Understanding Fairness: Exploring Subjectivity And Organizational Justice

Jean Mannheimer Forray, Ph.D.
Western New England College

Abstract: *The nature of justice has been specified historically in a number of different ways, including retribution, mercy, and equity. Contemporary management scholarship considers "organizational justice" synonymous with "fairness" and defined by individual perceptions of organizational policies and procedures. While traditional management research focuses on identifying variables related to perceptions of fairness, the connection between subjectivity and perceptions of fairness has been theorized (Leventhal 1980). The present study employs Q methodology as a means of bridging the gap between theory and research, and expanding this stream of management inquiry. Results reveal three distinct viewpoints, reflecting different understandings of organizational justice among members of a university human relations committee. These findings suggest enhanced opportunities for understanding the antecedents of conflict in organizational life.*

Introduction

As an ongoing theme in social affairs, justice has been specified in a multiplicity of ways. Within the Old Testament, for example, justice is linked with themes of *retribution* and *revenge*. For later philosophers, justice takes on aspects of *social harmony*, as in Plato, and *mercy*, as in Christian ethics (Solomon 1990). Montesquieu, in his *Persian Letters*, writes of justice as "an adverb; it defines the process by which human relations achieve order (Sheppard 1986)." In contemporary philosophy, justice takes on an imperative of *distribution* and *exchange*, as in Rawls' (1971) concepts of equitable rewards and accepted rules and procedures for the distribution of resources and opportunities.

Within the field of management, justice is considered synonymous with *fairness*. Theory and research focus on the variables that influence individual justice perceptions and on the ways in which these perceptions motivate organizational behavior (cf. Skarlicki, Folger, and Tesluk 1999). A distinction is made between two different types of justice. "Distributive justice" focuses on outcomes or allocations (Homans 1961), while "procedural justice" involves process or the means used to make decisions (Thibaut and Walker

Author's address: Western New England College, Department of Management, School of Business, 1215 Wilbraham Road, Springfield, MA 01119; jforray@wnec.edu.

1975). Distributive justice focuses on an individual's reactions to outcomes such as payment decisions, while procedural justice focuses on an individual's reactions to the way those decisions are made (Greenberg and Tyler 1987).

Management research seeks to define a set of rules of justice that can be applied to organizational situations, policies, and procedures (cf. Leventhal 1980). For example, procedural justice rules include consistency, voice, and accountability. This stream of management inquiry views justice as a static quality, one that is perceived as "present" (or "not present") in rules, procedures, and decisions. However, given the history of the justice concept, it is likely that justice "means" different things to different people in different circumstances.

A significant body of work within the management literature concerns the nature of justice and organizational life (cf. Cropanzano 1993; Sheppard et al. 1992). Yet, current management investigations fail to conceive of justice as a dynamic concept — a growing, changing subjectivity — or to consider the influence of such subjectivity on organizational circumstances. This subjectivity is particularly pertinent with respect to group-level phenomena. Shared subjectivity may contribute to an acknowledgement among organization members that an event is justice-related or to the particular manner in which members will respond to the event. A lack of shared subjectivity may explain levels of conflict or disharmony.

The importance of subjectivity relative to perceptions of justice has been theorized (Leventhal 1980). Q methodology is particularly appropriate for those instances where the intention is to "study intensively the self-referent perspectives of particular individuals" (McKeown and Thomas 1988, 36). Thus, the present study sought to explore the gap between theory and research using Q methodology.

Method

Twelve members of the human relations committee at a large northeastern university participated in this study. This group represented different areas and levels of the larger organization, its members were demographically diverse (Appendix Table 1), and the issue of organizational justice was considered relevant to the participants. Two Self-Q techniques (Bougon 1983) were used to develop the Q instrument. These included a participant-directed interview to develop each individual's concourse, and a separate session where each participant prioritized the statements drawn from the interview. A third session with each participant employed the standard Q technique for sorting.

