Organizational Justice Climate: Construct Measurement and Validation

by Yuni Siswanti

Organizational Justice Climate: Construct Measurement and Validation

Yuni Siswanti[1], Heru Kurnianto Tjahjono[2], Arif Hartono[3], Wisnu Prajogo[4]

[1]Faculty of Economics and Business, Department of Management, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia

[2]Faculty of Economics and Business, Department of Management, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

[3]Faculty of Economics, Department of Management, Universitas Islam Indonesia

[4]Department of Management, STIE YKPN, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: This study aims to re-validate the consistency test of organizational justice climate construct. Organizational justice climate in this study uses a 4-factor approach (dimension), namely procedural justice climate, distributive justice climate, interpersonal justice climate, and informational justice climate. This study was conducted on non-civil servant lecturers in 3 new state universities in Indonesia, located in Yogyakarta, East Java, and Jakarta. There are 55 unit/group examined in this study. The instrument validation test is carried out using Confirmatory Factor Analysis test. The results show that most of the instruments used in this study (which refer to Colquitt et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2007; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) were stated to have good validity and high internal consistency. Further studies needs to be carried out to examine organizational justice climate in different professions and regions.

Keywords: *Organizational Justice Climate, Distributive Justice Climate, Interpersonal Justice Climate, Informational Justice Climate, Consistency Test*

I. Introduction

There have been many studies on organizational justice that are carried out (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Dalal, 2005; Nowakowski &.Conlon, 2005; Colquitt et al., 2001, 2005, 2013). Most of these studies were done based on the notion that justice has become a big issue and plays a vital role for employees (Forret & Love, 2008). Organizational justice was initially divided into three dimensions, namely distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Konovskyl, 2000). These three dimensions of organizational justice are explained as follows. First, distributive justice is a perception of justice about the allocation of output in the organizations (Colqiutt, 2001). Distributive justice refers to equity theory (Adam's, 1963; 1965) which stated

that individuals define justice only on the comparison of outcomes received, so the relationship tend to be on economic exchange, which are more appropriately called as a contract; an agreement to create an obligation or to do nothing. Reciprocal economic exchanges will be limited to in-role behavior because employees see little possibility of doing this that go beyond the specific contractual agreements.

Second, procedural justice is the perception of justice in terms of rules or procedures used to determine the allocation of distribution among employees (Colquitt, 2001). This definition is strengthened by Conlon (1993) and Aquino et al. (1999) who stated that procedural justice is related to the fairness and appropriateness of the procedures used to allocate various decisions in organizations. Procedures that are considered fair

must meet several criteria, namely: consistency, lack of bias, correct ability, representation, accuracy, and ethics (Leventhal, 1976). According to Moorman (1991), the perception of justice is also seen from the treatment of management in carrying out their procedures.

Third, according to Cropanzano et al. (2012), interactional justice refers to the extent to which the authority given to employees is able to be well-communicated. In general, it can be said that interactional justice shows the state of activities that are not in contact with work, but are more dominant in aspects of interaction, both in information and interpersonal. Robbins & Judge (2012) stated that interactional justice is an individual perception of the level to which an employee is treated with dignity, attention, and respect. According to Colquitt (2001), interactional justice shows the level of someone being treated well, respectfully, politely, and valued.

Historically, the study on organizational justice tends to focus on how fair behavior impacts on unit/group processes. Most employees will be happier and work groups/work units will be more optimal when the members believe that they are treated fairly (Kirkman, R.G.Jones, & Shapiro, 2000; Philips, Douthitt, & Hyland, 2001). Mossholder et al. (1998) stated that individual approach fails to address social context when dealing with the formation of perception of justice. In a unit/group, each member interacts with each other, observes behavior with one another, and is bound in an understanding to build shared perceptions to evaluate fairness applied in the organization (Naumann & Bennett, 2000; Roberson, 2006a, 2006b; Li & Cropanzano, 2009). Consistent with this statement, current studies are suggested to see justice as a property and can be formed on the basis of interaction between each member in the same unit/group. This perception is then called justice climate. Moliner et al. (2005) in his study of 324 employees divided into 108 work units found that

the perception of unit/group level of justice is a predictor of a burnout in the unit level. Thus, both justice and burnout can be treated as a collective construct.

The measurement of organizational justice climate is still done in minimum, only a few researchers have tried to do so (Tang & Tang, 2012; Mossholder et al., 1998; Naumann & Bennett, 2000) with objects in large countries, such as America and several countries on the European continent. Therefore, this study tries to test the organizational justice climate instruments (procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational) in Indonesia, especially in the three new state universities (established by the President of Indonesia in October 2014).

II. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE CLIMATE CONSTRUCT

Naumann and Bennett (2000) are the researchers who first introduced the terminology of climate justice. According to Naumann & Bennett (2000), justice climate is about how a group/unit cognition (a working group) as a whole is treated. An understanding of this justice climate and its impact on employee behavior was then continued by Ehrhart (2004), Roberson & Colquitt (2005), Rupp et al. (2002). The study from Tang & Tang, (2012; Mossholder et al., 1998; Naumann & Bennett, 2000) used the perception of justice to be justice climate to explain its impact on employee work behavior. In its development, researchers have examined organizational phenomena in a broader scope, not only at the individual level, but also at the group and organizational level (Spell & Arnold, 2007), namely by aggregating members' perception of justice.

