# Distributive and procedural justice in a sales force context: Scale development and validation

By: Thomas G. Brashear, Charles M. Brooks, and James S. Boles

Thomas Brashear, Charles Brooks, and James S. Boles, "Distributive and Procedural Justice in a Sales Force Context: Scale Development and Validation" *Journal of Business Research* 57 (January 2004), pp. 86-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00288-6



**Abstract:**

Perceptions of managerial justice are essential to maintaining highly motivated, satisfied and committed salespeople. Even though there is extant research concerning justice in areas outside marketing, measurement of the distributive and procedural justice constructs has not been the focus of rigorous scale development. This study draws on a variety of literatures and develops scales for the measurement of distributive and procedural justice for use in a sales force context. The measurement scales were validated on three separate sales force samples providing strong evidence of reliability and validity.

**Keywords:** workplace justice | sales management | measurement scales | validation

**Article:**

## 1. Introduction

Workplace justice is a key issue in organizations Folger and Konovsky, 1989, Tyler, 1989. In the area of sales management, however, there is only limited empirical research examining the effects of justice despite its importance in maintaining a satisfied and productive sales force (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). Sales managers can affect salesperson rewards by changing sales objectives and territories (Churchill et al., 1997). Managers also evaluate performance (e.g., DeCarlo and Leigh, 1996). With such discretion, sales managers have a duty to see that reward processes are fair, since perceived injustices adversely influence salesperson satisfaction, commitment, and performance (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994).

Despite the extensive research in the area of justice outside of the marketing and sales management domain, there has been no consistently applied standard in this literature regarding the rigor of evaluating dimensionality, validity, and psychometric properties of the justice measures. This lack of consistency is, in large part, "a sure sign of the immaturity of the field of organizational justice…" (Greenberg, 1993, p. 143). In that light, justice research in a sales force context requires a clear conceptualization, operationalization, and standardization of the measures. The purpose of this study is to develop and validate scales for the measurement of both distributive and procedural justice in a sales force context.

## 2. Background

Researchers investigating the fairness of organizational and social interactions have identified two types of justice: distributive and procedural. These two types have been used as a theoretical framework in a wide range of contexts (e.g., Gilliland, 1993, Mansour-Cole and Scott, 1998, Tyler, 1994). Justice has been studied to a limited degree in marketing in conjunction with relationship quality (Kumar et al., 1995) and organizational responses to consumer complaint behaviors (Blodgett et al., 1997). It has also been examined in studies of organizational citizenship (Netemeyer et al. 1997), retail sales (Dubinsky and Levy, 1989), commitment and turnover (Roberts et al., 1999), and organizational change (McNeilly and Lawson, 1999). Nonetheless, Roberts et al. (1999) note the limited exploration of justice in sales research.

In the research noted above, the notions of equity, fairness, and distributive and procedural justice have been used inconsistently. As a result, the conceptualizations or domains of these constructs are unclear, particularly with regard to procedural justice. Previous studies reveal common measurement shortcomings such as an inconsistent number of scale items, a lack of consensus in the dimensionality of scales, and few scale validations.

In many studies examining justice, there are serious questions of reliability. The constructs are often measured with one or two items (e.g., Armstrong-Stassen, 1998, Tyler, 1994). Distributive justice has also been operationalized as a multidimensional construct (Conlon and Fasolo, 1990). The dimensionality issue is even more problematic for procedural justice with recent studies using one (Blodgett et al., 1997), two (Welbourne et al., 1995), or five (Gilliland and Beckstein, 1996) dimensions of procedural justice. Although rigorous scale validation and purification with factor analysis are performed in some studies (Welbourne et al., 1995), they have not been done in others (Blodgett et al., 1997).

Scales used in justice research in marketing have also been quite diverse. Dubinsky and Levy (1989) used a 45-item, seven-dimension scale of general workplace fairness developed by Dittrich and Carrell (1979). Subsequently, the same scale was reduced to five dimensions through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997). Roberts et al. (1999) created a 15-item scale to measure internal equity with six reward categories (recognition, incentive awards, raises, salary, fringe benefits, and promotions), but did not address the dimensionality or discriminant validity of these constructs. McNeilly and Lawson (1999) used scales by Folger and Konovsky (1989) but did not report a factor analysis or an assessment of unidimensionality. In this research, we present the following scale development study. We begin by providing a specific conceptualization of the justice constructs to be measured.

