd=1.86) showed that supervisors are not engaging with employees during work activities. This suggests that supervisors have adopted a passive information gathering role. Employees’ perceived level of interactional justice can be improved when their supervisor have positive, regular interaction with them. It is important that these interactions take place in the employees’ work areas. Supervisors should be made aware of the value and importance of getting out of their offices and engaging with their staffs.

Overall, respondents reported to have “fair” interactions with an immediate supervisor “Sometimes” (m=5.09, sd=1.42). This score is lower than the original Folger and Konovsky (1989) score (m=5.34). Upon deeper analysis, employees who responded to the questionnaire indicated that their supervisors gave them an opportunity to express their side of an issue, the supervisors were honest and ethical, and consider employees’ views regarding performance. However, respondents responded differently with regard to actually observed performance, asking the employees what they think about their own performance, and discussing with employees ways to improve their performance. These
results would suggest that the supervisors were willing to listen when approached by employees however, respondents did not consider the supervisors to be proactive and information gatherers, especially regarding employees’ performance. It is not uncommon for organizations to promote technically strong employees into management positions without providing the appropriate training to understand of the importance of communication satisfaction and the value of interactional justice. This oversight could result in an underperforming organization and/or the loss of top performers to other organizations. This would be an area of future professional development opportunities offered to the managers in the form of training.

Finally, the debate continues regarding the merits of identifying interactional justice as a separate construct or subconstruct of procedural justice. A key finding of the current research was that in the absence on communication satisfaction, interactional justice accounted for more organizational citizenship behavior variance than did procedural justice. It would not be possible for an organization to control communication satisfaction or interactional justice procedurally. Any attempts to procedurally mandate the interactions between supervisor and subordinate or the amount and timeliness of satisfactory communication will undoubtedly fall short. Organizational procedures are mechanical, satisfactory communication and perceptions of interactional justice are interpersonal.
Limitations

Online Questionnaire

A web-based, electronic questionnaire was used to collect data for this study. There are many reasons justifying the use on an electronic questionnaire. Electronic questionnaires offer potentially significant savings in time and money over paper (Olsen, Wygant & Brown, 2004). Response turn-around times are shorter. Data entry into an analysis package is quicker, easier, and less susceptible to data entry error.

An electronic questionnaire can only be completed online. Those who participate in electronic questionnaires may be more computer savvy and more highly educated (Andrews, Nonnecke & Preece, 2003). This could add a response bias by eliminating potential respondents who are not comfortable using a computer or the internet. Each Ohio University Administrative, Non-Bargaining Classified, and Bargaining Classified staff member has an email account, which was provided by the University. Due to the nature of their positions, employees might not have regular access to a computer during their work shift. Other potential respondents might have chosen not to participate because of an understanding that technology has the capability to identify the internet protocol (IP) address of the computer used and, thereby, identify the respondent.

An email notification went to all Ohio University administrators and staff making them aware that they were invited to participate in this study. It is possible that the initial email, as well as the instrument email, and subsequent follow up emails were identified as “spam,” and, never received. Additionally, ClearContext (2005) reported over 60% of respondents to an email usage questionnaire received more than 50 emails per day, while
15% received more than 250 emails per day. High email volume may leave participants with a sense of information overload and an unwillingness to respond. Given this level of information overload, it is possible that potential respondents to either deleted the emails without reading them or lost the emails in their inbox.

In the final analysis, the question that must be answered is whether an electronic survey, as opposed to a paper survey, add any additional participant bias? An assumption must be made that the administrators and staff of Ohio University are considered at least moderately computer savvy because every potential respondent has an email address. This would suggest that participants have access to a computer at some point during their professional day. Furthermore, Kiesler and Sproull (2001) found there was no significant differences between respondents of electronic surveys versus paper surveys.

**Case Study Methodology**

Historically, case study research has not been considered as credible as other types of research. At times, case study research has been accused of lacking rigor or being a research method which allows the researcher bias to influence the case. Although researcher bias is possible, other research methods are not bias-proof. In this specific case, the researcher was a member of the organization being studied and experienced many of the situations and perceptions of the research participants. Being impossible to completely eliminate all researcher bias, in this situation, having experienced the organization prior to the research enabled the researcher to have a fuller understanding of the impact of the organizational culture on the research participants. The researcher was
able to take a holistic approach and examine a variety of relationships between variables with a keen understanding of the entire environment (Gummesson, 2000; Yin 1984).