The logical and theoretical explanation of individual level variable (e.g. organizational justice variable) which transforms into a unit level variable (e.g. organizational justice climate) can be assessed from the analysis of Kozlowski and Klein (2000). According to Kozlowski & Klein

(2000), there are three types of unit level constructs, namely global unit properties, share unit properties, and configuration properties. The characteristics of global unit type properties construct are tend to be objective, easy observable, clearly showing unit characteristics, insignificant variations within the groups, and irrelevant existence of individuals in units, for example: group size, group functions, and location of group work units. The measurement of this construct usually uses object tend to be subjective, information comes from individual/personal, variations in groups must be low (within variance), and variations between groups (between variance) must exist. In measuring this construct, it is based on individuals who are in units that have a relatively similar perceptions, cognitions, attitudes, interests, and behaviors. This similarity arises because of the convergence formed from factors of interaction, socialization, experience-sharing, and exemplary leadership. The examples of these constructs are: group climate, group norms, group efficacy, and team cohesiveness.

The characteristics of configuration unit type properties construct include: the composition, patterns, and distribution or variability in groups. In order to measure this construct, it is sourced from individuals, for example: demographic factors, personalities, and behavior. In this construct, there is no assumption of convergence. Each individual has an unequal contribution to the diversity of units/groups, for example: diversity in groups and combinations of group abilities.

Based on these three types of unit level construct, justice climate is included in shared unit properties type of construct. Justice climate is the shared perception of justice of work unit members regarding how the organization and supervisors treat the work unit/work group related to the results, procedures, and interaction mechanisms. This shared perception arises because of the convergence of perceptions and cognition of work unit members, exchanging experiences, and exchanging information (Purnomo, 2014). According to Li and Cropanzano (2009), the perception of justice can be tested and measured at the unit/group level analysis. This opinion is based on two approaches proposed by Morgeson and Hoffman (1999) in conducting evaluation of a construct at the unit level. There are two approaches to understand the collective construct, namely the structural approach and functional approach.

The structural approach assumes that collective construct comes from individuals and is formed due to a series of interactions between individuals in the unit. Each member in the work unit interprets the events experienced through information sharing, collective meaning, and mutual understanding. The functional approach emphasizes the influence of unit-level constructs in the organizational system. A construct can be understood with the consequence of the construct; which means that the construct is meaningful if it produces certain effects. When individual level construct has the same effect with unit level construct, then this construct is said to have a cross level functionally. It means that if the perceptions of justice have consequences for the formation of individual behavior, then the justice climate also has the consequences for the formation of unit/group behavior.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice was first put forward by Homans (1961) based on the initial ideas introduced by Stouffer et al. (1949). This was stated by Colquitt et al. (2005), that in the development, many of Homans' ideas about distributive justice were integrally developed in Adams' equity theory (1965). This concept is then developed into distributive justice (Deutchs, 1975; Leventhal, 1976). Distributive justice according to Leventhal (1976) is an individual's belief that

something is fair and appropriate when rewards, sanctions, or resources are distributed according to predetermined criteria. Distributive justice is justice un which employees will assess the rewards they receive relating to the business (input) they have given to the company (Moorman, 1991). The concept of distributive justice is the distribution of rewards and sanctions among people who agree with the question: who receives, how much, and how the outcomes are distributed fairly.

According to Greenberg (1990), distributive justice involves valuing fairness in giving rewards to employees and exchanging their contributions in work. According to Aryee et al. 2002; Colquitt et al. 2006; & Greenberg, 2006), distributive justice is an organizational justice that focuses the attention to someone's belief who has received a number of vales for work related to outcomes, both in the form of monetary and non-monetary rewards fairly. Distributive justice relates to the end of an activity carried out (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). It also relates to final results that are expected to be consistent with predetermined targets, for example productivity optimization (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976).

Based on the definition and equity theory formulated by Adams (1963), distributive justice measurement tool is the main structural component of equity theory, namely input and outcomes. According to Clay-Warner et al. (2005), outcomes require justice based on the input carried out by employees, and the output they receive must be consistent with what other employees do. Leventhal (1976) stated that equity rule as a normative rule that determine reward and resources are allocated according to everyone's contribution. This theory of justice explains that every person has the right to determine whether they are treated fairly or not by comparing the ratio of inputs they provide (time and resources) related to what they receive (salary, opportunity for self-development, opportunity to be promoted)

then compared to the same ratio in other people (Lewis, 2013).

Procedural Justice

According to Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001), the existence of procedural justice is considered when there are inherent procedures that are in accordance with normatively accepted principles. The definition of procedural justice according to Lind & Tyler (1988) is justice of the process by which the outcomes are determined. Moorman (1991) stated that procedural justice is how organizational justice is perceived by employees through formal procedures applied in the organization to measure how far fair procedures are applied in the organization. In another definition, procedural justice is a view of justice from a method or procedure used to determine the outcomes (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Kreitner & Kinicki (2010) stated that procedural justice is perceived justice from a procedure and process used to allocate decisions.

