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ABSTRACT

This study is an investigation of the effect of supervisor's consideration of employee voice on organizational justice perceptions and motivation. The project builds on past literature which looked at opportunity to voice, by also including supervisor consideration of voice. One hundred and thirty-six clerical employees of a large western state urban school district read a performance appraisal scenario that randomly placed them into one of the four levels of voice (no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice). Participants responded to a motivation measure and a variation of Colquit's 2001 organizational justice measure. A MANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. Main effects were found for voice on perceptions of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. It was found that providing voice, even when a subordinate does not believe that their voice is being considered by a decision maker, does positively affect procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions. Informational justice perceptions were only found to be affected if a subordinate's voice is instrumental in affecting his or her performance appraisal. The study shows that organizational justice
perceptions can be a partial mediator between voice and motivation, and illustrates the effectiveness of Colquit’s four factor model approach to measuring organizational justice.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Performance appraisals are used to determine compensation and promotion decisions, to give employee feedback and development, and for personnel research. Unfortunately, too many employers view performance appraisals as a one-way communication to their employees instead of a two-way communication with their employees. In general, people believe their point of view to be valuable, and consequently believe that their point of view should be considered (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Thus, it makes sense that employees would want to be able to participate during a performance appraisal. Research has found that employee participation during a performance appraisal may affect such employee reactions as satisfaction with the performance appraisal, organizational commitment, improved performance after the appraisal, perceived fairness of the appraisal, and motivation to improve performance (cf. Burke, Weitzel, & Weir, 1980; Cawley et al., 1998; Dipboye & de Pontbriand 1981; Greenberg, 1986). These reactions to performance appraisals are, or should be, important to many employers. Not surprisingly, many researchers have studied employee
reactions to performance appraisals, and much of this research has focused on employee participation in the performance appraisal process (cf. Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998; Dipboye & de Pontbriand, 1980; Kanfer, Sawyer, Early, & Lind 1987).

There has been disagreement among researchers regarding the operational definition of participation in a performance appraisal (Cawley et al., 1998). Operational definitions of participation in performance appraisals have included the amount the subordinate talks (Greller, 1975), the opportunity to participate (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985; Greller, 1978; Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978), the opportunity to set goals for the future (Burke et al., 1978; Wexley, Sing, & Yukl, 1973), whether the subordinate felt that he or she influenced the appraisal in any way (Burke et al., 1978), the opportunity to self-appraise (Farh, Werbel, & Bedeian, 1988), and when during the performance appraisal process a person is allowed to participate (design and implementation, preappraisal stage - self assessment, during the performance appraisal, and after the performance appraisal) (Anderson, 1993). Despite the differences in operational definitions of participation, it is clear that each of these researchers is capturing some aspect of what happens when an employee,
in one shape or form, is given an opportunity to be a part of the performance appraisal process. Not surprisingly researchers have found consistent positive employee reactions toward the performance appraisal when participation is included in the process. Participation has been shown to increase morale and productivity simultaneously (Blumber, 1968; Katzell & Yankelovich, 1975; Levin & Tyson, 1990). In addition, Dipboye and de Pontbriand (1981) found that employees are more receptive of negative feedback if they are allowed to participate in the performance feedback session.

Other studies have found that the opportunity to provide input into a decision-making process enhances an individual’s perceptions of the fairness of the process (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Walker, LaTour, Lind, & Thibault, 1974). Landy, et al. (1978) tried to identify some elements that might account for an individual’s perception of the fairness and accuracy of his or her performance evaluation. They found that a performance evaluation was considered fair when goal setting by the employee, a form of participation, was tied into the performance appraisal process. Renn (1998) conducted a study using 200 employees who participated in a two-year goal-setting program used by one organization. The purpose of Renn’s study was to
examine participation’s indirect relationship with performance as mediated by goal acceptance and procedural justice perceptions (i.e., the perceived fairness of the performance appraisal process). More recently, Renn found that participation was indirectly and positively related to task performance through goal acceptance, and that participation was positively related to procedural justice perceptions.

The results from these studies show that allowing employee participation during the performance appraisal can have positive results on employee reactions to a performance appraisal. One form of participation that is prevalent in a performance appraisal and has been found to have positive results on employee reactions, is to allow an employee to have voice during the performance appraisal process.

Voice

Researchers have defined voice in many ways. For instance, Thibaut and Walker (1975) defined voice as the practice of allowing individuals who are affected by a given decision to present information relevant to the decision. Voice has also been defined as any opportunity to express one’s opinions, preferences, or views about
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decisions (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1996), as well as any effort to change a work situation by expressing one’s opinions about how routines and policies might be changed (Gordan, Infante, & Graham, 1988). Folger and Konovsky (1989) defined voice within the context of a performance appraisal in two ways: seeking subordinate input (feedback), and a subordinate’s ability to oppose a supervisor’s ratings (recourse). Folger and Konovsky found that both feedback and recourse predicted a subordinate’s satisfaction with pay, trust in management, and organizational commitment, regardless of the perceived fairness of the pay decision itself. A common theme found in all of these definitions is that voice occurs in a performance appraisal when individuals are allowed to express their views regarding some aspect of the performance appraisal. Another common theme found in the voice literature is that people value voice because they perceive that their views are worthy of hearing (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Consequently, one might predict that procedures that acknowledge the value of a subordinate’s voice will likely be viewed favorably, regardless of the effects on the outcome of the procedure.

Cawly et al. (1998) conducted a meta-analysis that found that voice had a moderate to strong positive
relationship related to satisfaction, perceived utility of the appraisal, perceived fairness of the appraisal, and a subordinates' motivation to improve after the appraisal. Satisfaction had the strongest relationship with participation \((\rho=.64)\). This was followed by fairness \((\rho=.59)\), utility \((\rho=.55)\), and motivation to improve \((\rho=.44)\). Overall, the results of Cawly et al.'s meta-analysis shows that there are strong relationships between voice in a performance appraisal and a variety of employee reactions.

Korsgaard and Robertson (1995) looked at voice as being either instrumental or non-instrumental. Instrumental voice is when an individual perceives that he or she has had a direct opportunity to influence a current performance appraisal. Non-instrumental voice is when an individual perceives that he or she did not have an opportunity to directly or indirectly influence a current performance appraisal. Korsgaard and Roberson believed that instrumental and non-instrumental voice perceptions will each be uniquely related to attitudes toward the appraisal and toward the manager rendering the appraisal because individuals intrinsically value the potential to influence regardless of whether the input influences the decision. The results of their study found that
instrumental and non-instrumental voice account for roughly the same amount of variance in satisfaction. However, only non-instrumental voice was significantly related to trust in the manager rendering the appraisal. Clearly this study shows that different forms of voice exist.

In a similar study, Lind, Kanfer, and Early (1990) studied the difference between symbolic voice effects, also known as non-instrumental voice, and instrumental voice effects. Lind and his colleagues had three experimental conditions of voice in their study: no voice, voice before the decision was made, and voice after the decision was made. The difference between fairness ratings for the no-voice condition and those for the post-decisional voice condition indicated the strength of symbolic voice processes, whereas the differences between post-decisional voice and pre-decisional voice provided an indication of the strength of instrumental voice over and above the symbolic processes. Thus, voice with no possibility of influence was considered more fair than no voice at all, and that voice with the possibility of influence led to an even greater amount of perceived fairness. According to Lind and his colleagues, fairness judgments are enhanced by the opportunity to voice
opinions even when there is no chance of influencing the decision.