## 3. Conceptualizations of justice

Distributive justice has it origins in the study of social exchange (Blau, 1964) and equity (Adams, 1965), and is concerned with the outcomes one receives in social exchanges. Perceptions of distributive justice are thought to result in three outcome components: equity, equality, or needs (Deutsch, 1985). The most commonly studied of these components is equity, which refers to the recipient's perception of whether or not rewards are proportional or fair given

the amount of inputs (Tyler, 1994). In the current study, distributive justice is defined as the equity or fairness of rewards with respect to salesperson inputs (required roles, responsibilities, and efforts), on one hand, and organizational benefits generated from those salesperson inputs, on the other. In the current study of managerial justice, a salesperson's perception of distributive justice is based on a manager's allocation of rewards.

Procedural justice has been conceptualized in various ways, but the key components pertain to fairness of policies and procedures, and fairness in the process or application of procedures (e.g., Thibaut and Walker, 1975, Lind and Tyler, 1988). Some research works have focused only on policies (e.g., Folger and Greenberg, 1985), the application of policies (e.g., Thibaut and Walker, 1975), or an evaluation of procedures and interactions (Aquino et al., 1997). Other research works have combined the evaluation with a variety of interrelated constructs such as communication, refutability, explanation, knowledge, and courtesy Lind and Tyler, 1988, Kumar et al., 1995. In line with Tyler's (1994) as well as Thibaut and Walker's (1975) conceptualizations, we focus on a specific facet of procedural justice, namely, procedures and the application of procedures. In the context of the sales manager–salesperson relationship, we define procedural justice as the salesperson's perception of the manager's fairness in developing and uniformly enforcing policies and procedures.

### 3.1. The relationship between procedural and distributive justice

Generally, distributive and procedural justice are considered to be conceptually and operationally distinct constructs. Folger and Konovsky (1989) argue that distributive justice predicts attitudes towards specific outcomes and procedural justice predicts attitudes towards authorities. Sheppard et al. (1992) state that distributive justice is about outcomes, where procedural justice is concerned with procedures and processes.

Researchers have argued that even though distributive and procedural justice are conceptually and operationally distinct constructs, they should be correlated (Tyler, 1994). Recently, Konovsky (2000) noted that early work was successful in empirically distinguishing both elements of justice with only moderate correlations; but the nature of the relationship is not completely clear and is often debated (Lind and Tyler, 1988). Therefore, there is no clear consensus on the causal ordering of distributive and procedural justice other than agreement that the concepts are positively related.

## 4. Relationships with other constructs

Previous research has established relationships between distributive and procedural justice and a number of other constructs. Conceptually and theoretically, the two types of justice have been predicted to have differential effects on many of the variables included. The constructs chosen to provide a nomological net are known to be important in organizational and social interaction research, as well as in the sales management literature. Potential antecedents and possible outcomes were included to form a nomological net and demonstrate construct validity for the justice scales.

### 4.1. Antecedents of procedural and distributive justice

Studies conducted by Conlon and Fasolo (1990) and Giacobbe-Miller (1995) indicate that, within the context of negotiations, the outcomes of negotiations are considered more fair or equitable (distributive justice) when participants have higher levels of influence in the final decisions. According to self-interest theory (Lind and Tyler, 1988), decision influence or control in either the development of processes or the application of process leads to higher evaluations of procedural justice. Based on these studies, a positive relationship between distributive justice and decision influence is predicted.

In a series of studies spanning a range of contexts, Tyler and Lind (1992) found that distributive and procedural justice are positively related to a variety of relational constructs. Tyler (1994) reported that standing or respectful treatment is positively related to perceptions of distributive and procedural justice. Kumar et al. (1995) found that, although both types of justice are positively related with relationalism (i.e., levels of social norms in exchange), procedural justice had a stronger correlation with relationalism than did distributive justice. Other research works indicate that commonly shared values are important to strong manager–subordinate relationships (Chatman, 1991). We predict that standing, relationalism, and shared values will be positively related to both types of justice, but relationalism will be more highly correlated with procedural justice.