Based on the definition above, there are two theories of procedural justice measurement tool, namely control theory and the group value model. Control theory stated that individual has the desire to exercise control over what happens to them (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The personal interest model for this instrumental model is based on the assumption that individuals try to maximize their personal gain when interacting with others. This model broadens the assumption by making the assumption that individuals will not only make a choice of outcomes and procedures that are in their interest, but also procedures that are seen as fair in general for them in a political system, work organization, and social groups (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

The group-value model according to Lind & Tyler (1988) is a model which shows that group values are introduced in addition to the self-interest model. Individuals are strongly influenced by identification with the group, while identification is based on the conditions that are assumed to be

minimal. Individuals in a group often argue that they want attention as a member, and are seen valuable in this group. They most likely can minimize to have a high voice in terms of personal interests and vice versa. Individuals will perceive high procedural justice when they believe that their existence is respected and valued by their group.

Leventhal (1990) & Kozlowski (2006) stated that procedural justice is a perception of the process of participation to achieve results by focusing on six rules that produce procedures which are considered fair, including: (a) consistency (the consistency rule), stating that the allocation procedure should be consistent across personal and various times (whenever and in any person); (b) free from bias-suppression rules, stating that the personal interests of decision makers must be prevented during the process of resource allocation; (c) accuracy (the accuracy rule) refers to the use of accurate information in the allocation process; (d) the ability to improve (the correct ability rule), agreed with the existence of opportunities to change unjust decisions; (3) representation (the representatives rule) that the needs, values, and views of all parties affected by the allocation process should be represented in the process; and (f) ethics (the ethicality rule), that the allocation process must be in accordance with moral and fundamental ethics.

Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the process by which a decision is made (Konovsky, 2000), for example, a number of employee voices (Folger, 1993). Voice is one of the major studies of procedural justice variables. Voice is owned by the individual when they are given sufficient opportunity to convey information to decision makers (Lind & Tyler, 1988). According to Folger & Konovsky (1989), voice tends to be a positive predictor and an individual's reaction to the organization.

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice was introduced by Bies & Moag (1986). Bies & Moag (1986) found that people who are being interviewed on average paid attention to the quality of treatment between personnel received and related it to the perceptions of justice. This perception of justice is called by Bies & Moag (1986) as interactional justice. Interactional justice believes in perceptions of procedural fairness derived from organizational procedures and how those procedures or mechanisms are applied (Wat & Shaffer,2005).

According to other researchers (Mikula, et al., 1998), the proportion or considerations of injustice is not due to the attention on distribution and procedural issues within narrow limits, but rather refers to ethics in treating someone personally during interactions and meetings. In general, it can be said that interactional justice shows the state of activities that are not in contact with work, but are more dominant in aspects of interaction, both information and interpersonal (Yaghoubi, 2011). Robbins (2012) stated that interactional justice is an individual's perception of the level to which an employee is treated with dignity, attention, and respect. Colquitt (2001) added that interactional justice includes seeing the behavior of leaders in paying attention to employee perspectives and being able to minimize subjectivity, treatment of employees in implementing a procedure, and bias in judgments (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Related to the concept from Bies & Moag (1986), Colquitt (2001) explained that the basis of interaction in fairness involves exchanges between employees and organizations. In this case, there are two dimensions that are considered quite important, namely:

1). Dimensions of sensitivity (including politeness/respectfulness in the process of interacting with the implementation of procedures, and not acting rude/propriety) in the form of a leader able to refrain from

making statements that are not true, or harming employees.

2). Dimensions of explanation (including the reasons underlying a decision that is justified), the honesty of individuals authorized in the implementation process, as well as interactions with an implementation procedure.

Interactional justice according to Greenberg (1993); Colquitt et al (2001) is distinguished into two types of justice, namely interpersonal justice and informational justice.

a). Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal justice is a justice for interpersonal treatment given during the implementation of procedures and distribution of results. Interpersonal justice sees the perception of personnel regarding the fairness/justice of the issue of how they are treated. Improper and unfair treatment done by superiors causes subordinates to experience a decrease in motivation and job satisfaction.

b). Informational Justice

Informational justice is a personal perception of information that is used as a basis for decision making. Informational justice motivates feelings of respect by others through clear information-giving mechanisms within the organization.

IV. RESEARCH METHOD

The population of this study is non-civil servant lecturers in three new state universities (PTNB) in Indonesia, which were established by the President of Indonesia in October 2014.

Table 1. Research Population

No.	Information	Number of Permanent Lecturers	Number of Study Program
1.	PTNB Yogyakarta	447	23
2.	PTNB East Java	391	24
3.	PTNB Jakarta	317	26

Source: Primary data, 2019

Since the level analysis of this research construct is unit, it must follow the rules for a minimum number of members in each unit/group. The minimum number of members in a group is five people, referring to the average size of the work unit (Epitropaki & Martin, 2012; Le Blanc & Gonzalez-Roma, 2012). From the minimum number of members in each group, the sample taken in this research in each study program is a minimum of five lecturers, with details in Table 2.

Table 2. Research Sample

No.	Information	Number of Population	Number of Study Program (Group)	Number of Minimum Sample of Each Group	Number of Minimum Sample
1.	PTNB Yogyakarta	447	23	5	5 x 23 = 115
2.	PTNB East Java	391	24	5	5 x 24 = 120
3.	PTNB Jakarta	317	26	5	5 x 26 = 130
	Total	1155	73		365

Source: Secondary data, 2019

Table 3. Questionnaire Distribution

No.	Institution	Number of Minimum Sample of Non-Civil Servant Lecturers	Distributed	Returned	Incomplete	Can be Used
1.	PTNB Yogyakarta	186	190	158	2	128
2.	PTNB East Java	180	190	171	0	171
3.	PTNB Jakarta	124	130	110	10	100
	Total	**490**	**510**	**439**	**12**	**399**

Source: Survey Result, 2019

From the results of the questionnaire returned and filled out completely, there were a number of 55 group/work unit/study programs entered as respondents.