At the first meeting, each participant received a handout from the researcher that was described as a "framing" statement for the interview (Bougon 1983). This statement asked the participant to develop questions the researcher should ask to obtain the most information possible about organizational justice. The individual questions were written down by the

researcher and formed the basis of the interview. Preliminary statements drawn from interview transcripts were developed for each participant, with particular attention to ensuring a complete representation of the facets revealed. This resulted in a range of 15-34 statements per person for a total of 235 preliminary statements.

At the second meeting, each participant was instructed to sort cards containing the statements drawn from the interview into three piles: "most important to me," "important to me," and "least important to me."[1] No instruction was given regarding the number of cards to be designated per pile and participants were free to leave any pile empty. Each participant was then instructed to take the first pile ("most important to me") and sort it into three additional piles: "clearly most important to me," "very important to me," and "important to me." Again, participants were free to designate the number of statements per pile.

The "Organizational Justice Q Sample" of 70 statements (Appendix Table 3) was developed by combining those sorted by each participant as "clearly most important" and "very important to me." An effort was made to include all facets represented without duplication. *Justice* was treated as a unified category encompassing both procedural and distributive aspects during Q set development to reflect adequately the participants' "concourse of communication" (Stephenson 1978) rather than to impose a theory-driven framework from outside their experience[2].

At the third meeting, participants performed a Q sort in the conventional manner on the "Organizational Justice Q Sample." Participants were instructed to "sort the statement cards according to the distinctions of 'most agree' to 'most disagree,' beginning with the positive extreme (+5), moving to the negative extreme (-5), and repeating this process from side to side until the last cards are placed in the 'neutral' (0) position." In some instances, participants indicated that they were uncomfortable with the designation "most disagree" since they did not really disagree with any of the statements. When this occurred, they were told to consider the condition of instruction as "most agree" to "least agree."[3] No attempt was made to force a quasi-normal distribution.

The 12 sorts were correlated and factored (SPSS, principal components method with varimax rotation), yielding three factors with eigenvalues >1.0.

---

[1] This aspect of instrument development follows the Self-Q method of Bougon (1983).

[2] Unlike projects that explore a wide array of viewpoints extant in society (cf., Thomas 1999), this study focused on the particular subjectivity of this group *as a group*. As such, the development of the Q sample was based on *their* assessment of priorities as these assessments reflected their concourse of justice.

[3] This instruction follows Brown (1986) who notes that the subjectivity of the individual is always self-referent. It is the distribution of the cards, rather than the specific condition of instruction, which provides the basis for analysis.

All participants provided sorts that achieved significant loadings on at least one factor. A composite Q sort for each factor was used for analysis.[4]

Results

Pictures of Shared Subjectivity: A Thematic View

Any thematic representation of the composite Q sorts, if it is to be organizationally relevant, must provide an interpretation of subjectivity within the context of the existing management literature (Appendix Table 2). All discussion of results is drawn from the "most agree" rankings (+5 and +4) due to the clarity and distinctiveness of the themes evoked and the dearth of statements in the "most disagree" rankings for 2 of the 3 factors[5].

Factor A: Experts

Factor A respondents, called "Experts," are concerned with both procedural and distributive justice issues, as well as the leadership and accountability aspects of procedure, and the importance of context in the perception of justice. Four of the eighteen statements in their "most agree" category involve the nature of *voice*, a procedural aspect of justice that concerns the ability of those involved to express input into the justice process. The procedural statements are straightforward in tone, broadly addressing the nature of justice.

Procedural Aspects of Justice

Score	Statement
4	(12) Exclusion ultimately leads to injustices because when people are locked out their needs and rights are being ignored.
4	(34) Justice can only be accomplished when all groups are represented in determining University policies.
5	(25) We have no common language to talk out social justice, and to know what it is that people who talk about it mean by it.
5	(15) This University is a hostile environment for people of color.

