

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2021-02-15

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Abril, T., Waldzus, S. & Collins, E. C. (2020). Validation of the organizational justice scale in a portuguese context. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*. 23 (2), 95-115

Further information on publisher's website:

[10.1037/mgr0000106](https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000106)

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Abril, T., Waldzus, S. & Collins, E. C. (2020). Validation of the organizational justice scale in a portuguese context. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*. 23 (2), 95-115, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000106>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Validation of the Organizational Justice Scale in a Portuguese Context

Tiago Abril¹, Sven Waldzus², and Elizabeth C. Collins²

¹ SPARC, Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (ICS-UL)

² CIS-IUL, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

Author Note

Tiago Abril <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7697-4758>

Sven Waldzus <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9633-2928>

Elizabeth C. Collins <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2117-6967>

The present validated scale is to be shared openly as part of the publication of the article.

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tiago Abril, SPARC, Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (ICS-UL), Av. Prof. Aníbal Bettencourt 9, 1600-189, Lisbon. Email: Lisboa. E-mail: tiagoabril@live.com.pt

Abstract

This paper presents a Portuguese translation and cultural modification of the Organizational Justice scale of Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The scale was tested in two correlational studies, one with 115 employees from the technical staff of a Portuguese organization and a second with 59 Portuguese teachers, testing the scale's discriminant validity through comparison with other measures such as psychological contract violation, organizational identification, work motivation, job satisfaction and perceived ability-job fit. The scale showed satisfying consistency and in a factorial analysis of the Portuguese version, the item distribution per factor was the same as that of the original scale (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). The Portuguese organizational justice scale showed adequate reliability and validity. Therefore, this Portuguese version can be considered a suitable instrument to assess organizational justice amongst the Portuguese population.

Keywords: organizational justice, equity, scale adaptation.

Validation of the Organizational Justice Scale in a Portuguese Context

Research has shown organizational justice to be an important concept explaining employee perceptions of an organization and their personal performance, with impact on organization performance as well (Elamin & Alomaim, 2011; Pérez et al 2013), yet there is a dearth of good scales validated in Portuguese. Part of the challenge is that the definition of organizational justice is controversial, with experts disagreeing about the important components of the concept (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009). As the scale with a theoretical approach that best replicates real behavior, we chose to validate the Niehoff and Moorman (1993) organizational justice scale to help improve research in this area.

Organizational justice focuses on the perception of the justness of the practices of organizations. For different authors these include the relation of outcomes that employees receive in relation to their input (Elamin & Alomaim, 2011; Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Pérez, Herrera, Torres, & Hernández, 2013; Reithel, Baltes, & Buddhavarapu, 2007), employee perceptions of their treatment from their employers (Pérez et al., 2013), employee perceptions of the justice and fairness of an organization's distribution of outcomes such as raises and promotions (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Pérez et al., 2013), perceptions of the justice of the processes and procedures used (Leventhal, 1976), perceptions of interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Pérez et al., 2013), and social factors related to the distribution of resources and processes (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Pérez et al., 2013).

In the literature, foundations of organizational justice have been identified either in self-interest, which implies that the less some event, interaction or process affects an individual's outcomes, the less they perceive injustice (Brockner et al., 1994; Daly & Geyer, 1994; Schweiger & DeNisi, 1991; Wanberg & Banas, 2000); or in social identification, based on social dynamics at the organizational and/or work-unit level (Haslam, 2001; Lind, Kray, & Thompson, 1998; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006).

Recent research demonstrated that employees' impressions of organizational justice effect their performance and outcomes, with more positive impressions fostering greater trust, organizational commitment, customer satisfaction and conflict reduction (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Pérez et al., 2013).

Organizational Justice Dimensions

To measure organizational justice, Niehoff and Moorman (1993) created an organizational justice scale with two dimensions: distributive and procedural justice, with procedural justice subdivided into formal procedures and interactional justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

The lack of a consensual definition of organizational justice has led to other scale formulations. Some researchers have suggested an additional interpersonal factor (Colquitt, 2001), but this was not supported empirically (Özmen, Arbak, & Özer, 2007). There is also debate about whether the interactional justice component should be separate from the procedural justice component or subsumed within it, because interactional justice is responsible for processes of information transmission (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2000).

Distributive Justice.

The distributive justice dimension of organizational justice addresses the perception of fair and equitable distribution of resources and outcomes (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Elamin & Alomaim, 2011; Heidari, Rajaeepoor, Mohammad, Davoodi, & Bozorgzadeh, 2012; Greenberg, 1990a; Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; McDowall & Fletcher, 2004; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Pérez et al., 2013; Saunders, Thornhill, & Lewis, 2002). Forms of distributive justice include (1) equality, distributing the same opportunities and rewards to all employees; (2) need, conducting the distribution according to individual needs; and (3) equity, a distribution based on the

comparison that employees make between themselves and other employees in terms of input to outcome proportionality (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Pérez et al., 2013).