A case study approach is appropriate when investigating a contemporary situation in which the investigator has little or no control. This addresses another common concern regarding case study research – generalizability. How can one generalize from a specific? Case study research is not intended to generalize to populations. Rather, case study research is intended to generalize theoretical propositions. Furthermore, if a researcher would replicate the conditions of the case, the replication of the results is possible. The current research results are consistent with results of other non-case study research.

**Modified Survey Instrument**

The use of a modified research instrument was necessary to address each of the constructs investigated in this study. Even though instrument section reliability was high, choosing items from multiple instruments made it difficult at times to reference the original surveys. Comparisons of the same construct across instruments could not be drawn in every instance. Comparisons of the same construct with previous studies could be made.

The five sections of this research instrument addressed organizational citizenship behaviors, communication satisfaction, procedural justice, interactional justice, and demographics, in that order. Due in part to survey fatigue and the amount of time needed to complete the 70-item instrument, fewer respondents answered the survey questions nearer the end of the instrument. Although the data collection was sufficient, more data
might have been gathered regarding interactional justice had that construct been addressed earlier in the instrument.

**Lack of Pilot Study**

A pilot study was not conducted prior to collecting data for this research. The reason for this decision was that by developing an instrument from previously used instruments, the new instrument would have essentially been pilot tested. Although true to some extent, it would have been beneficial to use the pilot feedback to organize the instrument used in this research as well as address any confusion or ambiguity with the survey questions. Furthermore, there were instances where questions were similarly worded. Upon completion of a pilot study and subsequent factor analysis, the instrument might have been reduced in length.

**Organization during Change**

Although interesting, this research did not intentionally identify Ohio University as a population to study during a time of prolonged change. One could question whether the results of the same study would yield different results under “normal” working conditions. One would suspect the results to change, however, that would be the expectation with any organizational change. In this case, one could argue that prolonged change has become the norm.

**Future Research**

The organizational environment at Ohio University during this research was one of prolonged change in organizational structure and communication processes. Results of this study are consistent with previous research indicating that perceived levels of
interactional justice and communication satisfaction predict an employee’s willingness to participate in organizational citizenship behaviors. However, communication satisfaction and interactional justice accounted for a small amount (R²=.041, p<.001) of the organizational citizenship behaviors. There were a number of confounding variables that were not examined. Research should be conducted to determine the remaining variables.

Future research could also be conducted using the same case study methodology within an organization of similar demographics, which is not experiencing the same environment of prolonged, significant, organizational change. A more stable environment may produce fewer confounding variables.

This research did not explore the level of each respondent within the organization. Nor did it investigate decision-making structure (e.g., centralized versus decentralized). Schminke, Cropanzano, and Rupp (2002) suggested that higher-ranking members of an organization will report higher levels of perceived justice. The same study reported higher levels of perceived justice will be associated with lower levels of organizational centralization. Future research could be conducted to investigate the relationship between an individual’s position within the organization and his or her perceptions of interactional justice. Research could also be conducted to explore the relationship between an organization’s decision-making structure and organizational member’s perception of interactional justice.

**Upper Administration Communication Dimension**

Pincus (1986) added to the communication satisfaction research by including an upper administration dimension to an organization’s communication practices. This upper
administration dimension was found to influence employee job satisfaction and job performance in the current study. The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Downs and Hazen (1977) and adapted for the current research did not address Pincus’ findings. This dimension was discovered by analyzing the open-ended responses gathered using the current instrument, but not discussed in this document. Further analysis could be conducted on the qualitative responses to the current instrument.
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APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY EMAILS

Initial Email (sent 5/28/2007, 3:22 PM)

My name is Bill Fournier. I am an Ohio University graduate student working on my dissertation. I am at a point in the process where I am collecting data. You will receive another email from me with the subject line "Staff Perceptions in a University Environment." The email will contain an introduction, explanation of what I'm studying, and a link to an electronic survey. Please take a few moments to read the forthcoming email carefully and complete the survey. Thank you for your assistance with this.

