

**INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STUDY GROUP**

**IIRA HRM Study Group Working
Papers in Human Resource Management**

No. 18

**THEORIES OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CRITERIA FOR
FAIRNESS JUDGEMENTS**

BRENDAN MAC PARTLIN AND COLETTE DARCY

August 2007



ISSN 1810-6897

Editors: Prof. Dr. Mick Marchington, Manchester Business School
Prof. Dr. Stefan Zagelmeyer, International University of Applied Sciences Bad Honnef-Bonn
© Brendan Mac Partlin and Colette Darcy

ABSTRACT

Blader and Tyler (2003), following the 'Organisational Justice' school of thought, attempted to further its concern with the nature of procedural justice by proposing their 'Four Component Model of Procedural Justice'. Darcy (2005) tested three of the components by recent empirical research into the factors that impact directly on an employee's perception of fairness in relation to the termination of their employment.

She found that factors derived from Blader and Tyler's model to be significant predictors of fairness judgments and in so doing confirms the relevance of the three components of Blader and Tyler's model. This paper reports briefly on Darcy's work but then turns its attention to the fourth component, formal quality of treatment. It attempts to conceptualise it further from the perspective of recent philosophising in the traditional natural law approach.

The **International Industrial Relations Association (IIRA)** was established in 1966 in response to the growing need to develop and exchange knowledge in industrial and labour relations at the international level. The IIRA (<http://www.ilo.org/iira>) provides academics and practitioners in the fields of labour relations and human resource management with a forum for discussion and research. The aims of the IIRA are of a purely scientific character, without regard to political, philosophic or religious considerations. Under the umbrella of the IIRA, 20 specialist study groups represent an integral element of the Association's activities.

The **Human Resource Management Study Group (SG13)** researches and discusses all aspects of human resource management, mainly from comparative or international perspectives. It cooperates with other academic and professional organisations in the field. The group currently consists of around 100 academics and HR practitioners from all over the world. The study group meets at least every two years at all IIRA World congresses and at as many regional congresses as possible. For further information on the activities of the IIRA HRM Study Group, please consult the study group's website (<http://www.iira.fh-bad-honnef.com>) or contact the coordinators of the study group:

Mick MARCHINGTON
Professor of Human Resource Management
Manchester Business School
The University of Manchester
Booth Street West
Manchester M15 6PB
United Kingdom

Phone: +44 (0) 161 306 3415
Fax: +44 (0) 161 306 3505
Email: mick.marchington@mbs.ac.uk

Stefan ZAGELMEYER
Professor of Economics and HRM
Department of Management
International University Bad Honnef
Muelheimer Strasse 38
53604 Bad Honnef
Germany

Phone: +49 (0) 2224 9605 206
Fax: +49 (0) 2224 905 500
Email: s.zagelmeyer@fh-bad-honnef.de

The **IIRA HRM Study Group Working Papers in Human Resource Management** are edited by the coordinators of the study group. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the International Industrial Relations Association (IIRA). The IIRA HRM Study Group Working Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. A revised version may be available directly from the author(s).

THEORIES OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CRITERIA FOR FAIRNESS JUDGMENTS

BRENDAN MAC PARTLIN AND COLETTE DARCY ^a

1. INTRODUCTION

Blader and Tyler (2003), following the 'Organisational Justice' school of thought, attempted to further its concern with the nature of procedural justice by proposing their 'Four Component Model of Procedural Justice'. Darcy (2005) tested three of the components by recent empirical research into the factors that impact directly on an employee's perception of fairness in relation to the termination of their employment. She found that factors derived from Blader and Tyler's model to be significant predictors of fairness judgments and in so doing confirms the relevance of the three components of Blader and Tyler's model. This paper reports briefly on Darcy's work but then turns its attention to the fourth component, formal quality of treatment. It attempts to conceptualise it further from the perspective of recent philosophising in the traditional natural law approach.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE THEORY

Organisational justice theory focuses on perceptions of fairness in organisations (Folger & Croponzano, 1998:xii ff; Warren & Lucas, 2006:322 ff). It is concerned with the perceptions of employees that result from the outcomes of decisions taken in an organisation, the procedures and processes used to arrive at these decisions, and their implementation. Organisational justice is concerned with the rules and social norms governing how outcomes should be distributed, the procedures used for making such distribution decisions, and how people are treated interpersonally" (Bies

^a School of Business, National College of Ireland, Mayor Street, Dublin 1, Ireland, email: bmacpartlin@ncirl.ie, cdarcy@ncirl.ie.

and Tripp 1995 in Folger and Cropanzano). Perceptions about the fairness of the procedures used to arrive at the decisions about outcomes entail evaluations about procedural justice and interactional justice.

