

It's all in the Treatment: An Empirical Study of Fairness Perceptions in the Workplace

**Shingirayi M. Mushonga
Coppin State University**

This study examined the distinct mechanisms through which supervisory interactional justice and affective trust elicit positive work outcomes via social exchange theory. Barron and Kenny's (1986) mediation test and Sobel's test were utilized to test data from 317 employees from organizations from various industries that included manufacturing, hospitality, and healthcare. The results support the proposed model and illustrate the salient role the supervisor plays as an alternative source of fairness perceptions in the workplace. Furthermore, the results illustrate how trust mediates the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and work outcomes. The implications, limitations and direction for future research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The supervisory justice impetus has been gaining significant attention amongst social scientists over the last decade, yet, research that clearly explicates this new phenomenon is scarce. This scarcity could be attributed to the fact that some researchers have focused solely on the organization when examining fairness perceptions in the workplace. Of the limited research that has focused on the supervisor as a source for fairness perceptions, the majority have mainly concentrated on supervisory procedural justice, thus neglecting supervisory interactional justice. In particular, the processes through which supervisory interactional justice elicits positive work outcomes has been largely unexplored and thus warrants examination (Yang, Mossholder, & Peng, 2009). Examining supervisory interactional justice perceptions will help researchers and practitioners alike to better understand how these perceptions manifest into various behavioral and attitudinal work outcomes. Therefore, the objective of this study is to examine how supervisory interactional justice elicits positive work outcomes. More specifically, we examine how affective trust mediates the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and work outcomes.

Social Exchange Theory

The social exchange theory is predicated on the notion of the interpersonal relationships in the workplace (Blau, 1964; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). These relationships tend to be long-term, based on good faith and reciprocity. For example, individuals who enter into relationships are not aware of the relationships' terms beforehand; instead, individuals who provide the services do so under the assumption that the other party will reciprocate by returning the favor in the near future. Because individuals are not aware of the terms of the relationship beforehand or if the other party will reciprocate, trust plays a crucial role in the development of these relationships. Trust becomes a central issue in the relationship because individuals typically enter into relationships with individuals they trust.

Accordingly, social exchange researchers have provided a plethora of empirical evidence illustrating how the employee's perceptions of fairness and trust affect the quality of the social exchange relationships with their supervisor (e.g. Byrne, Pitts, Wilson, & Steiner, 2012; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Yang et al., 2009). Byrne et al. (2012) examined the role of supervisory support in performance appraisals from a social exchange perspective and found that perceptions of supervisory support via interactional justice elicited trust. Similarly, Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) examined the social exchange model from a multi-foci perspective, whereby they compared the justice perceptions that were attributed to the organization and the supervisor. The authors found that organizational-focused justice and relationships have different outcomes from supervisory focused justice and relationships. In addition, the authors also found that different entity-focused justice led to different employee attitudinal and behavioral outcomes.

Lavelle et al. (2007) expanded on Rupp and Cropanzano's (2002) study by providing a parsimonious framework for conceptualizing and amalgamating multi-foci research by integrating multi-foci approaches in justice and social exchange. The authors demonstrated a positive, significant link and direct relationship between justice, leader-member exchange (LMX), perception of supervisor support (PSS), and trust.

Supervisory Interactional Justice

Supervisory interactional justice (SIJ) is based on the supervisor's fairness in the treatment of the subordinates and fairness in passing on relevant information to the subordinates (Bies & Moag, 1986). Despite the fact that this definition has been widely used to refer to the organization, this study argues that the same reasoning can be applied to the supervisor as well (see Yang, Mossholder, & Peng, 2009). The extension of Bies & Moag's definition to include the supervisor originates from the multi-foci justice research (e.g. Byrne, 1999; Lavelle et al., 2007; Liao & Rupp, 2005; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Yagil, 2006; Yang et al., 2009). In fact, Skarlicki and Folger (1997), found supervisors to have greater control over interactional justice than any other justice dimension.

