

The Influence of HRD Practices on Employees' Organizational Justice Perceptions

Deepu Kurian, *Director of Business Operations, University of Houston*

An effective system of organizational justice forms the foundation for an organizational culture which promotes inclusion and diversity, and therefore an important topic for human resources development (HRD). Organizational justice is an issue for HRD practice, because certain perceptions of organizational justice or fairness can be related to training and development opportunities, organizational change/development practices and career planning/development. HRD decisions may impact the employees on both personal and professional level and hence such decisions may have an impact on the employees' perceptions of fairness. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the influence of HRD practices on the employees' perceptions of justice at interactive, procedural and outcomes level. The results show that all dimensions of organizational justice influence the employees' fairness perception, however it is important to note that procedural and interactional levels dominated the employee's perceptions.

Key words: organizational justice, human resource development practices, work relationships.

Introduction

For centuries, authors and thinkers have researched and written about the importance of honesty, trust, ethics, fairness, justice and their influence on organizations, communities, and nations. In today's world, employees spend a major part of their life in organizations or activities connected to their organizational responsibilities and the day to day events in the workplace (interactions, processes, policies, outcomes and so on) has profound impact on their personal and professional lives. Even after developing numerous theories and designing impactful training, there are still an ample number of scandals (for example, Enron, Livestrong foundation, Tyco, Societe Generale, Samsung, Satyam) where individual actions were directed towards their personal enrichment rather than the advancement of the organization or the benefit of the employees. Such scandals also present questions about fairness within those organizations — whether it be related to organizational decisions, outcomes or information. Fairness in organizations, is a subjective and descriptive concept in that it captures what individuals believe to be right, rather than an objective reality or a prescriptive moral code (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). The notion of justice or fairness has become an increasingly visible construct in social sciences (Colquitt, 2001), and social scientists have long recognized the importance of the ideals of justice as a basic requirement for the effective functioning of organizations and the personal satisfaction of the individuals they employ (Greenberg, 1990). Studies on organizational justice emerged from related research in social psychology, particularly from studies on relative deprivation and in the social psychology of legal phenomena (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001).

The domain of organizational justice refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions, and outcomes to be fair in nature (Baldwin, 2006). Research has shown that the concept of organizational justice is a powerful predictor of people's affective, cognitive,

and behavioural reactions in various work contexts (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Similarly, organizational justice has the potential to create powerful benefits for organizations and employees alike; it defines the very essence of individual's relationship to employers (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Therefore, organizational justice (Greenberg, 1987) focuses on perceptions of fairness in organizations by categorizing employees' views and feelings about their treatment and that of others within an organization. Researchers found that perceptions of justice in one's workplace (organizational justice) are positively associated with self-report of "ideal" behaviours and negatively associated with self-report of misbehaviour and misconduct (Martinson, Crain, DeVries, & Anderson, 2010). Thus, most of the outcomes of justice perceptions can have an economic (positive or negative) impact on the organization. If employees perceive that the internal justice system does not work, the company will be unable to foster the critical values of integrity and trust, which in turn will impact the employees' performance and thereby the organization's bottom-line.

Problem Statement and Purpose of Study

Organizational justice is an issue for human resource development (HRD) practice, because some perceptions of organization justice or fairness can be related to training and development opportunities, organizational change/development practices and career planning/ development. Organizational justice shares many of the philosophical underpinnings of human resource development and justice plays a significant role in many organizational dynamics related to change, such as leader–follower relationships, organizational citizenship behaviour, and individual response to change (Foster, 2010). Much of HRD practice is oriented towards achieving organizational goals. Nonetheless, there are existing philosophical debates concerning the nature and purpose of HRD. Swanson and Arnold (1996) broadly addressed the philosophical differences from two arguments: 1) should HRD focus on increasing the performance requirements of host organizations and more directly the productivity of workforce or 2) should HRD focus on developing the individual in a broad manner without using bottom line results. This study adopted the Mclean and Mclean (2001) definition of HRD which incorporates the best of both paradigms and is stated as follows:

Human Resource Development is any process or activity that, either initially or over the longer-term, has the potential to develop adults' work based knowledge, expertise, productivity, and satisfaction, whether for personal or group/team gain, or for the benefit of an organization, community, nation, or, ultimately the whole humanity (p.1067).