Early research on organisational justice focussed on distributive justice which concerned perceptions of fairness about the allocation of resources and the value of outcomes. Fairness was assessed mainly by the criterion of equity. Employees felt that they were treated unfairly when equity was violated. A sense of equity was based on the balance between outcomes of an exchange in relation to inputs previously made or on the basis of comparison with others' ratio of input to outcome. Researchers like Giacalone et al (1997) argued that employees sought to restore a sense of equity sometimes through 'antisocial' behaviour including claiming behaviour.

Research on distributive justice came to be seen as of limited usefulness as judgments of fairness appeared to be problematic in that people tended to exaggerate the importance of their own contributions. As researchers began to show that people were more concerned about personal interactions and respectful treatment interest shifted towards procedural justice. Their research showed that procedural justice was one of the most potent influences on organisational attitudes and behaviours.

2.1 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is concerned with perceptions of fairness about the procedures and processes used to arrive at decisions about allocations and outcomes. Studies that identified components of procedure independent of outcomes focused on the concepts of process control (Thibaut and Walkers, 1975) and voice (Folger, 1977). Leventhal (1980) identified other qualities of procedural fairness such as consistency, impartiality, accuracy, representativeness, correctability and ethical standards.

An effect, of interest to practitioners, which has been observed in research in this area, is that a perception of fairness of a procedure helps to promote an acceptance of the outcome, even unfavourable outcomes.

2.2 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is the quality of interpersonal treatment meted out by the decision-makers (Bies and Moag, 1986). Tyler and others identified relational criteria of fairness that were independent of outcomes. There were two aspects to fair treatment. Firstly there was the explanation and justification of decisions made. Secondly there was sensitivity in the treatment of those affected by the implementation of the decisions. For instance when employees judge the fairness of a performance review they focus not only on their opportunity to represent themselves but also on whether their superior took the review seriously, treated them with respect and was unbiased in evaluation.

2.3 Blader and Tyler's Four Component Model of Procedural Justice

Despite all of this research on organisational justice Blader and Tyler (1993) believed that little was done on what employees consider when making procedural justice evaluations and that a clear understanding of the nature of procedural justice was lacking. They proposed a model to address the questions of what constitutes procedural justice, what people actually think about when deciding if an experience is fair and what the bases are for their evaluations of fairness. They included the established facts that employees evaluate their relationship with the organisation in terms of how decisions are made and how they are treated. They distinguish between 'types of justice' and 'the sources of justice'.

The first type of justice is concerned with how decisions are made. Are decisions made, for example, carefully or consistently? The second type of justice regards quality of treatment, for example treatment with dignity and concern for rights. Fair treatment improves people's sense of themselves, of their inclusion in and importance to the group. Both decision making and quality of treatment concerns are important for relational, and not material, reasons.

There are two sources of procedural experience from which justice evaluations are drawn. These are called the sources of justice. One source is the formal, official rules

and procedures of the organisation – the formal bases of procedural justice. The other source is the experience people have with their authorities (line managers etc) – the informal bases of procedural justice. The former is more constant and the latter is more variable. It depends on the perceiver (the employee), the organisational agent and their relationship.

The model is based on two justice types (quality of decision making and quality of treatment) and two justice sources (formal and informal). By placing them in orthogonal relationship to each other Blader and Tyler get four separate components to evaluations of procedural fairness as in Fig.1

Table 1: The four-component model of procedural justice

		Source of justice	
		Formal (Rules of the group)	Informal (Actions of supervisor)
Types of Justice	Decision-making	Formal quality of decision-making	Informal quality of decision-making
	Treatment	Formal quality of treatment	Informal quality of treatment

Formal quality of decision-making (FQDM) refers to the procedures prescribed by the rules of the organisation for making decisions about allocations, resolving conflicts etc. These have traditionally been the focus of procedural justice research. The function of the procedures is to ensure fairness in decision making and to ensure that employees are treated in a fair, consistent and equitable manner.