The saliency of supervisors in interactional justice perceptions among subordinates is context-specific and well-documented throughout the literature. For example, Greenberg's (2006) study examined the usefulness of supervisors' training techniques to mitigate the stressful nature of insomnia caused by underpayment inequities among nurses. Greenberg (2006) found that the extent of insomnia was considerably less among nurses whose supervisors had received the training in interactional justice, immediately after the training and six months later. This study shows how interactional justice can mitigate the effects of insomnia among nurses and how supervisors' training in promoting interactional justice can be an effective tool in organizations in attenuating injustices in organizations.

Kernan and Hanges (2002) examined the survivors' justice reactions to reorganization in two time periods (before and after the reorganization) and found that the supervisors' ability to afford employee input, victim support, and implementation and communication quality predicted interactional fairness. Kernan and Hanges' (2002) study highlights the extent to which the supervisor's compassion, diplomacy, and willingness to share information with subordinates leads to higher levels of interactional justice among subordinates.

Affective Trust

Affective trust develops between individuals in a relationship based on some emotional tie (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Subordinates are more likely to develop these emotional ties with supervisors who genuinely show concern towards them and pass on relevant information. Unlike cognitive trust, affective trust evaluations and perceptions by subordinates are more subjective in nature and tend to develop over time (McAllister, 1995; Parayitam & Dooley, 2009).

According to Johnson and Grayson (2005), affective trust can also be developed based on the involved parties' common beliefs, attitudes, values, and interests. Social psychology researchers have found that individuals tend to be more attracted to other individuals who display similar beliefs, attitudes, and interests. This logic is derived from social identity theory, which posits that individuals tend to categorize themselves and others into various social homogenous groups based on common interests

(Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Therefore, individuals in the same clique are more likely to develop affective trust perceptions a lot sooner than with individuals from a different group.

According to Leisen & Hyman (2004), affective trust is associated with benevolence and behaviors that can be perceived as benevolent by the subordinate include the supervisor's ability to provide opportunities for voice (Detert & Burris, 2007), feedback (Ashford, 1986), autonomy (Langfred, 2007), and general well being (Kossek, Colquitt, & Noe, 2001). Therefore, when a supervisor affords the subordinates the aforementioned characteristics, the subordinates are more likely to perceive and develop affective trust towards the supervisor.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Supervisory Interactional Justice, Affective Trust, and Job Satisfaction

Although some researchers have provided empirical evidence illustrating the relationship between supervisory procedural justice and job satisfaction (e.g. Yang et al., 2009), others have disputed this concept (e.g. Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002) and have argued that SIJ is a better predictor of job satisfaction. In their attempt to show the distinction between procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ), Cropanzano et al. (2002) found that the social exchange theory provided the theoretical basis for the distinction between the two concepts. More specifically, they found that IJ through the supervisor-subordinate dyadic relationships was a better predictor of job satisfaction than PJ. Similarly, Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor (2000) supported the notion that IJ predicted job satisfaction, although their relationship between IJ and job satisfaction was mediated by LMX. The authors found that interactional and procedural justice were differentially related to LMX and perceptions of organizational support (POS) illustrating the saliency of matching the source of fairness to the social exchange relationships and outcomes. Despite the limited amount of research supporting the relationship between SIJ and job satisfaction, it is the contention of this study that when supervisors are perceived to be fair in their overall treatment of subordinates and dissemination of information, they develop emotional ties and trust based on relationships (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), identification (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996), benevolence (Levin & Cross, 2004), relational trust (Tyler & DeGoey, 1996), and unconditional trust (Jones & George, 1998).

Hypothesis 1: Affective trust will mediate the relationship between SIJ and job satisfaction.