Results from an earlier study conducted by Tyler (1987) indicate that there may be more to consider with non-instrumental voice than indicated in the Lind et al. (1990) study. In Tyler’s study, he too looked at whether or not an individual’s perception of influence in performance appraisals impacted perceptions of procedural justice (i.e. procedural fairness). Tyler’s study involved a telephone interview conducted with a random sample of 1,574 Chicago citizens. These citizens were asked about their interactions with the Chicago police and/or the courts in the year prior to the interview. The interaction between the citizens and the police or the courts acted as a quasi performance appraisal. One of the results found in Tyler’s study was that simply providing a structural opportunity to speak was not enough to produce voice effects; it was also necessary for individuals to infer that what they say was being considered by the decision-maker. Thus, this need for one’s view to be considered, not just heard, is a distinction that needs to be considered when evaluating the effects of voice in the performance appraisal process.
Organizational Justice

Researchers that have studied participation have typically examined organizational justice as an outcome of the performance appraisal process. Research on organizational justice has traditionally distinguished two different types of organizational justice: distributive justice - the perceived fairness of performance ratings (the outcome) relative to the work performed; and procedural justice - the perceived fairness of the performance appraisal process itself (Greenberg, 1986). Research on organizational justice has shown that these two types of justice are distinct, and it has been demonstrated that both are important determinants of employee attitudes and meaningful organizational outcomes (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992).

Bies and Moag (1986) introduced another distinct type of organizational justice called interactional justice. According to Bies and Moag, interactional justice is the perception of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented, and thus a distinct construct from procedural justice. Over the years, researchers have gone back and forth on this issue of whether or not procedural justice and interactional
justice should be considered separate constructs. Bies later refuted having the two separate when he conducted a study with Tyler which argued that interactional justice and procedural justice should only be one construct (Tyler & Bies, 1990). However, more recent research conducted by Bies and others has once again separated the two (Bies, 2001; Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002).

A recent meta-analysis conducted by Colquitt, Conlon, Porter, Wesson and Ng (2001) revealed that interactional justice can be split into two distinct types of justice. The first type is interpersonal justice, the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. The second type of interactional justice is informational justice, the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion. Colquitt et al. demonstrated that procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice are distinct constructs that can be empirically distinguished from one another and they posit that since this distinction exists, that future research must not combine the three justice dimensions into a single variable. Furthermore, Colquitt
(2001) compared the fit of four different factor structures: one large organizational justice factor; a two factor model with distributive justice as one factor, and procedural justice as the other factor; a three factor model with distributive, procedural, and interactional justice; and a final model with distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. The results supported the meta-analysis done by Colquit et al. (2001) that showed that organizational justice is best conceptualized as four distinct dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice.

Most organizational justice research on voice involves the effect of voice on distributive and procedural justice perceptions. Numerous studies have demonstrated the impact of voice on procedural justice perceptions in a performance evaluation. In fact, it has been consistently shown that regardless of the perceived fairness of the decision itself, fair procedures will result in more positive attitudes. One consistent finding to emerge is that fair procedures or interpersonal treatment can compensate for a negative performance appraisal (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). Even when an individual receives a negative performance evaluation they
will still have positive procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions. Folger (1977) found that the presence or absence of voice in conjunction with other events that occur over time, such as subsequent payment, does have an effect on distributive justice perceptions. This shows that while it is obvious that performance appraisal procedures, such as allowing voice or not allowing voice, can affect procedural justice perceptions, performance appraisal procedures can also influence the perceptions of distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice which could then affect other employee reactions.

Motivation

Typically one of the objectives that an employer has when conducting a performance appraisal is to motivate employees to improve their performance. Cropanzano and Folger (1996) found through the review of several studies that if employees perceive that administrative conduct and procedures are just, employees are likely to improve performance. However, if performance appraisals are implemented in an unfair manner, employees are likely to lower their performance. Thus, organizational justice perceptions regarding a performance appraisal are an
important factor when using a performance appraisal as a tool to motivate an employee.

According to the social comparison theory, there is a tendency for individuals to compare themselves with others in order to make judgements regarding their own attributes (Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1990). According to Lyubomirsky and Ross (1997), individuals are not only concerned about their performance ratings, but also about how their performance ratings compares to their peers’ performance ratings. Performance appraisals are designed by employers to inform employees how well they are performing in their job. While on the surface a performance appraisal may not imply that an employee is being compared to their peers, employees are aware that some employees will be given higher appraisal ratings than others.

Considerable evidence suggests that individuals generally tend to evaluate themselves as above average in relation to others (Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbercher, Yurak, & Vredenburg, 1995; Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989). This tendency for individuals to believe they perform better than others indicates that individuals will enter appraisal situations viewing themselves as having performed at an above average level (Mohrman, Resnick-West, & Lawler, 1989) and therefore will expect ratings
near the top of the scale. Social comparison theory suggests that when individuals are given unfavorable comparative information (ratings on the low or moderate range of a scale) regarding their ability, they will be motivated to improve their performance (Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1990). Furthermore, Kluger and DeNisi (1996) propose that the first action individuals will typically take, when receiving feedback that differs from their self-evaluation, is to attempt to achieve a higher level of performance. This would indicate that even when negative ratings received differ from an individual's higher self evaluation, an individual will tend to be motivated to improve their performance.

Bartol, Durham, and Poon (2001) conducted a study investigating the impact of rating segmentation (i.e., the number of alternative appraisal categories available for rating employee performance) on motivation and perceptions of fairness. The results from their study indicated that a 5-category rating system resulted in higher self-efficacy regarding participants' ability to reach the next higher rating category, higher goals for rating improvement, and higher rating improvements than a 3-category rating system. The study also showed that characteristics of performance appraisal systems, such as rating
segmentation, can affect organization justice perceptions and motivation.

Present Study

The present study was designed to answer two questions. First, how do different forms of voice influence perceptions of organizational justice? Second, do organizational justice perceptions affect an individual’s motivation to improve their job performance?

As was discussed previously, Lind et al. (1990) found that fairness judgments are enhanced by the opportunity to voice opinions even when there is no chance of influencing the decision. However, the Tyler (1987) study appears to contradict these results by finding that the mere act of being given a structural opportunity to speak (i.e., non-instrumental voice) was not enough to produce procedural justice perceptions. It was also necessary for subordinates to infer that what they say was being considered by the decision maker. Tyler made a distinction that subordinates must believe that their superior is considering their voice and that consideration of voice, regardless of the outcome, can have an effect on procedural justice perceptions. In the Lind et al. (1990) study the subordinates in the non-instrumental voice group
may have felt that their voice was being considered and thus their fairness judgments were enhanced. Hence, the following hypotheses will attempt to clarify the influence of a superior’s consideration, and replicate the findings found by previous voice research:

**Hypothesis 1**: There will be a main effect of voice on perceptions of justice of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice.

**Hypothesis 1a**: Participants in the future voice condition (voice considered for future performance appraisal, but not for current performance appraisal) will have higher procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice perceptions than participants in the no-voice condition and participants in the non-instrumental voice condition.

