



# Paper

## **Fairness and wellbeing:**

### **Why good work and good management matter**

Dr Zofia Bajorek

March 2024

**Member Paper 163**

## Introduction

*“It’s about fairness...not being unmotivated. Issues of fairness such as not being treated with respect, being talked to in a condescending way – these are things that really bother people at work. Instead of having motivational speakers or worrying about psychological issues of, ‘How do we make everybody feel good?’, I say the fundamental grounds for making people feel good is treating them well.”*

Joanne Ciulla, American Philosopher and pioneer in leadership ethics

The beginning of this decade has been an interesting one (and not necessarily in a good way). The Covid-19 pandemic and the inequalities that people experienced during that time, the cost-of-living crisis, continued political unrest and the wars in the Ukraine and the Middle East have all differentially affected societal groups and at many times has led me to question: ‘why is society so unfair?’

These external situations have also had an impact on the world or work and on employee wellbeing. Employers should therefore make sure that good work and job quality remains on the agenda so employees are able to thrive at work, while maintaining organisational productivity and outcomes. An employee’s feelings, behaviours and attitudes will all have an impact on whether organisations will achieve its goals and objectives, and whether an employee remains at an organisation is not only based on whether their technical competency needs are being met, but on their salary, how they experience interactions in the workplace and how they are supported at work (Ajala and Bolarinwa, 2015). So, when things seem unfair outside of work, what can employers do to make sure that experiences in work are fair?

## Trends in workplace change

The World Economic Forum (2022) identified four trends they believe are having an impact on the future of work. These are:

- Increasing technological change (and speed of change) and the blurring of lines between people and technology that could lead to digital divides according to workers’ skills levels.
- Social and demographic transformations with workforces becoming increasingly diverse leading to a shift away from one-size-fits-all job models towards a greater personalisation of employee experience.
- Climate change and the green transition with the shift away from unsustainable sectors and practices towards more sustainable ones. In some sectors this could have implications for job design, and even job loss and so during this transition employees need to be supported into good quality work, and for some this may look vastly different to their current roles.
- The continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the dramatic acceleration towards hybrid work which has posed challenges for attaining and maintaining good

quality work for employers and employees alike.

How these changes are managed in an organisation can have profound consequences for the way in which employees involve and engage themselves in both the organisation and the role in which they work (Cohen, 2013). New working circumstances can have an impact on the way that organisations are structured, how work is designed and the policies and strategies that organisations implement. According to the World Economic Forum (2022), emerging challenges and opportunities that can have an impact on job quality are:

- A divergence in wages that has been further affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Income inequality remains, and with inflation and the rising cost-of-living there are greater wage and wealth disparities.
- Unequal access to flexible work. Although flexible and hybrid working seems to be set to persist for a sizeable minority of the workforce (predominantly to highly skilled, highly educated workers), it does also create new challenges in how it is managed equitably and for workforce cohesion.
- Pressures on worker mental health and wellbeing. With evidence to suggest that employee burnout has increased significantly since the pandemic, there are questions with regards to how all employees can be best supported to overcome mental health challenges.
- Diversity, equity and inclusion. Although EDI has risen up the organisational agenda, there are concerns that the pandemic could result in reversals of progress towards diversity, equity and inclusion, especially as the implications for employment and income were proportionally greater for women and those in many disadvantaged groups. The rate of recovery post pandemic has also been slower for these groups.
- A growing need for reskilling and upskilling. Automation and digitalization could lead to disruption and anxiety for employees in certain sectors and roles, and such transitions could leave individuals unemployed if they do not have access to reskilling or upskilling.

Changes in organisational environments as a result of such challenges and opportunities can have an impact on employment relationships, wellbeing and whether employment is seen as fair (Otake and Wong, 2014). The authors also noted how managers manage the nature of exchanges within employment relationships should be monitored to understand the implications of this, as unfairness in the workplace has been estimated to cost US employers \$64 billion each year. This estimate was thought to be a 'conservative calculation' based on the survey of US employees and represents the cost of losing and replacing employees who felt they had been treated unfairly at work (Level Playing Field Institution, 2007). Lockwood (2005) suggested that managers in organisations need to create and empower organisational cultures that foster a respectful and inclusive environment, where every employee has the scope to learn, grow and contribute meaningfully to an organisation's success. A lens through which this can be studied is organisational fairness.