SIJ, Affective Trust, and LMX

LMX is defined as the quality of exchange in the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate (Graen & Schiemann, 1978). Previous research has explicitly established the relationship between IJ and LMX (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002; Fein, Tziner, Lusky, & Palachy, 2014; Roch & Shanock, 2006; Yagil, 2006); however, this line of research has often overlooked the processes that facilitates the relationship. Empirical evidence has shown that supervisors who demonstrated interactional justice elicited high quality LMX relationships and supervisors who demonstrated interactional injustice elicited low quality LMX relationships. For example, Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris's (2012) study discovered that IJ leads to high quality LMX, but the study is deficient in explicating how and why such effects occur.

According to Dulebohn et al. (2012), both the supervisors and subordinates are influential in the development of the LMX relationship, although supervisors play a more prominent role in determining the quality of the LMX relationships. Supervisors initiate the development of the LMX relationships by exhibiting certain positive behaviors like showing concern for subordinates' well being and disseminating relevant information to the subordinates. This leads to the subordinate developing an emotional attachment to the supervisor, thus entering into a high quality LMX relationship. In other words, when subordinates perceive IJ in their supervisors, they are more likely to be willing to be vulnerable to the supervisor although this process develops over time and is based on reciprocity.

Hypothesis 2: Affective trust will mediate the relationship between SIJ and LMX.

SIJ, Affective Trust, and Loyalty to Supervisor

Loyalty to supervisor (LTS) is derived from the multifoci commitment research that evolved from organizational commitment (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002). Due to the popularity of the organizational commitment research, social scientists have endeavored to find other entities that subordinates would be committed to, in addition to the organization. Although there are a number of entities that have been identified in multifoci commitment research (see Becker & Billings, 1993), the supervisor is considered the most important, especially when examining supervisory-subordinate relations (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002).

LTS is more powerful than organizational commitment (Chen, Farh, & Tsui, 1998), which can be attributed to the fact that subordinates can create emotional bonds with a supervisor than with the organization. According to Jiang & Cheng (2008), there are two types of LTS: affect- and role-based. Affect-based loyalty is the result of the voluntary emotional bonds between the subordinate and their supervisor and role-based loyalty encompasses on the extent to which subordinates feel obliged to be loyal to a supervisor. The affect-based loyalty bonds are largely due to the subordinate's identification with and dedication to a supervisor. This identification is based on common beliefs, attitudes, values, and interests (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Therefore, it is reasonable for a subordinate's perception of interactional justice to lead to stronger emotional ties and identification with the supervisor, which ultimately leads to the subordinate's loyalty to their supervisor.

Hypothesis 3: Affective trust will mediate the relationship between SIJ and LTS.

METHOD

Participants

Data was collected via a self-report survey of employees working in various public organizations located in a southern state of the United States. A total of 1,000 employees were randomly selected from a generated list via systematic random sampling and 317 questionnaires were fully completed and deemed usable for further analysis, thus representing a final response rate of 31.7%.

Of the 317 final participants, 168 (53%) were men and 149 (47%) were women, ranging in age from 18 to 65 years ($M = 31$), 58% had a bachelor's degree or higher. The average participant had worked for their current organization for 2.1 years and under their current supervisor for 1.6 years.

Measures

The instruments utilized in this study to measure the constructs were obtained from previous research. The instruments were tested for reliability and validity in previous studies and were shown to meet the prescribed reliability and validity criteria. All responses were measured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Supervisory interactional justice (SIJ). SIJ was measured using a 7-item scale ($\alpha = .91$) developed and validated by Byrne (1999). A sample question asks, "Whether the outcome is good or bad, I always feel like I am kept informed by my supervisor."

Affective trust. Affective trust was measured using a 5-item scale ($\alpha = .87$) that was developed by McAllister's (1995). A sample question asks, "If I shared my problems with my supervisor, I know he/she would respond with care."