Formal quality of treatment (FQT) refers to the role played by the rules of the organisation in the treatment of employees. Companies often specify codes of conduct such as to how people are treated in relation to sexual harassment, discrimination, reasons for decisions, justification for treatment etc. They are analogous to citizen's rights. These rules are critical to peoples organisational experience.

Informal quality of decision-making (IQDM) refers to those aspects of decision making processes that originate with particular agents of the organisation. Supervisors influence quality of decision making in the decisions they make in the implementation of formal rules and procedures. Formal rules cannot cover every situation. Supervisors have more or less discretion in such situations. For instance unfair rules may be alleviated by the way a supervisor decides to apply them.

Informal quality of treatment (IQT) focuses on the treatment of people by agents of the organisation.

Blader and Tyler raise the question that in considering factors such as quality of treatment and sources of justice whether they have gone beyond the traditional meaning of procedure that referred to official rules of how things are done, how decisions are made, etc. They suggest a more inclusive understanding of procedures to comprise all processes and interactions that occur in the context of organisational life. They do however propose the model as a strong starting point for addressing empirically what people actually think about when reacting to procedural decision making and what the bases are for their judgments on its fairness.

3. THE ANTECEDENTS OF FAIRNESS PERCEPTIONS AND CLAIMING BEHAVIOR

Darcy (2005) adapted Blader and Tyler's model in order to explore fairness perceptions in the context of employee dismissals in Ireland. She attempted to operationalise some of the components of the model firstly to identify the factors underlying employees' perceptions of the fairness of their dismissals and secondly to identify the factors behind dismissed employees' decision to initiate claiming behaviour.

She developed a model based on the three macro level variables: Formal quality of decision making (FQDM), informal quality of decision making (IQDM) and informal quality of treatment (IQT). Her fourth macro level variable is a set of demographic and human capital characteristics. The macro level variables are further broken down into micro level variables.

The fourth component of Blader and Tyler's model, namely, formal quality of treatment (FQT) was omitted from the research design because it went beyond the scope of this piece of research. While it does require research it could not be addressed by a questionnaire to dismissed employees as they were not in a position to answer questions about the rules of the organisation and how they are applied.

She found factors based on the two components, FQDM and IQT, that significantly predict fairness perceptions amongst dismissed employees. The hypothesis that the formal quality of decision making (FQDM) has an impact on a dismissed employee's perception of fairness was supported. If there are formal policies and procedures in place employees are more likely to experience fairness in judgments. The greater the degree to which employees feel that an organisation has high formal quality of decision making in place to deal with disciplinary matters the more likely they are to perceive their dismissal as fair. A micro variable of FQDM the opportunity to amend undesirable behaviour (FQDM 3) was also found to have a causal relationship to the employees' perception of the fairness of their dismissal. The greater the degree to which employees feel they have been given adequate warnings and hence have had

an opportunity to amend their behaviour the more likely they are to perceive their dismissal as fair.

Two micro variables of IQT were also found to have an impact on the employees' perception of fairness. The absence of an adequate explanation of the decision to dismiss (IQT 2) had a causal relationship to the effect that the greater the degree to which an employee feels they have not been provided with an adequate explanation for the decision to dismiss them, the more likely they are to perceive the dismissal as unfair.

The second micro variable, perceived fair treatment at the time of dismissal (IQT 3) also has an impact on the employee's perception of fairness. The greater the degree to which an employee feels fairly treated by agents of the organisation at the actual time of their dismissal, the more likely, they are to perceive the dismissal as fair.

3.1 A model of the antecedents of claiming behaviour

Darcy's second model concerns those who arrive at an unfair justice judgment about their dismissal and proceed to file a case for unfair dismissal. The model addresses the factors that influence the employees' decision to initiate a claim for unfair dismissal. Darcy hypothesises that a similar set of macro level variables will influence a dismissed employee's decision to engage in claiming behaviour. They include formal quality of decision making (FQDM), informal quality of decision making (IQDM) and informal quality of treatment (IQT). A fourth set of factors included social guidance, union membership, legal awareness, gender, age, tenure, position and education. Again the macro level variables are further broken down into micro level variables as in the first. She expects that some of these variables will be common to both sets of operations.