In this study, there are two sources of data used, namely: primary data (obtained from interviews with several respondents and answers to questionnaires distributed to respondents) and secondary data (data obtained through other parties that are not from direct respondents) such as: company data records, government publications, company data as outlined through social media, internet, web (Sekaran, 2011).

The data collection in this study is carried out by the method of interview and questionnaire.

V. CONSTRUCT MEASUREMENT

Procedural Justice Climate (X_1)

Procedural justice climate is defined as the cognition of the level of group differences regarding how serious a team is in enforcing procedural justice (Naumann & Bennet, 2000; Mossholder et al., 1998). According to Niehoff & Moorman (1993), and strengthened by Lin, Tang, Li, Wu., & Lin (2007) procedural climate justice is a shared perception of individuals in groups regarding the procedures used in decision making. The dimensions, indicators, and questionnaire items of procedural fairness (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Dimension, Indicator, and Item of Procedural Justice Climate

Dimension	Indicator	Item
Bias Suppression	Procedures that seek to be safe from decision bias	Safe from bias (1)
Process Control	Procedures that provide opportunities to listen to information from subordinate	Want to hear subordinate information (2)
Correct ability	Procedures in explaining decisions and providing additional information when needed	Explain the decision (3) Provide additional information (4)
Accuracy	Procedures based on accurate and complete information	Accurate and complete information (5)
Consistency	Decisions are consistent, both in terms of personnel and time	Consistent with personnel (6) Be consistent in terms of time (7)
Decision Control	Decision making procedures affect the actions of members and may be refuted by members	The decision is followed by the actions of the members (8) Decisions may be refuted by members (9)

All items in procedural justice climate, distributive justice climate, interpersonal justice climate, and informational justice climate were

measured at the unit level with a 6 point scale of Adjusted Likert Scale (scale 1= very strongly disagree to scale 6 = strongly agree).

To measure procedural justice climate, 9 questionnaire items were used.

Distributive Justice Climate (X_2)

Li et al. (2007) defined distributive justice climate as a team/group/unit assessment of fairness on outcomes received by employees based on their contributions. The dimensions, indicators, and questionnaire items of distributive justice are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5. Dimension, Indicator, and Item of Distributive Justice Climate

Dimension	Indicator	Item
Justice (Equity) ($X_{2.1}$)	Provisions that enforce outcomes according to the contribution	Fair income according to member contributions (1) Income according to member work quality (2)
Balance (Equality) ($X_{2.2}$)	Provisions that enforce outcomes are obtained in balance according to the quality of work	Responsibilities that are balanced with member income (3), (4), (5)

The instrument to measure distributive justice uses the measurement developed by Li et al. (2007), namely: distributive intra unit justice, which consists of 5 questionnaire items.

Interpersonal Justice Climate (X_3)

Interpersonal justice is justice for interpersonal treatment given during the implementation of procedures and distribution of results. This interpersonal justice looks at the perception of personnel regarding the fairness of the issue of how they are treated. Impolite and unfair treatment by superiors causes subordinates to experience a decrease in motivation and job satisfaction (Colquitt, 2001).

The instrument to measure inter personal justice climate is using the measurement developed by Colquitt (2001) which consists of 4 questionnaire items. The dimension, indicator, and questionnaire

item from interpersonal justice climate is shown on Table 6.

Table 6. Dimension, Indicator, and Item of Interpersonal Justice Climate

Respect ($X_{3.1}$)	Provisions carried out in treating members politely, controlling themselves from inappropriate words	Treat members politely (1) Self-control from inappropriate words (4)
Propriety ($X_{3.2}$)	Provisions which respect members and treat members with respect	Respecting members (2) Treat members with respect (3)

Informational Justice Climate (X_4)

Informational justice is a personal perception of information that is used as a basis for decision making. Informational justice motivates the feelings of respect by others through clear information-giving mechanisms within the organization.

The instrument to measure distributive justice uses the measurement developed Colquitt (2001), which consists of 4 questionnaire items.

The dimension, indicator, and questionnaire item from informational justice climate is shown on Table 7.

Table 7. Dimension, Indicator, and Item of Interpersonal Justice Climate

Thruthfulness ($X_{3.4}$)	Communicate honestly with members	Honest to members (1)
Justification ($X_{3.5}$)	A detailed explanation of each decision, adjusting the communication style to the needs of members, explaining the work procedures carefully and logically.	Detailed explanation of each decision (2) Adapt the style of communication to members' needs (3) Explain work procedures carefully (4) Explain work procedures for obvious reasons (5)

Procedural Justice Climate Questionnaire Design (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993)

Table 8. Procedural Justice Climate Questionnaire Design

No.	Instruments
1.	Job decisions are made by the general manager in an unbiased manner.
2.	My general manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.
3.	My general manager explains his decisions
4.	My general manager provides additional information when requested by employees
5.	To make decisions, my general manager collects accurate and correct information.
6.	All jobs decisions in my unit related person are applied consistently across all affected employees.
7.	All jobs decisions in my unit related share about timing for job are applied consistently across all affected employees.
8.	All jobs decisions from my general manager motivated employee to better performance
9.	All job decisions from my general manager allowed every employee to challenge themselves

Distributive Justice Climate Questionnaire Design (Li et al., 2007)