**Hypothesis 1b**: Participants in the instrumental voice condition (voice considered for current appraisal) will report higher procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice perceptions than participants in the no-voice condition, participants in the non-instrumental voice condition, and participants in the future instrumental voice condition.
**Hypothesis lc:** There will be no difference in justice perceptions between participants in the no-voice and non-instrumental voice conditions.

**Hypothesis 2:** There will be a main effect of condition on perceptions of distributive justice.

*Hypothesis 2a:* Participants in the instrumental voice condition will report higher distributive justice perceptions than participants in the no-voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions.

*Hypothesis 2b:* There will be no difference in distributive justice perceptions among participants in the no-voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions.

As discussed previously, Bartol et al. (2001), Cropanzano and Folger (1996), and other researchers have shown that procedural justice perceptions can have an effect on motivation. The following hypothesis will attempt to show that as perceptions of organizational justice increase, so too does a subordinate’s motivation to improve.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be a direct relationship between each form of organizational justice perceptions and participant motivation. Specifically,
the more organizationally just that a participant believes the performance appraisal to be, the more motivated a participant will be to improve future performance.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

The participants in this study were clerical employees of a large western state urban school district. According to Cohen (1988) using a MANOVA at \( \alpha = .05 \) for a small effect size (.25) the number of participants to achieve a power of .80 is thirty four per group. Four groups were needed for this study, therefore a total of one hundred and thirty six participants were included in the study. Of the one hundred and thirty six participants 34.6% were Hispanic or Latino, 27.9% were Black or African American, 22.1% were White (Not Hispanic Origin), 6.6% were Asian, 4.4% were Filipino, .7% were American Indian or Alaskan Native, .7% were Pacific Islander, and 2.9% were Other. Approximately 90% of the participants were women. The ages of the participants ranged from 20 to 70 years of age, with a mean age of 38.2. The amount of time participants worked in a clerical position ranged from 1 month to 36 years, with a mean of 141.7 months (approximately 11 years and 10 months). The number of performance appraisals that participants had within the last five years ranged from 0 to 25, with a mean of 2.4
performance appraisals within the last five years. Participants in the study were recruited from various departments (Payroll, Personnel, Accounting, etc.). Participation in this research study was strictly voluntary. Those that participated in the study were entered into a drawing for two amusement park tickets. Participants were told that the study was being conducted to gain a better understanding of supervisor-employee interactions.

Procedure

This study utilized a MANOVA that looked at the impact of four levels of participant voice (no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice) in the performance appraisal process on employee’s organizational justice perceptions and how these perceptions influence an employee’s motivation. Participants were given a packet that included a demographic questionnaire, one of four scenarios, a motivation measure, an organizational justice measure, and a manipulation check measure. All packets were identical except for the scenario which was the manipulation of voice. Each scenario was a performance review episode that was based on a generic urban school district clerical
position that participants could easily identify with (see Appendix A).

The manipulation of voice occurred when participants were randomly assigned to one of the four scenarios: no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice. In the no voice scenario the supervisor denies the participant an opportunity to voice their opinion. In the other three scenarios (non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, instrumental voice) the participant is given an opportunity to voice their opinion. The difference in the other three scenarios was the type of influence that voice had on the participant’s performance appraisal score. In the non-instrumental scenario, participant’s voice had no explicit impact on their performance appraisal score or their future sixth month performance appraisal score. In the future instrumental voice scenario the participant’s voice had no explicit impact on their current performance appraisal score, but it may have an impact on their future sixth month performance appraisal score. In the instrumental voice scenario participant’s voice had an impact on their current performance appraisal score and possibly their future sixth month performance appraisal score.
Once participants finished reading the scenario, they completed a motivation measure, an organizational justice measure, and a voice manipulation check measure that determined if the appropriate level of voice was actually presented within each scenario. All three measures required participants to answer items that asked them to indicate their level of agreement with a statement (see Appendix B). When answering the statements participants used a 5-point Likert-style scale with these anchors: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

Measures

The first measure that participants completed was the six-item motivation measure (α=.90). The motivation measure was created specifically for this study. The first item, "If that were me, I would want to improve my performance" was adapted from a motivation measure used from a study conducted by Burke, Weitzel, and Weir (1978). The other five items were developed based on the following works: Bartol, Durham, and Poon (2001); Cropanzano and Folger (1996); and Lefton (1991). The six item motivation measure was pilot tested on thirty undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at
California State University, San Bernardino. The motivation measure, along with its scale, is included in Appendix B.

After participants completed the motivation measure they answered a seventeen-item organizational justice measure. The organizational justice measure was adapted from a 20-item measure created and validated by Colquit (2001). Colquit’s organizational justice measure assessed distributive justice (Colquit’s α=.93), procedural justice (Colquit’s α=.93), interpersonal justice (Colquit’s α=.92), and informational justice (Colquit’s α=.90). Three items from the original Colquit measure were removed, two procedural justice items and one interpersonal justice item, because they were not congruent with the scenarios used in the present study. The organizational justice measure, along with its scale, is included in Appendix A.

The manipulation check was assessed by using three items specifically created for this study. The manipulation measure checked for the four types of voice (no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice). The results of the manipulation check confirmed that each of the four
scenarios represented the level of voice that they were intended to represent. All means and standard deviations of the manipulation check measure are reported in Table B1. The manipulation check measure, along with its scale, is included in Appendix B.

To test hypotheses 1 and 2 a between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on four dependent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice), and the four levels of voice (no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice) as the independent variable. To test hypothesis 3 a standard multiple regression was performed with motivation as the dependent variable and levels of voice as the independent variable.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Prior to testing the hypotheses, descriptives and frequency analyses were run on all data to screen for entry errors, missing data, univariate and multivariate outliers, and violations of skewness and kurtosis. One case with missing data on the distributive and procedural justice scales was deleted from the future instrumental justice group. One case with a high $z$ score on procedural justice was found to be a univariate outlier and thus deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance, there were no multivariate within-cell outliers ($p=.001$). This left a final $N$ of 137. The procedural justice scale in the "no voice" condition was mildly positively skewed; however, for the purpose of interpretation and given the mildness of the violation it was not transformed. Results of evaluation of assumptions of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

In order to test the hypotheses, a between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on four dependent variables: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and
informational justice. There are four levels of the independent variable voice: no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice. SPSS MANOVA was used for the analyses. Factors were hierarchical loaded.

With the use of the Wilks’ Criteria, the combined dependent organizational justice variables were significantly different by condition, \( F(4, 344.239) = 11.471, p < .001 \) (Partial Eta Squared = 0.257). To investigate the impact of voice on each of the individual DVs, univariate ANOVAs were examined. All means and standard deviations are presented in Figure B1, B2, and B3 and Table B2.

As predicted by hypothesis one, there was a main effect of voice on perceptions of procedural justice \( F(3, 133) = 45.960, p < 0.05 \) (Partial Eta Squared = 0.509); interpersonal justice \( F(3, 133) = 13.795, p < 0.05 \) (Partial Eta Squared = 0.237); and informational justice \( F(3, 133) = 13.453, p < 0.05 \) (Partial Eta Squared = 0.233). Results of hypothesis 1a, however, were mixed. Procedural justice was found to be significantly higher in the future instrumental condition than in the no-voice condition, but not significantly different from the non-instrumental voice condition. Interpersonal
justice was found to be significantly higher for the future instrumental voice condition than the no voice condition, but not significantly different from the non-instrumental voice condition. However, contrary to what was predicted, informational justice was not found to be significantly higher for the future instrumental voice condition than the non-instrumental voice condition or the no voice condition (See Table B2).