The results of testing this model of claiming behaviour verified full support for factors derived from all three of Blader and Tyler's model as well as the factor, legal awareness, from the fourth set of factors. IQT and its three derived micro variables, dignified and respectful treatment (IQT 1), adequate explanation (IQT 2) and fair treatment at the time of dismissal (IQT 3) were shown to have predictive power in

relation to claiming behaviour. The third micro variable of formal decision making, an opportunity to amend (FQDM 3), was also found to have a causal relationship with claiming behaviour. IQDM, informal quality of decision making, was also found to be a strong predictor of claiming behaviour.

3.2 Interpreting Darcy's results: Verification, Judgment and Reasonableness

A first observation is the overlap of factors in the two cases. This was expected because there are two different judgments and two different populations involved. The first judgment was about the fairness of their dismissal by a population of dismissed employees. The second judgment was a prelude to a decision to claim in the case of employees who believed their dismissal to be unfair. The second judgment was expected to include considerations about fairness but there may also have been further considerations. Difference in factors were to be expected because the judgements were about different questions. The first judgment asked whether the dismissal was fair or unfair, the second asked about the worthwhileness of initiating a claim.

3.3 A Theory of Fairness

Factors common to both decisions were

- IQT3 – fair treatment at the time of dismissal
- IQT2 – an explanation for the dismissal
- FQDM3 – opportunity to amend

Factors that applied only to the decision to claim were:

- IQT – informal quality of treatment
- IQT 1 – treatment with respect and dignity
- IQDM – informal quality of decision making

FQDM, the formal quality of decision making, was the actor that applied only to fairness judgments.

In summary, the theory of fairness held by the dismissed employees in relation to their dismissal might be expressed as follows: In order to be fair the decision to dismiss should follow the formal decision making process of the organisation. An opportunity to amend should be provided in the form of warnings. Agents of the company should exercise discretion and judgment. The manner in which the agent treats the individual is important and should accord respect and dignity especially at the time of the dismissal process. Reasons should be given for decisions taken.

3.4 Verification and Judgment

Three judgments are involved in this account of dismissal. Firstly there is the employer's judgment which precedes his decision to dismiss. Secondly there is the dismissed employee's judgment about the fairness of the dismissal. Thirdly, there is the judgment which precedes the decision to claim. The form of judgments in general can be identified by paying attention to the process by which Darcy carried out her judgment about the correctness of Blader and Tyler's model. Following scientific method Darcy proposes hypotheses and verifies them by following proper procedure Her reasoning took the form:

- The hypothesis: That certain named factors have a strong link with fairness perceptions
- The link between the hypothesis and the empirical data: If there is a link then regression analysis will show certain values.
- The fulfilling conditions: Measurements were made, calculations were done and the required values were reached.
- The verification: There is sufficient evidence to conclude that the proposed factors are in fact causally related to fairness perceptions. The evidence justifies the conclusion that the hypotheses are verified.

The key moment in this process is the insight that sufficient evidence was found to assert the connection between the data and the conclusion.

3.5 Common Sense Judgments

The form of scientific judgment as described above is the form of all judgments. The difference between science and common sense is not in the form of the judgment but in the extent to which systematic procedure is followed in arriving at judgments – systematically in the case of scientific method and confusedly in the case of common sense. Common sense judgments, as used in the context of organisational practices follow this pattern. They look for a link between the evidence and conclusion and are reasonable in positing a conclusion. The antecedent discussions may be full of undefined terms and vague generalisations, pieces of evidence, valid arguments mixed with dubious inferences, but drawing on experience and custom they manage to reach workable conclusions.

The general form of arguing to a conclusion can be presented as follows:

Question	Is this hypothesis true?
Major Premise	If the evidence gathered by observation is sufficient, then the conclusion follows.
Minor Premise	But the evidence gathered by observation or experiment is sufficient.
Conclusion	Therefore the hypothesis is true.

The form of the judgment making process is: If A, then B. But A. Therefore B.