Organizational leadership looks for numerous ways to develop available human resources. Like other organizational assets, employee skills can be classified as a core asset (Quinn, Anderson, & Finkelstien, 1996), which are vital to the competitive advantage of an organization (Porter, 1985) and often require continual internal development. Training and Development (T& D) and career development (CD) involve so many organizational processes that can affect professional and personal development, it should come as no surprise that issues of justice in the workplace are critical for HRD practices (Wooten & Cobb, 1999). By its very nature, CD involves basic issues of fairness over the allocation of CD resources, the policies and procedures used to decide who receives them and the interactions between those who provide and those who not only receive CD rewards but also experience its losses. Considering that employees spend a major part of their daily lives with organizations, organizational actions can have substantial effects on employees' well-being. Kivimaki et al. (2004) carried out a study where they found that fairness

in interpersonal treatment, as rated by employees, was found to be a reliable predictor of self-assessed health. To summarize, organizations are social systems and their life and stability are dependent on the existence of strong bonds between organization's constituent elements (Lotfi & Pour, 2013).

Justice and its implementation is one of the basic needs of human instinct, and therefore organizational justice is a key element in surviving and sustaining the development of the organization and its employees. Since organizational justice impacts the organization and HRD practices impact employees' justice perceptions, it is important for HRD scholars and practitioners to study the concept and its implications. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the influence of HRD practices on the employees' perceptions of justice at interactive, procedural and outcomes level.

Organizational Justice and HRD

For this study, a targeted search for literature was conducted to review two major areas of interest:

- (1) Organizational justice; and
- (2) Role of HRD practices in developing organizational justice perceptions.

Organizational justice

Various contemporary theorists have argued that organizational justice is anything from a single dimension to four dimensions. Each of these dimensions and their theoretical foundation are explained in the following sections.

Distributive justice. Drawing from the work of Homans (1958) on social exchange and Adams (1965) on equity, distributive justice is considered as the original concept of organizational justice which deals with the fairness of outcomes including pay, rewards, and promotions (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Researchers call the first component distributive justice because it has to do with the allocations or outcomes that some get and others do not (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Wang, Hinrichs, Prieto and Howell (2013) suggested that perceived distributive justice might motivate employees to display appropriate work behaviour so as not to cause any problem for the organization (conscientiousness and sportsmanship), but its effect might not be strong enough to motivate people to take the extra steps required to bring about benefits to the organization (civic virtue).

Procedural justice. Drawing from Adams' (1965) equity theory, Thibaut and Walker (1975) conducted a series of studies on the fairness of decision-making processes and determined that the processes used to determine outcomes are equally important. The basic tenet of procedural justice is that a voice in the development of an outcome enhances the perceived fairness in the workplace independent of the effects of its implementation (Greenberg, 2002). Thus, procedural justice developed from the assertion that the participants in the process viewed the procedure as fair if they perceived that they had process control (and sufficient time to sustain their case), and process has a fair process effect or voice effect (Vosloban, 2013). Procedural justice explains to a great extent why employees are concerned about the procedures used to arrive at decisions along with the fairness and favourability of their outcomes.

Interactional justice. Grounded in social exchange theory and norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), interactional justice can be seen as an extension of procedural justice, but itself is significant enough to be considered as a separate dimension of organizational justice (Baldwin, 2006). Bies and Moag (1986) observed that decision events actually have three facets: a decision, a procedure, and an interpersonal interaction during which that procedure is implemented. Bies and Moag argued that that interactional justice was fostered when relevant authorities communicated procedural details in a respectful and proper manner, and justified decisions using honest and truthful information. Interactional justice typically has been operationalized as comprising two broad classes of criteria: (a) clear and adequate explanations, or justifications, and (b) treatment of recipients with dignity and respect (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001).