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured using a 3-item scale that was adapted by Illies, Wilson, and Wagner (2009) from Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) original 5-item scale that assessed daily satisfaction. In addition, this study also utilized a 3-item scale ($\alpha = .83$) of Job Satisfaction that was adapted by Yang et al. (2009) from Hackman and Oldham's (1975) measure of global satisfaction. A sample item from the daily satisfaction assessment includes "Right now I find real enjoyment in my

work.” A sample item from the global satisfaction assessment includes “All things considered, I am satisfied with my job.”

Leader-member exchange (LMX). LMX was measured using an 8-item scale ($\alpha = .94$) that was adapted by Bauer & Green (1996) from by Scandura & Graen’s (1984) original 7-item scale. A sample item from the LMX scale includes “I usually know where I stand with my supervisor.”

Loyalty to supervisor (LTS). LTS was measured using a 5-item scale ($\alpha = .91$) that was developed by Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert (1996). A sample item from the LTS scale includes “I would turn down another job for more pay in order to stay with my supervisor.”

ANALYSIS & RESULTS

In order to test for the mediating role of affective trust in the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and various work outcomes, the guidelines provided by Baron and Kenny (1986) were observed. In addition, the Sobel test for mediation was also utilized.

TABLE 1
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, & CORRELATIONS

Variable	Means	s. d.	1	2	3	4	5
1. SIJ	5.39	1.26					
2. AFT	5.34	1.45	.763**				
3. JBS	5.41	1.25	.746**	.813**			
4. LMX	5.10	1.29	.698**	.793**	.824**		
5. LTS	4.46	1.41	.308**	.342**	.352**	.352**	

Note: SIJ = Supervisory Interactional Justice; AFT = Affective Trust; JBS = Job Satisfaction; LMX = Leader Member-Exchange; LTS = Loyalty to Supervisor $n = 317$ ** $p < .01$

TABLE 2
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 1

Variables	β	R^2	Adj.	F
<i>Step 1</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow AFT	0.916**			
		0.630	0.628	535.210
<i>Step 2</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow JBS	0.458**			
		0.213	0.210	85.081
<i>Step 3</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow JBS	0.229**			
AFT \rightarrow JBS	0.249**			
		0.244	0.239	50.604

Note. SIJ = Supervisory Interactional Justice; AFT = Affective Trust; JBS = Job Satisfaction ** $p < .01$

Table 2 presents the results of the mediation of affective trust in the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 1). The results of the first equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.916$, $p \leq .00$). The second equation for supervisory interactional justice and

job satisfaction also indicates a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.458, p \leq .00$). Results of the third equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.249, p \leq .00$) for affective trust on job satisfaction and a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.229, p < .004$) with a decreased effect for supervisory interactional justice on job satisfaction. Overall, results of the third equation indicate that affective trust (mediating variable) has an effect on job satisfaction (dependent variable) while supervisory interactional justice (independent variable) has a reduced effect on job satisfaction (dependent variable). The Sobel test was significant with a statistic of 3.565 and a p-value of 0.004, thus providing support for mediation. Therefore, the results of the three regression equations and the Sobel test collectively provide support for Hypothesis 1.

TABLE 3
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

Variables	β	R^2	Adj.	F
<i>Step 1</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow AFT	0.916**			
		0.630	0.628	535.210
<i>Step 2</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow LMX	0.730**			
		0.508	0.507	325.764
<i>Step 3</i>				
SIJ \rightarrow LMX	0.201**			
AFT \rightarrow LMX	0.577**			
		0.666	0.663	312.458

Note. SIJ = Supervisory Interactional Justice; AFT = Affective Trust; LMX = Leader-Member Exchange ** $p < .01$

Table 3 presents the results of the mediation of affective trust in the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and LMX (Hypothesis 2). The results of the first equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.916, p \leq .00$). The second equation for supervisory interactional justice and LMX also indicates a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.730, p \leq .00$). Results of the third equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.577, p \leq .00$) for affective trust on LMX and a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.201, p < .00$) with a decreased effect for supervisory interactional justice on LMX. Overall, results of the third equation indicate that affective trust (mediating variable) has an effect on LMX (dependent variable) while supervisory interactional justice (independent variable) has a reduced effect on LMX (dependent variable). The Sobel test was significant with a statistic of 10.644 and a p-value of .00, thus providing support for mediation. Therefore, the results of the three regression equations and the Sobel test collectively provide support for Hypothesis 2.