## What is organisational fairness and why is it important?

Organisational justice and organisational fairness are terms that are often used interchangeably (Kurian, 2018), to define what employees believe to be right or fair in the social contexts, procedures and interactions in the workplace (Baldwin, 2006; Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007). Fairness perceptions in organisations are developed by employee's feelings of how they are being treated in comparison to other staff members. HR and managers need to be aware of fairness perceptions and be able to act to reduce any perceived unfairness, as it can play a significant role in organisational dynamics, how employees respond to change, their wellbeing and the line management relationship (Foster, 2010).

Organisational justice can be categorised in a number of different ways:

### Distributive Justice

This form of organisational justice refers to the perceived fairness of how rewards are shared (or distributed) equally among team members or the workforce as a whole. When evaluating whether an employee has been treated fairly or not, they may compare their input into task in comparison to others in the workplace and what they have received in return (be that salary, any distributions of bonuses, verbal praise or access to other employee benefits, and development opportunities (Baldwin, 2006).

If unfairness is perceived by employees, they may change their behaviours to reduce this by altering their input (working less, reducing levels of organisational commitment or organisational citizenship behaviours), or by changing outputs (an example could be stealing from an organization, or an employee campaigning to be rewarded differently in lines with their peers). Either way, such resultant actions may lead to negative organisational outcomes and individual wellbeing that will have to be managed by employers.

However, popularity towards distributive justice has reduced because fairness in the final allocation of rewards may not be as intrinsically important as the process through which the allocation of rewards was decided, which led to the development of procedural justice.

### Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is based on fairness of a decision-making process resulting in a particular outcome. Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) proposed a set of rules that if used could help organisational decision-making processes appear fair. These include:

- Consistency – ensuring that procedures used are applied consistently across people and across time – for example in organisations ensuring that standard criteria are used in recruitment, retention and dismissal decisions.
- Bias-suppression – making sure that all decisions are free from any bias, determined on facts and not personal interests or 'feelings' of a decision maker. This may include

collecting information from a variety of sources to help create an objective view of a situation before a decision is made.

- Accuracy – collecting information to be used in decisions accurately, for example data and information that it is up to date and relevant and any hearsay is validated before being included in any decision making.
- Correctability – having mechanisms in place to correct any flawed or inaccurate information provided during any decision-making process.
- Representativeness – including in the process the opinions of various groups and sub-groups that may be affected by the final decision (the importance of employee voice).
- Ethicality – ensuring that any procedures or organisational decisions that can have an impact on employee outcomes are mindful of equity, diversity and inclusion policies.

In many ways these rules could be seen as intuitive and ‘common sense’, but if implemented well could be very beneficial for organisations.

### **Interactional Justice**

It has been argued that distributive and procedural justice models focus solely on outcomes and procedures of decision-making, but neglect the role of social interactions that are critical in organisational settings. Interactional justice focusses on how individuals treat each other in the workplace – both in the distribution of resources and rewards, but also in everyday interactions. Bies and Moag (1986) identified four elements of communication to enhance perceptions of fairness that should be applied in the workplace:

- Truth: Any information presented should be accurate and presented in an open manner.
- Respect: Employees should be treated with dignity, courteous behaviours and no insults.
- Propriety: Any questions or statements should be free from prejudicial statements and elements (e.g., racism, sexism, ageism).
- Justification: If an injustice in an interaction has been perceived, then providing an explanation or account of the behaviour or an apology can reduce or eliminate the sense of hurt or anger this may have generated.

### **Informational Justice**

It may not just be the nature of the interactions between individuals that will have an impact on perceived fairness, but also the quality of information contained in the interactions and the timing of when the information is delivered (Le, Zheng and Fujimoto, 2016). Informational justice serves to provide the answers to ‘why’ procedures in an organisation were used in a certain way, and/or why outcomes were distributed in a

certain manner. Openness and honesty are pivotal for informational justice, and the information provided may change an employee's receptiveness to organisational decisions and policies if they have a better understanding of the underlying rationale for their use.

Although there have been debates regarding whether interactional and informational justice are subsets of procedural justice or entities of their own, there is less debate about just why organisational justice as a unified concept is important, and what managers and HR need to do to ensure that fairness is positively perceived in the workplace.

## What are the implications of fairness for organisational and individual outcomes?

Baldwin (2006) notes that well-designed organisational systems that promote organisational justice can be beneficial for individuals as they will feel satisfied that they have been fairly treated in the workplace. Organisations will also be perceived as a fair place to work, which can help HR and managers maintain control over potential challenges and threats (e.g. turnover, reduced productivity, reduced engagement) and indicate to employees that they should remain an employer of choice. When employees experience organisational fairness, it helps to maintain their wellbeing, and communicates to them that they are valued for the work they contribute (Blade and Tyler, 2003).