Informational justice. Informational justice was derived from the domain of interactional justice and focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes are distributed in a certain fashion (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Based on Bies and Moag's (1986) concepts of interactional justice, informational justice refers to the truthfulness and justification of information provided to employees. Informational justice is thought to consist of factors that enhance individual perceptions of efficacy of explanations provided by the organizational agents. Therefore, informational justice deals with the extent and effort made by the organization to justify decisions and procedures. From an organizational perspective, informational justice changes the reaction and receptivity of employees to procedures because information and explanations help those affected to understand the underlying rationale for the procedures (Greenberg, 1990).

Organizational justice and HRD

People care deeply about how they are treated by others (Demirtas & Akdogan, 2015). Individuals can fulfil their potential, enjoy healthy and creative lives in an enabling environment, one which facilitates opportunities, fosters relationships and builds capacity. There is substantial evidence demonstrating that employees' perceptions of organizational justice can influence their emotions, attitudes, and behaviours in the workplace (Wang, Lu, & Siu, 2015). According to Ahmed and Nawaz (2015), if an organization wants to make employees feel that they are supported they should offer justice and a supportive culture (support from supervisor and coworkers) at work. Employees who feel that they are treated fairly are more likely to be engaged at work. The stronger the employee's feelings of procedural fairness, the stronger their level of engagement and the lower their intentions to leave the organization (Malinen, Wright, & Cammock, 2013).

The employees of an organization are influenced by the perceptions of fair treatment in many ways which includes HRD practices (career development, training and development opportunities, change management and so on) within the organization. The theoretical foundations of organizational justice inform HRD practitioners that they should guide organizations to establish an open organizational culture that allows people to express their views, to listen to others' opinions, and to support questioning and feedback in decision-making processes. Most importantly, the perception of fair treatment enhances employees' predictability and controllability for future events, thereby reducing the uncertainties of day to day working life. The perceptions of fair treatment also indicate the commitment of an organization to high moral and ethical standards. The equity principle is upheld in organizations to a large extent by standardized policies, providing equal opportunities for training and development, and avoidance

of favouritism. Even though such policies exist, many organizations still grapple with complaints of unfair treatment and favouritism. Therefore, it is important for HRD practitioners and scholars to understand how the HRD practices influence employees' justice perceptions. In spite of all the potential benefits, HRD as a discipline has devoted very little attention to the construct of organizational justice; and had only done minimal efforts to study the influence of HRD practices and decisions on employees' perceptions of organizational justice. Thus, this study is an effort to address a very important issue which has been overlooked by HRD.

Theoretical basis

The theoretical framework which can provide support for hypothesizing a relationship between HRD and organizational justice is social exchange theory. Homans (1958) argued that, when individuals are in exchange relationships with others, they expect fair exchanges. Social exchange theory is one of the most important paradigms for comprehending employees' attitudes. When thinking about social exchange in an employment relationship, the employees expect a fair exchange for their effort, and the nature of exchange can be economic (salary) or social (recognition). Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) posits that when individuals receive favourable noneconomic transactions from organizational agents, there is a natural drive, i.e., the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) to respond by providing something comparable back to the organization. Researchers adopting the social exchange approach have focused more on the norm of reciprocity and found that followers are willing to reciprocate when treated fairly and with concern by their leaders (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009). Thus, fair treatment will enhance the social exchange relationship and will increase the level of trust between the two parties. According to Blau (1964), positive exchange behaviour comes to rely on mutual trust, which forms the foundation of an ongoing relationship of exchange between one person or entity and the other. Social exchange theory affirms that a realistic social relationship is likely to lead to gestures of goodwill being reciprocated, even to the extent of each side willingly going above and beyond the call of duty (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