Four statements ranked "most agree" involve distributive justice issues. The distributive justice statements are straightforward and directly tied to university activities. Thus, unlike their orientation to procedural justice, their

---

[4] For example, the composite Q sort for Factor A is developed as $[(0.295 \times f1) + (0.29896 \times f6) + (0.3244 \times f3) + (0.25385 \times f10) + (0.20635 \times f2)]$. This accounts for the weighting of each variable in the factor and thus its influence on the composite that represents the subjectivity of Factor A. Some variables are more closely associated with the composite subjectivity than others.

[5] As Brown (1980) suggests, either the statements in the extreme negative rankings (i.e., -5 and -4) or the extreme positive rankings (i.e., +5 and +4) may be used for interpretive purposes.

orientation to distributive justice is referenced with more concrete and organizationally specific examples.

Distributive Justice Issues

Score	Statement
4	(24) Justice is involved in decisions about how you're going to spend your resources and the implications of having made certain decisions.
4	(38) The benefits individuals receive as a consequence of being white are invisible to them.
4	(39) Individuals from different social classes experience this University differently.
4	(48) When you look at justice in this organization, you have to look at some point at class distinctions — how well the organization does at benefiting equally people at various levels within the organization.

The Experts are also interested in the *accomplishment* of justice with 5 "most agree" statements addressing issues of leadership (8, 17) and accountability (46, 57, 58). As justice-related themes, leadership and accountability represent achievement aspects of procedural justice.

Leadership and Accountability

Score	Statement
5	(8) In order to integrate justice into the philosophy of this organization, it has to come from people in leadership positions. That doesn't guarantee it will be there, but if it isn't there it can't happen.
5	(17) It is important that the head of the organization stand for justice, be vigilant about it, and make sure that it is a concept that is constantly talked about and referenced in relation to everything — from hiring employees to the implications of constructing a new building.
4	(46) The students at this University are the only ones who are expected to do the right thing and who are held accountable for it. It is not generalized to the faculty or the administration.
5	(57) As long as there is a lack of accountability between what you say and what you actually do — between the rhetoric and the actual day-to-day operation — there will be a lack of justice.
4	(58) When there is no visible accountability, there is no signal that certain behaviors are punishable. This results in injustice.

Another component of this factor's subjectivity is the importance of context as it relates to justice. Five of the eighteen "most agree" statements refer to the importance of culture or organizational position in relation to justice (3, 11, 30, 36, 39).

Importance of Context

Score	Statement
4	(3) The work that you do molds your consciousness of justice issues.
4	(11) Belonging to an identified group that isn't straight, white male increases the probability of being a victim of incidents of injustice.
5	(30) Euro-Americans in this organization regard their view of reality as "real," with those of others as a "cultural perspective."
5	(36) It is important to build ideas of social justice into institutional culture.
4	(39) Individuals from different social classes experience this University differently.

As Appendix Table 1 indicates, The Experts (Factor A) is composed of 5 committee members, 3 of whom joined in 1982 (Respondents 1, 6, and 3). Coupled with the committee member who joined in 1987 (Respondent 2), these 4 individuals have served the longest time of all committee members. Further, the fifth individual among The Experts (Respondent 10), who joined the committee in 1991, is the only member who works closely with another member of this committee on a daily basis (Respondent 1). It is possible that this ongoing exposure to each other's views, coupled with the long-term tenure of members, contributes to their shared subjectivity, and has sensitized them to the accomplishment of justice as an ongoing concern. The importance of shared experience, coupled with the nature of the themes represented by The Experts, provides a view of this group as being committed to achieving justice at the University with a fairly clear picture of what justice is and how it is (or is not) achieved.

Factor B: Ideologues

There are only 7 statements in the "most agree" positions of Factor B's composite sort. Two of these statements address procedural justice issues. These statements are quite general (64, 54), simply asserting the 'nature' of procedure (equal and fair fashion) rather than the details of fair process or the implications of a lack of process. E.g., (63: +4) "There should be a sense that the organization has a concern about implementing what it does in an equal and fair fashion."

Nature of Fair Procedure

Score	Statement
4	(64) Here, justice is when individuals feel they're being treated with fairness and impartiality.
5	(54) Justice comes from being able to treat individuals with respect, in which outcomes are completed in a fair and impartial manner, and consistently applied.

