

Organisational justice in the context of organisational change

Shaul Oreg* and Karen van Dam**

Recent research on justice in organisations has demonstrated the importance of justice perceptions for a wide range of organisational outcomes. This article examines the role of justice perceptions in the context of organisational change. First, the relevance of organisational justice during organisational change is discussed. Next, a review is presented of the literature on organisational justice and employee reactions to organisational change, whereby justice is considered either an antecedent or consequence of change reactions. Finally, several guidelines for future research are proposed. (*Netherlands Journal of Psychology*, 65, 127-135.)

Keywords: organisational justice; organisational change

Over the past two decades, organisational justice has emerged as a central concept in the psychology of work and organisations. Organisational justice refers to the conditions of employment that lead individuals to believe they are being treated fairly or unfairly (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Research has shown that organisational justice is an important determinant of organisational outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, withdrawal, organisational citizenship and retaliation behaviours (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Given the important role of justice in many areas of work and organisational psychology there has been increased attention for organisational jus-

tice in organisational research (Gilliland & Chan, 2002). As a consequence, a justice framework has been applied to different areas within this field, such as performance evaluation (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998), personnel selection (Truxillo, Steiner, & Gilliland, 2004), and diversity management (Gilliland & Gilliland, 2001).

Recently, researchers have been linking organisational justice with the particular context of organisational change. In order to survive in a fast-evolving environment, organisations apply a broad array of changes, such as mergers, layoffs, product innovation, and the implementation of new technological systems. Organisational changes can have profound effects on everyone in the organisation, eliciting strong reactions that can severely hamper the change process, and ultimately affect both organisational outcomes and employee well-being (e.g., V. D. Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994; Piderit, 2000). Justice perceptions may play a crucial role in these reactions. Workers' perceptions of the fairness of the decisions and of the implementa-

* University of Haifa, Israel

** Tilburg University, the Netherlands

Correspondence to: Shaul Oreg, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Haifa, Haifa, Mt. Carmel 31905, Israel, e-mail: oreg@soc.haifa.ac.il

Received 11 August 2008; revision accepted 16 September 2008.

tion of a change may affect both their cooperation with the change and their evaluations of the parties responsible for the change (Brockner, Konovsky, Cooper Schneider, & Folger, 1994; Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998).

Although recent research addressing this issue indicates the relevance of justice perceptions for the context of organisational change, it does not yet offer a comprehensive overview of the processes involved. From both theoretical and practical viewpoints it is important to understand how justice perceptions develop within a change situation, and how these perceptions can impact employees' reactions to a change. The purpose of the present paper was therefore to highlight the justice-related factors that have been examined in the context of organisational change. We begin by discussing the relevance of organisational justice to the context of organisational change. We then review the literature on organisational justice and employee reactions to organisational change, in which justice is considered either an antecedent or consequence of change reactions. We will also discuss the implications of extant findings and propose guidelines for future research.

Justice in the context of organisational change

By its very nature, organisational change is bound to raise justice-related questions. Breaking the status quo and disrupting the equilibrium that preceded the change typically elicits questions concerning the *outcomes* of change and the *process* through which change is implemented. First and foremost, employees want to know how the change will influence their lives. Most organisational changes involve, in one way or another, a redistribution of resources. For example, structural change typically entails a redistribution of power and status (Burkhardt & Brass, 1990); changes in compensation systems constitute a redistribution of financial resources (Hatcher & Ross, 1991); and technological change often yields a redistribution of knowledge (Orlikowski & Robey, 1991). Therefore, employees may wonder whether the change will have an impact on their personal experience at work. Will it influence their physical or social surroundings? The types of tasks they are required to perform? Their salaries or benefits? Or will it influence their social or political standing in the organisation? Based on Adam's (1965) equity theory we suggest that if the answer to any of the above questions is yes, the change will ultimately lead individuals to re-evaluate their beliefs concerning the fairness of the organisation.