Methodology

To explore the role of HRD practices in formulating employees' organizational justice perceptions, an interpretive qualitative study was undertaken to examine the employees' experiences in-depth. The participants for this study were the staff employees (non-managerial) working in the business operations of a very large public university in the United States. Employees were contacted in person or by e-mail to ascertain their willingness to take part in a study about their perceptions about the development opportunities they received in the organization. A total of 24 employees were contacted, out of which eight employees informed their willingness to take part in the study. However, one of them could not take part in the study due to scheduling conflicts which limited the sample size to seven. Five of the participants were male and two female. All the participants were minorities and six of them were in the age group of 20-30 years. Six of the participants had less than 10 years of service with the organization.

Semi-structured interviews were used as the method for primary data collection, working from a predetermined list of questions to ensure consistent information for comparative purposes but allowing flexibility for participants to elaborate their unique meanings and experiences and to raise issues not anticipated. Qualitative interviewing is a flexible and powerful tool to capture the

voices and the ways people make meaning of their experience (Rabionet, 2011). The participants were encouraged to describe their feelings about the opportunities received, organizational decisions and the impact on their careers, and their general feelings about the organization. If there was ambiguity in the responses, the participants were asked follow up questions to clarify their feelings and get a better understanding of their point of view towards the issues.

All interviews were conducted in person, and extensive handwritten notes were taken during the interview, which were transcribed at the earliest possible time after the interviews. The transcripts were read through multiple times, and headings were written to describe all the major aspects on the content which became the basis for coding. The data analysis process included steps and methods commonly recommended in qualitative research including coding and categorizing of data through the constant comparative method, refining the categories, and establishing validity and trustworthiness (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The research findings were informally presented to the participants without seeking any feedback as a token of appreciation. Three participants shared their feelings about the results, however no major revisions were done due to the feedback. The feedback was also undertaken as a form of member checking, and it also enhance the trustworthiness and verifiability of the study.

During the process of data collection and data analysis, major themes were developed which were refined and modified throughout the process. Secondary data, available from organizations publicly available resources, observations and personal experiences, were also used to analyse the emergent themes.

Findings

The themes derived from the literature review provided a guiding framework and five broad themes emerged from the analysis.

Theme 1: HRD practices and perceptions of fairness

HRD is considered as part of the human resources organization and performed an administrative role in the organization. Organization wide HRD initiatives include the annual mandatory training for all employees and free access to skills development websites such as ‘Skillport’ (owned by Skillsoft) which provide a wide array of content. However, there is specialized professional development for middle management and upwards. The individual colleges provided/supported development opportunities but it was more directed towards faculty and roles with student contact. All the participants found HRD practices as an important aspect of their professional development and some of them directly attributed HRD practices to their personal success. One of the participants commented on the HRD practices being fair; “Organization is fair, there are plenty of trainings available and also opportunities for personal development. Everybody has to do the mandatory training (Participant #1). Supporting this view, another participant stated, “Some mandatory training is good, and everybody needs to do them” (Participant #2). These references confirm findings from the previous studies that when individuals perceive inequity, comparison with others plays a more important role than objective criteria (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Folger and Cropanzano also stated that distributive justice is related to two different types of comparisons — one is the intrapersonal comparison of one’s own outcomes, and the other is the interpersonal comparison between their and others’ outcomes. This finding supports the comment

by another participant, who stated “They provide opportunities and professional development funds to faculty and not for staff. I think that is unfair” (Participant #5). To summarize, the participants in this study demonstrated higher perceptions of justice when they feel they are treated similarly to other employees in the organization. Individual attainment or personally favourable decisions had lesser impact on justice perceptions. That is, the more people perceive that the organizational resources and outcomes are fairly distributed, the more they are satisfied with their organization. It is also prudent to state that existence of HRD practices influence the organizational justice perceptions, because employees perceive that the organization is fairer because of its interest in employees’ development.