A model of fairness in hiring identifies feedback as one determinant of procedural justice (Gilliland, 1993). Folger and Konovsky (1989) report that the amount of feedback an individual receives is positively related to distributive justice. Accordingly, we expect that information flow or feedback will be positively correlated with distributive and procedural justice.

### 4.2. Outcomes of procedural and distributive justice

The importance of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit has been established in the sales management literature (Brown and Peterson, 1993). The justice literature has documented a positive association between organizational commitment and both types of justice Roberts et al., 1999, Folger and Konovsky, 1989. These studies indicate that organizational commitment tends to be more highly correlated with procedural justice. We predict that organizational commitment will be related to both types of justice, but will be more strongly related to procedural justice.

Research concerning job satisfaction indicates that it is positively correlated with distributive and procedural justice, with mixed findings regarding which form of justice has the strongest correlation with satisfaction. (e.g., Fryxell and Gordon, 1989). We predict that job satisfaction will be positively related to distributive and procedural justice, but differences in magnitude are not predicted.

Dailey and Delaney (1992) and Aquino et al. (1997) indicate that turnover intentions are negatively related to procedural justice. Likewise, in a sales force setting, Roberts et al. (1999) found that intention to quit is negatively related to both types of justice. We predict that intention to quit will be negatively related to both procedural and distributive justice.

## 5. Scale development

The scales for the two constructs were developed following established procedures (e.g., Churchill, 1979, Gerbing and Anderson, 1988). First, a pool of items was created for each construct based on existing scales in the literature (e.g., Price and Mueller, 1986, Kumar et al., 1995) and additional items were developed. Following established procedures, three experts in the fields of organizational behavior and sales management assessed content validity. These three judges rated each item as "clearly representative," "somewhat representative," or "not representative" of the construct. Any item rated not representative by two judges was eliminated. This procedure reduced the initial pool of 46 distributive justice items to 14, and the initial 54 items for procedural justice to 15.

Two marketing professors and two doctoral students conducted a second review. They reviewed conceptual definitions and repeated the initial item review. The second set of reviewers also performed a thorough evaluation of the item wording to eliminate any redundant, ambiguous, or poorly worded items. Any item marked by at least three of the four judges was eliminated. This reduced the pools to 9 (distributive) and 11 (procedural) items.

### 5.1. Data collection

Three separate data sets were collected for scale development and validation. All data collections followed similar procedures. A sampling frame of business-to-business salespeople was developed from a list of US manufacturers covering a wide range of product/service and consumer/industrial categories. Salespeople were then contacted and qualified. Only those employed full time in a business-to-business sales position with an identifiable direct manager were asked to participate. Follow-up contacts were used to assure response.

### 5.2. Sample 1

In the first data collection effort, a total of 187 salespeople agreed to participate. Of those, 118 responded, resulting in a usable sample of 110. The mean age of respondents was 39 years. Seventy percent was married and 87 percent was male. Sixty percent had a bachelor's degree or higher. Respondents averaged 11 years of experience.

The survey for the first sample contained the pool of 20 items for the key constructs of distributive (DIST) and procedural (PRO) justice. The preface to each set of questions specifically mentioned the manager. For the PRO items, the preface read, "Please answer your agreement or disagreement with the following statements about your manager's use of policies and procedures." The scale was a seven-point Likert-type scale with end points of *Strongly disagree*=1 and *Strongly agree*=7. For the DIST items, the preface read, "Please answer the following statements pertaining to the fairness of the rewards that are provided by your manager." The seven-point scale was coded *Not very fairly*=1 and *Very fairly*=7.