According to equity theory, distributive justice perceptions are based on comparisons that individuals make between their perceived ratio of outcomes (e.g., salary, job security, an interesting job) to inputs (e.g., education, job experience,

skills), with their perceived ratio of referent others' outcomes to inputs. One such referent is frequently individuals' own input/outcome ratio as it was prior to the change (Cherry, Ordonez, & Gilliland, 2003). Because personal information is often more readily available and is easier to access than information about others, individuals often use themselves as the referent to which they compare their post-change situation (Cherry et al., 2003). Because any organisational change has the potential of redistributing organisational resources (i.e., outcomes), it could therefore also influence employees' distributive justice perceptions. The outcomes of either the self, of others, or both, could be altered, which will bring about a new result to the equity equation, and thus directly influence distributive justice perceptions.

Changes in the distribution of outcomes also raise questions about the manner in which the redistribution of resources has been established. In fact, in the organisational change literature far more research attention has been given to questions concerning the change *process* (e.g., Korsgaard, Sapienza, & Schweiger, 2002) than change outcomes. When organisational changes occur, employees evaluate how the change was planned and implemented, the extent to which their input was solicited and considered, and the amount and type of information that was provided about the change. These assessments all relate to perceptions of procedural (Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) and interactional (Bies & Moag, 1986) justice.

Even when justice is not explicitly assessed, studies that focus on employees' reactions to organisational change often implicitly address notions of justice. For example, several studies of change reactions try to unravel the relationships between change process and employee reactions (e.g., van Dam, Oreg, & Schyns, 2008). Although in several of these studies employees are not asked directly about their justice perceptions, their evaluations of the change process typically reflect their judgements of how fair the organisation was in designing and applying the change. Similarly, in other studies (e.g., Oreg, 2006), employees are asked to judge the outcomes of change, and to evaluate their new situation relative to their old one. Here too, employees are not necessarily asked about their justice perceptions, although these can often be inferred from the judgements they provide.

Thus, although often without the term justice being explicitly used, many studies suggest that organisational change will naturally entail employee concerns about the fairness of the post-change resource distribution and the fairness of the process and style through which the change, and with it the new distribution, were determined. In other words, organisational change yields questions about distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

Beyond the fact that change *yields* justice-related questions, research indicates that change is among those contexts in which the meaningfulness of justice perceptions is particularly high (Lind & van den Bos, 2002; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). According to the theory of uncertainty management (Lind & van den Bos, 2002), the impact of fairness judgements on individuals' reactions (e.g., positive affect, acceptance of organisational decisions) becomes particularly significant in situations of uncertainty. This is because information about fairness serves in these situations as a substitute for other kinds of information that is normally available when the situation is not uncertain. As Lind and van den Bos (2002) note, 'Fair treatment helps people manage their uncertainty... both because it gives them confidence that they will ultimately receive good outcomes and because it makes the possibility of loss less anxiety-provoking or even... enjoyable' (pp. 196-197). Because uncertainty is a key characteristic of practically any change, information about fairness is more likely to be sought when organisational changes are initiated. Perceptions of the change as being fair increase the chances that change will be accepted, whereas perceptions of unfairness increase the chance of resistance to change (Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, & Walker, 2007).

Therefore, theory suggests that justice issues should be particularly relevant in the context of organisational change. Works that consider justice in the context of organisational change exist for all three justice categories: distributive, procedural, and interactional. Whereas some studies explicitly link justice to change situations, several others make implications or inferences that can easily be tied to justice concepts. We review both sets of studies next.

Distributive justice and reactions to change

Only a small number of studies explicitly addressed the relationship between distributive justice and employee reactions to organisational change. In a conceptual paper about employees' responses to organisational downsizing, distributive justice was highlighted as a potential moderator of survivors' reactions (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). Survivors who appraise the downsizing as distributively just are proposed to be more likely to exhibit constructive responses.