Theme 2: Outcomes and justice perceptions

Studies have shown that employees determine whether they have been treated fairly by first examining the ratio of their inputs e.g. effort, time, cognitive resources relevant to their outcomes (pay, promotions, opportunities for professional development etc.), and then comparing this ratio to the input-to-outcome ratio of a referent other (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Crawshaw, 2006). This view was visible in the comment made by one of the participants, who stated:

I received staff scholarship to obtain an MBA degree. I worked hard and completed the degree using my personal time, so I don’t think the organization made any special exceptions. I understand that some of my colleagues think differently, but that is the truth. (Participant #1).

This statement also reaffirms the previous studies that when individuals perceive inequity, comparison with others plays a more important role than objective criteria (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Therefore, employees also look at what their peers receive from the organization for reaffirming their beliefs about fairness in decisions. One of the participants commented as follows:

One of my performance goals was to complete training related to the job. I did some excel courses and was very helpful. It is actually good that now everybody’s performance is tied to achieving some goals (Participant #6).

This statement confirms the previous studies that when the employees perceive the outcomes to be fair, the organizational justice perceptions tend to be higher (Rupp, Shao, Jones, & Liao, 2014).

Theme 3: Processes and justice perceptions

It is known among scholars and among managers that individual perceptions of process fairness are important when it comes to employee reactions to organizational procedures (Pichler, Varma, Michel, Levy, Budhwar, & Sharma, 2016). Even though some employees attributed process fairness to the legal landscape, the more the participants perceived the organizational decision-making process to be fair, the more they are satisfied with the outcomes. One other finding is that some employees attribute process fairness as an outcome of the legal landscape, and not particularly an organization mission. This is evident from the reaction of the participant who stated; “I understand that they cannot discriminate, everything goes through a process and are reviewed by multiple people, but you know that it is the leadership which makes recommendations on who gets to attend the leadership institute” (Participant #4).

This finding is in line with studies conducted by several justice scholars who have suggested that leaders may have the greatest impact on overall fairness perceptions, but leaders are more likely to have lesser direct control over the fairness in rewards (distributive justice) or procedures (procedural justice), which are often at least partially governed by larger organizational or even industry-wide regulations. To summarize, the participants in this study attributed higher levels of procedural justice to legal and regulatory environment than organizational initiatives. The study also found that irrespective of the outcomes, employees' justice perceptions can be influenced by the knowledge of process which were used to determine the outcome.

Theme 4: Relationships and justice perceptions

Another common theme which surfaced frequently is the role of organizational relationships (professional and personal) which tend to influence the justice perceptions of the employees. This aspect of organizational justice is beyond individual level of analysis and researchers have examined the role of justice perceptions at the group level, which has been termed justice climate (Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002). Colquitt, Noe and Jackson considered justice climate as the shared perception of a group of employees about the organization in terms of its policies, practices, procedures and rewards. Most participants found organizational relationships (personal) as a determining factor in their perception of justice, but hierarchical relationship (supervisor-subordinate) were not mentioned impactful. As one of the participants stated;

We have a great working relationship between the staff employees and we help each other. We always help the new employees even without any instruction from supervisors. It is important that we share the department culture with new employees and they would be a great fit, but they need to know our culture. But the managers have better opportunities, because they look for each other (Participant #5).

This observation corroborates the proposition within the group engagement model and replicates previous findings that fair procedures and interpersonal treatment are the key sources of social-identity-relevant information (Blader & Tyler, 2003).

Theme 5: Communication and justice perceptions

Making employees aware of opportunities was another finding of the study. The participants cared about the procedures and outcomes, but at the same time they were also concerned about communication strategies utilized to disburse information about opportunities. Another finding was the importance of communication between the manager and the employee. One participant stated:

Our supervisor meets with us on a one on one basis, and that helps us to have less number of unanswered questions regarding decisions. It is helpful that we know what is happening and thereby reduces uncertainty. During the last round of budget cuts, he used to reassure us on a constant basis which was very helpful. However, the organization does not do a good job in communication, they send an email from a generic address which always gets overlooked (Participant #5).