In addition to the two focal constructs, items for the related constructs were included. The number of items and Cronbach's (1951) $\alpha$ for each scale are shown in Table 1. *Satisfaction* was a

global measure of job satisfaction using a four-item scale adapted from Brown and Peterson (1994). *Organizational commitment* was measured using a scale adapted from Mowday et al. (1990). Four items adapted from Hom and Griffeth (1991) were used to assess *quitting intentions*. *Relationalism* was assessed with an eight-item scale adapted from Gundlach et al. (1995). The *standing* was adapted from Tyler (1994), and *feedback* was measured using a scale adapted from work by Jaworski and Kohli (1991). *Decision influence* was a six-item measure reflecting the perceived decision-making influence of the salesperson.

**Table 1.** Final measurement items, CFA loadings, and psychometric properties

| | | **Sample 1** | **Sample 2** | **Sample 3** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Procedural justice* | | | | |
| (1) My manager administers policies fairly. | $\lambda_{21}$ | .85 | .87 | .82 |
| (2) The policies my manager creates treat everyone equally. | $\lambda_{22}$ | .78 | .92 | .88 |
| (3) The standards set by my manager are enforced equally among all salespeople. | $\lambda_{23}$ | .86 | .89 | .87 |
| (4) My manager treats all salespeople the same when implementing company policy. | $\lambda_{24}$ | .92 | .93 | .91 |
| (5) My manager follows different rules when dealing with different salespeople. | $\lambda_{25}$ | .90 | .92 | .91 |
| (6) My manager does not favor one salesperson over another. | $\lambda_{26}$ | .84 | .92 | .93 |
| (7) My manager applies policies consistently to all salespeople. | $\lambda_{27}$ | .72 | .90 | .86 |
| (8) My manager follows fair procedures in decision making. | $\lambda_{28}$ | .78 | .81 | .68 |
| (9) All salespeople are treated equally by my manager. | $\lambda_{29}$ | .83 | .91 | .87 |
| | $\alpha$ | .94 | .97 | .95 |
| | $\rho$ | .96 | .97 | .96 |
| | AVE | .66 | .74 | .74 |
| *Distributive justice* | | | | |
| To what extent are you fairly rewarded | | | | |
| (1) …for the investments in time and energy that you have made to support your company? | $\lambda_{11}$ | .78 | .84 | .86 |
| (2) …for the roles assigned to you? | $\lambda_{12}$ | .83 | .84 | .82 |
| (3) …compared to what your company earns from your sales? | $\lambda_{13}$ | .82 | .89 | .82 |
| (4) …compared to the contributions you make to your company's marketing effort? | $\lambda_{14}$ | .87 | .81 | .86 |
| (5) …considering the responsibilities you have? | $\lambda_{15}$ | .87 | .86 | .89 |
| (6) …for the amount of effort you put forth? | $\lambda_{16}$ | .85 | .91 | .79 |
| (7) …for the risks and exposure due to working for your company? | $\lambda_{17}$ | .78 | .74 | .86 |
| (8) …for the work you have done well? | $\lambda_{18}$ | .86 | .90 | .89 |
| | $\alpha$ | .95 | .95 | .95 |
| | $\rho$ | .95 | .95 | .95 |
| | AVE | .69 | .72 | .72 |

Sample 1: $\chi^2$ (118*df*)=272; CFI=.91; TLI=.90; IFI=.92; SRMR=.04; $\Phi_{12}$=.19; $P$<.05.
Sample 2: $\chi^2$ (118*df*)=329; CFI=.92; TLI=.91; IFI=.92; SRMR=.05; $\Phi_{12}$=.48; $P$<.01.
Sample 3: $\chi^2$ (118*df*)=238; CFI=.95; TLI=.94; IFI=.95; SRMR=.05; $\Phi_{12}$=.45; $P$<.01.

A preliminary confirmation of the DIST and PRO factors was conducted using principal components analysis with no restrictions placed on the number of factors to be extracted. A varimax rotated factor pattern confirmed two factors with eigenvalues of 8.88 (DIST) and 5.12 (PRO), accounting for 70% of the variance. All items loaded highest on the appropriate factors. One low loading item on the PRO scale was eliminated.