Compared to procedural justice, distributive justice is generally considered to show an organization that has higher sensitivity towards injustice (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Kickul, Lester, & Finkl, 2002).

Procedural Justice.

Procedural justice has been characterized as giving recipients a voice and respectful treatment (Lind & Tyler, 1988; MacCoun, 2005). It is based on the perception of organizational policies and processes used in decision-making, rather than on outcomes (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009). Typically, employees' perceptions of how much the decisions that affect them are made following fair guide-lines (Amirkhani & Pourezzat, 2008; Elamin & Alomaim, 2011; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) is considered important to the level of procedural justice in the functioning of organizations (Pérez et al., 2013). The most important element of this is the perception members of the organization have of the processes, not necessarily the real process value (Heidari et al., 2012), since at a psychological level people behave according to their perception of the organizational reality and not truth itself (Amirkhani & Pourezzat, 2008; Heidari et al., 2012).

Most authors assume that procedural justice encompasses voice, neutrality and respect/ respectfulness (Van Craen & Skogan, 2016; Rosenbaum, Maskaly, Lawrence, & Posicket, 2017; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Some emphasize additional components, such as accountability (Van Craen & Skogan, 2016) or truthfulness/ trustworthiness (Rosenbaum et al., 2017; Tyler & Huo, 2002), showing a lack of consensus regarding its components. Other proposed components include flexibility, timing/speed, accessibility, process control and decision control (Migacz, Zou, & Petrick, 2017).

Formal Procedures.

Several researchers further divide procedural justice into formal procedures and interactional justice (Greenberg, 1990b; Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Formal procedures were first suggested by Thibaut and Walker (1975), based on the assumption that the perception of the decision processes themselves influences the perception of justice in regard to organizational rewards (Greenberg, 1990b). Specifically, it is important whether employees believe that they have a voice and that the organization is neutral when making decisions based on those processes (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Decisions based on processes that are perceived as fair and free of bias tend to be better accepted by members than decisions based on processes that are regarded as unfair (Elamin & Alomaim, 2011).

Interactional Justice.

Interactional justice captures the perception of the justice that exists between employee and organization in terms of the communication and execution of procedures (Greenberg, 1990b; Gürbüz & Mert, 2009). It centers on the perceptions workers have of the way they are treated at the interpersonal level by the organization during the implementation of policies and procedures (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Heidari et al., 2012; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Pérez et al., 2013). For example, one important aspect is the concern a superior shows regarding the personal needs of his or her employees (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

According to Rodell, Colquitt and Baer (2016) the components of interactional justice are truthfulness/ trustworthiness and respect/ respectfulness. Interactional justice also comprises two sub-dimensions: interpersonal, referring to how much the way employees are treated at the interpersonal level by superiors transmits respect/ respectfulness, and informational justice, referring to truthfulness/ trustworthiness of information given to employees when implementing new processes (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Gürbüz & Mert, 2009; Pérez et al., 2013; Rodell et al., 2016).

While all these justice dimensions (distributive, formal procedures, and interactional) can be distinguished theoretically and empirically, they are inter-related. For example, perceptions of an outcome depend on both procedural and interactional justice; and procedural justice contributes to distributive justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Mechanisms and procedures that are just, or allow employee participation (e.g., in their evaluation or with input in organizational actions) lead to increased distributive justice perceptions. This happens even in situations in which such procedural aspects do not affect the results (Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Organizational Justice's Convergent and Discriminant Validity

The organizational justice study is fueled by its assumed potential to increase employees' commitment and diligence (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). The organizational justice literature examines employee behaviors and accordingly, has linked justice to other organizational topics, such as psychological contract violation (Kickul et al., 2002; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Morrison & Robinson, 1997), organizational identification (Lind et al., 1998), job satisfaction (Abdel-Halim, 1981; Moorman, 1991) and work motivation (Oren, Tziner, Nahshon, & Sharoni, 2013).

Necessity for the Organizational Justice Scale

Because of the importance organizational literature gives the theme of justice, Niehoff and Moorman (1993) created a reliable scale (in English) with acceptable fit indices (e.g., CFI = 0.92), including three dimensions, all with $\alpha > .90$. The scale includes twenty Likert-type items comprising three dimensions: one related to distributive justice (5 items) and two related to procedural justice, 6 items for formal processes and 9 items for interactional justice. The procedural justice items were based on Moorman's (1991) scale, which did not include distributive justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) scale has been widely used (e.g., Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; McAllister, 1995; Moorman et al., 1998; Tepper, 2000; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002) and been translated and validated in a number of languages, including Turkish (Gürbüz & Mert, 2009), Mexican Spanish (Pérez et al., 2013), and Saudi Arabian Arabic (Elamin & Tlaiss, 2015). Given the wide use and growing adoption of this scale to different languages, as well as the lack of sufficient Portuguese language scales rigorously validated in Portuguese (the one exception worth mentioning being Carochinho, Matos and Pinto's (2004) adaptation of Rousseau's psychological contract inventory), the current paper intends to validate the Niehoff and Moorman (1993) scale of organizational justice in Portugal with European Portuguese participants.