Sincerely,
Bill Fournier

Second Email (sent 5/28/2007, 3:27 PM)

An employee's satisfaction with communication and perceptions of interactional justice play a significant role in the amount and types of citizenship behavior performed in the workplace. Interactional justice looks at the day-to-day interactions an employee has with the supervisor and are the interactions considered fair by the employee. Organizational citizenship behaviors are the voluntary actions employees participate in that helps the organization and is above and beyond the job description.

The purpose of this study is to determine if Ohio University staff members participate in organizational citizenship behaviors, are satisfied with the communication practices of the organization, and perceptions regarding interactional justice (e.g., supervisor/subordinate fairness) in the workplace. Research of this kind has not been conducted in a work setting such as this (midsize, mid-western university). The information you provide will establish a foundation from which the interactions between supervisor and subordinate can be strengthened, communication can be improved, and provide a framework for enhancing the level of citizenship behavior within this or any similar organization.

I am conducting this research as partial completion of my doctoral degree. Your opinions and information are important to me. However, your identity is not. Your identity will remain anonymous. The survey you complete has no way to collect personal information or identify who completed it. This research is not being conducted at the request of Ohio University, nor will Ohio University receive any individual responses. A copy of the research results would be provided to the upper administration of Ohio University upon request. However, no individuals will be identified in any information provided to Ohio University. By completing this survey, you are granting consent to use your responses for
research purposes. Your responses will be seen by me and my advisor, Dr. Anita James. Your responses will be destroyed upon completion of my dissertation and its defense.

Please take a few moments to complete this electronic survey. You can access the survey by selecting the following link
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=OjbCg9u3KurbPzDeXgN4Ig%3d%3d>

I would like to thank you in advance for participating in my research.

Sincerely,
Bill Fournier

Follow Up Email #1 (sent 6/3/2007, 10:05 PM)

Administrators and Staff,

For those of you who have completed my dissertation survey, I would like to thank you. For those of you who have not completed it yet, I would like to ask you once again to take a moment to click on the following link and participate in my research:
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=OjbCg9u3KurbPzDeXgN4Ig%3d%3d>

Once again, thank you for participating.

Sincerely,
Bill Fournier

Follow Up Email #2 (sent 6/10/2007, 6:14 PM)

Administrators and Staff,

For those of you who have completed my dissertation survey, I would like to thank you. For those of you who have not completed it yet, I would like to ask you once again to take a moment to click on the following link and participate in my research:
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=OjbCg9u3KurbPzDeXgN4Ig%3d%3d>

I will be closing the survey on Friday, June 15th. Please complete the survey by then to have your responses included in my research. Once again, thank you for participating.

Sincerely,
Bill Fournier
APPENDIX B: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors are the behaviors you exhibit that are voluntary and go beyond your job descriptions. Please rate YOURSELF on the following statements using the scale presented below.

1 = Strongly disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Somewhat disagree  4 = Indifferent 
5 = Somewhat agree  6 = Agree  7 = Strongly agree

1. Represents organization favorably to outsiders. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
2. Tells acquaintances about the good aspects of the organization’s products or services. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
3. Shows pride when representing the organization in public. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
4. Talks favorably about the organization to friends in the community. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
5. Makes creative suggestions by offering unique ways of looking at a problem. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
6. Makes creative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
7. Makes creative suggestions by sharing ideas for new products and/or services. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
8. Makes creative suggestions to others regarding new and more effective ways of doing their jobs. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
9. Takes courses on own time and at own expense which increase your knowledge, skills, and abilities for work. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
10. Works to develop job-related skills even during off-duty hours. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
11. Subscribes to and reads for pleasure, business periodicals and/or professional journals related to your work. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
12. Attend career-related courses even when not required to do so by your job. 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
13. Helps others when their work-load increases (assists others until they get over the hurdle). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Helps others who have heavy work-loads. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Volunteers to help team members with their work when they have been absent. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Takes the initiative to orient new employees to the department even though doing this is not part of your job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. How satisfied are you with your job? (circle one)

1 = Very dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied 4 = Indifferent
5 = Somewhat satisfied 6 = Satisfied 7 = Very Satisfied

18. In the last 6 months, what has happened to your level of satisfaction? (circle one)

1 = Stayed the same 2 = Gone up 3 = Gone down

19. If the communication associated with your job could be changed in any way to make you more satisfied, please indicate how. __________________________

Listed below are several kinds of information often associated with a person’s job. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the amount and/or quality of each kind of information by circling the appropriate number at the right.