In line with this rationale, perceptions of distributive justice were shown to reduce employees' anxiety following a change (Paterson & Cary, 2002). In their study, Paterson and Cary collected data following the announcement of a restructuring and downsizing in a division of an Australian public sector organisation. The change included a transition to semi-autonomous work teams and downsizing by 60%. As was hypothesised, the fairer employees perceived the overall outcomes of the change to be, the less anxious

they were following the change. In another study, distributive justice was related to employees' commitment to an automobile parts manufacturer's spinoff from the parent corporation (Bernerth et al., 2007). Employees who felt that the outcomes of the spinoff were fairly expressed increased support for, and commitment to, the change.

Several other studies of reactions to change also appear to be relevant. Although distributive justice was not explicitly assessed, employees in these studies were asked about their judgements of the change outcomes (e.g., Naswall, Sverke, & Hellgren, 2005; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006; van Dam, 2005). In these studies, employees' evaluations of post-change outcomes were shown to directly relate to their responses to the change as a whole. Despite the distinction between outcome favourability and outcome fairness (e.g., Skitka, Winkvist, & Hutchinson, 2003), there is nevertheless a link between outcome favourability and justice perceptions, given the role of outcomes in the formation of employees' equity judgements.

As would be expected, previous studies found perceptions of negative outcomes to be associated with negative reactions to the change. For example, in a number of studies employees' overall evaluation of the benefit or harm elicited by the change was associated with negative attitudes towards the change and towards the organisation (Bartunek, Rousseau, Rudolph, & DePalma, 2006; Caldwell, Herold, & Fedor, 2004; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006; van Dam, 2005).

Other studies focused on changes in particular types of outcomes and the impact of these changes on employees' reactions. For example, several studies found perceived job or career insecurity following an organisational change to correlate with negative reactions, such as increased stress, increased propensity to quit, and decreased job satisfaction (Armstrong-Stassen, 1998; Ashford, 1988; Cunningham et al., 2002; Johnson, Bernhagen, Miller, & Allen, 1996; Naswall et al., 2005). Other works suggest that the perceived impact that a change has on employees' social or political standing also influences reactions to the change (Goltz & Hietapelto, 2002; Oreg, 2006; Tichy, 1983).

Reactions to change have also been shown to correspond with employees' perceptions of the implications that change has on the nature of their jobs. In several studies, employees who felt the change will make their jobs either too complex or too boring reported greater opposition to the change and exhibited negative reactions such as decreased organisational commitment and increased depression (Axtell et al., 2002; Fedor, Caldwell, & Herold, 2006; Oreg, 2006).

In each of these studies, employees were either explicitly or implicitly evaluating the fairness of the change outcomes. Considering that the most direct impact a change has on employees is through its ultimate consequences, it is not sur-

prising that negative judgements of change outcomes are strongly associated with negative judgements of the change as a whole, and negative reactions to the organisation, as well as detrimental psychological reactions, such as increased anxiety and depression.

Procedural justice, interactional justice, and reactions to change

While distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of outcomes, procedural and interactional justice refer to the perceived fairness of the means and style in which those outcomes are determined. Specifically, procedural justice refers to the mechanisms used for determining outcomes, and interactional justice, sometimes referred to as a social form of procedural justice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997), relates to the quality of the interpersonal treatment individuals receive, including the information they are provided with (i.e., informational justice) and the respect with which they are treated (i.e., interpersonal justice) (Colquitt et al., 2001). In the context of organisational change, both these forms of justice involve perceptions of the process through which change is designed and executed. Indeed, it is the change process that has received most of the attention in studies of employee reactions to change.