The dismissed employees, then, argue that their dismissal is fair if the conditions FQDM, FQDM 3, IQT 2 and IQT3 are fulfilled. They identify these four factors as the criteria of procedural fairness.

3.6 Reasonableness

We have focused sufficiency of evidence as an insight to be reached before it is possible to raise the status of a prospective judgment to the status of a true judgment. Such a reflective insight unites a vast multiplicity of data, insights, facts and previous evaluations. On grasping the insight it is reasonable to assert the

judgment as grounded and true. It would be unreasonable to assert a groundless judgment as true. A recent OJ style murder trial provided circumstantial evidence to the jury and asked it to reach a verdict. Many strands of the evidence pointed to the one conclusion and in the absence of any other explanation the jury were able to assert beyond reasonable doubt their judgment of 'guilty'. The judgment was grounded in a sufficiency of evidence that left the verdict beyond reasonable doubt. Where groundedness was the quality of the conclusion, reasonableness was the corresponding quality of the jury's operations in reviewing the evidence, in linking the facts to theories, in grasping the sufficiency of the evidence to assert the theories as true (see Lonergan, 1958; Cronin, 2006). Reasonableness is a quality of the judge's whole involvement in thinking and decision making, including his apprehension of value, and therefore, of respectful behaviour. Lacking any of these leaves his judgment flawed, his conclusions not properly grounded, and his decisions unreasonable. A person who arrives at a judgment of fact by connecting the fulfilment of criteria with empirical phenomena not only grounds an objective judgment in reality but at the same time shows his own reasonableness (Lonergan, 1958:323). It is reasonableness that sets up the criteria by which the cognitional process develops from experience to affirmation (Morelli and Morelli, 1980: 209).

So for an employer to arrive at a reasonable decision to dismiss, his observance of data, his cognitional processes, his apprehension of value, and his weighing of evidence must be skilled and thorough if he is to achieve the qualities of impartiality and thus establish a grounded conclusion in a reasonable manner. Anything less is biased, slipshod, mistaken and ultimately unfair. The accuracy of his findings depends not only on the body of rules guiding him but also on the quality of his deliberations. Reasonableness is something that the employer owes to the employee in dealing with his dismissal, and in its absence, the dismissal is unfair and calls for redress. The Unfair Dismissals Act points out that in all that pertains to dismissal the employer must act reasonably if he is to achieve fairness in dismissal.

4. BLADER AND TYLERS FORMAL QUALITY OF TREATMENT

Formal quality of treatment (FQT) is the fourth component of Balder and Tyler's (2003) model which was not tested by Darcy. Here we attempt to develop on its conceptualisation drawing on the perspective of natural law philosophy.

FQT as we saw above refers to the role played by the rules of the organisation in determining how fairly employees are treated. Rules are analogous to citizen's rights and are important to the employee's experience of the organisation.

Darcy (1996:39) refers to it as the culture of the organisation. In so far as "is concerned with higher order variables in terms of the conceptualisation of fairness [it] differs from the other components of the model".

Discipline, including dismissal, is the formal interface between the organisation and the employee (Salmon, 1998). In deliberating about the proposed dismissal of an employee the employer must arrive at a judgment of value about the proposed line of action. What are the grounds for such a judgment? Failure to reach a specified standard either of behaviour or performance is ground for dismissal. How are such standards specified? The body of rules, procedures, standards and values of an organisation act as guidelines. The issue is about the quality of the body of rules.

4.1 A body of rules

Greek philosophy sees the question of 'whose rules?' as at the centre of the justice question. Thucydides relates in his history of the Peloponnesian War how the island of Melos resisted the aggression of the more powerful Athenians (Adler, 1992:380ff). The Athenian envoys met with the representatives of Melos, who recognised the hopelessness of their position. If they insisted on their rights and refused to submit they could expect nothing from the negotiations except war and in the end slavery. The Athenians say frankly that they will not waste time with specious pretences "either of how we have a right to our empire...or are now attacking you because of a wrong you have done us". Instead they come to the point and put the matter realistically: "You know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, whereas the strong do whatever they can and the

weak suffer whatever they must". The Melians reply that "you debar us from talking about justice and invite us to obey your interest". The strong have the right, as far as they have the might, to exact from the weaker whatever serves their interests. Their laws or demands cannot be unjust and they cannot do injustice. The weaker can only do injustice but not suffer it. Injustice on their part consists in disobeying the law of their rulers.