1 = Very dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied 4 = Indifferent
5 = Somewhat satisfied 6 = Satisfied 7 = Very Satisfied

20. Information about University policies and goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. Information about how my job compares with others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Information about how I am being judged. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Recognition for my efforts. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Information about department policies and goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Information about government regulatory action affecting AFSCME. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. Information about changes in AFSCME. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Information about employee benefits and pay.  
28. Information about achievements and/or failures of the organization.  
29. Extent to which my University’s communication motivates me to meet its goals.  
30. Extent to which communication in my University makes me identify with it or feels a vital part of it.  
31. Extent to which my University’s communications are interesting and helpful.  
32. Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job.  
33. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through the proper communication channels.  
34. Extent to which the “grapevine” is active at my University.  
35. Extent to which communication with other employees at my level as accurate and free-flowing.  
36. Extent to which my work-group is compatible.  
37. Extent to which our meetings are well organized.  
38. Extent to which written reports are clear and concise.  
39. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication in AFSCME are basically healthy.  
40. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.  
41. Extent to which the amount of communication in AFSCME is about right.  
42. How would you rate your productivity in your job?

1 = Very low  
2 = Low  
4 = Average  
5 = Slightly higher than most  
7 = Very high
3 = Slightly lower than most  6 = High

43. In the last 6 months, what has happened to your productivity?

1 = Stayed the same  2 = Gone up  3 = Gone down

44. If the communication associated with your job could be changed in any way to make you more productive, please tell how: ____________________________

Procedural Justice refers to the perceptions of fairness we feel when we consider the process that was used by our supervisor to make decisions. We make a decision as to whether the procedures that our supervisor used when making decisions were fair, consistent, and justified.

Please indicate the extent to which your manager(s)/supervisor(s) does each of the following:

1 = never  2 = almost never  3= rarely  4 = indifferent  5 = sometimes  6 = almost always  7 = always

45. Used consistent standards in evaluating your performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. Showed a real interest in trying to be fair. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47. Took into account factors beyond your control. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48. Obtained accurate information about your performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49. Allowed personal motives or bias to influence recommendations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50. Was influenced by things that should not have been considered. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51. Make an appeal about the size of your raise. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Interactional justice refers to the perceptions of fairness we feel when interacting with our organization and/or our manager(s)/supervisor(s). We make a decision as to whether we were treated with respect, truthfulness, and whether we believe the decision made by our manager(s)/supervisor(s) was justified.

Please indicate the extent to which your manager(s)/supervisor(s) does each of the following:
52. Is honest and ethical in dealing with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
53. Gives me an opportunity to express my side. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
54. Considers my views regarding my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
55. Gives me feedback that helps me learn how well I’m doing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
56. Is completely candid and frank with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
57. Is thoroughly familiar with my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
58. Gets input from me before a recommendation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
59. Makes it clear what is expected of me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
60. Discusses plans or objectives to improve my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
61. Finds out how well I think I am doing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
62. Asks for my ideas on what I could do to improve organization performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
63. Frequently observes my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
64. Behaves in ways I think are not appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please indicate your demographic information. Your identity will remain anonymous so please be as accurate as possible.

65. Sex: (circle one)
   Female       Male

66. Age: (circle one)
   20 or younger  21-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60 or older

67. Level of education: (circle one)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized/Professional degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree (two-year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree (four-year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Salary Range: (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000-$29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. Length of time in current position: (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. Current position: (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bargaining Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. Current appointment: (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale developed by Vandenberg, Lance, and Taylor (2005). Items were anchored with a 6-point Likert-type scale 1 = Strongly disagree, 6 = Strongly agree. Participants were asked to rate themselves on the following items.