Hypothesis 1b was supported, as participants in the instrumental voice condition reported higher procedural interpersonal, and informational justice perceptions than the participants in the no voice condition, participants in the non-instrumental voice condition, and participants in the future instrumental voice condition (See Table B2).

Hypothesis 1c was supported in that informational justice perceptions were not significantly different between the no voice condition and non-instrumental voice condition. It was found that perceptions of procedural justice were higher for the non-instrumental voice condition than for the no voice condition which was not predicted. In addition, it was found that perceptions of interpersonal justice were higher for the non-instrumental voice condition than for the no voice condition (See Table B2).
As predicted by hypothesis two, there was a main effect of condition on perceptions of distributive justice \[F (3,133)=3.845, \ p < 0.05\] (Partial Eta Squared=0.080).

Hypothesis 2a indicated that participants in the instrumental voice condition would report higher distributive justice perceptions than participants in the no-voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions. However, distributive justice perceptions in the instrumental voice condition were only reported to be significantly higher than participants in the no voice condition. Distributive justice perceptions in the instrumental voice condition were not found to be significantly higher than the future instrumental voice and non-instrumental voice conditions (See Table B2).

Hypothesis 2b was supported in that there were no significant distributive justice perception differences among participants in the no voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions (See Table B2).

In order to test hypothesis 3 a standard multiple regression was performed with motivation as the dependent variable and levels of voice as the independent variable. Analysis was performed using SPSS REGRESSION.
A new motivation scale was developed for the current study. To ensure that the scale reported a single factor, a principal factor axis analysis was conducted. Strong evidence emerged for a single factor with an Eigen factor of 3.962. No other factor had a Eigen value greater than 0.67. Furthermore, all items loaded strongly on the factor, with values ranging from -0.606 (Item 6) to 0.929 (Item 3). Given these results, the remaining analyses were conducted utilizing the unidimensional motivation measure.

Table B3 displays the correlations among the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), the simipartial correlations (sr_i^2) and R^2, and adjusted R^2. R for regression was significantly different from zero, [F(4,131) = 12.799, p < .001].

Distributive justice (sr_i^2 = .06) was the only IV to contribute significantly to prediction of motivation. The four IVs in combination contributed another .47 in shared variability. Altogether, 28% (26% adjusted) of the variability in motivation was predicted by knowing scores on distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice.

In summary, for hypothesis 1, it was found that there was a main effect of voice on perceptions of procedural,
interpersonal, and informational justice. The results for hypothesis 1a, however, were mixed. It was found that participants perceived the future instrumental voice condition to be more procedurally and interpersonally just than no voice condition. However, participants did not perceive future instrumental voice condition to be informationally more just than the no voice condition, and participants did not perceive a significant difference between the future instrumental voice condition and the non-instrumental voice condition on perceptions of procedural, interpersonal, or informational justice.

The results supported hypothesis 1b in that participants perceived that instrumental voice was more procedurally, interpersonally, and informationally just than participants in the other three voice conditions. However, results for hypothesis 1c were mixed. Participants found the non-instrumental voice condition to be significantly more just than the no-voice condition on perceptions of procedural justice and interpersonal justice, but not significantly different on perceptions of informational justice.

Hypothesis 2 was supported; there was a main effect of condition on perceptions of distributive justice. However, hypothesis 2a was only partially supported.
Participants in the instrumental voice condition reported higher levels of distributive justice than participants in the no-voice condition, but not the future instrumental voice condition or non-instrumental voice condition. Hypothesis 2b was supported in that there were no significant differences in distributive justice perceptions among the participants in the no-voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions.

Hypothesis 3 was partially supported. The results indicate a direct relationship between each form of organizational justice perceptions and participant motivation. Only distributive justice, however, was found to contribute uniquely to the prediction of motivation.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

This study investigated how different forms of voice influence perceptions of organizational justice. Lind et al. (1990) found that organizational justice judgments are enhanced by the opportunity to voice opinions even when there is no chance of influencing the decision. However, Tyler (1987) contradicted these results by finding that the mere act of being given a structural opportunity to speak was not enough to produce procedural justice perceptions. Tyler states that it is also necessary for a subordinate to infer that what they say is being considered by the decision maker. Results from the present study appear to clear up the discrepancies of these two studies by showing more specifically how voice affects organizational justice perceptions.

Procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions appear to be enhanced by the opportunity to voice opinions even when there is no immediate opportunity to influence the decision. It was found that participants in the future instrumental condition and non-instrumental voice condition had significantly higher procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions than participants in the
no-voice condition. Also, as no differences were found between future instrumental voice and non-instrumental voice condition (contrary to what was predicted by hypothesis 1a), the results provide some support to Lind et al.'s (1990) findings, that having the opportunity to have voice of any form during the performance appraisal does have an influence on both procedural and interpersonal justice. Consequently, the fact that there was a difference in procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions between no voice and non-instrumental voice (contrary to what hypothesis 1c predicted), there appears to be more to the mere structural opportunity to speak than what the Tyler (1987) study indicated. Having a structural opportunity to speak, even when a subordinate does not believe that their voice is being considered by a decision maker, does positively affect procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions.

The instrumental voice condition had significantly higher procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions than the future instrumental voice, non-instrumental voice, and no voice conditions. This study, as well as previous research (Korsgaard & Robertson, 1995; Lind et al., 1990; Tyler, 1987), has found that when an employee's voice has an effect on a performance appraisal, the
employee is going to have higher procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions.

Interestingly, the results found for informational justice perceptions do not support earlier research. Results from this study showed no significant differences between non-instrumental voice and no voice conditions. These results support the Tyler (1987) study and contradict the Lind et al. (1990) study because the mere act of allowing voice had little effect on participants’ informational justice perceptions. Furthermore, the fact that no differences were found between the future instrumental voice and non-instrumental voice conditions contradict the Tyler (1987) study because participants believing that their voice is being considered appeared to have little effect on participants’ informational justice perceptions. Perceptions of informational justice were found to be significantly higher for instrumental voice than for future instrumental voice, non-instrumental justice, and no-voice conditions. Thus, it appears that participant’s informational justice perceptions are affected only if their voice is instrumental in affecting their performance appraisal score.

Results for hypothesis 2 were mixed. It was found that participants in the instrumental voice condition
reported higher distributive justice perceptions than participants in the no-voice condition. However, contrary to what was predicted by hypothesis 2a, participants in the instrumental voice condition did not report significantly higher distributive justice perceptions than participants in the future instrumental voice or non-instrumental voice conditions. Hypothesis 2b did accurately predict that there would be no differences in distributive justice perceptions among participants in the no-voice, non-instrumental voice, and future instrumental voice conditions. Results from hypothesis 2a and 2b are consistent with previous research which has found that distributive justice perceptions are tied with the fairness of outcome distributions or allocations (Greenberg, 1986). In other words, a participant’s voice must have a positive change to a participant’s performance appraisal score before his or her distributive justice perceptions will be affected. The fact that no distributive justice differences were found between instrumental voice and future instrumental voice or non-instrumental voice, may indicate I that the study was not sensitive enough to find a significant difference.