Table 9. Distributive Justice Climate Questionnaire Design

	Distributive Intra-Unit Justice Climate
1.	Some of my teammates have received a better grade for the team projects than they would have deserved
2.	The grade that my teammates have received for the projects is appropriate considering the quality of the work they have completed
3.	Some of my teammates did not do their share of the work, even though we have all received the same grade for the projects ®
4.	Some of my teammates did not meet their responsibilities, even though we have all received the same grade for the projects ®
5.	Some of my teammates put forth much less effort than other members of my team, even though we have all received the same grade for the projects ®

Interpersonal Justice Climate Questionnaire Design (Colquit, 2001)

Table 10. Interpersonal Justice Climate Questionnaire Design

	Interpersonal Justice Climate	Distributive Justice Climate
1.	My unit manager has treated every member in a polite manner	The leader in my work unit treats each member politely
2.	My unit manager has treated every member with dignity	The leader in my work unit glorifies every member
3.	My unit manager has treated every member with respect	The leader in my work unit treats each member with respect
4.	My unit manager has refrained from improper remarks or comments	The leader in my work unit controls themselves from inappropriate words or comments.

Informational Justice Climate Questionnaire Design (Colquit, 2001)

Table 11. Informational Justice Climate Questionnaire Design

	Informational Justice Climate	Distributive Justice Climate
1.	My unit manager has been candid in communication with every member	The leader in my work unit tries to be honest in their communication with each member
2.	My unit manager has communicated details in a timely manner with every member	The leader in my work unit communicates in detail in a timely manner to each member
3.	My unit manager seemed to tailor communication to our specific need	The leader in my work unit communicates in terms of the specific needs of each member
4.	My unit manager explained the procedures thoroughly to every member	The leader in my work unit explains the work procedures thoroughly to each member
5.	My unit manager explanations regarding the procedures reasonable	The leader in my work unit explained the work procedures for obvious reasons

The Development of Construct Instrument Design from Researchers

In this study, the researchers try to develop the instrument of organizational justice climate from four dimensions, with the answer choices as follows:

Very Strongly Disagree (ASTS)		score 1
Strongly Disagree	(STS)	score 2
Disagree	(TS)	score 3
Somewhat Agree	(AS)	score 4
Agree	(S)	score 5
Strongly Agree	(SS)	score 6

Table 12. Construct Instrument Design of Organizational Justice Climate

No.	Statement
	Procedural Justice Climate
1.	Job decisions are made by my study program leader in an unbiased manner.
2.	My study program leader makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.
3.	My study program leader always explain the decisions to the employee
4.	My study program leader provides additional information when requested by employees
5.	The decisions of the leader in my study program are based on complete and accurate information
6.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program are applied consistently across all affected employees.
7.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program related to the timing for job are applied consistently across all affected employees.
8.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program motivated employee to better performance
9.	Every employee are allowed to raise objections on the decision made by the leader in my study program
	Distributive Justice Climate
1.	Some of the employee in my study program have received a better grade for the team projects than they would have deserved
2.	The earnings that the employee in my study program have received for running special tasks/projects is appropriate considering the quality of the work they have completed
3.	Some of the employee in my study program did not do their share of the work, although we have all received the same earning for special projects
4.	Some of the employee in my study program were irresponsible for their duty, even though we have all received the same earning for special projects
5.	Some of my the employee in my study program put forth much less effort than other members of my team, even though we have all received the same grade for the projects
	Interpersonal Justice Climate
1.	My study program leader has treated every member in a polite manner
2.	The study program leader glorifies every member
3.	The study program leader treats each member with respect
4.	The study program leader controls themselves from inappropriate words or comments.
	Informational Justice Climate
1.	The leader in my work unit tries to be honest in their communication with each member
2.	The leader in my work unit communicates in detail in a timely manner to each member
3.	The leader in my work unit communicates in terms of the specific needs of each member
4.	The leader in my work unit explains the work procedures thoroughly to each member
5.	The leader in my work unit explained the work procedures for obvious reasons

VI. RESULTS

Construct Validity Test

The validity test of the research indicators was carried out using the exploratory factor analysis with Principal Component Analysis and Varimax Rotation techniques. The measurement of the level of validity is presented by factor loading scores. According to Hair et al. (2006), an instrument is said to be valid if it has a loading factor score of $\geq 0,5$.

Table 13 presents a summary of the results of the validity test of Organizational Justice Climate which consists of Procedural Justice Climate, Distributive Justice Climate, Interpersonal Justice Climate, and Informational Justice Climate. The

indicator of Procedural Justice Climate (8 items) are valid because the value is above 0.6. This test result found that 6 instruments of procedural justice climate perception are valid (*loading factor* $> = 0.6$), and there are only 3 instruments (item number 1, 2, and 9) that are invalid. Therefore, these three items are not included in the data processing. In the perception of distributive justice climate, there are 3 valid items (KD3, KD4, KD5), while the items of KD1 and KD2 are invalid (*loading factor* < 0.6), therefore they are not included in the subsequent data processing. The results of the validity test of the perception of interpersonal justice climate (KIT1 and KIT4) are valid, while KIT 2 and 3 are invalid, so they must be discarded. The perceptions of informational justice climate (KIF1, KIF2, KIF3, KIF4, and KIF5) all are valid.