Next, we subjected the items to CFA. A CFA offers a strong test of internal/external validity. By including measurement variances, CFA provides a stronger test of validity than is offered by PCA (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

A two-factor model was specified to represent the two correlated factors DIST and PRO such that no error variances were allowed to correlate. Following recommendations by Bagozzi and Yi (1988), a thorough examination of the results showed that all of the items loaded on their respective factors. One item from the PRO scale had strong error variance cross-loadings and standardized residuals and was eliminated from the scale. Additionally, it appeared that one item on the DIST scale had low loadings due to the fact that the item was based on a comparison to other sales people (equality-based distributive justice) rather than a comparison to inputs (equity-based distributive justice). Therefore, that item was also eliminated.

A second analysis found high loadings again on the appropriate factors and no cross-loadings. A variety of fit statistics are presented at the bottom of Table 1. An examination of the overall fit indices, standardized residuals, squared multiple correlations, and modification indices indicated that the items and the two-factor model had good fit. The $\chi^2$ was 272 (118*df*). The TLI (Tucker and Lewis, 1973) and the CFI (Bentler, 1990) were .90 and .91, respectively. These are both above recommended levels Bentler, 1990, Bollen, 1989. The IFI (Bollen, 1989) was also high at .92. The completely standardized loadings are in Table 1.

Internal consistency, assessed via Cronbach's (1951) $\alpha$, is presented in Table 1. The eight items for DIST had an $\alpha$ of .95. Closer inspection indicated that all items had item-to-total correlations greater than .75. The $\alpha$ for PRO was .94 and item-to-total correlations for all nine items were .74 or above. The $\rho$ values were .95 and .94 for DIST and PRO, respectively. The AVEs were also above recommended levels. The DIST factor accounted for 69% of the variance in the eight distributive justice items and the PRO factor accounted for 66% of the variance in the nine procedural justice items. The correlations for the relationship between PRO and DIST can be seen in the lower right side of Table 1. Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the squared correlation between factors with the AVEs of each construct (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). A comparison of the squared correlation of .036 to the AVEs for both distributive and procedural justice shows strong discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Final scale items for DIST and PRO are shown in Table 1.

5.3. Sample 2

The procedures used to contact salespeople for this sample were identical to those used in Sample 1. A total of 216 surveys were sent out, and 132 usable surveys were returned. Mean age of the respondents was 36 years. Seventy percent was married and 70 percent was male. Fifty-five percent had a bachelor's degree or higher. Respondents averaged 9.5 years of sales experience. In addition to the antecedents of justice perceptions measured in the first sample, measures of *shared values*, *organizational commitment*, and *intent to turnover* were included.

The 17 justice scale items (eight for DIST and nine for PRO) were subjected to a second CFA. Completely standardized loadings, fit statistics, and indices for this CFA are presented in Table 1. The measurement model had a $\chi^2$ of 329 (118*df*). The TLI was .91 and the CFI and IFI were

both .92. The $\alpha$ values for the DIST and PRO scales were .95 and .97, respectively, consistent with findings from Sample 1. The $\rho$ for DIST was .95, and the $\rho$ for PRO was .97. The AVEs indicated that DIST accounted for 72% of the variance in its eight manifest measures, and PRO accounted for 74% of the variance in the manifest measures. A comparison of the squared correlation of .23 with the AVEs of the two measures supports discriminant validity.

### 5.4. Sample 3

A third sample was employed to further validate the scales. A total of 347 surveys were mailed and 143 usable surveys were received. Mean age of the respondents was 37 years. Sixty-six percent was married and 80 percent was male. Fifty-three percent had a bachelor's degree or higher. On average, they had 12 years of experience.

The survey included the five antecedents measured in Sample 2 as well as a single outcome (*job satisfaction*). Similar to the previous analyses, the 17 justice items were subjected to a CFA. All items were retained after the analysis. Fit for the measurement model was once again very strong. The completely standardized loadings are presented in Table 1. The $\chi^2$ was 238 (118*df*). The TLI, CFI, and IFI were .94, .95, and .95, respectively.