Beginning with Coch and French's (1948) classic study of the Harwood Manufacturing Company, numerous studies tried to link the change process with reactions to change. Participation is perhaps the key variable through which the change process has been evaluated. At least 11 studies examined how participation in planning or managing an organisational change relates to employees' acceptance of the change and their longer-term functioning in the organisation (Amiot, Terry, Jimmieson, & Callan, 2006; Axtell et al., 2002; Bartunek, Greenberg, & Davidson, 1999; Bartunek et al., 2006; Coch & French, 1948; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007; Lau & Woodman, 1995; Steel & Lloyd, 1988; van Dam et al., 2008; Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Because participation pertains directly to Thibaut and Walker's (1975) *voice* criterion of procedural justice, and to Leventhal's (1980) *representativeness* criterion, participation in the change process should influence employees' justice perceptions, which in turn would be expected to influence employees' reactions to the change. Although the mediating role of justice has not been empirically tested, findings from the studies that have been conducted do correspond with this proposition. As a whole, findings show that increased participation is associated with greater acceptance of change, an improved orientation towards the organisation, and increased psychological well-being. The differences across studies pertain particularly to the type of outcomes that have been considered (e.g.,

change acceptance, job satisfaction, trust in management). It is noteworthy that *representativeness* appears to be the only one of Leventhal's process criteria to have been considered in studies of reactions to organisational change. As we propose in the final section of our paper, future studies should be designed to address other procedural justice criteria.

Also concerning the change process, but relating more to the informational component of interactional justice, several studies explored the role of information in explaining employees' reactions to change (e.g., Lau & Woodman, 1995; V. D. Miller et al., 1994; van Dam et al., 2008). The main argument in these studies is that the amount and type of information that is provided about an organisational change can have a substantial impact on employees' responses. For example, in a number of studies, perceptions of the quality of the information provided was associated with employees' openness to the change and willingness to cooperate with it (V. D. Miller et al., 1994; van Dam et al., 2008; Wanberg & Banas, 2000).

Research has also found significant relationships between judgements of the information provided and various work-related outcomes. For example, providing a realistic preview of a merger reduced uncertainty and stress, and increased job satisfaction, organisational commitment and employees' intentions to remain in the organisation (Schweiger & Denisi, 1991). Similar results were found for other types of changes, such as organisational restructuring or changes in the physical work environment (Bordia, Hunt, Paulsen, Tourish, & DiFonzo, 2004; K. I. Miller & Monge, 1985).

Overall, additional information about the change tends to elicit more positive responses to the change. However, at least in one study, the opposite relationship was found, whereby contrary to what was hypothesised, additional information about the change was associated with increased resistance to the change (Oreg, 2006). To explain this result, Oreg suggested that the influence of information may be contingent on its content. Important as it may be to inform employees about the change, if the information indicates negative consequences, one should expect negative reactions. Certainly, another important factor that could explain such a finding, which has not been thoroughly addressed in the literature, is the timing in which information is provided. Providing the same information at different times is bound to elicit different responses. Whereas providing information a reasonable amount of time before the change could decrease resistance, too long or too short a notice may actually increase employees' resistance to the change.

A few other aspects of the change process have also been examined, mostly relating to the impact of one's supervisors or coworkers. In addition to the effect of participation and informa-

tion, Amiot et al. (2006) found that the perceived effectiveness of leadership during the change was related to employee stress during the change. Such judgements of leadership effectiveness during change serve, in essence, as judgements of the process through which the change was managed, and thus elicit questions about procedural justice. Although having a change perceived by employees as being managed effectively is not the same as the change process being perceived as fair, the two perceptions would nevertheless appear to be related. Employees' perceptions of effective change leadership could be seen as indicative that employees perceive the change process as being fair, whereas perceptions of ineffective change leadership are likely to be associated with perceptions of an unfair change process. Similarly, management's support during change could also be expected to influence judgements of the change process and would relate to the interpersonal dimension of interactional justice. These judgements in turn would be expected to influence employees' reactions to the change. In one study, the extent to which management provided support during an organisational change process was related to employees' readiness for the change (Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000).

While all of the above studies address the link between change process and reactions to change, none of them explicitly employ the concept of *justice*. Employees in these studies were asked about their perceptions of the change process (e.g., 'Did you have the opportunity to take part in the planning of the change?', 'How much information did you receive about the change?'), but were not asked directly about their perceptions of the *fairness* of this process. Recently, however, a few studies did explicitly assess the role of procedural or interactional justice in organisational change situations. In one study, both procedural and interactional justice predicted employees' change commitment. Interactional justice in that study was also associated with organisational cynicism (Bernerth et al., 2007).