This study also investigated whether or not organizational justice perceptions affect an individual’s
motivation. According to results of this study, organizational justice perceptions do have an effect on an individual’s motivation. Overall, it was found that the more organizationally just participants believe the performance appraisal to be, the more motivated they are to improve performance on the job. These results support earlier research done by Bartol et al. (2001) which found that characteristics of performance appraisal systems can affect organizational justice perceptions and motivation. The results also support research done by Cropanzano and Folger (1996) which found that if employees perceive that administrative conduct and procedures are just, employees are predicted to improve performance. The current study adds to this body of research by illustrating that allowing voice in a performance appraisal can indirectly lead to employee motivation to improve performance.

Distributive justice was the only form of justice to contribute significantly to predictions of motivation. Procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice do appear to contribute to a prediction of motivation. However, distributive justice perceptions appear be the best of the four in predicting an individual’s motivation due to voice in the performance appraisal. These results indicate that when an employee perceives that his or her
voice positively impacts the outcome of the performance appraisal, he or she will perceive the performance appraisal to be just and thus will be more motivated to improve his or her performance.

Implications and Future Research

This study has both important applied implications and future research implications for understanding the effects of voice in a performance appraisal. This study adds to a growing body of evidence which should encourage employers to allow employees to be active contributors, such as allowing voice, in the performance appraisal process. An important objective of most performance appraisals is to motivate an employee to improve his or her performance. This study shows that allowing voice in a performance appraisal can indirectly lead to employee motivation to improve performance.

Employers should provide an opportunity for employee voice in the performance appraisal process. Results of this study show that employees do not need to feel that their voice was being considered by the decision maker in order to have feelings of procedural and interpersonal justice. It was shown that just giving an employee an opportunity to voice his or her opinion was enough to lead
to greater procedural and interpersonal justice perceptions. The results of this study are consistent to what Lind and Tyler (1988) postulated, people value voice because it suggest that their views are worthy of hearing. Furthermore, this study shows employers that, if at all possible, allowing employees to have voice during the performance appraisal will likely lead to distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice, which could then lead to higher levels of motivation to improve performance.

The present study’s use of the Colquit’s (2001) organizational justice scale illustrates the effectiveness of Colquit’s four factor model approach to measuring organizational justice. It was shown that interpersonal and informational justice have different correlates and that measuring them separately allows for further differences among the dimensions to be examined. Additionally, the Colquit four separate justice scales were able to show the subtleties of voice’s effect in a performance appraisal. Previous research lumped the three variables (procedural, interpersonal, and informational) into one variable (procedural justice), which masked a lot of the effects that voice has in a performance appraisal. Future researchers should use Colquit’s justice scales or
other scales that conceptualize organizational justice as four distinct dimensions (distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice) in order to better find and understand organizational phenomenon.

Limitations

One limitation of this study, which is typical for scenario based research, was that the scenario possibly limited the range of participant’s justice perception responses. When reading a scenario, participants may have had some difficulty involving themselves in the scenario, and they may also have had difficulty understanding the intended meaning of an item within a scale. For instance, one of the statements on the procedural justice scale read, “I was able to express my views and feelings during the performance-review session.” Although the employee within the scenario may have expressed their feelings the participant reading the scenario may not have identified with the employee or the same opinions expressed by the employee. It would be ideal to get reactions from employees of an organization after they were in a performance appraisal. However, due to the sensitive nature of the performance appraisal in organizations it
would be very difficult to get approval from an organization to allow such a study to occur. Conducting a scenario based project allowed me to indirectly gain data on employee in a working environment.

A second limitation of this study was the instrumental voice scenario’s restricted range in positive and negative reactions to the performance appraisal. Within the instrumental voice scenario, the supervisor changes the participants score from “Below Standards” to “Meets Standards”. However, many participants may have felt that their rating should have been changed to “Exceeds Standards”, especially since it could be construed that the employee within the scenario is working harder than the other employees who they work with. In addition to this, reactions to all of the scenarios were slightly negative. Making the scenarios a little more positive may have created more of a discrepancy between the levels of the independent variable. The restricted range in reactions to the performance appraisal could explain why no differences were found between the future instrumental voice scenario and the non-instrumental voice scenario.

A third limitation of this study was the fact that the organizational justice measure was administered before
the motivation measure. Exposing candidates to the organizational justice measure before taking the motivation measure could have inflated the fairness-motivation relationship due to the fact that participants were asked to think more about the fairness of the performance appraisal than they may have thought about it otherwise. An improvement to the design would be to counterbalance the scales so that some candidates would have responded to the motivation measure before responding to the organizational justice measure.

Another possible limitation of this study was the strength of manipulation of the future instrumental voice condition. The future instrumental voice condition was created to study the reactions of an employee when a supervisor showed them that their voice was considered, but changes were not made to their performance appraisal score. Although in this study future instrumental voice did not differentiate in terms of outcome from non-instrumental voice, it is difficult to imagine that employees in a performance appraisal do not care if their voice is being considered. Future researchers may be able to develop more powerful methods of capturing the consideration factor in a performance appraisal. One way would be to set up a situational design that had
participants interacting with a confederate supervisor in performance appraisal situation. Another way would be to have employees in organizational settings report their feelings after being given a performance appraisal, and creating a scale that would measure an employee’s belief that their voice was considered.

Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the role that employee voice has on organizational justice perceptions in the context of a performance appraisal. We advanced this by testing the relationship of whether or not allowing voice in a performance appraisal will lead to motivation, and by considering the levels of voice (no voice, non-instrumental voice, future instrumental voice, and instrumental voice) that can occur during a performance appraisal. Over the decades, research on voice has come a long way, but there is still a long way to go. Having tools such as Colquit’s (2001) justice scales will help voice researchers to better understand the role of voice in the performance appraisal process. It is my hope that future researchers continue to investigate the impact that employee voice during a performance appraisal has on
organizational justice perceptions and motivation to improve performance.
APPENDIX A

SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONNAIRE
Demographics Questionnaire

Please answer each of the general information questions below. Your responses will remain completely anonymous. Thank you for your honesty.

Age (years): _____

Gender (please check only one):
□ Male    □ Female

Ethnicity (please check only one):
□ American Indian or Alaskan Native
□ Asian
□ Black or African American
□ Hispanic or Latino
□ White (Not Hispanic Origin)
□ Filipino
□ Pacific Islander
□ Other

Think about your current job or any job over the last 5 years. How many performance appraisals have you had over the last 5 years? _____

How long ago was your last performance appraisal? _____ year(s)
           _____ month(s)

How much experience do you have working in a clerical position: _____ year(s)
                      _____ month(s)

In your current position, what is the average number of hours you work in a week? _____
Scenario A (No Voice)

Situation
You work as a Payroll Assistant in the Payroll Branch of Sunnyside Unified School District. You have completed three months of your probationary period thus far. In three more months you will be officially promoted to the position if you pass your sixth month probationary period performance review. The main duties of the Payroll Assistant position include producing payroll reports and answering customer service calls concerning general questions regarding an employee’s pay. You work with eleven other Payroll Assistants who perform the same duties as you do. The other Payroll Assistants have been friendly to you, but because of the fast paced environment of the office you have not had much opportunity to interact with them socially. Despite this you have really enjoyed the work that you are doing because the days seem to go by quickly, you get to help others, and unlike your last job you are not being watched over all the time by your supervisor. Your current supervisor, Pat Parkinson, was hired two months before you started. Pat seems to be very results driven and thus far she has always been very nice to you. When you started in the position she told you, “After three months on the job I expect you to be producing 35 to 40 reports a week and after six months you should be producing 40 to 45 reports a week like the other Payroll Assistants.”