$\alpha$ and $\rho$ for DIST were both .95 and the AVE was .72. For PRO, $\alpha$ was .95, the $\rho$ was .96, and the AVE was .74. Discriminant validity was again confirmed as the AVEs were much higher than .20, which is the square of the correlation between the constructs. These analyses confirm the two-factor structure of DIST and PRO and provide overwhelming evidence of their convergent and discriminant validities. Furthermore, both scales have high levels of internal consistency and internal reliability, and account for substantial amounts of the variance.

### 5.5. Correlation results

The correlations between DIST and PRO and the other constructs measured in the study are presented in Table 2. Predicted differences in the relationships were tested using Cohen and Cohen's (1975) formula. In general, predictions were supported by the analysis, as 36 of 40 predicted relationships were supported. Although only DIST was predicted to be related to *decision influence*, PRO was also significantly correlated in all three samples. Also, the predicted relationship between DIST and *feedback* was found in only two of the three samples.

Predictions were made concerning the relative magnitudes of the relationships. More specifically, it was predicted that DIST and PRO were both correlated with *relationalism* and *organizational commitment*, with PRO having the highest correlation. Of the five pairs of correlations, PRO was more highly correlated with relationalism but not *organizational commitment*. The relationship between DIST and PRO was predicted to be positive and the correlations were .19, .48, and .45, respectively for Samples 1, 2, and 3. The relationship was significant in all three samples. Overall, the pattern of correlations found across the three samples supports the construct validity of the measurement scales.

**Table 2.** Correlations with other variables

| Measure | Number of items | Sign[a] | Sample 1 | | | Sample 2 | | | Sample 3 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *α* | DIST | PRO | *α* | DIST | PRO | *α* | DIST | PRO |
| *Antecedents* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decision influence | 6 | +[b] | .92 | .38 | .30 | .94 | .47 | .45 | .92 | .35 | .34 |
| Relationalism | 9 | +[c] | .95 | .47 | .60* | .96 | .55 | .65* | .93 | .49 | .61** |
| Standing | 5 | + | .91 | .40 | .53 | .92 | .46 | .71** | .89 | .47 | .67** |
| Feedback | 7 | + | .93 | .18[b] | .38** | .95 | .30 | .58 | .94 | .53 | .55 |
| Shared values | 7 | + | | | | .96 | .45 | .72** | .95 | .50 | .64** |
| *Outcomes* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organizational commitment | 8 | +[c] | .95 | .55 | .42 | .96 | .56 | .46 | | | |
| Turnover | 6 | − | .93 | −.49 | −.34* | .92 | −.50 | −.38* | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 4 | + | .87 | .54 | .33** | | | | .90 | .42 | .31 |

[a] Expected direction of relationship.
[b] No predicted relationship for PRO.
[c] Higher expected relationship for PRO.
[d] Correlation is not significant at .05.
* Significantly different, $P<.10$.
** Significantly different, $P<.05$.

## 6. Discussion

This research was designed to develop and validate measures of distributive and procedural justice for use in research examining salesperson–sales manager relationships. The scales developed by this study evidenced acceptable levels of internal consistency and discriminant validity. Dimensionality was stable across three independent samples. Further, the measures evidenced acceptable construct validity. In three separate analyses, the justice measures performed as predicted relative to differences and similarities across the justice factors and various job-related constructs.

This study also verifies the importance of interpersonal justice in sales management. Previous research indicates that justice is important when examining a firm's relationships with its customers. Salesperson perceptions of just treatment are related to attitudes/behaviors such as job satisfaction, trust in the sales manager, organizational commitment, and intention to leave.

Findings from this study suggest that it is important for a sales organization to focus on insuring that managerial actions are perceived by salespeople as being just. This can be accomplished in several ways. First, clearly defining how decisions are made and disseminating that information to salespeople will likely improve perceptions of procedural justice. Providing information as to the specific criteria that will be used in making decisions on pay raises, quota setting, territory assignment, and other actions that sales managers take can help improve perceptions of distributive justice. Further, if salespeople know and understand how criteria are used to make decisions, they may be more motivated to work toward specific goals.