In a study of a divestiture in a large chemical company, procedural justice was positively correlated with employees' trust in management and organisational commitment (Gopinath & Becker, 2000). The perceived quality of communication, which implicitly taps informational justice, predicted organisational commitment above and beyond the effect of procedural justice. Similarly, in the Paterson and Cary (2002) study mentioned above, in addition to the effect of distributive justice, interactional justice was related to trust in management, and procedural justice to change acceptance.

In each of the studies reviewed above, justice perceptions are viewed as an antecedent of employees' reactions to change. Indeed, this is the case for the vast majority of studies on justice and change. However, this was not the case in

three of the studies we came across in our review. In one study, rather than an antecedent, justice was considered an outcome of employees' beliefs about the organisational change (Armenakis, Bernerth, Pitts, & Walker, 2007). In the context of validating an organisational change beliefs scale, Armenakis et al. found that beliefs about the organisational change (e.g., 'the change we implemented was correct for our situation') predicted perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice. However, given the cross-sectional design of their study, the directionality of the relationship may also be the other way around, whereby justice perceptions yield a more positive evaluation of the organisational change. The value of this study is in highlighting the conceptual possibility that justice may also be an outcome, and not only an antecedent of employees' reactions to change.

In a second study, of relocations of seven private-sector organisations, the favourability of the change outcome moderated the relationship between informational justice (termed 'justification') and distributive justice, such that the relationship existed only when outcome favourability was low (Daly, 1995). When outcome favourability was high, distributive justice perceptions were high regardless of the level of informational justice.

Finally, in a third study, of a large-scale re-engineering planning project in two power plants, procedural justice buffered the potentially detrimental effect that the planning of the organisational change had on employee responses, including their perceptions of their obligations and their intentions to remain in the organisation. The greater the justice employees perceived in how the change was managed, the smaller the negative effect of the change initiative on employee outcomes.

Much remains to be investigated about the role of justice in the context of change, in particular when one goes beyond the simple effect of justice on reactions to change. In the next section we suggest directions for future research and discuss how what we know so far about justice and change may translate into organisational practice.

Implications for future research

As we hope to have demonstrated in this review, justice perceptions can play an important role during organisational change. Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice all appear to constitute both an antecedent and a consequence of employee reactions in change situations. At the same time, we wish to draw attention to the need for additional research on a number of issues.

First, as noted above, by focusing on employee participation, studies that link justice perceptions to the change process considered only the

representativeness procedural justice criterion (Leventhal, 1980). One would assume, however, that other criteria may also be employed by employees in the formation of their justice-related reactions to organisational change. For example, the degree to which change agents leave room for adjusting the progression of the organisational change, and at times even reverting to previous forms when necessary, as would be prescribed by the *correctability* criterion, could well influence how employees feel about the fairness of an organisational change.

Second, several variables are likely to affect the relationship between the change process, justice perceptions and change outcomes. Some of these variables may be present in the daily work context in which the change takes place (van Dam et al., 2008). Extant literature suggests that culture and leadership may influence the relationship between change process characteristics and perceptions of justice. For example, employees working in organisations with an individualistic culture, where individual performance is strongly stimulated and rewarded, may react more strongly to distributive aspects of the change process compared with employees working in organisations with a collectivistic culture (Gilliland & Paddock, 2005). Similarly, employees who experience a high-quality relationship with their supervisor, or who work for a transformational leader, may have greater confidence in the fairness of the processes and outcomes of the change (Tierney, 1999; Wu, Neubert, & Yi, 2007). Both of these examples portray the notion that the work setting within which changes are initiated is likely to have an effect on the degree to which employees perceive organisational changes as fair as well as on how employees react to these changes. As such, these variables may set certain boundary conditions to what we know today about justice perceptions and reactions to change.