Plato and Aristotle differentiated between good and bad governments by characterising those which serve the common good as just, and those which serve the private interests of the rulers as unjust. Applying these guidelines to organisations we can argue that the values, policies, procedures and rules that make up the common culture of an organisation can be said to be just if they serve the common good of the organisation and sectional to the extent that they serve the interests of a part of the organisation. The issue, then, is to evolve or design principles or rules that serve the common good of the organisation.

Rawls dealt with this question in his attempt to outline principles for a just society. With his thought experiment on the 'original position' of people under a 'veil of ignorance' he attempted to describe a situation of rule making whereby self interested actors can make impartial and fair judgments in drawing up a fair system of rules acceptable to reasonable people. In practice, the ability of self-interested actors to take an impartial stance at the design stage of the principles and rules of a social unit calls for an unusual degree of objectivity, impartiality, intelligence and reasonableness. Our position is, that through self-appropriation, the subject is in principle capable of tending towards such a posture. Objectivity can be approximated through authentic subjectivity. The analysis of judgment made above is one moment in understanding this approach. Scientists do it in the area of cognition. Meta scientists can do it in the area of practical reasoning.

Our dilemma, in the interests of formal quality of treatment, is how to get a fair system of rules that are acceptable to self-interested people. Since the seventeenth century we have been concerned to recognise only the rules made by the contracts of free and equal people.

4.2 Contract of employment and the emergence of system

Contracts are entered freely, on the basis of quid pro quo, and commutative justice specifies the basic standard of fairness that contracts should honour. The law of contract is typically associated with procedural justice in Anglo Saxon common law. Naumann & Bennett are cited by Darcy as claiming that “procedural justice has typically been conceptualised as an individual level based phenomenon”. If this is an assumption that procedural justice is in the nature of individual exchange then the fairness involved is a matter of balance in exchange. However, if workplace relations were simply a matter of commutative justice then there would be no need for the construct of the psychological contract to account for changing expectations, nor for subsequent negotiation on terms and conditions. We look then for a more complex source for the rules of an organisation.

4.3 Individual exchanges and the emergence of structures

Individuals enter into collaboration to achieve a goal that neither or none can achieve alone. The collaboration allows for differentiated functions and mutual exchange. Acceptable arrangements are made by shared discussion and agreement. Through a myriad of such exchanges people coalesce into larger social units set up to achieve their purposes. Purpose governs the relationships of the members. Each member remains in the collaboration because through it he can achieve the fulfilment of his own goals. He is willing to contribute to the common purpose of the collaborating group so that he, like each of the others, can achieve their own ends. By contributing to the common good of the social unit each can at the same time gain his own individual goods. In order to better coordinate the contribution required of each as well as the distribution due to each it is reasonable to recognise the function of a guiding coordinator. The exercise of the authority is in the service of the common good and it is reasonable and acceptable that the exercise of authority, the distributing of functions, the coordinating of relations serves the purpose of the social unit. Patterns of interaction emerge through the myriad of dyadic exchanges and are sanctioned as the structures, rules and systems of the social unit.

The model of reciprocal relations between individuals governed by commutative justice is appropriate for individual interactions but as an organisation grows and develops a system of rules relations are mediated by a shared culture.

Commutative relations between individuals should be distinguished from the relations of individuals to systems. There are two relationships between the individual and the organisation. The organisation allocates benefits to the individual member and this relationship is governed by distributive justice. The individual member owes a contribution to the organisation and this relationship is governed by contributive justice (scholastic philosophy termed this legal justice).

4.4 System and Reasonableness

When an organisation decides to dismiss it is not a transaction between equal individuals but between the organisation (through its agents) and the individual. The organisation's concern is with the contribution of the employee to the organisation. The employer's dilemma in considering dismissal is to establish the content of what is due to the organisation from the employee and whether in failing to reach the required standard s/he should be dismissed. The determination of what is owed the organisation by the employee depends on the purposes of the organisation and the body of goods, rules and virtues that have built up with a view to achieving the purposes of the organisation. The common good of the organisation determines what the organisation distributes as due to its members and what the members contribute as due to the organisation. What is to be distributed and what is to be contributed is not symmetrical and they are governed by two different justices. The determination of the contents of either derives from the body of guidelines. As in any body of law it falls to people conferred with authority to make the determination. As in the case of a judiciary trying to apply the law to citizens, not all cases are exactly determinable, so it is reasonable to accept a ruling by an authority in the situation.