Table 13. The Validity Test Result of Organizational Justice Climate Perception

Variable	Item	Factor				information
		1	2	3	4	
Procedural Justice	KP1	.567	.443	.079	.072	Invalid
	KP2	.517	.451	.206	.125	Invalid
	KP3	.456	**.712**	.091	.113	Valid
	KP4	.423	**.632**	.312	.009	Valid
	KP5	.444	**.721**	.206	.129	Valid
	KP6	.312	**.731**	.192	.201	Valid
	KP7	.259	**.748**	.276	.155	Valid
	KP8	.330	**.770**	.172	.218	Valid
	KP9	.636	.310	.136	.084	Invalid
Distributive Justice	KD1	-.090	.137	.492	.484	Invalid
	KD2	.092	.598	.184	.090	Invalid
	KD3	.026	.162	-.075	**.871**	**Valid**
	KD4	.199	.176	.011	**.871**	**Valid**
	KD5	.215	.068	.157	**.828**	**Valid**
Interpersonal Justice	KIT1	.407	.223	**.693**	.022	Valid
	KIT2	.499	.318	**.415**	.062	Invalid
	KIT3	.484	.259	**.434**	.024	Invalid
	KIT4	.184	.379	**.732**	.133	Valid
Informational Justice	KIF1	**.695**	.261	.482	.069	Valid
	KIF2	**.782**	.376	.204	.134	Valid
	KIF3	**.683**	.347	.372	.102	Valid
	KIF4	**.771**	.385	.141	.218	Valid
	KIF5	**.755**	.441	.120	.175	Valid

Source: Primary Data Processing, 2019

From the results of the CFA data processing, after deducting invalid items, a new table of the instruments from the construct of Organizational Justice Climate is formed, and can be used by the researcher as follows:

Table 14. Valid Construct Instrument Design of Organizational Justice Climate

No.	Statement
	Procedural Justice Climate
1.	My study program leader always explain the decisions to the employee
2.	My study program leader provides additional information when requested by employees
3.	The decisions of the leader in my study program are based on complete and accurate information
4.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program are applied consistently across all affected employees.
5.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program related to the timing for job are applied consistently across all affected employees.
6.	All jobs decisions made by the leader in my study program motivated employee to better performance
	Distributive Justice Climate
1.	Some of the employee in my study program did not do their share of the work, although we have all received the same earning for special projects
2.	Some of the employee in my study program were irresponsible for their duty, even though we have all received the same earning for special projects
3.	Some of my the employee in my study program put forth much less effort than other members of my team, even though we have all received the same grade for the projects
	Interpersonal Justice Climate
1.	My study program leader has treated every member in a polite manner
2.	The study program leader controls themselves from inappropriate words or comments.
	Informational Justice Climate
1.	The leader in my work unit tries to be honest in their communication with each member
2.	The leader in my work unit communicates in detail in a timely manner to each member
3.	The leader in my work unit communicates in terms of the specific needs of each member
4.	The leader in my work unit explains the work procedures thoroughly to each member
5.	The leader in my work unit explained the work procedures for obvious reasons

Construct Reliability Test

Reliability test is used to measure the accuracy and precision of measurement procedures (Cooper & Schidler, 2014). The higher the level of reliability of a measuring instrument, the more precise the measuring tool will be. Reliability testing was carried out with the Cronbach's Alpha which shows the instrument consistency in measuring concept. A construct has high reliability when there are high inter-correlations because they measure the same latent construct (Sekaran, 2000).

The test results as presented in Table 15 shows that all constructs have met the minimum threshold. The reliability value of Procedural Justice Climate is 0.925; Distributive Justice Climate is 0.722; Interpersonal Justice Climate is 0.922; and Informational Justice Climate is 0.906. All of the Cronbach's Alpha value is above 0.7, which shows a good reliability; therefore all variables can be used for the next analysis.

Table 15. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Number of Item	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Procedural Justice Climate	7	0,925	Good
Distributive Justice Climate	3	0,722	Good
Interpersonal Justice Climate	2	0,922	Good
Informational Justice Climate	5	0,906	Good

Source: Primary Data Processing, 2019

VII. DISCUSSION

This study supports the four dimension model from Colquitt, which shows that procedural justice climate, distributive justice climate, interpersonal justice climate, and informational justice climate are four separate but interrelated aspects of organizational justice climate. This study shows

that procedural justice climate, distributive justice climate, interpersonal justice climate, and informational justice climate has a satisfying internal consistency, as evidenced by the results of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient which is above 0.6. That way, this study provides further supports for the four dimension structures of organizational justice climate, and shows that the scale from Colquitt (2001), Niehoff & Moorman (1993) and Li et al. (2007) developed by current researchers are all valid and reliable instruments. The results of this study also show that there are inter-dimensional forces that are inter-related in the organizational justice climate. The critical boundary value required for an item is said to be valid in the CFA method is that it must exceed 0.50 (Zinbarg et al., 2007). The results of this study fulfill the element, which shows that in general, organizational justice climate can indeed be seen as one construct.

Organizational justice climate includes in shared unit properties type of construct. Justice climate is a shared justice perception of work unit members regarding how the organization and supervisors treat the work unit/work group related to the outcomes, procedures, and interaction mechanisms. This shared perception arises because of the convergence of the perceptions and cognitions of work unit members, exchanging experiences, and exchanging information. According to Hoffman & Morgeson (1999), in evaluating a construct at the unit level, there are two approaches to understand collective construct, namely structural approach and functional approach. The results of this study tend to be structural approach. The structural approach assumes that collective construct comes from individuals and is formed due to a series of interactions between individuals in the unit. Each member in the work unit interprets the events experienced through sharing information, collective meaning, and mutual understanding. This happened to the non-civil servant lecturers in

the three new state universities which become the current research object.