The organisation's environment may constitute yet another boundary condition. In times of turbulence and uncertainty, existing norms relating to what is considered fair could be disturbed (Gilliland & Paddock, 2005). According to the justice model of Folger, Sheppard, and Buttram (1995), the importance that individuals ascribe to aspects of distributive justice depends on the particular context within which organisational events occur. For example, when organisational change takes place in times of economic affluence, change-related layoffs, when based on an employee's performance, may seem fair. Contrarily, in times of poor economic conditions, factors other than performance, such as seniority or financial need, may be expected for layoffs to be perceived as fair (Folger et al., 1995). Future research is required before we can more fully understand the boundary conditions, both within and outside organisations, which may moderate justice-related effects in the course of organisational change.

Third, beside organisational and environmental variables, individual characteristics, such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and proactivity may also influence fairness perceptions in the context of change. Employees who have little confidence in their competencies, or who are not used to proactively taking charge of their own situation, may feel particularly dependent on the system and thus hold higher expectations of being treated fairly. As a consequence, their reactions to injustice may be particularly strong (De Cremer, 2003). Similarly, employees with low self-esteem may exhibit particularly strong affective reactions, including increased stress, when experiencing injustice in the context of organisational change (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Furthermore, employees inherent orientation towards change (Oreg, 2003; Oreg et al., 2008) may also influence employees' sensitivity to issues of fairness in the context of change. Those who are dispositionally resistant to change may be more focused on issues of justice and react more strongly to perceptions of informational and procedural unfairness during change than those who are not dispositionally resistant to change. More research is needed to better understand the role of dispositional differences in explaining employees' justice-related reactions to organisational change.

Fourth, more attention could be paid to differences across types of change. The concept of organisational change represents a large variety of organisational transitions. These vary from abrupt transformative and organisation-wide changes, such as mergers, acquisitions, and downsizing, to smaller and more emergent changes, such as the updating or implementation of new technological systems. Change processes and justice perceptions may differ as a function of the severity or degree of discontinuity of the change. Perceived injustice may evoke resistance especially in cases of transformational change, where there is more uncertainty and a greater chance for previous agreements to be reneged and replaced with fundamentally new ones (Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio, 2008). There is some evidence that the type and size of the change may impact employees' perceptions and reactions to the change. For instance, Kim and Rousseau (2006, working paper cited in Ford et al., 2008) found that the acceptance of, and willingness to participate in, a change depended on what employees believed they, and the organisation, had to gain from it. They suggested that when smaller changes are concerned, employees may be less focused on injustice issues and more inclined to participate. This is in line with the theory of uncertainty management (Lind & van den Bos, 2002) and relates to our earlier observation that uncertainty and ambiguity may frequently trigger employees' justice seeking.

Fifth, not much is known about the relative weight each of the three justice dimensions has in influencing reactions to change. There are

times when employees may set a particularly high priority to being well informed about an upcoming change. At other times employees' expectations may focus on the opportunity to take part in the planning and implementation of the change. Therefore, it is important to think about fairness judgements in a more context-specific way and try to understand the conditions that make one form of justice more salient than another (Folger et al., 1995; Gilliland & Paddock, 2005). Similarly, it may be necessary to look at the underlying causal agent (i.e., individual manager versus the organisation as a whole) when studying justice perceptions during change (Gilliland & Paddock, 2005). Justice perceptions may be influenced by those who are responsible for implementing the change in addition to the actual content and design of the change. There is some empirical evidence showing that perceptions of justice may vary depending on whether the cause of the unfairness was an individual or the organisational system as a whole (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). To increase our understanding of employees' reac-

tions to change situations, future research should consider the varying importance of each justice dimension and the causal source underlying justice perceptions.

Finally, we wish to emphasise the need for additional theory and model development in the realm of justice and change. In a review of the justice literature, Greenberg (1993) suggested that the field was in a state of 'intellectual adolescence', being characterised by underdeveloped research agendas and the absence of underlying theory. While justice research has since proliferated (see for instance Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007), this claim would appear to still apply to research of justice and organisational change today. Although the number of studies on the topic has substantially increased, little efforts have been made to integrate and consolidate the various findings. Our review was aimed to provide a first step towards a better understanding of the underlying justice-related processes involved in the context of organisational change.