Ideologues also consider the importance of individual perspective as theme of justice with 2 of the 7 statements in the "most agree" category focused on this aspect (52, 69).

Importance of Individual Perspective

Score	Statement
4	(52) What people seek when they seek justice has an infinite variety of possibilities.
4	(69) How one interprets an interaction is extremely personal — this makes the accomplishment of justice extremely personal as well.

Here again, the Ideologues' orientation is general in tone. Similarly, the achievement of justice appears problematic for this factor. Their 2 accomplishment statements (29, 37) focus on what is missing rather than what is necessary to achieve justice.

What Is Missing

Score	Statement
4	(29) If an organization doesn't have a sense of morals or ethics — of rightness or wrongness — it really undermines morale. There is something missing.
5	(37) It is easier to define injustice than justice.

Only 1 "most agree" statement in the Ideologues' sort concerns accountability (44: +5, "It is not possible to encourage women in classes where the professors are sexually harassing them to come forward when the professors can punish them with grades."). Here, the statement is contextually referenced in that it is organizationally specific. Thus, while their overall representation of justice seems philosophical in tone, this clear contextual reference to the classroom suggests that in terms of the actual accomplishment of justice, the Ideologue's subjectivity is related to specific situations.

Ideologues appear more ambivalent than Experts about what justice is or how it is accomplished. The accomplishment of justice, which appears as a

strong element of Experts' composite sort, does not appear as a strong theme for Ideologues. This might suggest that the accomplishment of justice is somewhat more problematic for Ideologues than for Experts, or that, consistent with their overall tone, Ideologues are oriented to justice more in its philosophical sense than in its achievement.

Given the dependence on context for accomplishment, and the lack of emphasis on procedure or distribution except in very philosophical tones, it appears that justice for Ideologues is linked to real situations. In other words, the concept of justice is vague in its overall sense and is embedded in particular situations and circumstances. Ideologues exhibit justice subjectivity that is consistent with the thrust of current organizational literature and theory. That is, as Greenberg (1987) has suggested, that justice resides in the attributions of individuals regarding specific outcomes or procedures rather than in the evaluation of some distanced body.

Interestingly, 2 of the 3 individuals in this factor were the only members to join the committee that year, nearly 7 years after those with the longest tenure on the committee. The third individual, while of relatively recent tenure on the committee, was the only individual whose primary job responsibility involved justice-related work.[6] Thus, while Experts seem to have a broader vision of how justice is to be accomplished, or at least a greater interest in accomplishment as an issue, Ideologues appear to reflect a more context-driven orientation to the achievement of organizational justice.

Factor C: Believers

The composite sort for Believers, Factor C, includes 30 statement cards in the "most agree/disagree" categories, addressing a wide range of justice themes

Philosophical Statements

Score	Statement
5	(56) 'What is just' is a more powerful consideration than 'what is fair.'
5	(37) It is easier to define injustice than justice.
5	(61) A just organization demonstrates openness about issues.
5	(45) Justice, if it's done properly in an organization, really reflects a healthy organization.
5	(29) If an organization doesn't have a sense of morals or ethics — of rightness or wrongness — it really undermines morale. There is something missing.
4	(59) The whole notion of justice is something that has to be part of the philosophy of what goes on here in order for people to think about it in relation to their lives.

---

[6] This individual was the highest-ranking police officer for the campus community.

including philosophy, process, distribution, accountability, and accomplishment in relatively equal numbers.

Six statements are broadly philosophical (56, 37, 61, 45, 29, 59). Eight of their "most agree" statements relate to process issues, e.g., 50. Almost equally important to Believers were distributive issues (39, 24, 33, 48) that were generally organization specific or organizationally related.