The majority of organisational justice research has highlighted its benefits for a range of organisational outcomes, which as Blader and Tyler (2003) say, '*is one of the most compelling testaments to its importance*' (page 108). For example, research into procedural justice has been found to be a predictor of:

- Organisational commitment (Korsgaard, Schweiger and Sapienza, 1995)
- The effort that employees put in to undertaking their required duties (Lee, 1995)
- The likelihood that employees will stay in their organisations (Taylor et al., 1995)
- The acceptance and compliance with organisational rules (Kim and Mauborgne, 1993)
- The extent to which employees engage in employee citizenship behaviours and extra roles (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994).

Invista (2021) reported that when employees in their survey reported perceived fairness in the way that rewards were distributed (for example, salary rises, time-off and employment flexibility and promotional opportunities), the more satisfied they were.

Distributive justice has also been related to:

- Supervisor ratings of performance (Invista, 2021)
- Work commitment (when resources are provided in a fair manner, employees feel that they need to reciprocate in their relationship by fulfilling their duties) (Nasurdin and Khuan, 2007)
- Turnover intentions (Harr and Spell, 2009).

There has also been research to indicate that fairness perceptions, especially interactional justice, can have implications for employee health and wellbeing, which in turn can influence organisational outcomes. For example:

- Invista (2001) reported that when employees in their surveys reported unfavourable perceptions of interactional justice, average workplace wellbeing scores were also reduced.
- Kivimäki et al., (2004) found that perceived fairness of interactional relationships was a reliable predictor of self-assessed health in three- and 6-year follow-ups. The best predictor of poor health in the survey was the question 'do you ever get criticised unfairly?'
- Liljergren and Ekberg (2009) found that poor interactional justice led to an increased chance of developing burnout.
- Ahmed and Muchiri (2013) highlighted that interactional justice was important to affirming the 'psychological needs' of employees including control, belonging, self-esteem and the feeling of a meaningful existence. In their research, if employees perceived unfairness in the workplace, they would moderate both their attitudes and behaviours in response.
- Invista (2021) using their own survey data found that individuals who have increased positive fairness interactions with supervisors showed decreased levels of stress indicators such as worry and employee tension.
- Ndjaboué, Brisson and Vézina (2012) in their review of organisational mental health found that interactional justice had a significant effect on mental health and sickness absence.

Mikula (1986) in a study of fairness noted that the workplace was one of the social settings in which most unfair events took place, and there is still evidence that this could be the case today. Kropp, Knight and Shepp (2022) reported that although many organisations are expanding commitments to corporate social responsibility and equality in the workplace, only 18 per cent of respondents in their worldwide employee survey indicated that they worked in a 'high fairness' environment. The authors also noted that only 33 per cent of organisations practice information transparency, and only 32 per cent of employees reported feeling supported at work. There were also differences in employee populations in how supported they felt (e.g., 37 per cent of parents felt supported in comparison to 27 per cent without children; and 37 per cent of hybrid workers felt supported in comparison to only 23 per cent of in-office workers). Survey results have also shown discrepancies in internal promotion opportunities with only 18 per cent of respondents feeling that they are fairly considered for these opportunities. Finally, only 24 per cent of employees currently feel acknowledged for the contributions they make in the workplace (and this has decreased in the past two years). Such findings suggest that organisations, HR and line managers could be doing more to ensure that fairness in organisational policies and practices are achieved in the workplace.

## Why is good work and good management important in fairness?

As has been discussed, organisational fairness can have implications for both individual and organisational outcomes, and therefore it is important that policies and practices are in place and implemented correctly to help promote and maintain fairness at work. Over the last few years, a focus on 'good work' and 'good management' have provided ways through which this can be achieved. Fairness was at the heart of Matthew Taylor's review into modern working practices (2017) which noted that: "*All work in the UK economy should be fair and decent with realistic scope for development and fulfilment.*" (page 6). The review highlighted a number of reasons for how and why 'good work' can help to promote fairness, including:

- Fair routes to progression in work, particularly for those who are on lower incomes, so they have the opportunity to boost their earning power and are treated with respect and decency at work.
- Having employment itself is important for employee health and wellbeing, but the quality of people's work is also a major factor in helping people to stay healthy and happy, which benefits organisations and serves the wider public interest too.
- If jobs are better designed, then this can help encourage productivity as employees will have better engagement with their work. It will also help to make working practices fairer based on people's capability and skills.
- Ensuring that employees have a positive experience at work by matching the aspirations of modern citizenship – that people feel respected, trusted and enabled and expected to take responsibility and given the rewards for doing so.