We can make an inference that as employees interact, share in important experiences and events at work, and discuss important information with other members of the organization they develop consensus in their interpretation of these events and experiences which eventually lead to the development of organizational justice perceptions (Schminke, Arnaud, & Taylor, 2015). The justice climate spreads through the organization by way of employee exchanges, communication, and the sharing of justice-related information.

Discussion and Implications

A perpetual challenge faced by working people is to make judgments of fairness and ethics, both to understand the behaviour of others but also to decide how to act themselves (Trevino, 1986). There is substantial evidence demonstrating that employees' perceptions of organizational justice can influence their emotions/affects, attitudes, and behaviours in the workplace (Wang, Lu & Siu, 2015). The prominent dimensions of organizational justice are distributive and procedural justice. However, researchers vary on the importance of those dimensions with some insisting procedural justice more important than distributive justice (Valsoban, 2013), while some others favouring distributive justice followed by procedural justice (Bebenroth, Ismail, & Sekiguchi, 2016). This study supports the prior findings that each dimension of justice have varying levels of impact on employees. It was found that from an HRD perspective, interactional and procedural justice hold more weightage than distributive justice. As employees interact, share in important experiences and events at work, and discuss important information with other members of the organization they develop consensus in their interpretation of these events and experiences. And as employees collectively engage in sense making processes, they develop these justice judgments which in turn are readily accessible, interpreted, and applied by the group as a cognitive shortcut in determining fair and unfair treatment of self and others (Li & Cropanzano 2009). The study also supports previous findings that when procedures are fair or when a clear and adequate explanation for unfair outcomes is given, employees will find it more difficult to imagine outcomes that are better than their current outcomes, making them less inclined to perceive distributive injustice (Gelens, Dries, Hofmans, & Pepermans, 2013).

Implications for research

A major theme/finding which has not gained much attention is the influence of personal relationships or effects of one's colleagues and relationships with one's colleagues in creating justice perceptions. There have been periodical studies focusing on supervisors' procedural justice perceptions and mentoring behaviour leading to subordinates' justice perceptions (Tepper & Taylor, 2003); helping behaviour of group members and justice perceptions (Shin, Du, & Choi, 2015); and impact of networking in creating justice perceptions (Dutton & Ragins, 2017). However, there is no major study exploring informal relationships and informal teams in workplace and their influence in creating justice perceptions. Organizations create the need for proximity and dependence of people on each other. Peer relationships at work are considered to be one of the primary means by which organizational socialization takes place and therefore a major contributor to individual's organizational justice perceptions. Hence, "when coworkers convey expectations for or model biased behaviour, an employee is more likely to follow suit" (Cortina, 2008, pp. 62-63). Therefore, it is important for organization justice/HRD researchers to study the impact of peer relationships and informal teams in creating justice perceptions of employees.

Implications for practice

The theoretical foundations of organizational justice inform HRD practitioners that they should guide organizations to establish an open organizational culture that allows people to express their views, to listen to others' opinions, and to support questioning and feedback in decision-making processes. This study found that employees focus on the procedures utilized when they evaluate the outcomes/decisions providing some empirical support for practitioners to focus on procedures that are fair which would lead to fairer outcomes. In reviewing the growth of

HRD from an organizational context, we can definitely say that most HRD practices are strongly grounded in the principle of ‘learning for performance’. As a profession, HRD is now visible and maturing, it is now time for practitioners to focus on the injustices in their organization which ultimately impacts learning and performance outcomes. Acts of social injustice in an organization can interfere with work relationships, decrease job satisfaction and performance, create stressful conditions, and prevent an overall sense of well-being (Byrd, 2018). By providing fair organizational policies and practices regarding HRD opportunities could enhance distributive justice not only within the organizational HR policies for a diverse workforce but also within a wider social justice framework (Crawshaw, 2006).