Table 4 presents the results of the mediation of affective trust in the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and LTS (Hypothesis 3). The results of the first equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.916, p \leq .00$). The second equation for supervisory interactional justice and LTS also indicates a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.715, p \leq .00$). Results of the third equation indicate a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.570, p \leq .00$) for affective trust on LTS and a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.192, p < .00$) with a decreased effect for supervisory interactional justice on LTS. Overall, results of the third equation indicate that affective trust (mediating variable) has an effect on LTS (dependent variable), while supervisory interactional justice (independent variable) has a reduced effect on LMX (dependent variable). The Sobel test was significant with a statistic of 8.6517 and a p-value of .00, thus providing support for mediation. Therefore, the results of the three regression equations and the Sobel test collectively provide support for Hypothesis 3.

TABLE 4
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 3

Variables	β	R^2	Adj.	F
<i>Step 1</i>				
SIJ → AFT	0.916**			
		0.630	0.628	535.210
<i>Step 2</i>				
SIJ → LTS	0.715**			
		0.409	0.407	217.567
<i>Step 3</i>				
SIJ → LTS	0.192**			
AFT → LTS	0.570**			
		0.537	0.534	182.112

Note. SIJ = Supervisory Interactional Justice; AFT = Affective Trust; LTS = Loyalty to Supervisor ** $p < .01$

DISCUSSION

Overall, the results provide support for the mediating role of affective trust in the relationship between supervisory justice and work outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, leader member exchange and loyalty to supervisor). Although the link between interactional justice and job satisfaction is not new (e.g. Cropanzano et al., 2002; Masterson et al., 2000), this study provides a more detailed explanation of how affective trust elicits job satisfaction. The logic here is that when supervisors show concern for their subordinates, they earn the trust of their subordinates, which in turn, increases the subordinate's job satisfaction. This trust that subordinates develop is emotional and based on personal bonds that transcends an objective level of trust (i.e. cognitive trust). Once subordinates develop these emotional bonds with their supervisors, they are less likely to be concerned about the supervisors' ulterior motives and more likely to focus on and enjoy their job. Affective trust has a spillover effect that transcends the subordinates' initial link to the supervisor and carries over to others in the workplace (Yang et al., 2009), thus increasing the subordinates' overall job experience.

Support for hypothesis 2 regarding the mediating role of affective trust and LMX was also supported. This lends support to a plethora of research that has found a link between interactional justice and LMX (Crapanzano, Prehar, and Chen, 2002; Erdogan, Liden, & Kraimer, 2006; Scandura, 1999) and a link between trust and LMX (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2008). According to Dulebohn et al. (2012), leaders are instrumental in defining the quality of LMX, although the subordinates play a part to a smaller extent. Based on this view, supervisors will demonstrate certain behaviors to initiate a high quality relationship. For example, a leader will show concern and disseminate relevant information to only those subordinates who they wish to engage with in a high quality relationship (i.e. in-group). By showing concern for the subordinate and disseminating relevant information, a leader evokes an emotional personal bond with subordinate, who in turn will enter into a high quality relationship with the leader. The same is true regarding low quality relationships in which subordinates don't perceive interactional justice from the leader. As a result, they will not trust that leader and are doomed to a low quality relationship.

Results of hypothesis 2 also explicitly demonstrate that trust is an antecedent of LMX and hence, lends support to research that has advocated for trust as an antecedent of LMX (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Gomez & Rosen, 2001). As this study has shown, subordinates first develop emotional bonds with their supervisors before entering into a LMX relationship, but it is also conceivable that trust can become a consequence once the relationship is initiated because over time, the LMX relationships evolve and both leader and subordinates are constantly evaluating the status of the relationship (Dulebohn et al., 2012).