To develop the measure of organizational justice climate with high validity, Colquitt & Shaw (2005) explained several issues that need to be addressed. First, after deciding what form of justice to measure (for example a procedural or integrative approach), there is a question about the source from which justice can originate: is it the behavior of leaders or organizational structures that activate the perceptions of justice? In Colquitt's (2001) measure, human agents are defined as sources of informational and interpersonal justice, while there is freedom for researchers to choose sources of procedural and distributive justice. Colquitt & Shaw (2005) also emphasize differences between direct questions such as "How fair is that…," and indirect questions such as "How often are you invited to discuss…" Both assess the activities or rules that emphasize a sense of justice.

VIII. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

1. This study uses cross sectional approach in collecting data, so that further studies can try to do it in time series approach, therefore the results of the study can be generalized at different times.
2. This study of organizational justice climate has only been conducted on respondents who work as non-civil servant lecturers in three new state universities in Indonesia. Thus, further studies can do it in different profession, workforce status, and other institution or agency settings.

CONCLUSION

The scale of Organizational Justice Climate used in this study has good validity and internal consistency, and it supports previous literature on organizational justice climate (4 factors).

REFERENCES

[1]. Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of*

Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(5), 422–436

[2]. Adams, J. Stacy. 1965. Inequity in social exchange. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2, *Academic Press*, pp. 267-299.

[3]. Aquino, Karl., Lewis, Margareth. U., & Murray, Bradfields. 1999. Justice Construct: negative affectivity, and employee deviance: a proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 20: 1073-1091.

[4]. Aryee, Samuel., & Lam, Simon. S. K. 2002. Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23(1):1 - 18.

[5]. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. 1986. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotioations in organizations*. Vol. 1: 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

[6]. Cohen-Charash, Y. and Spector, P.E. (2001), "The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 278-321.

[7]. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3),* 386-400.

[8]. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C, & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 425-445.

[9]. Colquitt, J. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational behavior: The state of the science (pp. 165–210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.

[10]. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of OrganizationalJustice* (pp. 3-58). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[11]. Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), Handbook of organizational justice (pp. 589-619). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[12]. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B.A., Judge, T., & Shaw, J. C. (2006). Justice and personality Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 100,* 110-127'.

[13]. Colquitt, , Jason. A., Rodell, Jessica, B., Zapata, Cindy, P., Scott, Brent. A., Long, David. M., & Conlon, Donald, E. 2013. Justice at the millenium, a decade later: a meta analytic Test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 96, No. 2: 199-236.

[14]. Conlon, D. E., & Ross, W. H. (1993). The effects of partisan third parties on negotiator behavior and outcome perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 280-290.

[15]. Cooper, Donald., & Schindler, Pamela. 2014. *Business Research Metdhos.* 12th Edition. Mc-Graw Hill.

[16]. Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J. and Roman, P., 2005, ' Organization justice and job satisfaction: a set of three competing models', *Social Justice Research*, Vol.18: 391-409.

[17]. Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A. and Chen, P.Y. (2002), "Using social exchange theory to distinguish

[18]. procedural from interactional justice", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 27 No. 3: 324-51.

[19]. Dalal, R. S. 2005. A meta analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90 (6): 1241- 1255.

[20]. Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice *Journal of Social Issues, 31,* 137-149.

[21]. Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. 2013. Transformational-transactional leadership and upward influence: the role of Relative Leader-Member Exchanges (RLMX) and

Perceived Organizational Support (POS). *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 299-315

[22]. Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and Procedural Justice Climate as Antecedents of Unit-Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57: 61-94.

[23]. Folger, R. & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.

[24]. Forret, Monica., dan Mary Sue Love. 2008. Employee Justice Perceptions and Cowoker Relationships. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 29 Issue 3, pp.248-260.

[25]. Greenberg,J. 1990b. Organizational justice: yesterday, tolday, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*,16 (20: 399-432.

[26]. Greenberg, J. (1993a). *The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice*. In R. Cropanzano (ed.), Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[27]. Greenberg, J. (1993b). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.

[28]. Greenberg, J., and Colquitt, J. A. (2005). *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[29]. Hair, J.F. 2009.*Multivariate Data Analysis*. Edisi 9.New Jersey: Pearson Education.

[30]. Hofmann, D. A., & Morgeson, F. P. 1999. Safety-related behavior as social exchange: The role of perceived organizational support and leader-member ex- change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 286– 296.

[31]. Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

[32]. Jawad. Muhammad. 2012. Empowerment Effects and Employees Job Satisfaction. *Academic Research. International*, Vol. 3 (2): 392-400.

[33]. Kirkman, R. G. Jones, and D. L. Shapiro. 2000. "Why Do Employees Resist Teams? Examining the 'Resistance Barrier' to Work Team Effectiveness," *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11 (49) : 74–92.

[34]. Konovsky, M. 2000. Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. Journal of Management, 26, 489–511.

[35]. Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 7, 77-124.

[36]. Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). *A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes*. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Koslowski (Eds.), Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations (pp. 3-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[37]. Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. 2010. *Organizational Behavior*. Mcgraw-Hill, Boston.