**Cooperative Behaviors**

CB1 Takes the initiative to orient new employees to the department even though doing this is not part of his or her job.

CB2 Helps others with heavy work loads.

CB3 Helps others when their work-load increases (assist others until they get over the hurdles).

CB4 Volunteers to help team members with their work when they have been absent.

CB5 Voluntarily trains or helps others to perform their jobs better.

CB6 Volunteers to do things for others even though they are not formally required by the job.

**Constructive Suggestions**

CS1 Makes creative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department.

CS2 Makes creative suggestions by offering unique ways of looking at a problem.

CS3 Makes creative suggestions by championing others’ ideas when he or she believes implementing them will improve the organization.

CS4 Makes creative suggestions for accomplishing tasks when usual resources are in short supply.

CS5 Makes creative suggestions to others regarding new and more effective ways of doing their jobs.

CS6 Makes creative suggestions by sharing ideas for new products and/or service.
**Favorable Climate**

FC1 Talks favorably about the organization to friends in the community.

FC2 Speaks well of the organization’s products.

FC3 Attends community functions as organizational representative that are not required, but that help the organization’s image.

FC4 Shows pride when representing the organization in public.

FC5 Represents organization favorably to outsiders.

FC6 Tells acquaintances about the good aspects of the organization’s products or services.

**Self-Training**

ST1 During own time, reads and keeps up with developments in his or her organization’s area.

ST2 Voluntarily seeks to enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform better in his or her current position.

ST3 Attends career-related courses even when not required to do so by his or her job.

ST4 Subscribes to and reads for pleasure, business periodicals and/or professional journals relating to his or her job.

ST5 Works to develop job-related skills even during off-duty hours.

ST6 Takes courses on own time and at own expense which increase his or her knowledge, skills, and abilities for work.
APPENDIX D: ORIGINAL COMM SAT INSTRUMENT

Original Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), by Cal W. Downs and Michael D. Hazen (Clampitt & Downs, 2004).

INTRODUCTION: Most of us assume that the quality and amount of communication in our jobs contribute to both our job satisfaction and our productivity. Through this study we hope to find out how satisfied our communication practices are and what suggestions you have for improving them. We appreciate you taking the time to complete the questionnaire. Hopefully, you should be able to complete it in 10-15 minutes. Your answers are completely confidential, so be as frank as you wish. This is not a test – your opinion is the only right answer. Do not sign you name; we do not wish to know who you are. The answers will be combined into groups for reporting purposes. An initial report will be given to management and a brief report will be distributed to all employees.

1. How satisfied are you in your job? (circle one)
   1. Very Dissatisfied
   2. Dissatisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Indifferent
   5. Somewhat satisfied
   6. Satisfied
   7. Very satisfied

2. In the past 6 months, what has happened to your level of satisfaction? (circle one)
   1. Stayed the same
   2. Gone down
   3. Gone up

3. If the communication associated with your job could be changed in any way to make you more satisfied, please indicate how._________________________

A. Listed below are several kinds of information often associated with a person’s job. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the amount and/or quality of each kind of information by circling the appropriate number to the right.
   1 = Very dissatisfied  2 = Dissatisfied  3 = Somewhat dissatisfied  4 = Indifferent
   5 = Somewhat satisfied  6 = Satisfied  7 = Very satisfied

4. Information about my progress in my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Personnel news. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Information about company policies and goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Information about how my job compares with others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Information about how I am being judged. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Recognition of my efforts. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Information about departmental policies and goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Information about the requirements of my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Information about government regulatory action affecting ACME. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Information about changes in ACME. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Information about employee benefits and pay. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Information about profits and/or financial standing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Information about achievements and/or failures of the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following by circling the appropriate number at the right.

18. Extent to which my managers/supervisors understand the problems faced by staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Extent to which AMCE’s communication motivates me to meet its goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Extent to which the people in ACME have great ability to communicate. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job-related problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Extent to which communication in ACME makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. Extent to which ACME communications are interesting and helpful. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Extent to which the grapevine is active in ACME. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. Extent to which communication with other employees at my level is accurate and free-flowing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. Extent to which my work group is compatible. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. Extent to which our meetings are well organized. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication in ACME are basically healthy. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. Extent to which the amount of communication in ACME is about right. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C. Please indicate your estimates of your productivity.