The review sets out seven steps towards developing fair and decent work practices, which were seen to have realistic scope for development and fulfilment. Within this was a national strategy directed towards 'good work for all', for which everyone has responsibility. However, the model made it very clear that the best way to achieve good and fair work *'is not through national regulation, but responsible corporate governance, good management and strong employment relations within organisations'* (page 9). To do this, organisations must be seen to take good work seriously, to be open about their working practices and provide opportunities for workers to be engaged and heard. This also includes the acknowledgement that the shape and content of work and individual health and wellbeing are strongly related and that a more proactive approach to workplace health is needed.

However, it is the role of the line manager in an organisation that is important for the implementation of good workplace practices. Frederick Herzberg famously said, *'If you want someone to do a good job, then give them a good job to do'*. But are employers doing enough to ensure that we have 'good management' to ensure that employees have access to good quality and fair work? If employees have a good line manager, then they can take it for granted that they are treated with fairness and respect in the workplace, and that day-to-day work is conducted with a manner that is fair, employee views are



considered and listened to, timely feedback is provided and work factors such as autonomy, training and development, psycho-social support and job design are considered. 'Well-run' organisations recognise the importance of looking after the people who work for them, investing time in good management relationships to help with both health and wellbeing in the workplace and retention. There is still a lot of truth in the old adage, *'join an organisation, leave a manager'*.

There is a lot of evidence about the importance of line management for organisational productivity, employee health and wellbeing and ensuring that good work is supported (Bajorek, 2020). In addition, line managers are key for the maintenance a positive psychological contract and ensuring that any 'deals' are maintained or re-negotiated over time in relation to contextual factors (Guest, 2004). A psychological contract that characterised by predictability and fairness, and that is supported by a positive work environment will show to an employee that they are highly valued and respected. But the reverse is also true, and this has implications for the social support and perceived stressors that employees experience at work (Reknes, Glambek and Einarsen, 2021). If there is a perceived injustice this can also have an impact on future perceptions of fairness and the negotiations or acceptance of any psychological contracts going forward (Cropanzano, 2001).

However, the quality of line management is not as good as it could be (CMI, 2023), as line managers are often 'squeezed', with the people management aspects of the role usually being the elements that are 'squeezed-out' when managers are too busy. The Taylor (2017) report also provided evidence of when good work is not supported by line managers including supervisors treating individuals badly by offering 'one-sided flexibility' and limited autonomy over working patterns; managers not seeking employee views and limited opportunities for employees to influence decision making. Sometimes this is through no fault of their own, as line management training and skill development is rarely offered when employees become line managers, and they also do not receive an appropriate level of support for the tasks that they do undertake. Consequently, it seems that organisations and HR should be doing more to promote good work and good management if they want the best for their staff.

## **What can organisations do to establish fairness in working practices?**

As good work and good management are important components for achieving fairness at work, questions inevitably turn to what organisations can practically do to ensure that positive wellbeing and organisational outcomes can be maintained. A number of actions for organisational stakeholders have been identified in research.

### **Recommendations for HR:**

- Organisations should have standard practices intended to improve fairness in place. These could include standardised pay scales, equal access to training and

development opportunities, clear and consistently applied rewards for good practice, and clear flexible working policies to avoid one-sided flexibility (including attention when zero-hour contracts are used). Policies and practices to promote fairness at work should be revised to ensure that potential for gross injustices is eliminated (Baldwin, 2006).