References

- Adams, S. J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-300). New York: Academic Press.
- Amiot, C., Terry, D., Jimmieson, N., & Callan, V. (2006). A longitudinal investigation of coping processes during a merger: Implications for job satisfaction and organizational identification. *Journal of Management*, 32, 552-574.
- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25, 293-315.
- Armenakis, A. A., Bernerth, J. B., Pitts, J. P., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Organizational change recipients' beliefs scale: Development of an assessment instrument. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43, 495-505.
- Armstrong-Stassen, M. (1998). The effect of gender and organizational level on how survivors appraise and cope with organizational downsizing. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34, 125-142.
- Ashford, S. J. (1988). Individual strategies for coping with stress during organizational transitions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24, 19-36.
- Axtell, C., Wall, T., Stride, C., Pepper, K., Clegg, C., Gardner, P., et al. (2002). Familiarity breeds content: The impact of exposure to change on employee openness and well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 217-231.
- Bartunek, J. M., Greenberg, D. N., & Davidson, B. (1999). Consistent and inconsistent impacts of a teacher-led empowerment initiative in a federation of schools. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 457-478.
- Bartunek, J. M., Rousseau, D. M., Rudolph, J. W., & DePalma, J. A. (2006). On the receiving end: Sensemaking, emotion, and assessments of an organizational change initiated by others. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 42, 182-206.
- Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43, 303-307, 311-317, 319-326.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D., & DiFonzo, N. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13, 345-365.
- Brockner, J., Konovsky, M., Cooper Schneider, R., & Folger, R. (1994). Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 397-409.
- Burkhardt, M. E., & Brass, D. J. (1990). Changing patterns of patterns of change: The effects of a change in technology on social network structure and power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 104-124.
- Caldwell, S. D., Herold, D. M., & Fedor, D. B. (2004). Toward an understanding of the relationships among organizational change, individual differences, and changes in person-environment fit: A

- cross-level study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 868-882.
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 615-633.
- Cherry, B., Ordóñez, L. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (2003). Grade expectations: The effects of expectations on fairness and satisfaction perceptions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 16, 375-395.
- Coch, L., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 1, 512-532.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2002). Changing employee attitudes: The independent effects of TQM and profit sharing on continuous improvement orientation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 38, 57-77.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21, 34-48.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.
- Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., et al. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 377-392.
- Daly, J. P. (1995). Explaining changes to employees: The influence of justification and change outcomes on employees' fairness judgements. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31, 415-428.
- De Cremer, D. (2003). How self-conception may lead to inequality: Effect of hierarchical roles on the equality rule in organizational resource-sharing tasks. *Group & Organization Management*, 28, 282.
- Eby, L. T., Adams, D. M., Russell, J. E. A., & Gaby, S. H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: Factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team-based selling. *Human Relations*, 53, 419-442.
- Erdogan, B., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). Procedural justice as a two-dimensional construct: An examination in the performance appraisal context. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 37, 205-222.
- Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Herold, D. M. (2006). The effects of organizational changes on employee commitment: A multilevel investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 1-29.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Folger, R., Sheppard, B. H., & Buttram, R. T. (1995). Equity, equality, and need: Three faces of social justice. In J. Z. Rubin & B. B. Bunker (Eds.), *Conflict, cooperation, and justice: Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch* (pp. 261-289). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 362-377.
- Gilliland, S. W., & Chan, D. (2002). Justice in organizations: Theory, methods, and applications. In H. K. Sinangil, C. Viswesvaran, N. Anderson & D. S. Ones (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology, Volume 2: Organizational psychology* (pp. 143-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Gilliland, S. W., & Gilliland, C. K. (2001). An organizational justice analysis of diversity training. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Gilliland, S. W., & Paddock, L. (2005). Images of justice: Development of justice integration theory. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *What Motivates Fairness in Organizations?* (pp. 49-78). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Goltz, S. M., & Hietapelto, A. (2002). Using the operant and strategic contingencies models of power to understand resistance to change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 22, 3-22.
- Gopinath, C., & Becker, T. E. (2000). Communication, procedural justice and employee attitudes: Relationships under conditions of divestiture. *Journal of Management*, 26, 63-83.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The intellectual adolescence of organizational justice: You've come a long way, maybe. *Social Justice Research*, 6, 135-148.
- Hatcher, L., & Ross, T. L. (1991). From individual incentives to an organization-wide gainsharing plan: Effects on teamwork and product quality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 169-183.
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43, 232-255.
- Johnson, J. R., Bernhagen, M. J., Miller, V., & Allen, M. (1996). The role of communication in managing reductions in work force. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 24, 139.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Schweiger, D. M. (2002). Beaten before begun: The role of procedural justice in planning change. *Journal of Management*, 28, 497-516.
- Lau, C.-M., & Woodman, R. W. (1995). Understanding organizational change: A schematic perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 537-554.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In L. Gergen, M. Greenberg & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum.

- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and Social Interaction: Experimental and Theoretical Contributions from Psychological Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lind, E. A., & van den Bos, K. (2002). When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management. In R. M. Kramer & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (pp. 181-223). US: Elsevier Science / JAI Press.
- Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. (1985). Social information and employee anxiety about organizational change. *Human Communication Research*, *11*, 365-386.
- Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *22*, 59-80.
- Mishra, A. K., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1998). Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work redesign. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 567-588.
- Naswall, K., Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2005). The moderating role of personality characteristics on the relationship between job insecurity and strain. *Work and Stress*, *19*, 37-49.
- Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 680-693.
- Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *15*, 73-101.
- Oreg, S., Bayazit, M., Vakola, M., Arciniega, L., Armenakis, A. A., Barkauskiene, R., et al. (2008). Dispositional resistance to change: Measurement equivalence and the link to personal values across 17 nations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 935-944.
- Orlikowski, W. J., & Robey, D. (1991). Information Technology and the Structuring of Organizations. *Information Systems Research*, *2*, 143-169.
- Paterson, J. M., & Cary, J. (2002). Organizational justice, change anxiety, and acceptance of downsizing: Preliminary tests of an AET-based model. *Motivation and Emotion*, *26*, 83-103.
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 783-794.
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). Perceptions of Organizational Change: A Stress and Coping Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1154-1162.
- Schweiger, D. M., & Denisi, A. S. (1991). Communication with Employees Following a Merger: A Longitudinal Field Experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 110-135.
- Skitka, L. J., Winquist, J., & Hutchinson, S. (2003). Are Outcome Fairness and Outcome Favorability Distinguishable Psychological Constructs? A Meta-Analytic Review. *Social Justice Research*, *16*, 309-341.
- Steel, R. P., & Lloyd, R. F. (1988). Cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes of participation in quality circles: Conceptual and empirical findings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *24*, 1-17.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates; Distributed by the Halsted Press Division of Wiley.
- Tichy, N. M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: technical, political, and cultural dynamics*. New York: Wiley.
- Tierney, P. (1999). Work relations as a precursor to a psychological climate for change The role of work group supervisors and peers. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*, 120-133.
- Truxillo, D. M., Steiner, D. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (2004). The importance of organizational justice in personnel selection: Defining when selection fairness really matters. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *12*, 39-53.
- van Dam, K. (2005). Employee attitudes toward job changes: An application and extension of Rusbult and Farrell's investment model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *78*, 253-272.
- van Dam, K., Oreg, S., & Schyns, B. (2008). Daily work contexts and resistance to organizational change: The role of leader-member exchange, perceived development climate, and change process quality *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *57*, 313-334.
- van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgements. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 34 (pp. 1-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 132-142.
- Wu, C., Neubert, M. J., & Yi, X. (2007). Transformational leadership, cohesion perceptions, and employee cynicism about organizational change: The mediating role of justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *43*, 327-351.