Laws and rules can become dysfunctional over time in that the rule persists long after its purpose, and the good to be achieved by it, have been lost sight of. In this way rules can become oppressive, meaningless or unfair in their application.

When the social unit in question is an employing organisation among the goods sought by employees (and similarly by employers in different ways) is a living wage and fair conditions. In the context of a very competitive labour market with very high participation rates (by women, foreign labour or under age labour) that market price for labour may fall below that of the living wage. If commutative justice is the only consideration there is no remedy for this situation. If the notion of distributive justice (as an aspect of social justice) is admitted and the common good of people in the labour market accepted, the state will regulate for remedies through devices such as minimum wage legislation, child labour acts, equal opportunities and bargaining rights. Similarly for wider goods such as non-discrimination, bullying and harassment at work, and redundancy. The generation of fair rules in the employing organisation depends on wider legislation.

Employee participation and enterprise partnership are further means for achieving buy in on the part of employees to the rules, norms and goals of the organisation ideally operating at all levels of the company. Collective bargaining is a well tried means of rule making both within the organisation and in the wider labour market.

As we have seen in relation to distributive justice the determination of the just outcome was problematic and research interest turned to procedural justice. Similarly in relation to contributive justice the exact determination of a fair contribution is problematic and we will prescind from this issue by turning attention to the process by which the judgement is made. The law of unfair dismissal requires that the employer is able to prove the fairness of his decision to dismiss and lays down criteria for fairness in dismissal. Besides the quantifiable grounds of performance and ability to work (as well as redundancy) the law requires that in all things that concern the dismissal the employer act reasonably. The organisation is obliged to the formation of a reasonable body of rules and the reasonable application of those rules to specific cases. The quality of reasonableness is essential to Blader and Tyler's formal quality of treatment. Perusal of tribunal cases shows all sides placing a high value on their quality of reasonableness. It can be measured by the groundedness of their decisions.

5. CONCLUSION

Blader and Tyler sought further understanding of the nature of procedural justice and drawing on work in the field of Organisational Justice proposed a model of four components. Darcy (2005) verified empirically that three of those components, namely, formal and informal quality of decision making and informal quality of treatment were criteria by which former employees judged the fairness of their dismissal. Blader and Tyler's fourth component, namely, formal quality of treatment remained unexplored. Darcy suggested that it differed from the other components of the model in that it is concerned with higher order variables in terms of the conceptualisation of fairness. Applying a background of traditional natural law philosophy it was proposed that reasonableness, both in the development of the body of rules in an organisation as well as in their application to concrete cases was the procedural element essential to fairness in deliberation about dismissal. Lack of reasonableness issued in unfairness in decision making about dismissal. It is hypothesised that all sides in unfair dismissal cases will make claims to reasonableness and that its presence or otherwise can be inferred from the groundedness of their judgments.

Blader and Tyler broadened the model of procedural fairness to include decision making, fair treatment as well as the corpus of guiding rules and norms in the organisation. They ask if the meaning of the term procedure should not be expanded to encompass all processes of the organisation. One author observed that informal quality of treatment was similar to the question of 'ethicality'. We are now proposing that reasonableness is the quality behind decision making and treatment, both formal and informal. There is undoubtedly a close connection between justice, morality and reasonableness but they are distinct concepts. The principle of parsimony in scientific method suggests an economical use of names and concepts in explaining phenomena. The expansion of the meaning of procedural justice may trespass on territory already named as morality and reasonableness. Delineation and relating of these concepts is a task that requires review.