It's important to highlight that previous studies have been carried out using measures to assess organizational justice in a Portuguese context, such as the study by Caetano and Vala (1999), and by Rego and Cunha (2010). In these studies, the organizational justice measures used had a similar set of dimensions to the present scale, with distributive, procedural and interactive justice, but without a focus on validation.

Beyond increasing the number of validated and adapted organizational justice scales in the European Portuguese population, we hope this adaptation will encourage and expedite cross-cultural research by providing a reliable tool for studying organizational justice.

Overview

The current study is an exploratory factor analysis for a Portuguese version of Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) organizational justice scale. We also tested the relation between this scale and a psychological contract violation scale in Studies 1 and 2 (Robinson & Morrison, 2000), an organizational identification scale in Studies 1 and 2 (Tavares, Caetano, & Silva, 2007), a work motivation scale in Study 1 (Ferreira, Diogo, Ferreira, & Valente, 2006), a job

satisfaction scale in Study 2 (Macdonald & MacIntyre, 1997) and a perceived ability-job fit scale in Study 2 (Abdel-Halim, 1981) to examine discriminant and convergent validity. We also translated the psychological contract violation scale, the job satisfaction scale and the perceived ability-job fit scale for this research and they are being validated concurrent with the Portuguese Organizational Justice scale, however, those data will be published separately. The purpose of Study 2 was to test whether results of Study 1 replicated with a different professional population, as an indication of measurement invariance (Greiff & Iliescu, 2017).

Study 1

Method

Sample

This study had a 115-employee sample from the technical staff of a Portuguese public company (all Portuguese), with an average age of 43.78 years ($SD = 8.253$), 39.8% of the participants were male, 60.2% female.

Instrument

The initial Portuguese translation of Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) scale was made by a professional English into Portuguese translator, to ensure the translation used common language and provided equivalence in the meaning of questions. Subsequently, a professional Portuguese to English translator translated the Portuguese items back into the source language, English. The first translator was then asked to compare the original English scale to the back-translation to examine consistency in the meaning of the items in Table 1. The meaning of all back-translated items corresponded to the original ones.

The internal consistency of the Portuguese version of Niehoff and Moorman's Organizational Justice scale, hereafter referred to as the Portuguese Organizational Justice scale or POJ, was assessed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient (SPSS version 20). Prior to an exploratory factor analysis, the suitability of data for such a factor analysis was assessed by

the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett's test (Bartlett, 1954) of sphericity, to test if the variables were related and therefore suitable for structure detection. To examine the factorial structure of the scales, an exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood extraction was undertaken. Because of the known correlation between the scale dimensions, direct oblimin rotation was used, which simplified the factorial structure and made it easier to replicate with different samples. This rotation also allowed the evaluation of the sturdiness of the rotational interpretation, where factors are allowed to correlate, controlling for relationships between multiple factors.

To check the validity of the scale, in this study, participants also completed measures of psychological constructs that should be related to organizational justice, namely our translation of the psychological contract violation scale by Robinson and Morrison (2000), the Portuguese adaptation (Tavares et al., 2007) of Mael and Ashforth's (1992) organizational identification scale, and the Portuguese work motivation scale by Ferreira et al. (2006).

Design

We contacted a mayor's office and acquired general consent to conduct this research with employees working there. The human resources department helped in distributing paper questionnaires, including obtaining individual consent from each participant. The first application of the questionnaire lasted for a month, with 79 participants. To increase the number of participants, the questionnaire was applied for a second month, one month later, resulting in 36 additional completed surveys from new participants.

Results

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the psychological contract violation scale (Robinson & Morrison, 2000) was .90 (9 items); for the organizational identification scale (Tavares et al., 2007), it was .81 (6 items) and for the work motivation scale (Ferreira et al., 2006), it was .78 (28 items). These alphas were all within an acceptable range.

For the POJ scale the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .93, quite similar to the value of the original Niehoff and Moorman (1993) scale, of .92.

The Kaiser–Meyer–Oklin value was 0.87, which exceeded the minimum recommended value of 0.60 suggesting that the sample was adequate for an exploratory factor analysis. The Barlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(190) = 1802.09$, $p < .001$, indicating that the original correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, and pointing to the usefulness of a factor analysis to understand the data. Therefore, all assessment results supported the suitability of the data for factorial analysis.

Factor analysis with Maximum likelihood estimation revealed the presence of three components with eigenvalues exceeding 1. Table 2 shows the pattern matrix loadings, Table 3 the correlation matrix and table 4 the structure matrix loadings. Factor 1 explained 48.37% of the variance, with items 12 through 20 loading higher than .59 (procedural justice: interactional justice, $\alpha = .95$). Factor 2 explained 11.79% of the variance, with items 6 through 11 loading higher than .42 (procedural justice: formal procedures, $\alpha = .90$). Factor 3 explained 5.43% of the variance, with items 1 through 5 loading higher than .54 (distributive justice, $\alpha = .75$). The third factor was correlated weakly with the first ($r = .24$) and the second ($r = .25$), but the correlation between factors 1 and 2 was quite strong ($r = .77$). The structure matrix allows us to conclude that factor 1 and factor 2 can be considered as a single factor (procedural justice, $\alpha = .96$) with 15 items.

The Portuguese organizational justice scale (average of all 20 items) had a negative correlation with psychological contract violation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000), as did all its dimensions individually, with distributive justice having the strongest negative correlation in Table 5. It had a positive correlation with organizational identification (Tavares et al., 2007), but only the distributive justice sub-dimension of the POJ was significantly correlated with it. Finally, the scale was positively correlated with work motivation (Ferreira et al., 2006), as

were all its dimensions. In all cases these significant correlations were small to moderate, the highest being .477, clearly suggesting that the constructs captured by the POJ scale and its individual dimensions were not wholly captured by these other scales.

Study 2

Method

Sample

This study had a sample of 59 teachers from a Portuguese public school. All participants were Portuguese, with an average age of 49.59 years ($SD = 6.422$), 22.4% of the individuals were male and 77.6% female.

Instrument

The translation of the Niehoff and Moorman (1993) scale used in study one was slightly adapted to reflect terms used by the school staff in Table 1. For instance, the term “salary” (salário) was changed to “salary rank” (escalão salarial) because teachers’ salaries are dictated through levels on a national salary rank scale and within these levels there is no differentiation possible; also, the corresponding Portuguese term for general manager was changed from “superior hierárquico” to “coordenador” (coordinator) because that is the term used in the school context in Portugal.

As in the previous study, the internal consistency was assessed with Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (SPSS version 20). Because the number of participants was small, two factor analyses were run with a fixed number of extracted factors, in order to check whether the item distribution on these pre-defined factors would replicate results of study 1 and the structure of the original scale. More precisely, we ran (1) an exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood extraction with direct oblimin rotation and a fixed number of three factors, and (2) an exploratory factor analysis using principal component analysis with direct oblimin rotation and a fixed number of two factors.

In this study we again applied additional measures of concepts that should be related to procedural justice, all three of which were translated using the same procedure as was used for the POJ, described in Study 1. These were the psychological contract violation scale (Robinson & Morrison, 2000), the job satisfaction scale (Macdonald & MacIntyre, 1997) and the perceived ability-job fit scale (Abdel-Halim, 1981).

Design

We contacted a public school and acquired consent to conduct this research. The Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) online survey platform was used to build and apply the questionnaire, including requesting individual consent from each participant. Data collection lasted for a month.

Results

Cronbach's alphas were satisfactory for the psychological contract violation scale (Robinson & Morrison, 2000; $\alpha = .90$; 9 items), the job satisfaction scale (Macdonald & MacIntyre, 1997; $\alpha = .76$; 10 items), and the perceived ability-job fit scale (Abdel-Halim, 1981, $\alpha = .78$; 5 items).

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the POJ scale was of .96. In the factor analysis the Kaiser–Meyer–Oklin value was 0.89 and Barlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(190) = 1459.7, p < .001$. These results again suggested that the sample was sufficient and that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix; all of which supported conducting a factor analysis.

The factor analysis using maximum likelihood extraction with direct oblimin rotation and a fixed number of three factors revealed that, although the structure matrix was slightly different from that found in study 1, it allowed for the same conclusion, namely that there are only two components, component 1 (procedural justice, $\alpha = .97$; 15 items) and component 3 (distributive justice, $\alpha = .80$; 5 items; in Table 6). Because component 2 did not show any

similarity with the results in the structure matrix from study 1, expressing instead noise, we conducted a second analysis using principal component analyses with direct oblimin rotation and a fixed number of two factors, to remove the visible noise. Factor loadings on these two components can be seen in Table 7. They correlated with $r = .36$ and were identical with the two theoretically meaningful components from the previous analysis. While subcomponents of procedural justice could not be separated in this factorial analysis, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for formal procedures was .90 (6 items), and for interactional justice, .98 (9 items), suggesting it may have been the small sample that did not allow them to be disentangled.

The POJ scale and its two individual dimensions, had a negative correlation with psychological contract violation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000) and a positive correlation with job satisfaction (Macdonald & MacIntyre, 1997). Only the distributive justice dimension was significantly (positively) correlated with perceived ability-job fit (Abdel-Halim, 1981), as shown in Table 8. Again, the correlations were small to moderate, with the largest being .534, suggesting discriminant validity of the Portuguese organizational justice scale.

Summary and Concluding Discussion

In order to increase the number of available scales to measure organizational justice with a Portuguese population and to provide a valuable tool for cross-cultural research into organizational justice, we tested the validity of a Portuguese translation of the popular and well-validated scale of organizational justice developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Results of the factor analysis in Study 1 indicate that the Portuguese organizational justice (POJ) scale items can be divided into three factors, but the first and the second factor are highly correlated, behaving as one factor with two sub-factors. These results match the dimensions present in Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) original scale. Factor one includes the items of the original dimension of interactional justice, factor two includes the items of the

original dimension of formal procedures, and factor three has the items of the original dimension of distributive justice. Results in both Studies 1 and 2 show the existence of a strong relation between interactional justice and formal procedures, replicating the results obtained by Gürbüz and Mert (2007), Pérez et al. (2013) and the original results by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), with procedural justice being a unique variable comprised of interactional justice and formal procedures. The two sub-dimensions of procedural justice could not be separated in our second study, however, this was likely due to limited sample size. In both studies the internal consistency of the POJ scale was acceptable, for all components and for the overall scale.

As expected, in Studies 1 and 2, this POJ scale showed a negative relation with psychological contract violation, replicating other results (Kickul et al., 2002; Moorman et al., 1998; Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Again as expected, Study 1 showed a positive correlation between organizational justice, particularly distributive justice, and organizational identification (Tavares et al., 2007), highlighting the importance of fairness for organizational identification. Moreover, Study 1 showed a positive correlation between organizational justice and work motivation, confirming the importance of organizational justice perceptions for employees' underlying work motivation (Oren et al., 2013). The findings of Study 2 show, as expected, a positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction (Abdel-Halim, 1981; Moorman, 1991), plus a new finding, not yet reported in the literature, of a positive correlation between distributive justice and perceived ability-job fit (Abdel-Halim, 1981). The latter result calls for further investigation, as it indicates that organizational equity in the perceived relation between person and organization may influence, or be influenced by, individual level self-perception of fit in the job. It is possible that persons with higher perceptions of their ability-job fit benefit more from the organization in the form of more favorable outcomes than those with lower ability-job fit, and perceive the

situation as just. On the other hand, by having a job they perceive to fit their skills well, they may perceive their relation to the organization as more just. However, it is also possible that experiencing just treatment (or the opposite), truly affects employee's professional identities. Further research is necessary to elaborate these different causal directions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this Portuguese organizational justice scale has good internal consistency and reliability. The factorial structure is the same as that of the original scale by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and similar to the factor structure of other translations, emphasizing its value for cross-cultural research. Moreover, this Portuguese version of the organizational justice scale shows meaningful and plausible relations to other relevant psychological constructs in the organizational context. Thus, it is a suitable instrument to assess and evaluate organizational justice for Portuguese speakers, and can be an extremely useful tool for management, while additionally contributing to our understanding of the relationship between employee and organization. It may be used to study factors influencing Portuguese-speaking employees' behavior towards an organization and entities associated with it, work performance and even the influence of the organization on how employees see themselves and others.

References

- Abdel-Halim, A. A. (1981). A reexamination of ability as a moderator of role perceptions—satisfaction relationship. *Personnel Psychology*, 34(3), 549–561.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1981.tb00495.x>
- Amirkhani, T., & Pourezzat, A. (2008). A look at the possibility of the development of social capital in the light of organizational justice in government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration*, 1(1), 19-32. <http://doi.org/10.22037/bj.v4i12.14172>
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 267-285. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.138>
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on multiplying factors for various chi squared approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 16, 296–298.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.349>
- 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 negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43-55). JAI Press.
- Brockner, J., Konovsky, M., Cooper-Schneider, R., Folger, R., Martin, C., & Bies, R. J. (1994). Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 397-409.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/256835>
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. (1996). An interactive framework for explaining reactions to decisions: interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 189-208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.189>

- Caetano, A., & Vala, J. (1999). Efeitos da justiça organizacional percebida sobre a satisfação no trabalho e as opções comportamentais. *Psicologia: Revista da Associação Portuguesa Psicologia*, 13(1-2), 75-84.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17575/rpsicol.v13i1/2.560>
- Carochinho, J. A., Matos, S., & Pinto, D. (2004). Estudo psicométrico do "Psychological Contract Inventory" (PCI) de Denise Rousseau. *Revista de Psicologia Militar*, 15, 181-192.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z., Bobocel, D., & Rupp, D. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 164-209. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1791>
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D., & Gilliland, S. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338>
- Daly, J. P., & Geyer, P. D. (1994). The role of fairness in implementing large scale change: employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 623-638. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150706>