Process: Organizationally-Related Distributive Issues

Score	Statement
4	(50) If you have a system, the greatest injustice is if you don't use it.
4	(39) Individuals from different social classes experience this University differently.
4	(24) Justice is involved in decisions about how you're going to spend your resources and the implications of having made certain decisions.
5	(33) A state institution has a responsibility not to create a two-tier society — the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' — by virtue of its tuition rates and other costs. This is an issue of justice for a state school.
5	(48) When you look at justice in this organization, you have to look at some point at class distinctions — how well the organization does at benefiting equally people at various levels within the organization.

Interestingly, only among Believers did the issue of diversity, much discussed on the university campus, arise as a justice theme. Three of their thirty statements related to diversity (7, 28, 67). It would seem that for Believers, whose subjectivity includes so many themes, justice is a complex and multifaceted subjectivity.

Process: Diversity Issues

Score	Statement
5	(7) The more diverse this campus gets, the whole sense of the rights of other people and everything else is much more complicated.
5	(28) The University's attempt to address multiculturalism is an example of the organization's attempt to deliver justice.
5	(67) Everyone agrees that access and openness are necessary at the University, but there is no clarity about what the obligations of the University are to change its environments and its ways of doing things in response to its diversity.

A number of their statements concerned the institution but, similar to Experts and unlike Ideologues, reflected this interest in a global sense (e.g. 45: +5, "Justice, if it's done properly in an organization, really reflects a healthy organization."). Believers are a highly philosophical group both in general understanding of justice and orientation to particular themes such as process, distribution, or accomplishment.

Unlike Ideologues, whose issues of distribution did not appear in the "most agree" rankings, Believers were concerned with the distribution of benefits in the organization. The fact that the individuals in this factor are all recent additions to the committee may help to explain some of the complexity of their subjectivity with close to half of the statement cards in the "most agree" category[7]. As a group, these individuals appear to engage justice enthusiastically, but with a large measure of universal reference and somewhat uncertainly in terms of specifics. Their involvement in the committee may respond to individual interest in the subject of justice but their relatively recent involvement may reflect a subjectivity of the novice to "justice work."

Conclusion

The results of this study clearly indicate that individuals develop different schemata of organizational justice, and that the concept of justice is subjectively constructed and understood. Further, given the distinctive themes represented by the factors described above, these schemata extend beyond the distributive and procedural elements previously considered in the organizational justice literature to include other conceptual and philosophical aspects. This provides support for the assertion that individuals and groups have different "visions" of organizational justice.

This study raises important questions about differences in subjectivity and reactions to behavior in organizations. For example, might those whose subjectivity is quite broad (such as Believers) be more likely to ascribe justice-related concerns to a wide range of organizational activities? Alternatively, does a more narrowly-defined subjectivity (such as Ideologues) reduce the range of organizational actions that might be considered justice related? Indeed, the relationship between subjectivity and the importance of particular organizational activities, an under explored area of management scholarship, is clearly relevant to our understanding of organizational justice.

Further research could help to identify not only those factors that influence justice subjectivity, but also the extent to which subjectivities influence event salience or create conflict, and the extent to which shared justice schemata influence conflict resolution. For example, a fruitful avenue for future research might be to investigate the relationship between subjectivity and policy-making initiatives among managers or responses to such initiatives from employees.

---

[7] The data for this study was collected in the Spring of 1993.

The "themes" represented by the composite sorts of each factor also provide fertile ground for further exploration. Although this study utilized the "most agree" rankings in the clustered sort, the "most disagree" rankings are also relevant to our understanding of justice subjectivity. What kinds of statements evoke disagreement? While this study assumed that the participants had well-developed schemata of justice, what would be the result of a similar study among a different and less justice-oriented group? Further, how (and why) do individuals develop schemata that are more clearly defined than others? Are there explanations for a greater or lesser emphasis on procedure or outcome? What aspects of personal experience influence these themes?

A central question for justice research, if it is to be organizationally relevant beyond mere policies and procedures, is the extent to which exposure to others alters or consolidates one's views of justice or justice-related phenomena. Although Tyler and Lind (1990) suggest that non-instrumental concerns such as group identification are an important element in perceptions of procedural justice, the link between justice perceptions and shared experience has not been adequately explored. While it appears that the length of time the individuals in this study served on the committee had some relationship to their shared subjectivity, it is unclear *why* this phenomenon existed or whether it would be replicated elsewhere. Through an extensive body of empirical work, management scholars have explored theoretical underpinnings of justice judgments relative to particular procedures or distributions. These inquiries provide understandings of *post hoc* justice perception. However, organization theorists have yet to adequately explore the salience of subjectivity relative to perceptions and the larger social environment that serves to provide structure and definition to them. It is hoped that this study provides a first step in such inquiry.

References

Bougon, M. 1983. Uncovering cognitive maps: The self-Q technique. In G. Morgan (Ed.) *Beyond method*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Brown, S.R. 1986. Q technique and method. In Berry, W.D. and Lewish-Beck, M.S. (Eds.) *New tools for social scientists*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Brown, S.R. 1980. *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cropanzano, R. and Randall, M. L. (1993). Injustice and work behavior: A historical review. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 3-20). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Greenberg, J. 1987. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review* 12(1): 9-22.

Greenberg, J. and Tyler, T.R. 1987. Why procedural justice in organizations? *Social Justice Research* 1: 127-42.

Homans, G.C. 1961. *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

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

McKeown, B. and Thomas, D. 1988. *Q methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Scarlicki, D.P., Folger, R., and Tesluk, P. 1999. Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal* 42(1): 100-108.

Sheppard, B. H., Lewicki, R. J., and Minton, J. W. 1992. *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the workplace*. New York: Lexington Books.

Solomon, R.C. 1990. *A passion for justice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Stephenson, W. 1978. Concourse theory of communication. *Communication* 3: 21-40.

Thibaut, J. and Walker, L. 1975. *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Tyler, T.R. and Lind, E.A. 1990. Intrinsic versus community-based justice models: When does group membership matter? *Journal of Social Issues* 46(1): 83-94.

Appendix

Table 1: Demographic Information by Factor

ID	Sex	Age	Ethnicity	Degree	Field	Yrs at Coll.	Joined Comm.
Factor A							
1	M	45	Euro-Am.	PhD	Org.Psych.	21	1982
2	M	40	African-Am.	BA	Psychology	17	1987
3	F	46	Euro-Am.	MA	Slavic Lang.	24	1982
6	F	46	Asian-Am.	PhD.	Psychology	18	1982
10	M	37	African-Am.	MA	Psychology	3	1991
Factor B							
8	F	35	Jewish-Am.	BA	Journalism	3	1989
9	F	45	African-Am.	PhD	Ed./Child Dev.	4	1989
12	M	37	Euro-Am.	MA	Pub. Admin.	15	1992
Factor C							
4	F	43	Euro-Am.	MA	Ed./Human Services	1.5	1992
5	M	36	Hispanic	PhD	Span./Am. Lit	8	1992
7	F	42	Jewish-Am.	BA	English	21	1992
11	F	46	Jewish-Am.	JD	Law	19	1992

Table 2: Selected Statement Interpretations by Theme

Theme	Selected Statement	A	B	C
Distribution	(33) A state institution has a responsibility not to create a two-tier society — the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' — by virtue of its tuition rates and other costs. This is an issue of justice for a state school.	3	3	5
Context	(30) Euro-Americans in this organization regard their view of reality as "real," with those of others as a "cultural perspective."	5	2	2
Process	(54) Justice comes from being able to treat individuals with respect, in which outcomes are completed in a fair and impartial manner, and consistently applied.	3	5	3
Accountability	(46) The students at this University are the only ones who are expected to do the right thing and who are held accountable for it. It is not generalized to the faculty or the administration.	4	-2	0
Philosophy	(52) What people seek when they seek justice has an infinite variety of possibilities.	0	4	3
Diversity	(28) The University's attempt to address multiculturalism is an example of the organization's attempt to deliver justice.	1	1	5

Table 3: Organizational Justice Q Sample and Factor Scores

Factor Score			Statement
A	B	C	
3	-1	0	(1) The rules and regulations here lack a sensitivity to perspectives of those not involved in developing those policies or procedures.
-4	-3	0	(2) There is no answer to what is just or unjust in the academic sphere because it involves academic freedom, which is the whole reason for the University to exist.
4	1	-1	(3) The work that you do molds your consciousness of justice issues.
2	-1	-1	(4) It's not that people aren't concerned about justice issues, its just that they don't know how to do it yet.
3	0	5	(5) People forget that Affirmative Action was created in response to the acknowledgement of institutional inequalities and injustice.
3	0	3	(6) In American society, there is a strong element of individual responsibility in our approach to problems. We focus on placing blame rather than fixing problems.
1	-1	5	(7) The more diverse this campus gets, the whole sense of the rights of other people and everything else is much more complicated.
5	3	5	(8) In order to integrate justice into the philosophy of this organization, it has to come from people in leadership positions. That doesn't guarantee it will be there, but if it isn't there it can't happen.
-1	-2	-1	(9) What is actually happening inside the University has nothing to do with what is being promoted outside the University.
0	-4	1	(10) Equal justice and inclusion are only words people use here. There are no actions to back them up.

Factor Score			Statement
A	B	C	
4	0	4	(11) Belonging to an identified group that isn't straight, white male increases the probability of being a victim of incidents of injustice.
4	2	4	(12) Exclusion ultimately leads to injustices because when people are locked out their needs and rights are being ignored.
0	-4	2	(13) Justice is a hollow term in American society. It's just a word people use when it's convenient for them.
3	0	2	(14) It is unfair when some individuals know how to work the system and some don't.
5	0	0	(15) This University is a hostile environment for people of color.
1	3	3	(16) Justice is like everything else in an organization — it trickles down from 'the top.'
5	2	5	(17) It is important that the head of the organization stand for justice, be vigilant about it, and make sure that it is a concept that is constantly talked about and referenced in relation to everything — from hiring employees to the implications of constructing a new building.
3	1	5	(18) We address the results of inequities but not how they arise in the first place.
4	1	2	(19) This University is unclear about what it means or what role a sense of justice plays in the everyday business of the community.
3	1	4	(20) There are many contradictory symbols in this organization.
1	1	3	(21) Men and women differ in how to achieve justice. Men line up the right buttons and push them to fix things, while women network and collaborate more to try to move on together.
0	-2	4	(22) Sometimes the problem of injustice rests on an individual but more often it rests in the system. Individuals are just purveyors of the system.
1	0	3	(23) The system that runs this University is constantly being gerrymandered in some kind of way — there is no integrity invested in this system.
4	2	4	(24) Justice is involved in decisions about how you're going to spend your resources and the implications of having made certain decisions.
5	2	2	(25) We have no common language to talk out social justice, and to know what it is that people who talk about it mean by it.
3	2	2	(26) Organizational notions of justice are embedded in certain cultural experiences.
2	-1	-1	(27) I think that having rules and writing them down is very important because that's the only justice you can have. Otherwise, people can make all kinds of arbitrary decisions.
1	1	5	(28) The University's attempt to address multiculturalism is an example of the organization's attempt to deliver justice.
3	4	5	(29) If an organization doesn't have a sense of morals or ethics — of rightness or wrongness — it really undermines morale. There is something missing.
5	2	2	(30) Euro-Americans in this organization regard their view of reality as "real," with those of others as a "cultural perspective."
2	2	1	(31) There can be value in the 'process' even if it can't result in anything but a predetermined outcome.

Factor Score			Statement
A	**B**	**C**	
2	1	3	(32) When a minority group is doing well statistically at the University, the portion of the group that is not doing well tends to be forgotten in terms of academic support programs.
3	3	5	(33) A state institution has a responsibility not to create a two-tier society — the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' — by virtue of its tuition rates and other costs. This is an issue of justice for a state school.
4	1	-1	(34) Justice can only be accomplished when all groups are represented in determining University policies.
2	-1	0	(35) The rules and regulations of the University discourage people of color from being a part of this community.
5	2	5	(36) It is important to build ideas of social justice into institutional culture.
1	5	5	(37) It is easier to define injustice than justice.
4	0	5	(38) The benefits individuals receive as a consequence of being white are invisible to them.
4	1	4	(39) Individuals from different social classes experience this University differently.
0	-4	1	(40) Whatever justice exists here is for whites, not for people of color.
0	-1	1	(41) The system is set up to protect the greater group, not individuals.
2	1	2	(42) The system is not fair and just when it doesn't support people making judgments that they are qualified to make and are qualified to correct if necessary.
2	-1	4	(43) There are natural inequalities that exist in the structure of relationships at the University which make it hard for people to recognize that you're equal as a person even if you're not equal in terms of organizational authority.
0	5	1	(44) It is not possible to encourage women in classes where the professors are sexually harassing them to come forward when the professors can punish them with grades.
2	2	5	(45) Justice, if it's done properly in an organization, really reflects a healthy organization.
4	-2	0	(46) The students at this University are the only ones who are expected to do the right thing and who are held accountable for it. It is not generalized to the faculty or the administration.
3	-1	3	(47) This University has a rhetorical sense of the role of justice here, but doesn't know how that informs the way we do business.
4	0	5	(48) When you look at justice in this organization, you have to look at some point at class distinctions — how well the organization does at benefiting equally people at various levels within the organization.
0	0	3	(49) When integrity is placed in the system and outcomes aren't what is desired, the system needs to be changed — not bastardized by only a select few who know how to do that.
-1	-1	4	(50) If you have a system, the greatest injustice is if you don't use it.
0	0	3	(51) It is not clear where justice falls within the broader issue of being a multicultural community.
0	4	3	(52) What people seek when they seek justice has an infinite variety of possibilities.

Factor Score			Statement
A	B	C	
0	3	5	(53) There are three kinds of justice in this organization: (1) judicial systems for individual's violations of organizational policies, (2) judicial systems for individual's grievances against the organization, and (3) the more nebulous question of the extent to which concepts of justice or fair play enter into the decision-making of people within the organization.
3	5	3	(54) Justice comes from being able to treat individuals with respect, in which outcomes are completed in a fair and impartial manner, and consistently applied.
1	-1	2	(55) The only time you hear justice, as a word, on this campus is when people relate it to oppression.
0	1	5	(56) 'What is just' is a more powerful consideration than 'what is fair.'
5	2	5	(57) As long as there is a lack of accountability between what you say and what you actually do — between the rhetoric and the actual day-to-day operation — there will be a lack of justice.
4	2	4	(58) When there is no visible accountability, there is no signal that certain behaviors are punishable. This results in injustice.
1	3	4	(59) The whole notion of justice is something that has to be part of the philosophy of what goes on here in order for people to think about it in relation to their lives.
2	0	2	(60) In looking at justice in an organization, it is important to ask how things are done.
2	2	5	(61) A just organization demonstrates openness about issues.
1	0	3	(62) A just organization gives all employees an opportunity to advance and have their ideas appreciated.
2	4	3	(63) There should be a sense that the organization has a concern about implementing what it does in an equal and fair fashion.
1	1	2	(64) Here, justice is when individuals feel they're being treated with fairness and impartiality.
0	1	5	(65) If you are an organization that's concerned with justice, you have to be able to balance what 'the policy' is against people's individual circumstances.
3	3	1	(66) When we talk about organizational justice, we're talking about the standards that the organization sets and how the organization maintains those standards.
3	0	5	(67) Everyone agrees that access and openness are necessary at the University, but there is no clarity about what the obligations of the University are to change its environments and its ways of doing things in response to its diversity.
0	-2	-1	(68) Faculty, by and large, are not concerned with justice at the University.
0	4	-1	(69) How one interprets an interaction is extremely personal — this makes the accomplishment of justice extremely personal as well.
3	0	5	(70) Non-majority groups tend to be more in tune with the symbolic level of justice in this organization.