Your Performance
During the first four weeks of your probationary period you had some minor problems learning how to produce the payroll reports (you averaged 33 reports a week). You also had a few mishaps when answering customer service calls, but your supervisor Pat told you that, “Overall you are performing well for a new employee.” In fact, during the second month of your probation you were producing on average 40 reports per week.

Unfortunately, in your third month you noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls you received. This increase in customer service calls has had a negative impact on the number of payroll reports you are able to produce. During your third month you averaged only 29 reports a week. Up to this point in time you haven’t thought too much about this significant decrease in your production since it only makes sense that an increase in customer service calls is going to result in a decrease in your payroll report production. Also, if you are receiving more customer service calls the other Payroll Assistants are probably also receiving more calls. Yesterday, however, while talking to one of the other Payroll Assistants you complained about the increased number of customer service calls you have been receiving and how this has taken time away from producing the payroll reports. She responded by saying that she hasn’t noticed an increase in customer service calls, and that her payroll report production has not
decreased. You then talk to some of the other Payroll Assistants and discover that they too haven’t noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls they have received and that their payroll report production has also not decreased. You know that the increase in customer service calls is not a figment of your imagination, but you cannot figure out why more calls would be routed to your phone line than the other Payroll Assistants. There must be some logical explanation for this occurrence, but you just can’t figure out what that could be. Normally you would not be too worried, but your three month appraisal with your supervisor, Pat Parkinson, is scheduled for later today. You are worried that she might give you a negative performance review and that she might see you as being an unproductive slacker.

**Performance Review Meeting**

Later that day Pat calls you into her office. She says to you, “Close the door and take a seat.” Pat then gives you a written copy of the performance appraisal and tells you, “I will be putting a copy of this performance appraisal into your file.” On the performance appraisal form you see that she has marked “Meets Standards” on every factor except for the factor “Work Production.” You are alarmed to find that for “Work Production” she has given you a “Below Standards” rating. Pat then gives you a report that shows your weekly totals for the last three months and then tells you, “Let me get right to the point, I have noticed that you have been spending a lot of time making personal phone calls and I believe that your production has suffered as a result. Over the first two months you were producing at a high level, so I know you have the potential to work at the same level as the other Payroll Assistants.”

During this lecture you try to think of how she could have gotten the impression that you have been making a lot of personal phone calls because you are always very conscientious about keeping personal phone calls to a minimum. You then remember that earlier that week, just before lunch, she came to your desk to schedule a time to meet with you in regards to your performance appraisal. At the time you were finishing up a phone conversation with a friend you were meeting for lunch. You think that perhaps this is why she thinks you are making a lot of personal calls.

You want to explain the situation to her. Just at that time she tells you that your performance appraisal is over. She then reminds you that it is important that you improve your performance before your sixth month performance review comes up, because if it doesn’t she will have no other choice than to let you go. In your most forceful tone you try to explain to her the situation as you see it, but she interrupts you and says that she doesn’t want to hear excuses, she want to see results. She then thanks you for coming and informs you that she must leave to attend a meeting.
Scenario B (Non-Instrumental Voice)

Situation
You work as a Payroll Assistant in the Payroll Branch of Sunnyside Unified School District. You have completed three months of your probationary period thus far. In three more months you will be officially promoted to the position if you pass your sixth month probationary period performance review. The main duties of the Payroll Assistant position include producing payroll reports and answering customer service calls concerning general questions regarding an employee’s pay. You work with eleven other Payroll Assistants who perform the same duties as you do. The other Payroll Assistants have been friendly to you, but because of the fast paced environment of the office you have not had much opportunity to interact with them socially. Despite this you have really enjoyed the work that you are doing because the days seem to go by quickly, you get to help others, and unlike your last job you are not being watched over all the time by your supervisor. Your current supervisor, Pat Parkinson, was hired two months before you started. Pat seems to be very results driven and thus far she has always been very nice to you. When you started in the position she told you, “After three months on the job I expect you to be producing 35 to 40 reports a week and after six months you should be producing 40 to 45 reports a week like the other Payroll Assistants.”

Your Performance
During the first four weeks of your probationary period you had some minor problems learning how to produce the payroll reports (you averaged 33 reports a week). You also had a few mishaps when answering customer service calls, but your supervisor Pat told you that, “Overall you are performing well for a new employee.” In fact, during the second month of your probation you were producing on average 40 reports per week.

Unfortunately, in your third month you noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls you received. This increase in customer service calls has had a negative impact on the number of payroll reports you are able to produce. During your third month you averaged only 29 reports a week. Up to this point in time you haven’t thought too much about this significant decrease in your production since it only makes sense that an increase in customer service calls is going to result in a decrease in your payroll report production. Also, if you are receiving more customer service calls the other Payroll Assistants are probably also receiving more calls. Yesterday, however, while talking to one of the other Payroll Assistants you complained about the increased number of customer service calls you have been receiving and how this has taken time away from producing the payroll reports. She responded by saying that she hasn’t noticed an increase in customer service calls, and that her payroll report production has not
decreased. You then talk to some of the other Payroll Assistants and discover that they too haven't noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls they have received and that their payroll report production has also not decreased. You know that the increase in customer service calls is not a figment of your imagination, but you cannot figure out why more calls would be routed to your phone line than the other Payroll Assistants. There must be some logical explanation for this occurrence, but you just can't figure out what that could be. Normally you would not be too worried, but your three month appraisal with your supervisor, Pat Parkinson is scheduled for later today. You are worried that she might give you a negative performance review and that she might see you as being an unproductive slacker.

Performance Review Meeting

Later that day Pat calls you into his office. She says to you, "Close the door and take a seat." Pat then gives you a written copy of the performance appraisal and tells you, "I will be putting a copy of this performance appraisal into your file." On the performance appraisal form you see that she has marked "Meets Standards" on every factor except for the factor "Work Production." You are alarmed to find that for "Work Production" she has given you a "Below Standards" rating. Pat then gives you a report that shows your weekly totals for the last three months and then tells you, "Let me get right to the point, I have noticed that you have been spending a lot of time making personal phone calls and I believe that your production has suffered as a result. Over the first two months you were producing at a high level, so I know you have the potential to work at the same level as the other Payroll Assistants."

During this lecture you try to think of how she could have gotten the impression that you have been making a lot of personal phone calls because you are always very conscientious about keeping personal phone calls to a minimum. You then remember that earlier that week, just before lunch, she came to your desk to schedule a time to meet with you in regards to your performance appraisal. At the time you were finishing up a phone conversation with a friend you were meeting for lunch. You think that perhaps this is why she thinks you are making a lot of personal calls.