References

- Adler, M.J. (1992). *The Great Ideas: A Lexicon of Western Thought*. New York: Macmillan.
- Barden, G. (1999). *Essays on the Philosophical Interpretation of Justice*. Lampeter, Wales: The Edwin Mellin Press Ltd.
- 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 organisations*, Vol. 1:43 – 55. Greenwich. CT:JAI.
- Bies, R.J., & Trip, T.M. (1995). The use and abuse of power: Justice as social control. In R.Cropanzano, & K.M. Kacmar (Eds.). *Organisational politics, justice and support: Managing the social climate of work organisations*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Blader, S. and Tyler, T. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review* 13, 107-126.
- Cronin, Brian. (2001). *Foundations of Philosophy: Lonergan's Cognitional Theory and Epistemology*. Nairobi: Consolata Institute of Philosophy Press.
- Cronin, Brian. (2006). *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective*. Nairobi:Consolata Institute of Philosophy Press.
- Darcy, Colette. (2005). *Understanding fairness judgments in respect of termination of employment; the antecedents of claiming decisions*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Limerick.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organisation Justice and Human Resource Management*. California: Sage.
- Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, H.J. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K.J. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg & R.H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchanges: Advances in theory and research*: 27-55. New York: Plenum.
- Lewis, P., Thornhill, A. & Saunders, M. (2003). *Employee Relations: Understanding the employment relationship*. England: Pearson Educational Ltd.
- Lonergan, B.J.F. (1958). *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Meenan, F. (1994). *Working Within the Law: A Practical Guide for Employers and Employees*. Dublin: Oak Tree Press.
- Morelli, E.A. and Morelli, M.D. (Eds). (1980). *Understanding and Being: An Introduction and Companion to Insight*. Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press.

- Naumann, S.E. & Bennett, N. 2000. A Case for Procedural Justice Climate: Development and Test of a Multilevel Model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (Issue 5):881.
- Salamon, M. (1998). (3rd ed). *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Thibaut, J. & Walkers, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Warren, R. and Lucas, R. (2006) *Ethics and organisational justice*. In R.Lucas, B. Luptton & H. Mathieson, *Human Resource Management in an International Context*. London: CIPD.

Previously published Working Papers:

An up-to-date list of working papers can be found at: <http://iira.fh-bad-honnef.com>

No.	Author(s)	Title	Date
16	Hebson, G., Marchington, M., Cooke, F.L.	Shifting Careers, Shifting Organizations: Developing Careers across Organizational Boundaries	10/2006
15	Mitlacher, L.	Implications of Triangular Employment Relationships for Human Resource Management: The Case of Temporary Agency Work in Germany and the US	10/2006
14	Farndale, E., Paauwe, J.	Best Practice Versus Best Fit HRM: Within and Across MNC Comparisons	10/2006
13	Nash, D.	A Recepte for Creating Resentment and Dissatisfaction: A Study of Payment Systems in Investment Banking	09/2004
12	Procter, S., Burridge, M.	Extent, Intensity, and Context: Teamworking and Performance in the 1998 UK Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS98)	09/2004
11	Marsden, D.	The Role of Performance Related Pay in Renegotiating the 'Effort Bargain': The Case of the British Public Service	09/2004
10	Galang, M. C.	High Performance Work Systems and Organisational Performance: A Six-Country Study	09/2004
09	van Veldhoven, M., Verhagen, M.	The Relationship Between Employee Survey Data And Performance: A Longitudinal Study Using Multiple Types Of Outcomes	09/2004
08	Thompson, M., Heron, P.	Management Capability And High Performance Work Organization	09/2004
07	Heffernan, M., Dundon, T.	High Performance Work Systems and Employee Outcomes: Rebalancing the Argument	09/2004
06	Kalmi, P., Pendleton, A., Poutsma, E.	Financial Participation And Performance: New Survey Evidence From Europe	09/2004
05	Stavrou, E., Brewster, C., Charalambous, C.	Human Resource Management As A Competitive Tool In Europe	09/2004
04	Bacon, N., Blyton, P.	Does Co-operation to Negotiate High Performance Work Practices Pay for Unions?	09/2004
03	McNabb, R., Whitfield, K.	Does Pay-for-Performance Pay?: Incentive Pay, Employee Participation and Earnings	09/2004
02	Kinnie, N., Swart, J., Rayton, B., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J.	HR Policy and Performance: An Occupational Analysis	09/2004
01	Boselie, P., Paauwe, J.	HRM and Performance: What's next?	09/2004