- Elamin, A. M., & Alomaim, N. (2011). Does organizational justice influence job satisfaction and self-perceived performance in Saudi Arabia work environment? *International Management Review*, 7(1), 38-49.
- Elamin, A. M., & Tlaiss, H. A. (2015). Exploring the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice in the Islamic Saudi Arabian context. *Employee Relations*, 37(1), 2-29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2014-0033>
- Ferreira, A., Diogo, C., Ferreira, M., & Valente, A.C. (2006). Construção e validação de uma escala multi-factorial de motivação no trabalho (Multi-Moti). *Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão*, 12(2), 187-198.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256422>
- Greiff, S., & Iliescu, D. (2017). A test is much more than just the test. Some thoughts on adaptations and equivalence. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33, 145-148. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000428>
- Greenberg, F. (1990a), Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568. <https://doi.org/0021-9010/90/S00.75>
- Greenberg, F. (1990b). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- Gürbüz, S., & Mert, I. S. (2009). Validity and reliability testing of organizational justice scale: An empirical study in a public organization. *Review of Public Administration*, 42(3), 117-139.
- Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. Sage.

- Heidari, M., Rajaeepoor, S., Mohammad, S., Davoodi, R., & Bozorgzadeh, N. (2012). Investigating the relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers of Abadeh. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 18(1), 113-122. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.18.01.197>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291817>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Kickul, J., Lester, S., & Finkl, J. (2002). Promise breaking during radical organizational change: do justice interventions make a difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 469-488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.151>
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). Fairness in social relationships. In J. T. Spence & R. C. Carson (Eds.), *Contemporary topic in social psychology* (pp. 211-239). General Learning Press.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2115-4_1
- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 952-959. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.952>
- Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. (1998). The social construction of injustice: Fairness judgments in response to own and others' unfair treatment by authorities. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 75(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2785>

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992). Alumni and their alma maters: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030130202>
- Masterson, S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B., & Taylor, M. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment of work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556364>
- Macdonald, S., & MacIntyre, P. (1997). The generic job satisfaction scale: Scale development and its correlates. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 13, 1–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J022v13n02_01
- MacCoun, R. J. (2005). Voice, control, and belonging: The double-edged sword of procedural fairness. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 1, 171–201. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.115958>
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256727>
- McDowall, A., & Fletcher C. (2004). Employee development: An organizational justice perspective. *Personnel Review*, 33(1), 8-29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480410510606>
- Migacz, S. J., Zou, S., & Petrick, J. F. (2017). The “terminal” effects of service failure on airlines: Examining service recovery with justice theory. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516684979>
- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226–256. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259230>

- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256913>
- Olkkonen, M. E., & Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationship between organizational justice, Identification with organization and work unit, and Group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 202-215. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.08.007>
- Oren, L., Tziner, A., Nahshon, Y., & Sharoni, Y. (2013). Relations between OCBs, organizational justice, work motivation and self-efficacy. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 15(34), 505-516.
- Özmen, N. T., Arbak, Y., & Özer, P. S. (2007). Adalete Verilen Değerin Adalet Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Sorgulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 7(1), 17-33.
- Pérez, J., Herrera, R., Torres, E., & Hernández, R. (2013). Validez y confiabilidad de la escala de justicia organizacional de Niehoff y Moorman en población mexicana. *Contaduría y Administración*, 59(2), 97-120.

- Rego, A., & Cunha, M. P. (2010). Organisational justice and citizenship behaviors: A study in the Portuguese cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(3), 404-430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00405.x>
- Reithel, S., Baltes, B., & Buddhavarapu, S. (2007). Cultural differences in distributive and procedural justice: Does a two-factor model fit for Hong Kong employees? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(1), 61-76. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1470595807075172>
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 525-546. [http://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200008\)21:53.0.CO;2-T](http://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:53.0.CO;2-T)
- Rodell, B. J., Colquitt, A. J., & Baer, M. D. (2016). Is adhering to justice rules enough? The role of charismatic qualities in perceptions of supervisors' overall fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 140, 14-28. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2017.03.001>
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Maskaly, J., Lawrence, D. S., & Posick, C. (2017). The police-community interaction survey: measuring police performance in new ways. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 40(1), 112-127. <http://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-07-2016-0119>
- Saunders, M., Thornhill, A., & Lewis, P. (2002). Understanding employees' reactions to the management of change: an exploration through an organizational justice framework. *Irish Journal of Management*, 23(1), 85-108.
- Schweiger, D., & DeNisi, A. (1991). Communication with employees following a merger: A longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 110-135. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256304>

- Tavares, S., Caetano, A., & Silva, S. (2007). Não há bela sem senão. A identificação organizacional, os comportamentos de dedicação ao trabalho e o conflito trabalho-família. *Revista Psicologia*, 21(1), 133-149. <http://doi.org/10.17575/rpsicol.v21i1.360>
- Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1556375>
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). *Essays in social psychology. Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. Russell-Sage Foundation.
- Van Craen, M., & Skogan, W. G. (2016). Achieving fairness in policing: The link between internal and external procedural justice. *Police Quarterly*, 0, 1-21. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611116657818>
- Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 132-142. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.1.132>
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 590-598. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.590>

Table 1

Scale anchors and items of the translated organizational justice scale.