- HR should collect data, monitor and evaluate policies to ensure that they are working as intended. For example, is data about gender pay gaps (potentially ethnicity and disability pay gaps) collected and recorded and are changes made if gaps are identified? Are opportunities for learning and development being fairly distributed across all staff? Are there differences between demographics and tenure related to promotion opportunities? If discrepancies are found, HR must discover why these exist and work to see where changes can be made to improve fairness.
- There is a role for HR in guiding organisations to establish an open organisational culture that allows people to express their views, to listen to the opinions of others, to support questions and provide feedback to organisational decision-making processes (Kurian, 2018). If this process when developing policies and strategies is managed correctly then this could ultimately have a positive impact of the success of any policy intervention and organisational practice.
- HR managers need to be aware of the importance of high-quality management and the role this plays in fairness perceptions and employee wellbeing. Thought therefore needs to be put into the process of promoting and selecting line managers and developing a line management pipeline. Developing consistently competent line managers so that positive line managerial relationships can occur can help develop perceptions of fairness, job satisfaction and positive wellbeing (Otake and Wong, 2014). Line management training and development can be part of this; however, it is also important that line managers are motivated to line manage and have the resources to support them in the role when needed.
- Clear and transparent communication channels (both in person, and in a hybrid situation) need to be developed, so information is provided to staff as quickly and fairly as possible. This is especially important in times of change or uncertainty (Proudfoot and Lind, 2015), where speculation about what is going on may move employees to thinking that situations and policies are fair, to them being unfair, if the process has not been adequately communicated. Once again, employees also wish to be involved in the decision-making process, with suggestions being taken seriously and acted upon, as this help employees understand any rationale for the change (Sharpe, 2006), and could help to sustain commitment and loyalty going forward.

### Recommendations for Line Managers:

- Managers need to make job related decisions in an impartial manner. Such decisions are usually made during an appraisal process, but as Baldwin (2006) noted, there is often a suspicion or dislike for the appraisal process, based on the way in which they are conducted.
- There are a number of ways in which appraisals can be conducted to ensure that they are performed consistently and fairly. These include making sure that appraisals are

undertaken for all employees; that managers are familiar with the work that the appraisee has done and are competent in undertaking performance reviews, use rating systems that are goal-oriented, behaviour based and use detailed information. Peer ratings can also be used alongside a manager's assessment. If negative feedback needs to be provided then this should be given in a constructive manner, and a written account of the appraisal should be provided for the appraisee to view and comment on, in case there any points of disagreement to be resolved.

- Managers should also be clear about opportunities for career development and progression, to help minimise employee frustration when they are unsuccessful for a promotion opportunity. Clear and timely feedback should also be provided as to why they did not get the new role, as well as clarifying what potential future opportunities may be.
- Successes should be celebrated consistently across organisations. Desired behaviours should be fairly acknowledged to make it clear why employees did (or did not) receive a reward.
- Managers should be able to have 'difficult conversations' as well as positive ones, as this creates trust in the employment relationship. When line management meetings occur, objectives for the meeting should be shared, and the employee should have the opportunity to voice their concerns or opinions and be heard. It may be useful to set clear goals and follow-up on progression, so employees feel recognised and that they have been treated fairly. Employees want to be managed with dignity and respect.
- Workplace connections are important to all, and managers must apply rules fairly and consistently, as this can lead to resentment among staff who feel they are treated differently in the workplace. Decisions made should be free from bias.

## Recommendations for Employees

- If you feel that you have been treated unfairly in the workplace, make sure you know where you can go to understand what has occurred. If you feel comfortable having that conversation with your line manager this may open a path for transparency in communication. However, if this is not the case, HR should be able to deal with any concerns.
- If you are part of a trade union this may be an alternative route for employee voice and representation.

## Conclusions

Unfairness in society is becoming more apparent, however the same does not have to be the case in the workplace. Research clearly highlights the benefits of workplace fairness for both organisational productivity and employee health and wellbeing, as well as the role that 'good work' and 'good management' have in establishing fair practices, trust in management judgements and the employment relationship. It could therefore be argued that if organisations want to be seen as fair for positive organisational outcomes and

employee wellbeing then the quality of work and managers should be two areas of focus for improvement.

## References

Ahmed, E and Muchiri, M. (2013). *Effects of psychological contract breach, ethical leadership and supervisors' fairness on employees' performance and wellbeing*. Proceedings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> International Business Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Ajala, EM and Bolarinwa, KO (2015). Organisational justice and psychological well-being of employees in the local government service of Osun State, Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 9, 55-72.

Baldwin, S. (2006). *Organisational Justice*. Institute for Employment Studies: Brighton.

Bies R, and Moag, J. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organisations*, 1, 43-45.

Blade, SL and Tyler, TR. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 107-126.

Cassell, DG and Hyde P. (2016). The subjectivity of fairness: Managerial discretion and work-life balance. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 23, 89-107.

Cohen A, (2015). A global evaluation of organizational fairness and its relationship to psychological contracts. *Career Development International*, 18, 589-609.

Cropanzano, R., and Prehar, C.A. (2001). Emerging justice concerns in an era of changing psychological contracts. In Cropanzano, R., *Justice in the workplace. From theory to practice. Volume 2*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey.