The prediction of affective trust mediating the relationship between supervisory interactional justice and loyalty to supervisor was also supported by the results. This finding lends support to the research that has identified interactional justice as an antecedent of LTS (Wong, Wong, & Ngo, 2002). However, this study goes beyond identifying LTS antecedents by focusing on the exact mechanism through which subordinates develop loyalty to their supervisors. As posited by the social exchange framework, when subordinates perceive supervisor interactional justice, they are more likely to develop an emotional tie with the supervisor and reciprocate by exhibiting loyalty towards the supervisor. Although Cheng, Jiang, Cheng, Riley, & Jen (2014) asserted that LTS and trust in supervisor were different constructs with different outcomes, this study supports that notion and clearly shows that affective trust is an antecedent of LTS.

Although this study's measure of LTS did not delineate between affect- and role-based loyalty, it is plausible that the affect-based component of loyalty was more dominant since subordinates voluntarily enter into a social exchange relationship and therefore, are not obligated to be loyal to their supervisors. In fact, the results of this hypothesis highlight the saliency of the emotional bonds that supervisors and subordinates form in a social exchange relationship. Because of the nature of such relationships that tend to be long-term and based on reciprocity, subordinates who perceive IJ are willing to be more than vulnerable to the supervisor, better yet, loyal to the supervisor.

Limitations & Future Research

Notwithstanding the notable overall support of hypotheses, this study is not immune to some limitations. The present study utilized cross-sectional data, which does not allow for causal inferences. Only experiments can afford a researcher the opportunity to assert causal inferences (Cook & Campbell, 1976). There has been a considerable debate about whether Baron & Kenny's (1986) mediation test allows for causal inferences. Some researchers (e.g. Baron & Kenny, 1986; MacKinnon et al., 2002) have affirmed that Barron and Kenny's mediation test allows causal inferences, while others researchers (e.g. Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2004) contend that Barron and Kenny's (1986) mediation test does not allow causal inferences. Therefore, future research endeavors should conduct true experiments that allow for causal inferences.

Second, common method variance might be present in the study because of the use of self-reported data. Common method variance is likely to arise in the case where subordinates respond to the questionnaire in a way that makes them look favorable. In addition, subordinates might also rate their relationship with their supervisor or the organization favorably in fear of reprisal if they rated the relationship unfavorably. Future research should collect data via triangulation.

Finally, the generalizability of the results may be somewhat limited (i.e. low external validity) because the majority of the respondents were African American. Therefore, future research needs to utilize a more diverse sample to examine whether the results still hold true and to generally increase external validity. Future research needs to explore other mediators that may alternatively, if not additionally, afford researchers the opportunity to better understand the mechanisms through which the effects of SIJ on various work outcomes occur.

Implications of Findings

Significant theoretical implications can be drawn from this study. This study shows that trust is an antecedent of LMX and thus supports researchers who argue for the position (e.g. Dulebohn et al., 2008; Gomez & Rosen, 2001). This finding highlights the saliency of the supervisory role in eliciting work outcomes in the workplace.

Managers should be committed to eliciting positive perceptions of fairness from their subordinates, which will most likely lead to increased trust in the supervisors and positive work outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, LMX, & LTS). This argument was advanced by Yang et al. (2009) and is supported by the incumbent study, presents a promising impetus for future research endeavors to explore. Another implication of this study is that organizations can provide justice training to their supervisor employees,

so that they can be able to make fair decisions independent from the organization's fairness (i.e. even when the organization does not make fair decisions).

Furthermore, future research needs to examine whether subordinates perceive a substantial difference in fairness between entities within the organization (i.e. organization and supervisory justice) and specific work outcomes. Some researchers (Choi, 2008; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Wong et al., 2002) believe that each entity (i.e. organization and supervisor) is associated with specific outcomes.