Discordo Totalmente	Discordo	Discordo Moderadamente	Não concordo Nem discordo	Concordo Moderadamente	Concordo	Concordo Totalmente
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Niehoff and Moorman (1993)	Study 1	Study 2
1	My work schedule is fair.	O meu horário de trabalho é justo.	O meu horário de trabalho é justo.
2	I think that my level of pay is fair.	Penso que o meu salário é justo.	Penso que o meu escalão salarial é justo
3	I consider my work load to be quite fair.	Considero que a minha carga de trabalho é bastante justa.	Considero o meu volume de trabalho bastante justo.
4	Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.	De maneira geral, os prémios que recebo neste trabalho são bastante justos.	De maneira geral, os prémios que recebo neste trabalho são bastante justos.
5	I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.	Sinto que as minhas responsabilidades no trabalho são justas.	Sinto que as minhas responsabilidades no trabalho são justas.
6	Job decisions are made by the general manager in an unbiased manner.	As decisões relacionadas com trabalho são tomadas pelo superior hierárquico de forma imparcial.	As decisões relacionadas com trabalho são tomadas pelo coordenador de forma imparcial.
7	My general manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.	O meu superior hierárquico certifica-se que ouve as preocupações de todos colaboradores antes de tomar decisões de trabalho.	O meu coordenador certifica-se que ouve as preocupações de todos colaboradores antes de tomar decisões de trabalho.
8	To make job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information.	O meu superior hierárquico recolhe informações corretas e completas antes de tomar decisões de trabalho.	O meu coordenador recolhe informações corretas e completas antes de tomar decisões de trabalho.
9	My general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.	O meu superior hierárquico clarifica as decisões e oferece informações adicionais quando os colaboradores pedem	O meu coordenador clarifica as decisões e oferece informações adicionais quando os colaboradores pedem.
10	All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.	Todas as decisões de trabalho são aplicadas de forma consistente a todos os colaboradores afetados.	Todas as decisões de trabalho são aplicadas de forma consistente a todos os colaboradores afetados.
11	Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the general manager.	Os colaboradores podem questionar ou contestar decisões de trabalho tomadas pelo meu superior hierárquico.	Os colaboradores podem questionar ou contestar decisões de trabalho tomadas pelo coordenador.
12	When decisions are made about my job the general manager treats me with kindness and consideration.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico trata-me com delicadeza e consideração.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador trata-me com delicadeza e consideração.
13	When decisions are made	Quando são tomadas decisões	Quando são tomadas decisões

	about my job the general manager treats me with respect and dignity.	sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico trata-me com respeito e dignidade.	sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador trata-me com respeito e dignidade.
14	When decisions are made about my job, the general manager is sensitive to my personal needs.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico é sensível às minhas necessidades pessoais.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador é sensível às minhas necessidades pessoais.
15	When decisions are made about my job the general manager deals with me in a truthful manner.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico lida comigo de forma honesta.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador lida comigo de forma honesta.
16	When decisions are made about my job, the general manager shows concern for my rights as an employee.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico mostra preocupação com os meus direitos enquanto colaborador.	Quando são tomadas decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador mostra preocupação com os meus direitos enquanto colaborador.
17	Concerning decisions made about my job the general manager discusses the implications of the decisions with me.	Relativamente a decisões tomadas sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico discute as implicações dessas decisões comigo.	Relativamente a decisões tomadas sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador discute as implicações dessas decisões comigo.
18	The general manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.	O meu superior hierárquico fornece justificações adequadas sobre decisões tomadas sobre o meu trabalho.	O coordenador fornece justificações adequadas sobre decisões tomadas sobre o meu trabalho.
19	When making decisions about my job the general manager offers explanations that make sense to me.	Quando toma decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o meu superior hierárquico fornece explicações que fazem sentido para mim.	Quando toma decisões sobre o meu trabalho, o coordenador fornece explicações que fazem sentido para mim.
20	My general manager explains very clearly any decision made about my job.	O meu superior hierárquico explica de forma bastante clara qualquer decisão tomada em relação ao meu trabalho.	O coordenador explica de forma bastante clara qualquer decisão tomada em relação ao meu trabalho.

