Journal of Organizational Behavior

Special Issue Call for Papers

Justice Enactment – Research on "Doing Justice" in Organizations

Guest Editors: **Chris Bell (Schulich School of Business, York University); Marjo-Riitta Diehl (EBS University); Marion Fortin (University of Toulouse 1 Capitole); Mario Gollwitzer (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München); Tessa Melkonian (emlyon Business School)**

Background and Rationale for the Special Issue

Although a wealth of evidence suggests that organizations and managers should care more about justice, workplace injustice shows little sign of abating (e.g. Matta, Scott, Colquitt, Koopman, & Passantino, 2017). As academics, we still know little about how justice agents make sense of the justice recipient's situation or experience and how they decide to enact justice upon it or not (O'Reilly, Aquino, & Skarlicki, 2016). One reason may be that much of the organizational justice literature has focused on the perspective of the justice recipient and on the consequences of justice perceptions (Brockner, Wiesenfeld, Siegel, Bobocel, & Liu, 2015; Scott, Colquitt, & Paddock, 2009), or more recently on third party reactions to unfair treatment of others (Skarlicki, O'Reilly, & Kulik, 2015), while our understanding of the perspective of *justice agents* or "actors" remains less well developed (Bies, 2015; Blader & Tyler, 2005). Given the importance of fairness in the workplace, the *prerequisites and conditions for, and outcomes of, (in)justice enactment*, defined as the deliberate, conscious, and intentional actions of an individual to treat others in an either just or unjust manner, merit further study. Theoretically, such an actor focus would allow for a "more complete picture of justice in organizations" (Scott et al., 2009: 757). Practically, broadening the existing understanding of the underlying forces of just or unjust treatment is an important step towards fairer workplaces.

The emerging literature on the actor's perspective shows much promise but also points to the multiplicity of aspects involved. One group of studies has focused on factors that lie within the manager, including personality traits (Schuh, Zheng, Xin, & Fernandez, 2017), emotions (e.g. Cohen, Patner & Turan, 2012; Patient, & Skarlicki, 2010) and moral identity (e.g. Brebels, De Cremer, Van Dijke, Van Hiel 2011). Another (small) body of studies has examined managers' experiences and work relationships and shown that managerial actions are influenced, for instance, by subordinates' reactions (Van Houwelingen, Van Dijke, & De Cremer, 2017; Oc, Bashshur, & Moore, 2015). A third stream of research has focused on situational factors and the work context, and how for example the depletion of self-regulatory resources, (e.g. Whiteside & Barclay, in press;) workload (Sherf, Venkataramani, & Gajendran, 2018), status and power (Blader & Chen, 2012) and politics (Monin, Noorderhaven, Vaara, & Kroon, 2013) influence justice enactment. Finally, the fourth stream of research concerns the effects of justice enactment on actors themselves, including effects on the actors' regulatory resources (Johnson, Lanaj, & Barnes, 2014) and how managers conceptualize (in)justice or even use different forms of justice for specific purposes (Zapata, Olsen, & Martins, 2013; Zhao, Chen, & Brockner, 2015). At the core of all these streams of research is the subjective nature of managers' justice perceptions and

the extent to which they care about and do justice in a motivated way (Barclay, Bashshur, & Fortin, 2017; Brockner et al., 2015).

The above contributions have created new, promising links between the fields of organizational justice, behavioral ethics, decision-making and leadership that researchers can build on. In particular the behavioral ethics literature (Brockner et al., 2015) and recent conceptual papers in the justice literature, for example on motivated justice reasoning (Barclay et al., 2017) can further contribute to our understanding of the important question of what makes managers act justly or unjustly and help riding the emerging wave of studying justice or fairness as a dependent variable.

Objectives of the Special Issue
With this special issue we seek to advance existing knowledge on why and how managers make, think, and feel about justice-related decisions, as well as on the consequences of these decisions on others and on themselves (e.g., for their own careers and health). We hope that the special issue will encourage research from a wide range of contexts and draw on several OB themes.

An indicative but not exhaustive list of questions that we are interested in addressing includes:

- How do managers cognitively approach and frame justice related questions as justice agents? How do they decide to enact justice (or not) based on their analysis of the situation? How do they cope with potential dissonances between their justice analysis of the situation and their justice enactment (or lack thereof)?
- How do managers justify and frame their own decisions in terms of different conceptualizations of justice versus non-justice framings (economic etc.) and how do they make sense of reactions of employees that may challenge their own framing?
- How do managers deal with having to enact what they see themselves as injustice (e.g. "necessary evils")?
- What are the boundary conditions (e.g. inequality, corporate culture, ethical climate, psychological safety climate) for justice enactment?
- How does justice enactment by managers interact with (actual or anticipated) reactions of other parties (followers, managers' superior, etc.)?
- What are the links between different types of leadership behaviors and styles and justice enactment?
- What roles do emotions (e.g., empathy, guilt, liking, shame, envy) or emotion suppression play in managers' and employees' justice enactment?
- How do justice enactment styles differ between contexts and cultures? How do expatriate managers adjust their justice enactment when moving across cultures?
- Which types of managerial justice trainings are perceived as most helpful by managers, and which result in managerial behavior perceived as fairest by followers?
- What are the outcomes of acting unjustly / justly for managers? How does justice enactment influence managers' career trajectories?
- How do phenomena at other levels of analysis (e.g. individuals nested within groups or organizations; behaviors nested within individuals) affect individuals' justice enactment?

This list is not exhaustive. The key requirement is that the paper makes a new contribution to our understanding of the actor perspective to organizational justice. We especially encourage papers

that include empirical investigations of these issues, but we will also consider strong theoretical or conceptual papers that stimulate the research agenda on justice enactment.

Submission Instructions
This call is open and competitive, and the submitted papers will be blindly reviewed. Scholars interested in submitting their papers to this special issue are encouraged to also consider submitting to the 6th International Workshop on Insights in Organizational Justice and Behavioural Ethics which takes place at EBS Business School in Germany in June 5 – 7, 2019.

The deadline for submissions is **September 15, 2019** and papers should be submitted online via http://mc.manuscript.central.com/job (selecting 'Special Issue Paper' as the manuscript type). The special issue is intended for publication in the second half of 2021. Papers submitted should be no more than 40 pages long, should be accompanied by a separate cover letter, and - to be eligible for review - must follow the Journal of Organizational Behaviour guidelines.

Please direct questions about the submission process, or any administrative matter, to the Managing Editor at JOBedoffice@wiley.com. Please address any content related questions you may have at Marjo-Riitta Diehl: **marjo-riitta.diehl@ebs.edu.**

References

Barclay, L. J**.,** Bashshur, M. R., & Fortin, M. (2017). Motivated cognition and fairness: Insights, integration, and creating a path forward. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102,* 867-889.

Bies, R. J. (2015). Interactional justice: Looking backward, looking forward. In R. S. Cropanzano & M. L. Ambrose (Eds.), *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace* (pp. 89-107). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Blader, S. L., & Chen, Y. R. (2012). Differentiating the effects of status and power: a justice perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(5), 994 - 1014.

Blader, S.L., & Tyler, T.R. (2005). How can theories of organizational justice explain the effects of fairness? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice*, 329-354. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Brebels, L., De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., & Van Hiel, A. (2011). Fairness as Social Responsibility: A Moral Self-regulation Account of Procedural Justice Enactment. *British Journal of Management*, *22*, 47-58.

Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., Siegel, P. A., Bobocel, D. R., & Liu, Z. (2015). Riding the fifth wave: Organizational justice as dependent variable. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *35*, 103-121.

Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Turan, N. (2012). Guilt proneness and moral character. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*, 355–359.

Johnson, R. E., Lanaj, K., & Barnes, C. M. (2014). The good and bad of being fair: Effects of procedural and interpersonal justice behaviors on regulatory resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*635-650.

Leventhal, G. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In: K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (ed.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., Koopman, J., & Passantino, L. (2017). Is consistently unfair better than sporadically fair? An investigation of justice variability and stress. *Academy of Management Journal, 60,* 743-770.

Monin, P., Noorderhaven, N., Vaara, E., & Kroon, D. (2013). Giving sense to and making sense of norms of justice in post-merger integration. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*, 256-284.

Oc, B., Bashshur, M. R., & Moore, C. (2015). Speaking truth to power: The effect of candid feedback on how individuals with power allocate resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 450-463.

O'Reilly, J., Aquino, K., & Skarlicki, D. (2016). The lives of others: Third parties' responses to others' injustice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(2), 171.

Patient, D. L., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). Increasing interpersonal and informational justice when communicating negative news: The role of the manager's empathic concern and moral development. *Journal of Management*, *36*(2), 555-578.

Scott, B., Colquitt, J., & Paddock, E. (2009). An actor-focused model of justice rule adherence and violation: The role of managerial motives and discretion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 756-769.

Schuh, S. C., Zheng, M. X., Xin, K. R., & Fernandez, J. A. (online June 2017). The interpersonal benefits of leader mindfulness: A serial mediation model linking leader mindfulness, leader procedural justice enactment, and employee exhaustion and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-19.

Sherf, E. N., Venkataramani, V., & Gajendran, R. S. (in press). Too busy to be fair? The effect of workload and rewards on managers' justice rule adherence. *Academy of Management* Journal, (online first 2018).

Skarlicki, D. P., O'Reilly, J., & Kulik, C. T. (2015). The Third-Party Perspective of (In) justice. In R. Cropanzano & M. L. Ambrose (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace* (pp. 235–255). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Van Houwelingen*, G., van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2017)*. Fairness enactment as response to higher level unfairness: The Roles of self-construal and spatial distance. *Journal of Management, 43*(2), 319 – 347.

Whiteside, D. B., & Barclay, L. J. (in press). When wanting to be fair isn't enough: The effects of depletion and self-appraisal gaps on fair behavior. *Journal of Management.*

Zapata, C. P., Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2013). Social exchange from the supervisor's perspective: Employee trustworthiness as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *121*, 1–12.

Zhao, G., Chen, Y., & Brockner, J. (2015). What influences managers' procedural fairness towards their subordinates? The role of subordinates' trustworthiness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *59*, 96–112.