

**The Management of Justice through Accounts:
Constructing Acceptable Justifications**

by
Francis M. Frey

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
MANAGEMENT

April 23, 1997
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Social Accounts, ELM, Justifications, Specificity,
Expertise, Involvement, Acceptability

THE MANAGEMENT OF JUSTICE THROUGH ACCOUNTS:
CONSTRUCTING ACCEPTABLE JUSTIFICATIONS

by

Francis M. Frey

Anthony T. Cobb, Chairman

Management Department

ABSTRACT

The most recent research trend within the field of organizational justice is the study of interactional justice (Tyler & Bies, 1990; Greenberg, 1990). Most of the work conducted in this area focuses on the explanations leaders give to followers about decisions made or actions taken that frequently lead to adverse consequences or loss. These explanations are called “social accounts”. While research indicates that social accounts are effective at mitigating negative reactions to adverse decisions, and improving perceptions of justice, the underlying causes remain largely unknown.

This study used the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) as a theoretical base to explore what factors make an account “acceptable”, and the impact that an acceptable account has on a number of organizationally relevant outcomes. Specifically, this study used an experimental design in a pay-for-performance context to assess the impact of

message specificity (high vs. low) and source expertise (expert vs. non-expert), under varying conditions of outcome involvement (higher vs. lower) on the acceptability of a justification for a change in a distributive criterion that resulted in a loss. Other dependent variables investigated included perceptions of justice (procedural, interactional, and distributive fairness), attitudes (satisfaction with the trainer and the task), and behaviors (commitment to the trainer and the task, and complaints).

The results indicated that justifications delivered by the expert trainer were more acceptable than non-experts under conditions of lower involvement (except when a non-expert delivered a specific justification). This effect reversed itself, however, under higher involvement. There was a main effect of specificity such that specific justifications were more acceptable than vague justifications regardless of the level of involvement.

Acceptability was positively related to all dependent measures with the exception of complaints, which had a negative relationship. Furthermore, acceptability fully mediated the impact of message specificity on trainer commitment, and partially on procedural fairness, distributive fairness (assessment), and task commitment. Acceptability fully mediated the negative impact of expertise under high involvement on procedural and distributive fairness (assessment), and interactional fairness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It would not have been possible to complete this research project without the encouragement, assistance, and support from my family, friends and colleagues. First, I would like to thank my committee. The chairman of my committee, Terry Cobb, deserves special thanks for helping me “craft” this project. He was instrumental in helping me organize my thoughts and communicate them effectively on paper. More importantly, he encouraged me to set my goals high and to pursue them diligently. I would also like to thank my committee. Thanks go to Rich Wokutch for helping me see the practical/applied side of my research. I appreciate Mary Connerley for her responsiveness, and her willingness to talk with me at a moments notice. Neil Hauenstein deserves special thanks for sharing his methodological and statistical expertise. I learned a great deal about experimental methods from him. John Bunch was very generous to serve as an outside committee member on this project. He challenged my thoughts and helped me see the flaws and tradeoffs in my research design.

Very few experimental simulations can be conducted alone. This one was no different. There were several friends and colleagues that helped conduct the experiment who deserve special thanks. First, I would like to thank Marcy Schnitzer, for helping me out of every jam. She more than anyone else (and in ways too numerous to mention) helped me complete the collection of my data. Most importantly, she was supportive of me at times when I needed it the most. I would also like to thank Will Lamb, Mike

Goldsby, Scott Casino, Bob D’Intino, and Bob Hoell for serving as my “experimenter confederates” in the experimental (and pilot) sessions. Each of them took time out of their busy schedules to help me complete my data collection.

I would also like to thank my friends at Radford University, Joretta McLaughlin and Frank Markham for providing access to their students. The scope and nature of this project required me to seek participants from other universities. Joretta and Frank were quite helpful in recruiting these participants, and securing rooms for the experimental sessions at their university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTS PERSPECTIVE	14
A PERSUASION APPROACH TO SOCIAL ACCOUNTS.....	20
CHAPTER 3: METHOD	52
SAMPLE AND DESIGN.....	52
PROCEDURE	52
INDEPENDENT MANIPULATIONS	63
MANIPULATION CHECKS.....	68
DEPENDENT MEASURES	71
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	78
MANIPULATION CHECKS.....	78
THE IMPACT OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	82
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY AND THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES	89
THE MEDIATING IMPACT OF ACCEPTABILITY ON OUTCOME VARIABLES.....	90

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	104
THE DETERMINATES OF JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY.....	105
THE ROLE OF JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY.....	114
IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT.....	117
CAVEATS	121
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	127
APPENDIX A:	129
APPENDIX B:	145
REFERENCES	154
CURRICULUM VITA	167

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: THE HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS	10
FIGURE 2: THE EFFECT OF SPECIFICITY X EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY	84
FIGURE 3: THE EFFECT EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY	85
FIGURE 4: THE EFFECT OF SPECIFICITY X INVOLVEMENT ON JUSTIFICATION ACCEPTABILITY	87
FIGURE 5: THE EFFECT OF EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS	93
FIGURE 6: THE EFFECT OF EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON INTERACTIONAL FAIRNESS.....	94
FIGURE 7: THE EFFECT OF EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON DISTRIBUTIVE FAIRNESS (ASSESSMENT).....	95
FIGURE 8: THE EFFECT OF SPECIFICITY X INVOLVEMENT ON SATISFACTION WITH THE TRAINER	99
FIGURE 9: THE EFFECT OF SPECIFICITY X INVOLVEMENT ON TASK SATISFACTION	100
FIGURE 10: THE EFFECT OF SPECIFICITY X INVOLVEMENT ON INTERACTIONAL FAIRNESS.....	101
FIGURE 11: THE EFFECT OF EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON TASK SATISFACTION	102
FIGURE 12: THE EFFECT OF EXPERTISE X INVOLVEMENT ON TASK COMMITMENT	103