### 6.1. Future research and limitations

The current study suggests several directions for future research. First, additional validation is needed for the proposed measures. Although we tested our scales with three independent samples

of salespeople from diverse firms, further validation of the scales may be necessary in other settings. Future sales and organizational research would do well to address the issue of interactional justice (Bies and Shapiro, 1987). Research among retail customers suggests that the process through which complaints are resolved can affect feelings and perceptions of justice (injustice). These constructs may be helpful in extending our understanding of the dynamics of sales manager–salesperson relationships.

Identifying additional interpersonal outcomes of the sales manager–salesperson dyad would add greater depth to our understanding of justice in sales settings. Do perceptions of justice on the part of salespeople affect liking for sales managers? Are salespeople who perceive that they have been treated justly more likely to perform better than salespeople who believe that they have not been treated justly?

One limitation of this study is that the DIST and PRO scales presented do not provide a multidimensional assessment of those two types of justice. Though these scales assess a general measure of both distributive and procedural justice, we focused on developing single dimension measures for both distributive and procedural justice. Future studies may attempt to expand the measurement of each component of justice using multidimensions of the constructs.

Another limitation involves the cross-sectional, self-report nature of the study. Our study was not an experimental design; therefore, our results are strictly correlational in nature and do not allow us to make statements about the causality of relationships between distributive or procedural justice and other job-related measures. All that can be concluded from this study is that these constructs are related at one point in time.

## 7. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate scales for the measurement of distributive and procedural justice for use in a sales force context. Based on conceptual definitions, scales were developed and confirmed. The convergent and discriminant validities of these scales, as well as measures of internal consistency, all meet high standards. Predicted differential correlations were also supported in the three independent samples. In the end, the study provides valid and reliable justice scales to be used in future sales research.

## References

Adams JS. Inequity in social exchange. In: Berkowitz L, editor. Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press; 1965. p. 267–99.

Anderson JC, Gerbing DW. Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two step approach. Psychol Bull 1988;103(3):411– 23.

Aquino K, Griffeth RW, Allen DG, Hom PW. Integrating justice constructs into the turnover process: a test of referent cognitions model. Acad Manage J 1997;40(5):1208– 27.

Armstrong-Stassen M. The effect of gender and organizational level on how survivors appraise and cope with organizational downsizing. J Appl Behav Sci 1998;34(2):125 –42.

Bagozzi RP, Yi Y. On the evaluation of structural equation models. J Acad Mark Sci 1988;16(1):74 – 94.

Bentler PM. Comparative fit indices in structural models. Psychol Bull 1990;107(2):238– 46.

Bettencourt LA, Brown SW. Contact employees: relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. J Retail 1997;73:39 – 61 (Spring).

Bies RJ, Shapiro DL. Interactional fairness judgments: the influence of causal accounts. Soc Justice Res 1987;1:199– 218.

Blau PM. Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley; 1964.

Blodgett JG, Hill DJ, Tax SS. The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on postcomplaint behavior. J Retail 1997;73(2): 185– 210.

Bollen KA. Structural equations with latent variables. New York: Wiley; 1989.

Brown SP, Peterson RA. Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. J Mark Res 1993;30:63– 77 (February).

Brown SP, Peterson RA. The effects of effort on sales performance and job satisfaction. J Mark 1994;58:70 – 80 (April).

Chatman JA. Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms. Adm Sci Q 1991;36:459 – 84 (September).

Churchill GA. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. J Mark Res 1979;16:64–73 (February).

Churchill GA, Ford NM, Walker OC. Salesforce management. Irwin: Boston MA; 1997.

Cohen J, Cohen P. Applied multiple correlation/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale (NJ): Erlbaum; 1975.

Conlon DE, Fasolo PM. Influence of speed of third-party intervention and outcome on negotiator and constituent fairness judgments. Acad Manage J 1990;33(4):833–46.

Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika 1951;16:297–334 (September).

Dailey RC, Delaney KJ. Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job satisfaction and intent to turnover. Hum Relat 1992;45:305– 17 (March).

DeCarlo TE, Leigh TW. Impact of salesperson attraction on sales managers' attributions and feedback. J Mark 1996;60:47–66 (April).

Deutsch M. Distributive justice. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 1985.