Creating a climate of fairness requires employees to be communicating between themselves without fear of repercussions. Providing learning opportunities in informal settings where employees have the opportunity to learn from each other and encouraging peer to peer learning networks should be an area of increased focus for HRD. Finally, focus on communicating the opportunities in a consistent and strategic manner would influence the employees’ perceptions of fairness. Informational justice should be considered with similar importance to procedural justice when it comes to HRD practices and interventions.

Limitations

All studies have limitations and this one is no exception. First, although the data were collected from real employees in real organizational settings, the author of the study was the member of the same organization. All the participants in this research were minorities and therefore the sample may not be considered as a representative sample. All the participants were from the same organization and from same geographic area. Finally, the systems in a public educational entity is different from a for profit business.

Conclusion

In all, the study and its results speak to an issue that deserves additional attention in HRD research. The relationship between HRD practices and organizational justice perceptions represents an interesting and important area of inquiry. For human resources in organizations to contribute productively and even passionately to the success of their organizations is an outcome that every HRD practitioner and scholar has concern for (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Similarly, organizational justice is an issue for human resource development (HRD) practice, because some perceptions of organization justice or fairness can be related to training and development opportunities, organizational change/development practices and career planning/development. HRD as a profession has significant role in employees’ opportunities in workplace — whether it is training and development, career development or managing change. Therefore, it is safe to assume that most HRD practices have justice perceptions tied to them. If an organization wants to have satisfied, committed, and engaged employees, they should offer justice at the workplace along with supportive culture. Organizational justice is a matured area of research in other fields in United States. More recent scholarship is coming from Asia, which may be a result of the growing middle class and the access to information through advancement in technology. This study is a small but important step to begin to address this critical area of organizational life with a view to providing the HRD professional with insight, understanding and to support and influence HRD practice.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2
- Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. M. (2015). Antecedents and outcomes of perceived organizational support: A literature survey approach. *The Journal of Management Development*, 34(7), 867-880.
- Baldwin, S. (2006). *Organizational justice*. Institute for employment studies. London, United Kingdom.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Biswas, S., Varma, A., & Ramaswami, A. (2013). Linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange: A field study in India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(8), 1570-1587. doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.725072
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(1), 107-126. doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00101-8
- Blau, M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Byrd, M. Y. (2018). Does HRD have a moral duty to respond to matters of social injustice? *Human Resource Development International*, 21(1), 3- 11.https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2017.1344419
- Byrne, Z. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). The history of organizational justice: The founders speak. *Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice*, 2(1), 3-26.
- Byrne, Z. S., Kiersch, C. E., Weidert, J., & Smith, C. (2012). The justice-oriented face of organizations. In M. A. Sarlak (Ed.), *The new faces of organizations in 21st century* (Vol. 4; pp. 95-163). Toronto, ON: NAISIT Publishers.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001) On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 425-445
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*, Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Colquitt, J. A., Noe, R. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(1), 83-109. doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00104.x
- Cooper, H. M. (1988). Organizing knowledge syntheses: A taxonomy of literature reviews. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy*, 1(1), 104-126.
- Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 55-75.
- Crawshaw, J. R. (2006). Justice source and justice content: evaluating the fairness of organisational career management practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 98-120.
- Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. (2005), Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review, *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-899.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4): 34-48.
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 164-209.
- Demirtas, O., & Akdogan, A. A. (2015). The effect of ethical leadership behavior on ethical climate, turnover intention, and affective commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1), 59-67.
- Dutton, J. E., & Ragins, B. R. (2017). Positive relationships at work: An introduction and invitation. In *Exploring positive relationships at work*, 1st Ed (pp. 2-24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In: Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R., (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*, (pp. 1-55) Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Folger, R. G., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management* (Vol. 7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Foster, R. D. (2010). Resistance, justice, and commitment to change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1): 3–39.
- Gelens, J., Dries, N., Hofmans, J., & Pepermans, R. (2013). The role of perceived organizational justice in shaping the outcomes of talent management: A research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 341-353.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2). 161-178. doi: 10.2307/2092623
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy Of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (2002). *The quest for justice on the job: essays and experiments*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597-606.
- Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J. E., Head, J., Shipley, M. J., Vahtera, J., & Marmot, M. G. (2004). Organizational justice and change in justice as predictors of employee health: the Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 58(11), 931-937.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Fairness at the group level: Justice climate and intra-unit justice climate. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 564–569.
- Lotfi, M. H., & Pour, M. S. (2013). The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among the employees of Tehran Payame Noor University. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93(2013), 2073-2079
- Malinen, S., Wright, S., & Cammock, P. (2013). What drives organizational engagement? *Evidence Based HRM*, 1(1), 96-108. doi.org/10.1108/20493981311318638
- Martinson, B. C., Crain, A. L., De Vries, R., & Anderson, M. S. (2010). The importance of organizational justice in ensuring research integrity. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 5(3), 67-83.
- Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 1-13.
- McLean, G. N., & McLean, L. (2001). If we can't define HRD in one country, how can we define it in an international context? *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 313-326.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994
- Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2002). The effects of procedural justice climate on work group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33(3), 361-378. doi: 10.1177/10496402033003004
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Parker, L.D. (2003), Qualitative research in accounting and management: The emerging agenda. *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 2(2003), 15-30.
- Pichler, S., Varma, A., Michel, J. S., Levy, P. E., Budhwar, P. S., & Sharma, A. (2016). Leader-Member Exchange, Group- and Individual-Level Procedural Justice and Reactions to Performance Appraisals. *Human Resource Management*, 55(5), 871-883.
- Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Quinn, J. B., Anderson, P., & Finkelstein, S. (1996). Managing professional intellect: Making the most of the best. *Harvard Business Review*, 74 (March-April), 71-80.
- Rabionet, S. E. (2011). How I learned to design and conduct semi-structured interviews: An ongoing and continuous journey. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(2), 563.

- Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123(2), 159-185.
- Schminke, M., Arnaud, A., & Taylor, R. (2015). Ethics, values, and organizational justice: Individuals, organizations, and beyond. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(3), 727-736.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Shin, Y., Du, J., & Choi, J. N. (2015). Multi-level longitudinal dynamics between procedural justice and interpersonal helping in organizational teams. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(3), 513-528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9379-0>
- Swanson, R. A., & Arnold, D. E. (1996). Part one: What is the purpose of human resource development? The purpose of human resource development is to improve organizational performance. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 72, 13-19.
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 97-105.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Trevino, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 601-617.
- Vosloban, R. I. (2013). Employee Engagement Concept-A Theoretical and Practical Approach. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, 5(2), 759-765
- Wang, H., Lu, C., & Siu, O. (2015). Job insecurity and job performance: The moderating role of organizational justice and the mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1249 -1259. doi.org/10.1037/a0038330
- Wang, L., Hinrichs, K. T., Prieto, L., & Howell, J. P. (2013). Five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing antecedents and levels of engagement in china and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 30(1), 115-147.
- Wooten, K. C. and Cobb, A. T. (1999), Career development and organizational justice: Practice and research implications. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10(2), 173-179.

The Author

Deepu Kurian is a business professional with 20 years of experience in business management and currently serves as the Director of Business Operations for Conrad N Hilton College, University of Houston. His undergraduate degree is in hotel management, and holds two graduate degrees — a MBA and a MS in Management. He is currently pursuing his doctoral degree in human resources development from Texas A & M University, College Station. His research interests are in the areas of organizational justice and leadership development.