Table 2

Pattern matrix of the loading of each item on factors extracted for the Portuguese organizational justice scale (Study 1)

Maximum likelihood with direct oblimin rotation of the three-factor solution, n = 115			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	-.120	-.065	.568
Item 2	-.001	.022	.582
Item 3	.011	-.047	.548
Item 4	.160	.012	.590
Item 5	.028	.042	.727
Item 6	.192	-.495	.191
Item 7	-.105	-1.044	-.011
Item 8	.053	-.797	.137
Item 9	.347	-.540	-.010
Item 10	.320	-.421	.015
Item 11	.120	-.550	-.040
Item 12	.593	-.203	-.037
Item 13	.743	-.149	-.118
Item 14	.820	.057	.107
Item 15	.763	-.016	.093
Item 16	.639	-.187	.003
Item 17	.830	-.027	-.021
Item 18	.940	.108	.065
Item 19	.790	-.058	.020
Item 20	.835	-.036	-.102
Cronbach's alpha	0.95	0.90	0.75

Table 3

Factor correlation matrix of the three factors for the Portuguese organizational justice scale (Study 1)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1	-.765	.236
Factor 2	-.765	1	-.250
Factor 3	.236	-.250	1

Table 4

Structure matrix of the loading of each item on factors extracted for the Portuguese organizational justice scale (Study 1)

	Maximum likelihood with direct oblimin rotation of the three-factor solution, n = 115		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.064	-.116	.556
Item 2	.119	-.123	.576
Item 3	.176	-.192	.563
Item 4	.290	-.258	.625
Item 5	.168	-.162	.723
Item 6	.615	-.689	.360
Item 7	.691	-.961	.226
Item 8	.695	-.872	.349
Item 9	.758	-.803	.207
Item 10	.646	-.670	.196
Item 11	.531	-.632	.126
Item 12	.739	-.647	.153
Item 13	.829	-.688	.095
Item 14	.802	-.597	.286
Item 15	.797	-.623	.277
Item 16	.782	-.676	.200
Item 17	.846	-.657	.182
Item 18	.872	-.627	.259
Item 19	.838	-.666	.221
Item 20	.839	-.649	.104

Table 5

Pearson correlations between the Portuguese organizational justice scale, including its individual dimensions and psychological contract violation, organizational identification and work motivation (Study 1)

POJ and individual dimensions	Psychological contract violation	Organizational identification	Work motivation
Entire scale	-.368 ^{***}	.201 [*]	.306 ^{**}
Distributive justice subscale	-.477 ^{***}	.297 ^{**}	.299 ^{**}
Procedural justice subscale	-.261 ^{**}	.131	.249 [*]
Formal procedures sub-dimension of Procedural Justice	-.236 [*]	.101	.195 [*]
Interactional justice sub- dimension of Procedural Justice	-.255 ^{**}	.142	.270 ^{**}

*Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$*

Table 6

Pattern matrix of the loading of each item on factors extracted for the Portuguese organizational justice scale, forced 3-factor solution (Study 2)

Maximum likelihood with direct oblimin rotation of the three-factor solution, n = 59			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.164	.226	.573
Item 2	-.078	-.075	.730
Item 3	-.012	-.049	.841
Item 4	.035	-.160	.792
Item 5	.020	.090	.415
Item 6	.461	.030	.148
Item 7	.829	.249	.000
Item 8	.915	.272	-.011
Item 9	.841	.081	-.113
Item 10	.759	.061	-.023
Item 11	.628	-.117	-.080
Item 12	.881	-.333	.031
Item 13	.830	-.459	-.008
Item 14	.864	-.232	.051
Item 15	.850	-.253	.058
Item 16	.837	-.216	.146
Item 17	.880	.143	.056
Item 18	.964	.101	.034
Item 19	.959	.113	.039
Item 20	.933	.107	.095

Table 7

Pattern matrix of the loading of each item on factors extracted for the Portuguese organizational justice scale, forced 2-factor solution (Study 2)

Principal components with direct oblimin rotation of the two-factor solution, n = 59		
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.092	.732
Item 2	-.091	.817
Item 3	-.013	.835
Item 4	.086	.775
Item 5	-.004	.551
Item 6	.453	.252
Item 7	.818	.055
Item 8	.900	-.007
Item 9	.880	-.152
Item 10	.808	-.016
Item 11	.720	-.135
Item 12	.912	.009
Item 13	.879	-.045
Item 14	.899	.016
Item 15	.895	.024
Item 16	.870	.114
Item 17	.866	.047
Item 18	.942	.029
Item 19	.936	.045
Item 20	.916	.085

Table 8

Pearson correlations between the Portuguese organizational justice scale, including its dimensions, and psychological contract violation, work satisfaction and perceived ability-job fit (Study 2)

	Psychological contract violation	Work satisfaction	Perceived ability-job fit
Organizational justice	-.419 ^{**}	.534 ^{***}	.197
Distributive justice	-.408 ^{**}	.416 ^{**}	.275 [*]
Procedural justice	-.367 ^{**}	.491 ^{***}	.149

*Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$*