Dittrich JE, Carrell MR. Organizational equity perceptions. Employee job satisfaction, and departmental absence and turnover rates. Organ Behav Hum Perform 1979;24:29 –40 (August).

Dubinsky AJ, Levy M. Influence of organizational fairness on work outcomes of retail salespeople. J Retail 1989;65:221– 52 (Summer).

Folger R, Greenberg J. Procedural justice: an interpretive analysis of personnel systems. Res Pers Hum Res Manage 1985;3:141– 83.

Folger R, Konovsky MA. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. Acad Manage J 1989;32(1):115–30.

Fornell C, Larcker DF. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. J Mark Res 1981;18:39–50 (February).

Fryxell GE, Gordon ME. Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of satisfaction with union and management. Acad Manage J 1989;32(4):851– 66.

Gerbing DW, Anderson JC. An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. J Mark Res 1988; 25:186– 92 (May).

Giacobbe-Miller J. A test of the group values and control models of procedural justice from the competing perspectives of labor and management. Pers Psychol 1995;48(1):115–42.

Gilliland SW. The perceived fairness of selection systems: an organizational justice. Acad Manage Rev 1993;18(4):694– 734.

Gilliland SW, Beckstein BA. Procedural and distributive justice in the editorial review process. Pers Psychol 1996;49(3):669– 91.

Greenberg J. The intellectual adolescence of organizational justice: you've come a long way, maybe. Soc Justice Res 1993;6(1):135–48.

Gundlach GT, Achrol RS, Mentzer JT. The structure of commitment in exchange. J Mark 1995;59:78–92 (January).

Hom PW, Griffeth RW. Structural equations modeling test of a turnover theory: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. J Appl Psychol 1991;76(3):350– 66.

Jaworski BJ, Kohli AJ. Supervisor feedback: alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. J Mark Res 1991;28:190–201 (May).

Konovsky MA. Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. J Manage 2000;26(3):489 –511.

Kumar N, Scheer LK, Steenkamp JBEM. The effects of supplier fairness on vulnerable resellers. J Mark Res 1995;32:54–65 (February).

Lind EA, Tyler TR. The social psychology of justice. New York: Plenum; 1988.

Mansour-Cole DM, Scott GS. Hearing it through the grapevine: the influence of source, leader-relations, and legitimacy on survivors' fairness perceptions. Pers Psychol 1998;51(1):25–53.

McNeilly KM, Lawson MB. Navigating through rough waters: the importance of trust in managing sales representatives in times of change. Ind Mark Manage 1999;28(1):37 – 49.

Mowday RT, Steers RM, Porter LW. The measure of organizational commitment. J Voc Behav 1990;14:224– 47 (October).

Netemeyer RG, Boles JS, McKee DO, McMurrian R. An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. J Mark 1997;61(3):85–98.

Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB. Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. J Mark Res 1994;22:185–91 (May).

Price JP, Mueller CW. Handbook of organizational measurement. Marchfield (MA): Pittman, 1986.

Roberts JA, Coulson KR, Chonko LB. Salesperson perceptions of equity and justice and their impact on organizational commitment and turnover. J Mark Theor Practice 1999;7(1):1–16 (Winter).

Sheppard BH, Lewicki RJ, Minton JW. Organizational justice: the search for fairness in the workplace. New York (NY): Lexington Books, 1992.

Thibaut JW, Walker L. Procedural justice: a psychological analysis. Hillsdale (NJ): Erlbaum; 1975.

Tucker LR, Lewis C. A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. Psychometrika 1973;38:1–10.

Tyler TR. The psychology of procedural justice: a test of the group values model. J Pers Soc Psychol 1989;57:330–8 (November).

Tyler TR. The psychological models of the justice motive: antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. J Pers Soc Psychol 1994;67:850–63 (November).

Tyler TR, Lind EA. A relational model of authority in groups. In: Zanna M, editor. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, vol. 25. San Diego: Academic Press; 1992. p. 115–92.

Welbourne T, Balkin DB, Gomez-Mejia LR. Gainsharing and mutual monitoring: a combined agency– organizational justice interpretation. Acad Manage J 1995;38:881–99.