You want to explain the situation to her. Just at that time she tells you "I would like to hear your thoughts regarding your performance appraisal." You then tell her about how for some reason you are receiving more customer service calls than the other Payroll Assistants and how this increase in customer service calls is taking away from the time you could be spending on the payroll reports. You also explain that you understand the importance of keeping personal phone calls to a minimum and that you are always very conscientious about not making personal phone calls. You further explain that you can see how it may look like you are making more personal phone calls because you are on the phone more often than the other Payroll Assistants,
but that this is because you are on the phone more often answering customer service calls.

After you explain your side of the story to Pat, she concludes the performance review session by telling you that she will include your comments with your performance review and place the performance review in your employee file, but that she will not be changing your performance appraisal scores. She also reminds you that it is important that you improve your performance before your sixth month performance review comes up, because if it doesn’t she will have no other choice than to let you go. She then thanks you for coming and informs you that she must leave to attend a meeting.
Scenario C (Future Instrumental Voice)

Situation

You work as a Payroll Assistant in the Payroll Branch of Sunnyside Unified School District. You have completed three months of your probationary period thus far. In three more months you will be officially promoted to the position if you pass your sixth month probationary period performance review. The main duties of the Payroll Assistant position include producing payroll reports and answering customer service calls concerning general questions regarding an employee’s pay. You work with eleven other Payroll Assistants who perform the same duties as you do. The other Payroll Assistants have been friendly to you, but because of the fast paced environment of the office you have not had much opportunity to interact with them socially. Despite this you have really enjoyed the work that you are doing because the days seem to go by quickly, you get to help others, and unlike your last job you are not being watched over all the time by your supervisor. Your current supervisor, Pat Parkinson, was hired two months before you started. Pat seems to be very results driven and thus far she has always been very nice to you. When you started in the position she told you, “After three months on the job I expect you to be producing 35 to 40 reports a week and after six months you should be producing 40 to 45 reports a week like the other Payroll Assistants.”

Your Performance

During the first four weeks of your probationary period you had some minor problems learning how to produce the payroll reports (you averaged 33 reports a week). You also had a few mishaps when answering customer service calls, but your supervisor Pat told you that, “Overall you are performing well for a new employee.” In fact, during the second month of your probation you were producing on average 40 reports per week.

Unfortunately, in your third month you noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls you received. This increase in customer service calls has had a negative impact on the number of payroll reports you are able to produce. During your third month you averaged only 29 reports a week. Up to this point in time you haven’t thought too much about this significant decrease in your production since it only makes sense that an increase in customer service calls is going to result in a decrease in your payroll report production. Also, if you are receiving more customer service calls the other Payroll Assistants are probably also receiving more calls. Yesterday, however, while talking to one of the other Payroll Assistants you complained about the increased number of customer service calls you have been receiving and how this has taken time away from producing the payroll reports. She responded by saying that she hasn’t noticed an increase in customer service calls, and that her payroll report production has not
decreased. You then talk to some of the other Payroll Assistants and discover that they too haven't noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls they have received and that their payroll report production has also not decreased. You know that the increase in customer service calls is not a figment of your imagination, but you cannot figure out why more calls would be routed to your phone line than the other Payroll Assistants. There must be some logical explanation for this occurrence, but you just can't figure out what that could be. Normally you would not be too worried, but your three month appraisal with your supervisor, Pat Parkinson, is scheduled for later today. You are worried that she might give you a negative performance review and that she might see you as being an unproductive slacker.

Performance Review Meeting
Later that day Pat calls you into her office. She says to you, “Close the door and take a seat.” Pat then gives you a written copy of the performance appraisal and tells you, “I will be putting a copy of this performance appraisal into your file.” On the performance appraisal form you see that she has marked “Meets Standards” on every factor except for the factor “Work Production.” You are alarmed to find that for “Work Production” she has given you a “Below Standards” rating. Pat then gives you a report that shows your weekly totals for the last three months and then tells you, “Let me get right to the point, I have noticed that you have been spending a lot of time making personal phone calls and I believe that your production has suffered as a result. Over the first two months you were producing at a high level, so I know you have the potential to work at the same level as the other Payroll Assistants.”

During this lecture you try to think of how she could have gotten the impression that you have been making a lot of personal phone calls because you are always very conscientious about keeping personal phone calls to a minimum. You then remember that earlier that week, just before lunch, she came to your desk to schedule a time to meet with you in regards to your performance appraisal. At the time you were finishing up a phone conversation with a friend you were meeting for lunch. You think that perhaps this is why she thinks you are making a lot of personal calls.

You want to explain the situation to her. Just at that time she tells you “I would like to hear your thoughts regarding your performance appraisal.” You then tell her about how for some reason you are receiving more customer service calls than the other Payroll Assistants and how this increase in customer service calls is taking away from the time you could be spending on the payroll reports. You also explain that you understand the importance of keeping personal phone calls to a minimum and that you are always very conscientious about not making personal phone calls. You further explain that you can see how it may look like you are making more personal phone calls because you are on the phone more often than the other Payroll Assistants,
but that this is because you are on the phone more often answering customer service calls.

After you explain your side of the story to Pat, she concludes the performance review session by telling you that she will include your comments with your performance review and place the performance review in your employee file. She also tells you that she will not be changing your performance appraisal score. However, Pat tells you that she will look into what you have told her and that if she finds that what you have told her is true, she will be sure to make an adjustment when your sixth month review comes up. She also reminds you that it is important that you improve your performance before your sixth month performance review comes up, because if it doesn’t she will have no other choice than to let you go. She then thanks you for coming and informs you that she must leave to attend a meeting.
Scenario D (Instrumental Voice)

Situation
You work as a Payroll Assistant in the Payroll Branch of Sunnyside Unified School District. You have completed three months of your probationary period thus far. In three more months you will be officially promoted to the position if you pass your sixth month probationary period performance review. The main duties of the Payroll Assistant position include producing payroll reports and answering customer service calls concerning general questions regarding an employee’s pay. You work with eleven other Payroll Assistants who perform the same duties as you do. The other Payroll Assistants have been friendly to you, but because of the fast paced environment of the office you have not had much opportunity to interact with them socially. Despite this you have really enjoyed the work that you are doing because the days seem to go by quickly, you get to help others, and unlike your last job you are not being watched over all the time by your supervisor. Your current supervisor, Pat Parkinson, was hired two months before you started. Pat seems to be very results driven and thus far she has always been very nice to you. When you started in the position she told you, “After three months on the job I expect you to be producing 35 to 40 reports a week and after six months you should be producing 40 to 45 reports a week like the other Payroll Assistants.”

Your Performance
During the first four weeks of your probationary period you had some minor problems learning how to produce the payroll reports (you averaged 33 reports a week). You also had a few mishaps when answering customer service calls, but your supervisor Pat told you that, “Overall you are performing well for a new employee.” In fact, during the second month of your probation you were producing on average 40 reports per week.

Unfortunately, in your third month you noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls you received. This increase in customer service calls has had a negative impact on the number of payroll reports you are able to produce. During your third month you averaged only 29 reports a week. Up to this point in time you haven’t thought too much about this significant decrease in your production since it only makes sense that an increase in customer service calls is going to result in a decrease in your payroll report production. Also, if you are receiving more customer service calls the other Payroll Assistants are probably also receiving more calls. Yesterday, however, while talking to one of the other Payroll Assistants you complained about the increased number of customer service calls you have been receiving and how this has taken time away from producing the payroll reports. She responded by saying that she hasn’t noticed an increase in customer service calls, and that her payroll report production has not.
decreased. You then talk to some of the other Payroll Assistants and discover that they too haven't noticed an increase in the number of customer service calls they have received and that their payroll report production has also not decreased. You know that the increase in customer service calls is not a figment of your imagination, but you cannot figure out why more calls would be routed to your phone line than the other Payroll Assistants. There must be some logical explanation for this occurrence, but you just can't figure out what that could be. Normally you would not be too worried, but your three month appraisal with your supervisor, Pat Parkinson, is scheduled for later today. You are worried that she might give you a negative performance review and that she might see you as being an unproductive slacker.

**Performance Review Meeting**

Later that day Pat calls you into her office. She says to you, “Close the door and take a seat.” Pat then gives you a written copy of the performance appraisal and tells you, “I will be putting a copy of this performance appraisal into your file.” On the performance appraisal form you see that she has marked “Meets Standards” on every factor except for the factor “Work Production.” You are alarmed to find that for “Work Production” she has given you a “Below Standards” rating. She then gives you a report that shows your weekly totals for the last three months and then tells you, “Let me get right to the point, I have noticed that you have been spending a lot of time making personal phone calls and I believe that your production has suffered as a result. Over the first two months you were producing at a high level, so I know you have the potential to work at the same level as the other Payroll Assistants.”

During this lecture you try to think of how she could have gotten the impression that you have been making a lot of personal phone calls because you are always very conscientious about keeping personal phone calls to a minimum. You then remember that earlier that week, just before lunch, she came to your desk to schedule a time to meet with you in regards to your performance appraisal. At the time you were finishing up a phone conversation with a friend you were meeting for lunch. You think that perhaps this is why she thinks you are making a lot of personal calls.

You want to explain the situation to her. Just at that time she tells you “I would like to hear your thoughts regarding your performance appraisal.” You then tell her about how for some reason you are receiving more customer service calls than the other Payroll Assistants and how this increase in customer service calls is taking away from the time you could be spending on the payroll reports. You also explain that you understand the importance of keeping personal phone calls to a minimum and that you are always very conscientious about not making personal phone calls. You further explain that you can see how it may look like you are making more personal phone calls because you are on the phone more often than the other Payroll Assistants,
but that this is because you are on the phone more often answering customer service calls.

After you explain your side of the story to Pat, she concludes the performance review session by telling you that she will include your comments with your performance review and place the performance review in your employee file. She then tells you that she will go ahead and change your “Work Production” score from “Below Standards” to “Meets Standards.” She also tells you that she will look into what you have told her and that if she finds that what you have told her is true, she will be sure to also take it into consideration when your sixth month review comes up. She also tells you that if she finds no evidence of what you have told her and you have not improved your performance by the time your sixth month review comes up, she will have no other choice than to let you go. She then thanks you for coming and informs you that she must leave to attend a meeting.
Items to Check Manipulation

Please indicate your response to each of the following statements. Give a response to all statements and circle only one number for each statement using the following responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. "I believe that within the situation described in the scenario, I was able to state my side of the story during the performance review session."

   1 2 3 4 5

2. * "I believe that within the situation described in the scenario, my supervisor did not consider what I had to say and did not use the information I provided when determining my current performance appraisal ratings."

   1 2 3 4 5

3. "I believe that within the situation described in the scenario, although my input will not affect my current performance appraisal ratings, my supervisor will use it when determining my future performance appraisal ratings.

   1 2 3 4 5

*This item was reverse scored.
Items to Measure Organizational Justice Perceptions

Please indicate your response to each of the following statements. Give a response to all statements and circle only one number for each statement using the following responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributive Justice

1. “The results of the performance-review session were reflective of the effort I have put into my work.”
   1   2   3   4   5

2. “The results of the performance-review session were appropriate for the work I have completed.”
   1   2   3   4   5

3. “The results of the performance-review session reflect what I have contributed to the organization.”
   1   2   3   4   5

4. “The results of the performance-review session were justified, given my performance.”
   1   2   3   4   5

Procedural Justice

1. “I was able to express my views and feelings during the performance-review session.”
   1   2   3   4   5
2. "I was able to have an influence over the results arrived in my performance-review session."
   1  2  3  4  5

3. "I believe that the results of my performance-review session are based on accurate information."
   1  2  3  4  5

4. "I was given an opportunity to appeal the results arrived in the performance-review session."
   1  2  3  4  5

5. "I believe that the performance-review session upheld ethical and moral standards."
   1  2  3  4  5

Interpersonal Justice

1. "My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) has treated me in a polite manner."
   1  2  3  4  5

2. "My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) treated me with dignity."
   1  2  3  4  5

3. "My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) treated me with respect."
   1  2  3  4  5

Informational Justice

1. "My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) has been candid in his communication with me."
   1  2  3  4  5
2. “My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) explained the procedures thoroughly.”
   1  2  3  4  5

3. “My supervisor’s (Pat Parkinson’s) explanations regarding the procedures was reasonable.”
   1  2  3  4  5

4. “My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) communicated details in a timely manner.”
   1  2  3  4  5

5. “My supervisor (Pat Parkinson) seemed to tailor his communications to my specific needs.”
   1  2  3  4  5
Item Measuring Motivation

Please indicate your responses to each of the following statements. Give a response to all statements and circle only one number for each statement using the following responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After my interaction with my supervisor (Pat Parkinson):

1. "I would be **more** motivated to improve my performance."
   
   1: 2 3 4 5

2. "I would feel **more** excited about doing my job."
   
   1 2 3 4 5

3. "I would feel **more** dedicated to doing a better job than I did before."
   
   1 2 3 4 5

4.* "I would be **less** enthusiastic about doing a good job."
   
   1 2 3 4 5

"I would feel **more** motivated to do a good job."
   
   1 2 3 4 5

6.* "I would be **less** concerned about working hard."
   
   1 2 3 4 5

*These items were reverse scored.
APPENDIX B

TABLES AND FIGURES
Table B1  Manipulation Check's Means and Standard Deviations for Each Level of Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manipulation Check Question #1</th>
<th>Manipulation Check Question #2</th>
<th>Manipulation Check Question #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Voice</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values ranged from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”.

Table B2  Group Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Interpersonal Justice</th>
<th>Informational Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Voice</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Voice</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values ranged from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”.
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Figure B1  Hypothesis 1a Group Means

Note: Values ranged from 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 5 = "Strongly Agree".
Figure B2 Hypothesis 1b Group Means

Note: Values ranged from 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 5 = "Strongly Agree".

Figure B3 Hypothesis 2a, and 2b Group Means

Note: Values ranged from 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 5 = "Strongly Agree".
Table B3  Correlation table of Standard Multiple Regression of the Effect of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mot. Scale (DV)</th>
<th>Dist. Scale</th>
<th>Proc. Scale</th>
<th>Interp. Scale</th>
<th>Info. Scale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$\text{s}^2$ (unique)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Scale</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.296**</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc. Scale</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interp. Scale</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. Scale</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept = 1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.1629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviations</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.85321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.53\text{a}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = 0.26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R = 0.28^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

a Unique variability = .06; shared variability = .47.
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