39. How would you rate your productivity in your job?
   1. Very low
   2. Low
   3. Slightly lower than most
   4. Indifferent
   5. Slightly higher than most
   6. High
   7. Very high

40. In the last 6 months, what has happened to your productivity?
   1. Stayed the same
   2. Gone up
   3. Gone down

41. If the communication associated with your job could be changed in a way to make you more productive, please tell how.

D. Indicate your satisfaction with the following only if you are responsible for staff as a manager or supervisor.

42. Extent to which my staff are responsive to downward-directive communication. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. Extent to which my staff anticipate my needs for information.
44. Extent to which I can avoid having communication overload.
45. Extent to which my staff are receptive to evaluations, suggestions, and criticism
46. Extent to which my staff feel responsible for initiating accurate upward communication.
APPENDIX E: ORIGINAL COMM SAT INSTRUMENT ITEMS OMITTED

Items not retained from the original communication satisfaction questionnaire (CSQ) (Downs & Hazen, 1977):

4. Information about my progress in my job

5. Personnel news

11. Information about the requirements of my job

14. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled

16. Information about profits and/or financial standing

18. Extent to which my managers/supervisors understand the problems faced by staff

20. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me

21. Extent to which the people on ACME have great ability as communicators

22. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job-related problems

25. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me

29. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas

31. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies

34. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right

42. Extent to which my staff are responsive to downward-directive communication

43. Extent to which my staff anticipate my needs for information

44. Extent to which I can avoid having communication overload
45. Extent to which my staff are receptive to evaluations, suggestions, and criticisms

46. Extent to which my staff feel responsible for initiating accurate upward communication
APPENDIX F: ORIGINAL INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE INSTRUMENT


**Type:** Procedural (and interactional); **Source:** Human agent;  
**Context:** Single event; **Approach:** Indirect; **Repetition:** Thibault and Walker/Leventhal rules (and Bies and Moag).

“Indicate the extent to which your supervisor did each of the following.”

1. “Was honest and ethical in dealing with you.”
2. “Gave you the opportunity to express your side.”
3. “Used consistent standards in evaluating your performance.”
4. “Considered your views regarding your performance.”
5. “Gave you feedback that helped you learn how well you were doing.”
6. “Was completely candid and frank with you.”
7. “Showed a real interest in trying to be fair.”
8. “Became thoroughly familiar with your performance.”
9. “Took into account factor beyond your control.” (R)
10. “Got input from you before a recommendation.”
11. “Made clear what was expected of you.”
12. “Discussed plans or objectives to improve your performance.”
13. “Obtained accurate information about your performance.”
14. “Found out how well you thought you were doing your job.”
15. “Asked for ideas on what you could do to improve company performance.”
16. “Frequently observed your performance.”
17. “Behaved in a way you thought was not appropriate.”
18. “Allowed personal motives or biases to influence recommendation.” (R)
19. “Was influenced by things that should not have been considered.” (R)

“Indicate how much of an opportunity existed, AFTER THE LAST RAISE DECISION, for you to do each of the following things:”

20. “Review, with your supervisor, objectives for improvement.”
21. “With your supervisor, resolve difficulties about your duties and responsibilities.”
22. “Find out why you got the size raise you did.”
23. “Make an appeal about the size of your raise.”
24. “Express your feelings to your supervisor about salary decision.”
25. “Discuss, with your supervisor, how your performance was evaluated.”
26. “Develop, with your supervisor, an action plan for future performance.”
APPENDIX G: ORIGINAL IJ INSTRUMENT ITEMS OMITTED

Items deleted from the original Interactional Justice instrument (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

20. Review, with your supervisor, objectives for improvement.

21. With your supervisor, resolve difficulties about your duties and responsibilities.

22. Find out why you got the size raise you did.

23. Make an appeal about the size of your raise.

24. Express your feelings to your supervisor about salary decisions.

25. Discuss, with your supervisor, how your performance was evaluated.

26. Develop, with your supervisor, an action plan for future performance.
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