[38]. Le Blanc P. M., & González-Romá V. 2012. A team level investigation of the relationship between Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) differentiation, and commitment and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 534–544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.006

[39]. Lee, H., Murrmann, S.K., Murrmann, K.F. and Kim, K. (2010), "Organizational justice as a mediator of the relationships between leader-member exchange and employees' turnover intentions", *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, Vol. 19 No. 4: 97-114.

[40]. Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 9, pp. 91–131. New York, NY: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60059-3

[41]. Leventhal, G. S. 1980. What should be done with equitytheory? New approaches to the study of fairness insocial relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg & R.Willis

(Eds.),*Social exchange: Advances in theoryand research*:27–55. New York: Plenum.

[42]. Lewis, A. V. 2013. Reflective practice what is it and how do I do it?. *Journal of Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology*, 15(2), 70-74.

[43]. Li, A., Cropanzano, R., & James, K. (2007). Intraunit justice and imerunic justice and the People who experience them. *Research in Multi-level Issues*, 6, 415-437.

[44]. Li, Andrew and Russell Cropanzano. 2009. Do East Asians Respond More/Less Strongly to Organizational Justice. Than North Americans? A MetaAnalysis. *Journal of Management Studies*; Volume 46 (5): 787-805.

[45]. Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Fairness at the group level: Justice climate and intraunit justice climate. Journal of Management, 35, 564-599.

[46]. Lin, S. P., Tang, T. W., Li, C. H., Wu, C. M., & Lin, H. H. (2007). Mediating effect of cooperative norm in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors from procedural justice climate. *Psychological Reports*, 101, 67-78. Doi: 10.2466/pr0.101.1.67-78

[47]. Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K. Goldman, B.M. and Taylor, M.S. (2000), "Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 738-48.

[48]. Mikula, G., Scherer, K. R., and Athenstaedt, U. (1998). The role of injustice in the elicitation of differential emotional reactions. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, 24, 769–783.

[49]. Moliner, Crolina., Tur, Vicente. Martinez., Peiro, Jose. M., Ramos, Jose., & Cropanzano, Russel. 2005. Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Burnout at The Work-Unit Level. *International Journal of Stress Management*. Vol. 12 (2): 99-116.

[50]. Mooman, R.H. 1991. Relationship Between Organizational Justice & Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Do Fairness Perception Influence Employee Citizenship?

Journalof applied Psychology,Vol. 76, No. 6: 845-855.

[51]. Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., & Martin, C. L. 1998. A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,19:* 131–141.

[52]. Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal. 43:* 881–889.

[53]. Niehoff, B.P dan Moorman, R.H. 1993. Justice As A Mediator Of The Relationship Beetween Methods Of Monitoring And Organizational Citizen Behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal* (36). 527-556.

[54]. Nowakowski. Jaclyn.M., & Conlon. Donald.E. 2005. Organizational Justice: Looking Back, Looking Forward. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*. Vol. 16, No.1: 4-29.

[55]. Phillips, J. M., Douthitt, E. A., & Hyland, M. M. 2001. The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(2), 316–325. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.316

[56]. Purnomo, Ratno. 2014. *Konsekuen Iklim Keadilan Dengan Kepercayaan Sebagai Pemediasian: Pendekatan Multifoci Dan Analisis Lintas Level*. Disertation. Gadjah Mada University.

[57]. Robbins, Stephen. P., & Judge, Timothy. A. 2012. *Organizational Behavior*. [15] Edition. Pearson Education.

[58]. Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Justice in teams: The effects of interdependence and identification on referent choice and justice climate strength. *Social Justice Research, 19:* 323–344.

[85]. Rupp, D.E. and Cropanzano, R. (2002), "The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice", *Organizational Behavior inHuman Decision Process*,Vol.89, No.1, pp.925-946.

[86]. Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research Methods for business: A Skill Building*

Approach.Singapore: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[87]. Skarlicki, D.P. and Folger, R. (1997), "Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive,

[88]. procedural, and interactional justice", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82, pp. 434-43.

[89]. Spell, C. S., & Arnold, T. J. (2007). A multi-level analysis of organizational justice climate, structure, and employee mental health. *Journal of Management*, 33(5): 724-751.

[90]. Stouffer, S. A., Suchman, E. A., DeVinney, L. C, Star, S. A., & Williams,R. M. (1949*).* *The American soldier: Adjustment during Army life* (Vol.1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[91]. Tang, T.-W., & Tang, Y.-Y. (2012). Promoting service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors in hotels: The role of high-performance human resource practices and organizational social climates. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31: 885–895.

[92]. Thiabut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[93]. Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors. The mediating role of trust in the supervisor and empowerment. *Personnel Review,* 34, 406-422.

[94]. Yaghoubi, Esmaeil and Ahmadzadeh Mashinchi, Sina and Ebrahimi, Ahmad and Abdollahi, Hadi and Ebrahimi, Hamid (2011): An analysis of correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Published in: *African Journal of Business Management* , Vol. 6, No. 3 (25 January 2012): pp. 995-1002.

[95]. Zinbarg , Richard E., Revelle, William., & Yovel, Iftah. (2007). Estimating ω_h for Structures Containing Two Group Factors: Perils and Prospects. *Applied Psychological Measurement*.

[96]. Zhang, Z., Zypur, M.J., & Preacher, K.J. (2009).Testing multilevel mediation using hierarchical linearmodels: problems and solutions. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12 (4): 695-719.

Organizational Justice Climate: Construct Measurement and Validation