CONCLUSION

A plethora of previous justice research has focused solely on the organization as the sole basis of justice within the organization. The present study examined the mechanisms through which SIJ elicits various work outcomes. More specifically, it examined how affective trust mediated the relationship between SIJ and work outcomes. Despite some limitations, the results provide some new insights on how supervisory fairness leads to positive subordinate work outcomes. The findings illustrate that trust does mediate the relationship between supervisory justice and various work outcomes, thus lending support to the diminutive research studies that have examined the paradigm shift from organizational justice to supervisory justice.

REFERENCES

- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 267 - 285.
- Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*(3), 465 - 487.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173 - 1182.
- 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 negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43 - 55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. R. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307 - 311.
- Brower, H. H., Lester, S. W., Korsgaard, M. A., & Dineen, B. R. (2009). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management, 35*(2), 327 - 347.
- Byrne, Z. (1999). *How do procedural and interactional justice influence multiple levels of organizational outcomes?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- 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. 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*(3), 425 - 445.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 223 - 336). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management, 27*(3), 324 - 351.

- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three roads to organizational justice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* 20, 1 - 113.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869 - 884.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611 - 628.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 340.
- Greenberg, J. (1987a). Reactions to Procedural Injustice in Payment Distribution: Do the Means Justify the Ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(1), 55 - 61.
- Greenberg, J. (1987b). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9 - 22.
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 58 - 69.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job design diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159 - 170.
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76(4), 408-420.
- Holland, P. W. (1988). Causal inference, path analysis, and recursive structural equations models. *Sociological Methodology*, 18, 449-493.
- Illies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), 87 - 102.
- Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 500 - 507.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 531 - 546.
- Karriker, J. H., & Williams, M. L. (2009). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediated multifoci model. *Journal of Management*, 35(1), 112 - 135.
- Kernan, M. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2002). Survivor reactions to reorganization: Antecedents and consequences of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 916 - 928.
- Kossek, E. E., Colquitt, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2001). Caregiving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 29 - 44.
- Langfred, C. W. (2007). The downside of self-management: A longitudinal study of the effects of conflict on trust, autonomy, and task interdependence in self-managing teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 885 - 900.
- Lau, D. C., & Liden, R. C. (2008). Antecedents of coworker trust: Leaders' blessings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1130 - 1138.
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841 - 866.
- Leisen, B., & Hyman, M. R. (2004). Antecedents and consequences of trust in a service provider: The case of primary care physicians. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(990 - 999).
- Levin, D. Z., & Cross, R. (2004). The strength of weak ties you can trust: The mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science*, 50(11), 1477 - 1490.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114 - 139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63, 967 - 985.
- Liao, H., & Rupp, D. E. (2005). The impact of justice climate and justice orientation on work outcomes: A cross-level multifoci framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2), 242 - 256.
- Malatesta, R. M., & Byrne, Z. S. (1997). *The impact of formal and interactional procedures on organizational outcomes*. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology St. Louis, MO.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effect of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738 - 748
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709 - 734.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24 - 59.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626 - 637.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1985). Cognitive vs. affect measures of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 241 - 254.
- Parayitam, S., & Dooley, R. S. (2009). The interplay between cognitive- and affective conflict and cognition- and affect-based trust in influencing decision outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 789 - 796.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897 - 933.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavioral Research Methods*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 925 - 946.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee rec. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219 - 227.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434 - 443.
- Sobel, M. E. (1990). Effect analysis and causation in linear structural equation models. *Psychometrika*, 55, 495-515.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (Vol. 2, pp. 7 - 24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tyler, T. R., & DeGoey, P. (1996). Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attribution on willingness to accept decisions. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 331 - 356). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513 - 530.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601 - 617.
- Yagil, D. (2006). Perceptions of justice within leader-employee dyads. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 9(3), 291 - 306.

Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2009). Supervisory procedural justice effects: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 143-154.