Cropanzano, R, Bowen, D.E and Gilland, S.W (2007). The management of organisational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21. 34-48.

Forster, R.D. (2010). Resistance, justice and commitment to change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21, 3-39.

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

Guest, D. E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53, 541-555.

Kim, WC and Mauborgne, RA. (1993). Procedural justice, attitudes and subsidiary top management compliance with multinational' corporate strategic decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 502-526.

- Kivimäki M, Ferrie, J, Head, J, Shipley M, Vahtera, J and Marmot M (2004). Organisational justice and change in justice as predictors of employee health: The Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 58, 931-937.
- Kropp, B, Knight, J and Shepp, J. (2022). *How fair is your workplace?* Harvard Business Review. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2022/07/how-fair-is-your-workplace#:~:text=Of%20the%203%2C500%20employees%20we,retention%20by%20up%20to%2027%25>.
- Konovsky, MA and Pugh SD. (1994). Citizenship behaviour and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.
- Korsgaard, MA, Scweiger, DM, and Sapienza, HJ. (1995). Building commitment, attachment and trust in strategic decision-making teams: the role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 60-84.
- Kurian, D. (2018). Organizational Justice: Why does it matter for HRD. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 18, 11-22.
- Le, H, Zheng, CS and Fujimoto, Y. (2016). Inclusion, organisational justice and employee well-being. *International Journal of Manpower*, 37, 945-964.
- Lee, C. (1995). Prosocial organisational behaviours: the roles of workplace justice, achievement striving and pay satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10, 197-206.
- Level Playing Field Institute. (2007). *The corporate leavers survey. The cost of employee turnover due solely to unfairness in the workplace.* Available at <https://www.smash.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/corporate-leavers-survey.pdf>. (Accessed February 2024).
- Leventhal, G, Karuza, J and Fry, W. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In Mikula, G. (ed), *Justice and Social Interaction*. Springer-Verlag.
- Lockwood, NR (2005). *Workplace diversity: Leveraging the power of difference for competitive advantage.* Retrieved from: [www.shrm.org/research/quarterly/2005/0605](http://www.shrm.org/research/quarterly/2005/0605).
- Mikula, G. (1986). The experience of injustice: Toward a better understanding of its phenomenology. In Bierhoff, HW, Cohen RL and Greenberg, J. (eds), *Justice in Social Relations*. New York: Plenum.
- Ndjaboué R, Brisson C and Vézina M. (2012). Organisational justice and mental health: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Occupational Environmental Medicine*, 69, 694-700.
- Otaye L and Wong, W. (2014). Mapping the contours of fairness. The impact of unfairness and leadership (in)action on job satisfaction, turnover intention and employer advocacy. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1, 191-204.
- Proudfoot, D. and Lind, E.A. (2015). Fairness heuristic theory, the uncertainty management model and fairness at work. In Cropanzano, R.S and Ambrose, M.L. (Eds), *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*. Oxford Press University: Oxford.

Reknes, I., Glambek, M., and Einarsen, S.V. (2021). Injustice perceptions, workplace bullying and intention to leave. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 43, 1-13.

Sharpe, A. (2006). *The psychological contract in a changing work environment*. The Work Institute. Available at:

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=c7cdf6cadb40d9622a6f70a43dc5456e40f2cf81>. (Accessed September, 2023).

Taylor, M. (2017). *Good Work: The Taylor review of modern working practices*. Available at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/627671/good-work-taylor-review-modern-working-practices-rg.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/627671/good-work-taylor-review-modern-working-practices-rg.pdf) (Accessed September 2023).

Taylor, MS, Tracy, KB, Renard, MK, Harrison, JK and Carroll, SJ. (1995). Due process in performance appraisal. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 495-523.

World Economic Forum (2022). *The Good Work Framework: The new business agenda for the future of work*. Available at: <https://www.weforum.org/whitepapers/the-good-work-framework-a-new-business-agenda-for-the-future-of-work/>. (Accessed June 2023).

---

## About IES

IES is widely respected for its knowledge, insight and practical support in HR, OD, L&D and people management issues. The Institute combines expertise in research with its practical application through our consultancy work. Our approach is based on:

- building, exploiting and sharing the evidence base
- independence, objectivity and rigour
- considering the whole people system, not just the individual parts
- delivering practical, sustainable business benefits
- building our clients' capabilities rather than their dependence.

Whatever your professional and HR needs, get in touch: