

Cross-Cultural Examination of Organizational Justice: Trends, Dynamics, and Future Directions

Hajar BOUDRAINE

Laboratory of Researches in Management and Organizational Sciences

National School of Business and Management

Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

Hamid AIT LEMQEDDEM

Laboratory of Researches in Management and Organizational Sciences

National School of Business and Management

Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

Abstract : studying justice in a cross cultural approach ,requires researchers to consider the risks and complexities inherent in the field.On one hand there is the need to accurately capture the multidimensionality that characterises the cross cultural justice field .On the other hand, it is obvious that ,many studies attempting to articulate predictive "culture-justice-outcome models" have produced inconsistent and mixed findings. At this level of analysis, these elements contribute to strengthening confusion effects, while there is still a need for an overarching theoretical framework that would guide researchers in finding the right answers to adequately formulated questions .That is why we aimed, through this essay, to provide valuable assistance to new researchers, helping them feel less disoriented and more knowledgeable about the intricate field of cross-cultural justice research.The essay will provide an opportunity to propose various criteria that researchers can use to determine how to position their research problem within the current state of knowledge. By outlining these criteria, we aim to facilitate a more informed approach to framing research questions and exploring relevant issues in the field.Moreover, our objective is to present a comprehensive analytical overview of the chronological development of research in this domain by describing and examining the three main phases, while highlighting various approaches that connect the constructs of culture and justice, such as the motivational foundations of justice and the target similarity model (TSM). By doing so, we hope to create a clearer understanding of how these elements interact and evolve over time.We choose to close the essay by a set of personal reflexions and formal point of view about the current state and future areas of research, while highlighting some methodological suggestions.

Keywords : organizational justice ,cultural dimensions ,fairness perception ,justice outcome

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14215731>



1. Introduction

Studying organizational justice as a whole in the academic field would do justice to the significant, yet often underestimated, benefits and insights that researchers could gain by delving into its structural and functional components. Apart from being a fundamental aspect that captures, nowadays, the attention of various entrepreneurial, social, and governmental strategies, it is considered one of the typically moral constructs that are still universally able to lead the organization-employee relationship to different levels.

The issue of justice in the workplace is becoming, today more than ever, more exciting and relevant for researchers, along with all the structural changes that occur in the international socioeconomic area. The world is witnessing the proliferation of communities that are intensively open to universal opportunities, and are able to imagine the possibility of worldwide economic collaboration, regardless of cultural or geographic borders, emphasizing a shift towards greater inclusivity. Nevertheless, This openness that allows richer interactions and a huge potential for growth, is not without challenges, as it implies, along with the required adaptability, a remarkable diversity and complexity within those professional contexts.

Studying justice cross culturally asserts itself, and emerges as essential in such context. It enables researchers to develop a holistic and deep understanding of basic components related to the construct of organizational justice, making it easy then to engage in more specific and targeted studies, such as those aiming to check the universality of justice principles or outcomes. Ultimately, This proactive approach can lead to managerial implications, helping multicultural managers and firms better understand the requirements and behaviours of their target communities (Skarlicki, 2001).

In this essay, our major concern will be to address the dynamics that exist in the research field that integrates both organizational justice and national culture constructs, where researchers examine how cultural values and norms influence parameters of fairness within organizations. Hence, our primary objective is to enable any researcher to gain a clear, comprehensive, and holistic vision of the current state of knowledge surrounding this multidimensional subject. We aim to provide a thorough understanding that encompasses deeper insights into the various aspects and perspectives of the subject, facilitating informed decision-making for future research and global methodological choices.

In pursuing this goal, we believe it is essential to begin by outlining the fundamental principles that most researchers rely on to underpin their hypotheses and motivations in enhancing multicultural justice studies. In addition to that, we will be exposing different perspectives adopted by those researchers, and how they chose to approach the subject when dealing with the multifaceted issues examined to date in this field. The second part of this essay will present, in a non-exhaustive manner, major dynamics and tendencies that have been examined, describing also the current state of knowledge and all the changes that are occurring.

As a conclusion, The third and last part of this essay will be an opportunity, for us, to highlight our personal reflexions and views about this research field and help identify other areas for improvement that future researchers May consider.

2. Methodology

As part of our thesis project, this essay sets basic foundations — and may be taken as a starting step — for a more developed and detailed literature review in the field, which inspired us to use a relatively similar methodology. Firstly, Our investigation began by examining key academic references that established the concept of organizational justice since its inception, after what, We aimed to construct a summarized view of its development over time, focusing particularly on the methodologies and operationalizations employed in the research.

Initially, our primary concern is to make sure we cover the most relevant facets and aspects, before transitioning towards cross cultural justice studies, for instance, This first phase revealed that justice was nearly all times considered in research as a subjective perception rather than an objective reality.

In the second phase, we judged it efficient to explore comparative studies that would allow us apprehend different perspectives adopted by researchers in this field, while aiming simultaneously to identify stable models or trends guiding perceptions of justice worldwide. Here, the inconsistency emerged as a dominant characteristic in the findings. This prompted us to shift focus towards meta-analytical studies, which we anticipated would clarify this inconsistency by increasing the overall sample size, thereby improving statistical power. The larger sample sizes achieved through meta-analysis would enhance the generalizability of findings to broader populations and also help reduce biases that might occur in individual studies by considering a wider range of research.

The fourth phase was an invitation to explore remarkable theoretical contributions that were more about commenting on the state of knowledge and addressing gaps and recommendations such as (Greenberg 2001).

All the phases provided a deep understanding of the various dynamics characterizing this field, which we organized and analyzed thematically. This proactive approach allowed us to gain a comprehensive overview of the chronological development in cross-cultural justice research while simultaneously fostering personal reflections on the topic

3. How is the cultural-justice fact approached in the cross cultural literature ?

As stated by (Birnbbaum-More & Wong, 1995), « *Justice principles that align with cultural values are likely to be more acceptable and perceived as fairer than those that contradict these values* », hence, Evaluating justice involves assessing the consistency between three types of outcomes received by the individual, and the norms valued by the individual. At this level of analysis, researchers agree that employees use specific criteria to evaluate the fairness of situations and people behaviours. It is primarily the extent to which the organization and its representatives adhere to these criteria that shapes employees' perceptions of organizational justice. Therefore, it is acknowledged that the determining factors for judgments of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice rely on the compatibility between—on one hand—the characteristics of the outcomes received, the decision-making procedures related to all types of outcomes, and the interpersonal behaviours of authority figures, and —on the other hand—the norms and principles of justice valued by the individual.

Thus, the information that individuals use to assess the fairness of outcomes, procedures, and the behaviours of authority figures primarily comes from their experiences with these three elements.

Extensive research over the years has demonstrated that individuals' perceptions of fairness are significantly influenced by the norms and values they hold (Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, & Schminke, 2001; Greenberg & Colquitt). What people consider fair largely depends on their exposure to commonly accepted beliefs about the appropriate distribution of outcomes and treatment of others. This ongoing exposure shapes expectations that inform their evaluations of fairness; behaviours that conform to these expectations are viewed as fair (Greenberg, 2001), while those that diverge are seen as unfair. As a result, differing perceptions of fairness can emerge because individuals internalise varying norms and values, often shaped by their cultural backgrounds.

As far as anthropology is concerned, it has been long asserted that national culture reflects the shared norms and values of a population, serving as a framework for socially transmitted expectations regarding behavior (Williams, 1993). The differences in norms and values across countries help define their cultures and account for variations in fairness perceptions. Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of justice perceptions must consider the impact of national culture. This aligns with Durkheim's (1960) observation according to which « ... Social facts depend mainly on the social system to which they belong; thus, they cannot be fully examined when considered in isolation to that social frame ». Consequently, understanding perceptions of fairness necessitates an awareness of the prevailing norms within the cultural contexts in which individuals exist.

While the necessity of considering culture in the study of organizational justice appears now to be both reasonable and accurate, El Akremi (2009) also emphasises that culture interferes at two levels:

- Impacting Perception: Culture influences how individuals perceive justice within their organizational contexts. This means that what is considered fair or just can vary significantly depending on cultural background.
- Moderating Outcomes: Culture also affects the behavioural and attitudinal outcomes related to justice. Different cultural norms can shape how individuals respond to perceived justice or injustice in the workplace.

This dual-level impact underscores the importance of considering cultural factors when studying organizational justice.

In order to give clear insight of different types of researches conducted around this linkage, it stands out as significant, to proceed by presenting criteria that make studies different from one another.

- The first criterion is basically about the perspective upon which the researcher chooses whether to consider the country or the national culture declining from it. At this level, it is noteworthy to indicate that if the choice is made for the second option, it becomes fundamental to integrate national culture dimensions already developed in the theoretical frame related to this construct. At this stage of defining study objectives, the researcher must also decide whether to integrate cultural values measured at the country level or the individual level.
- The second criterion is about whether the conducted study aims to proceed by comparing results from two or more non-North American countries, or, as a second option, collecting data from a single non-North American country, in order to explore the extent to which findings differ from those observed in North America, the 'original land' on which the concept of organizational justice appeared for the first time.
- As a third criterion, studies about cross cultural justice, can also be categorised according to the main targeted aspect in the culture justice linkage. As a first concern, researchers may study how the basic justice-outcome relation differs among cultures. As a second option, researchers may choose to

study differences related to justice preferences. This may include examining intra-dimension preferences (Operationalization rules within each facet) or inter-dimension preferences (the three facets of organizational justice).

- As far as the evaluation of justice is concerned, the fourth criterion suggests that the researcher may choose to examine overall fairness perception without considering each facet separately. Prior Justice theory asserts that individuals develop perceptions related to different types of justice (Colquitt, 2001). However, this fragmentation within the organizational justice framework can pose certain limitations. In practical scenarios, factors such as challenging work conditions, high performance demands, and limited cognitive resources complicate the separate assessment of fairness dimensions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Nicklin et al., 2014). Consequently, the concept of overall justice has emerged in the early twenty-first century. As defined by Cropanzano and Molina (2015, p. 382), overall justice refers to the process by which "individuals form global judgments of how they are treated," rather than viewing distinct types of justice as separate components of a larger puzzle. In the context of organizational life, employees are less focused on specific types of justice; instead, they evaluate and respond to experiences based on their broader overall perspective. Importantly, the concept of overall justice does not dismiss the relevance of fairness dimensions. When individuals articulate a global judgment, they have effectively processed specific perceptions of justice in a "bottom-up" manner (Russell Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).
- Regarding methodological choices, while specific references explicitly stating that quantitative surveys are "the most used technique" may not be directly articulated, both Robert J. Folger and Kirkman & Shapiro discuss the prevalence and effectiveness of quantitative methods in this field. Robert J. Folger, in his various publications, underscores the widespread use of surveys in organizational justice research, implying that this methodology holds a dominant position. Additionally, Kirkman & Shapiro (2001) emphasise the importance of quantitative approaches for examining cultural differences in organizational justice, suggesting that such methods are commonly utilised in the discipline.
- The last element that helps categorise vast array of studies ,conducted in the cross cultural Organizational justice field , is again related to the chosen conceptualization of justice to be evaluated . Hereby, two main approaches appear as options; the event-based approach and the general approach,(Thibaut and Walker ,1975).
 - Event-Based Approach:This approach focuses on specific situations within the organization, such as:Performance evaluations, Promotion practices,Conflict management.... In these cases ,Research often relies on case studies or surveys related to specific events, allowing for analysis of how perceptions of justice evolve in response to particular incidents.
 - The general approach to examining organizational justice encompasses a broad theoretical framework that integrates several key components. It includes justice theories, such as distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, which explore how fairness is perceived in different contexts. For instance ,this approach May consider organizational culture, investigating how the unique cultural attributes of an organization shape employees' perceptions of justice,or it can also emphasizes the impact of perceived justice on employee well-being, focusing on the long-term effects on job satisfaction and performance... This approach aims to establish overarching models and principles that can be applied to various organizational situations.

Each of these approaches allow a unique perspective on organizational justice, and both can be complementary for a comprehensive understanding of the subject. Empirical research can integrate both to offer a solid overall view.

The aggregation of all these elements, while constructing any research problematic and methodology, may lead to think that we are witnessing a scientifically mature field in terms of concepts and theories. However, many authors still hesitate to deem it as a fully developed body of literature. This hesitation is reasonable given the existing divergences in some basic and structural ideas.(more elements will be explored further in greater details).

4. What is the current state of the literature on cross-cultural organizational justice?

4.1. A summarising timeline:

In the field of cross-cultural organizational justice, research in the 1970s was characterised by a fragmented landscape, where the results formed a puzzle of disparate information. These initial studies, often limited in scope and methodology, struggled to provide clear conclusions on how justice was perceived and experienced across different cultures. Variations in results were often attributed to cultural factors that were not genuinely considered in the studies, complicating the development of a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

However, starting in the 1980s, a significant transformation occurred with the integration of Hofstede's theory (1980, 1984). This theory offered a systematic framework for exploring the cultural dimensions that influence perceptions of justice, with power distance emerging as the most studied cultural value. By providing an analytical structure to the study of intercultural justice, Hofstede's theory enabled researchers to better understand how these cultural dimensions shape employees' expectations and reactions to organizational justice practices (Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996); Mäkelä, L., & Häkinen, L. (2002); Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. (2015)).

In the 1990s, research continued to evolve with the introduction of the concept of situational interaction, as highlighted by Morris and Leung (2000). This approach emphasised that perceptions of justice cannot be fully understood without considering the specific contexts in which they manifest. By recognising that justice is influenced by both cultural and situational factors, alongside the contribution of the Target Similarity Model, all these perspectives have enriched the understanding of justice dynamics within multicultural organizations. To better assess this chronological scientific progress in the field, here is a timeline that highlights the evolution of cross-cultural organizational justice research, showcasing key developments and concepts.

- 1970s to 1980s:

Initial comparative justice-outcome studies, focusing primarily on distributive and procedural justice.

Research characterised by a fragmented landscape with heterogeneous results, often lacking cultural considerations.

- During 1980s:

- Introduction of Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (1980, 1984).

This framework provides a systematic approach to understanding how cultural factors, such as power distance, influence justice perceptions.

- **Late 1990s - Early 2000s:**

- Emergence of the Target Similarity Model (TSM), emphasising the role of perceived similarity between individuals and justice targets.
- Researchers begin to examine how social identity and cultural context affect fairness perceptions.
- Introduction of the concept of situational interaction (Morris & Leung, 2000), emphasising the context in which justice is perceived.
- Recognition that justice evaluations are influenced by both cultural and situational factors.

- **2000s to Present:**

- Continued exploration of how TSM interacts with various cultural dimensions, justice motives and situational particularities

the next three sections, are an attempt to address the specificities of each of the three first phases, mentioned above in the timeline

4.2. Born locally, but measured universally:

At first glance, studying organizational justice around the world may appear simplistic and overstated, particularly for those who have not delved deeply into the current and ongoing findings in this field. However, what is really understated here, is the cruciality of the questions one should ask. It's only after selecting the right initial question that one can judge whether it is worth all the huge efforts deployed till today.

A brief overview of the cross-cultural justice research field reveals that the most popular type of study examines the link between organizational justice and outcomes across multiple countries by evaluating perceptions of fairness among each facet of organizational justice.

Here are a few examples out of many findings on cross-cultural justice outcomes, highlighting specific countries:

- **Procedural Justice in the U.S. and Japan:** Research by Morris and Leung (2000) found that procedural justice positively influenced employee satisfaction in both the United States and Japan. Employees in both cultures reported higher levels of commitment when they perceived that procedures were fair, indicating a universal appreciation for fair processes.
- **Distributive Justice in India and the U.S.:** Pillai, Scandura, and Williams (1999) examined the effects of distributive justice in Indian and U.S. workplaces. They found that employees in both countries responded positively to perceptions of fairness in resource allocation, leading to enhanced job satisfaction and performance.

- **Interactional Justice in Germany and China:** Study: Research indicated that interactional justice—how fairly employees are treated by their supervisors—has a significant positive effect on employee morale in both Germany and China. Employees who felt respected and valued reported higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Zhang et al., 2015).
- **Universal Fairness Across Multiple Countries:** A study by Tyler et al. (1997) investigated fairness perceptions in various countries, including the U.S., Canada, Australia, and several European nations. The findings indicated that fairness perceptions led to increased trust in authorities and higher levels of cooperation in all cultures studied.

For further empirical results ,Meta analysis (Colquitt, J. A. (2008)-Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996)-Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003)-Nielsen, K., & Randall, R. (2013)-Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008),would provide a solid foundation for understanding cross-cultural organizational justice-outcome correlations.

Those studies, even-though they intend to measure the justice /fairness perception cross culturally, but what they actually do, is measuring behavioural and attitudinal variability across countries while linking it to standard-justice-measurement results -basically adopted from north America - and supposing that the created linkage is able to teach us a lot about the perception of justice .As Greenberg (2001) noted, this perspective provides rather insights into whether behaviour changes in response to varying situations and perceptions. However, it does not address the actual process of constructing perceptions of justice. Instead, it highlights the normative structures that underpin justice-related behaviours and reveals aspects of culture that are likely to influence these perceptions.

The standard justice measurement tools mentioned above reflect the operationalization of justice that was initially developed in North American countries, where the concept first emerged. Accordingly, the main question asked in those studies is: would the consequences observed in the homeland be similar in other parts of the world?.

Put differently, researchers are testing the stability of the North American justice-outcome model globally. As mentioned below, it would be scientifically questionable to conclude whether justice norms or perception formulation models are universal based solely on the invariability of justice outcomes.

Firstly, the measurement tools might not adequately cover all the real and effective aspects of justice expected by the populations in target non-North American cultures. Additionally, they may fail to provide evidence of a direct link between justice and outcomes, as these tools are not culturally sensitive and may not measure the entire construct. Furthermore, the outcomes might also be insensitive to variations in justice in a given cultural contexts.

Researchers in organizational justice have generally accepted that workplace fairness concerns are universal in nature (James, 1993; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997). This perspective aligns with the sociological insight that the normative regulation of behavior—such as the imposition of justice norms—is essential for social life across all cultures (Aberle, Cohen, Davis, Levy, & Sutton, 1950). As noted by Marieke C. Scilpzand et al. (2013), it is common to find a positive correlation between justice outcomes across different cultures. In their review of cross-cultural research, Morris and Leung (2000) observed that procedural justice typically yields similar positive effects in various countries. Similarly, Pillai, Scandura, and Williams (1999) contended that fairness can universally enhance job attitudes. Leung (2005) further supported this view by emphasising the universality of justice concerns, suggesting that a functionalist approach implies all societies prioritise justice for the benefits it brings to social

groups. At this level of reflexion ,we suggest that What would be particularly exciting and beneficial in managerial contexts is to conduct studies that assist multicultural managers in adapting this universal connection to meet both their own needs and those of their collaborators ,since , Justice concern is universal because of its functional rôle but its operationalization is particularistic ,Specifically, culture's influence on distributive justice and procedural justice may manifest itself in several different ways(Greenberg 2001).

4.3. *Larger than a country, rather consider the cultural construct*

In order to palliate all previously mentioned gaps in prior cross cultural justice studies, authors of the 1980s interested in justice issues , integrated cultural dimensions , considering a basic conclusion according to which dimensions and different operationalizations of organizational justice are culturally sensitive , and that Hofstede's dimensions could be a great foundation to embrace this sensitivity .Initially most of the studies channeled their efforts into examining distance to power and collectivism (Vs individualism)cultural dimensions(Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. 2002-Shao, R., Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D. P., & Jones, K. S. 2013).

Later , the two other cultural dimensions were considered as well while integrating cultural differences among communities. (Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1997)-Pillai, R., Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (1999)-Morris, M. W., & Leung, K. (2000)-Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. (2015)-Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010)-Zhang, Z., & Li, J. (2010) and others , channeled their efforts towards finding linkage between justice dimensions and Hofstede's cultural construct, in an attempt from them , to build a theoretical framework specific to the panels through which they intend to conduct the study .

To do so , either the authors engage in an attempt to find reasonable direct link between the cultural dimension and the justice dimension , basing on the fact that ,naturally, a theoretical fit exists between Hofstede's values and the organizational justice dimensions as stated by(Shao et al., 2013) (e.g.Steiner, Trahan, Haptonstahl et Fointiat, 2006-Kim et Mauborgne, 1996).Otherwise, authors would look for an other area in which the justice and culture would create significant dynamics , and that is the justice motives literature .At this level of reflexion, justice concern if justified through **four Motivational Foundations** that The literature consider as not mutually exclusive. The two traditional views of justice relate to material needs and self-esteem within the group (the instrumental and relational models) (Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, & Schminke, 2001), while the third, more recent view is based on morality (see Cropanzano, Goldman, & Folger, 2003). It is noteworthy here to indicate that these Foundations try to find answer to the question:why do individuals care about justice?

- *The Instrumental Motive(Introduced: Early 1970s)*

The instrumental model of organizational justice is based on the classical view that justice is important because it brings material rewards (cf. Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001; Shapiro, 1993). Furthermore, empirical studies support this instrumental view of justice, at least as a partial explanation; several have shown that individuals judge fair treatment primarily because it is in their interest (Shapiro & Brett, 1993), noting a positive correlation between salaries and perceptions of procedural justice (meta-analysis, Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). However, this view is limiting when justifying the importance of justice within the organization, as it risks overestimating this instrumental motive by assigning exclusive capacity to economic gains in justifying individuals' interest in justice. In this context, many studies have been unable to significantly verify the relevance of the instrumental model (cf. Giacobbe-Miller,

1995; Tyler, 1994). Additionally, researchers such as Conlon (1993), Cropanzano & Randall (1995), Krehbiel & Cropanzano (2000), Lind, Kanfer & Early (1990), and Shapiro & Brett (1993) have demonstrated in their research that the concern for justice and the associated feelings remain present even when economic gains are controlled.

- *The relational Motive(Introduced: Early to mid-1990s)*

This motive relies on the relationships between individuals to find justification for the importance given to the concept of organizational justice. Based on the same motivational foundation, two theoretical frameworks have emerged: the relational model and social exchange theory. The founders of the group value model—another name for the relational model—(Tyler & Lind, 1992) propose the idea of relational identity as a key element for individuals when determining the value accorded to them by the group, organization, or authority, by evaluating the fairness or unfairness of the procedures adopted by these entities towards them. This reflection is based on social identity theory, which posits that every individual has a need to belong to social groups (Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1998). Thus, individuals value justice because it indicates their position within the group; the level of respect that the group holds for the individual is systematically inferred from the judgment of procedural justice. It should be noted that much research has shown that the effect of procedures on this sense of self-worth or, conversely, this feeling of alienation, is not dependent on the rewards received (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

According to the relational model:

- The more important the group is to the individual, the more we find people who fear exclusion from their group, for whom the feeling of identification with the group is strong. Consequently, the sense of justice would be a crucial, if not vital, issue, which is why organizational justice becomes more significant when identification with the group is strong.
- There are three relational considerations that individuals take into account when evaluating the fairness/unfairness of a decision-making or treatment procedure: neutrality, benevolence, and recognition of status (or standing). The principle here is that if an authority figure treats group members with dignity and respect, it demonstrates sensitivity to the status of these members.

Furthermore, research has shown that when subordinates strongly identify with their supervisor, the effects of the aforementioned relational considerations were strong. Conversely, when subordinates had weak identification with their hierarchy, the effects were weak, and those of instrumental considerations (particularly the favorable outcome) proved to have strong effects.

Social Exchange Theory

According to modern exchange theories, individuals adjust their exchange strategies based on their relationships with others or with the organization. This exchange may be either economic or social, with these types positioned at opposite ends of a continuum.

When it comes to economic exchange, the transaction typically involves concrete, material elements; quid pro quo. Therefore, it would be limiting to say that the prevailing norm in such exchanges is profit maximization. It would be more appropriate to consider the norm of reciprocity at this analytical level, whereby individuals feel obligated to reciprocate benefits or favors received. Consequently, failing to

meet this obligation results in feelings of injustice, highlighting the explicit interest in the concept of justice, especially in organizational settings.

At the other end of the continuum lies social exchange, a situation in which the exchange concerns relatively abstract benefits such as values and/or feelings (e.g., emotional support, empathy, etc.). Key characteristics of social exchanges include commitment (Bishop & Scott, 2000; Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000; Deckop, Mangel, & Cirka, 1999), trust (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994), and a low emphasis on the urgency of rewards or the need for immediate reciprocation of favors extended to others. This represents a relationship invested in long-term logic and high-quality human interaction. Consequently, in organizations where individuals have social exchange relationships with their employer, we observe higher levels of job performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (Cropanzano et al.; Moorman et al., 1998; Masterson et al., 2000; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

In this regard, we can say that organizational justice can be viewed as a form of social exchange. Thus, particularly in organizational contexts, treatment perceived as fair is, in essence, an exchange in itself. This reflection has been strongly supported by integrative models that have attempted to demonstrate the strong link between organizational justice theories and social exchange. These currents have shown that procedural and interactional justice particularly engender social exchange-type relationships due to the quality of the relationship created; this relationship is perfectly suited to serve as a mediating element between justice (i.e., antecedent) and workplace behaviours.

Several social parameters have been integrated to drive research aimed at verifying and thereby supporting this theory:

- **Konovsky & Pugh (1994):** Procedural justice predicts trust, and trust predicts OCB; distributive justice has not shown significant links with these variables.
- **Moorman et al. (1998):** Procedural justice predicts perceived organizational support, which in turn predicts high levels of adherence to OCB.
- **Cropanzano et al. (2002):** The relationship between organizational justice and performance is mediated by the quality of the exchange between leader and subordinate (LMX model, see Liden et al., 1997; Wayne et al., 1997).

Recent research continues to acknowledge the importance of organizational justice in the development of social exchange relationships, while placing greater attention on the social entity that will experience the effects of this relationship. Masterson and colleagues (2000) stipulate that an employee may develop a social exchange relationship either with their immediate supervisor or with their employer as a whole.

- *Moral Motives of Justice(Introduced: Mid to late 1990s)*

Greenberg and Bien (1992) demonstrated a significant disconnect between organizational justice theories and business ethics. This finding is considered surprising given that both domains focus on the study of perceptions of moral conduct within organizations, highlighting the need to remember that it is a "moral" concept, whose importance is closely tied to ethics. That said, justice requires less external justification for the great interest derived from its application and evaluation. According to the previously cited motives, one would be interested in justice only because it promises economic advantages

(instrumental motive) and assurance regarding one's place and status within the group (interpersonal/relational motive); in those two cases, the intrinsic motive of justice was not considered at all.

In contrast to these two motives, theorists of business ethics adopt a broader view of organizational justice; doing what is right is considered to have value beyond the financial and social rewards it may bring (Halberstam, 1993; Henrich et al., 2001; Holley, 1999). By adopting this relevant approach, which bridges the gap between organizational justice and ethical considerations, one could argue that the interest accorded to organizational justice is partially based on a moral obligation; individuals adhere to norms of justice because they believe it aligns with moral duty and is the right thing to do

The Uncertainty Control Motive

The uncertainty control perspective (and its predecessor, fairness heuristic theory) suggests that individuals are concerned with justice because (a) they have an inherent need for certainty and predictability, and (b) employees' perceptions of justice can provide information that helps reduce uncertainties (Lind & van den Bos, 2002; van den Bos & Miedema, 2000). As proposed by van den Bos and colleagues, fairness judgments serve as heuristics for interpreting events. In other words, we care about how fairly we are treated by others because perceptions of justice provide us with an effective tool to navigate the uncertainties we encounter. Thus, individuals tend to react positively to fair treatment, as fairness perceptions can reduce uncertainty (e.g., regarding whether an authority figure is trustworthy) or at least alleviate the discomfort associated with uncertainty (Elovainio et al., 2005; van den Bos, Wilke, & Lind, 1998).

In contrast, people respond negatively to unfair treatment because perceptions of injustice can generate uncertainty, which in turn can exacerbate life's discomfort. For example, Reb, Goldman, Kray, and Cropanzano (2006) argued that perceptions of injustice (i.e., procedural injustice) can increase uncertainty by diminishing an individual's influence in the decision-making process. In summary, the uncertainty control perspective emphasizes uncertainty reduction as the primary assumption underlying individuals' concerns with justice: people respond positively to justice and negatively to injustice because fair treatment can reduce uncertainty, while injustice can increase it.

These four Justice motivational foundations are being integrated with cultural dimensions and justice perceptions by examining how different cultures prioritise various justice motives. For example, in collectivist cultures, individuals may be more driven by relational motives, valuing group harmony and interpersonal relationships, which influences their perceptions of fairness in organizational settings. In contrast, in individualistic cultures, instrumental motives may take precedence, with individuals focusing on personal gain and outcomes. Research could explore how these cultural dimensions impact employees' reactions to perceived injustices, suggesting that justice interventions need to be tailored to align with the predominant motives in each cultural context. This approach emphasises the interplay between cultural values and motivational foundations in shaping justice perceptions. These are Some of the authors that treated the subject from this perspective and their respective main hypothesis :

- Shao et al. (2013)

Hypothesis: Justice perceptions will vary across cultures due to differing justice motives, with cultural dimensions mediating these relationships.

- Rupp,D.E.,& Cropanzano,R.(2002)

Hypothesis: Justice motives (relational, instrumental, and moral) will mediate the relationship between social exchange factors and employee reactions to justice in the workplace.

- **Mäkelä, L., & Häkkinen, L. (2002)**

Hypothesis: Justice perceptions will differ across cultures, with cultural values influencing the relative importance of different justice motives (e.g., relational vs. instrumental) in shaping these perceptions.

- **Kim, P. H., & Kuo, S. (2015)**

Hypothesis: Employees' justice perceptions will vary across cultures due to differing cultural values, with relational motives being more significant in collectivist cultures and instrumental motives being more prominent in individualistic cultures.

Another recently added element to cultural configuration of the organizational justice is **The Target Similarity Model (TSM)** of justice, which posits that individuals are more likely to perceive justice when they see similarities between themselves and the decision-makers or authorities. When integrating TSM with cultural dimensions, researchers examine how cultural factors influence these perceptions of similarity.

For example, in collectivist cultures, where group identity and relationships are emphasised, individuals may feel a stronger sense of justice when they identify closely with leaders or peers. This could lead to higher justice perceptions if the leader shares similar cultural or social backgrounds. Conversely, in individualistic cultures, the emphasis might be on personal achievement, leading individuals to assess justice based more on outcomes rather than relational similarities.

Studies might explore how cultural dimensions, such as power distance or individualism-collectivism, affect the degree to which perceived similarity influences justice perceptions. This integration highlights the importance of considering cultural contexts in understanding how justice is experienced and enacted within organizations. These studies are examples recorded under this specific perspective:

- **Rupp & Cropanzano (2002):** This study explores how social exchange theory and justice motives, including relational motives, impact employee reactions across different cultures. The findings suggest that perceived similarity in interpersonal relationships can influence justice perceptions, which may vary based on cultural context.
- **Kim & Leung (2007):** This research examines the impact of cultural dimensions on procedural justice perceptions in teams. It found that in collectivist cultures, the perceived similarity among team members enhances justice perceptions, aligning with TSM principles.
- **Brockner et al. (2001):** This study investigates how group identity and the perceived similarity of decision-makers affect justice perceptions across cultures. It highlights that individuals from collectivist backgrounds may place greater importance on the perceived similarity of leaders.
- **Morris & Leung (2000):** Their review discusses how different cultural contexts impact justice perceptions and highlights the importance of similarity in relational justice, aligning with TSM concepts.

Cultural dimensions have also proven to be a significant factor in explaining various paradoxes in managerial applications. For instance, countries with high power distance—such as India, the Middle

East, and Colombia—tend to believe that transformational leadership, while being more participative and thus perceived as procedurally fair, does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction.

Research has shown that hierarchical cultures like India often prefer a more nurturing type of leadership, akin to the traditional model of parental authority (Pillai et al., 1999, p. 772). This preference may explain why employees in such cultures experience less injustice when a manager uses harsh language; it can be easier to accept criticism from an authoritative figure who resembles a parental role than from a participative manager.

In contrast, countries with lower power distance, such as the United States and Australia, associate participative management with both procedural justice and greater job satisfaction (Pillai, Scandura, & Williams, 1999).

Bass and Avolio (1994) highlight that while transformational leadership can enhance employee engagement and satisfaction, its effectiveness may be limited in high power distance contexts, where employees often expect more directive leadership rather than participative approaches. Similarly, Sosik and Godshalk (2000) found that employees in these cultures tend to value stability and clarity in leadership over participative methods. This creates a paradox: although transformational leadership is viewed positively, it may fail to enhance job satisfaction in high power distance environments.

In summary, these findings underscore the importance of cultural context in shaping perceptions of leadership effectiveness. Managers operating in high power distance cultures may need to adapt their approaches to align with local expectations to foster both fairness and job satisfaction.

4.4. Situation vs. Cultural Values: Interaction or Dissonance

The concept of situational interaction, as proposed by Morris and Leung (2000), underscores the role of context in shaping perceptions of justice. This framework indicates that individuals' assessments of fairness are influenced not only by universal standards but also by situational elements, including cultural norms and particular circumstances. By acknowledging the varying perceptions of justice across different contexts, the model illustrates how cultural values and situational factors converge to shape individuals' judgments about fairness. This perspective fosters a deeper understanding of organizational justice by considering the intricacies of cross-cultural interactions and the specific conditions surrounding justice situations.

The notion of situational interaction was introduced to overcome the shortcomings in the cultural analysis of justice perceptions. It emphasises that, while cultural values are crucial, the particular context and circumstances individuals face can greatly affect their justice perceptions. This perspective fosters a more detailed understanding of how justice is perceived in various cultural settings, recognising that both situational and cultural elements influence individuals' assessments and responses to fairness in organizational environments, (M. L., & Schminke, M. 2003-Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. 2015-Leung, K., & Morris, M. W. 2015).

The increasing interest attributed to the situational variable as another crucial determinant for justice perceptions, comes from the effective fact that culture has been shown ,in some empirical research, unable to predict the right tendency of variability among many dependent constructs.This conclusion challenged the strength of the cultural variable even when Hofstede's dimensions were integrated and

measured ,in a direct approach and even, when the motivational foundations of justice were considered(Shao et al., 2013).

The first example to mention at this level is from Morris et Leung (2000, p. 121) and Leung (2005, pp. 571, 576). These studies indicate that although interactional justice has shown weak effects in high power distance countries, it becomes evident that when another situational variable (the face concept) is violated, the effects are as pronounced as in low power distance countries. In other words, a high power distance individual in Taiwan might accept disrespectful criticism from their supervisor only if no peers are present to witness the situation; otherwise, the employee would perceive the situation as unjust and may react similarly to a low power distance individual—or even more negatively.

Another area that explicitly motivates the need for an interactive approach, while considering situational and cultural variables, is the effect of collectivism (vs. individualism) on preferences for distributive justice norms. In other words, while collectivistic cultures prioritise the equality rule in distributing organizational outcomes, this statement shows limitations when confronted with the element of group membership. Employees from countries with a strong collectivist culture prefer the criterion of equality primarily when it concerns members of their in-group. When they interact with outsiders, they believe that a distribution based on individual contributions is fairer. This ethnocentric perspective includes family members, friends, or, in a professional context, close partners. In contrast, individualistic societies adopt a more universal view of justice principles (Leung, 2005, p. 560);The further we move away from our in-group, the more we tend to shift the allocation rule towards contribution.

A third example may be presented following the same pattern, demonstrating again how managerial situations can sometimes override cultural values. A study comparing managers from Hong Kong and the U.S. found that both groups favored equality when tasks were interdependent or solidarity was required. However, they preferred equity when tasks were independent or focused on productivity(Chen, Meindl et Hui, 1998). Similarly, a review of studies on allocation criteria in EU countries revealed mixed results. One reason for this ambiguity is that some studies emphasised competition, which may have skewed preferences towards contribution and obscured the subtler effects of cultural variables.(Miles et Greenberg, 1993)).

The strength of the situational variable was also demonstrated in one of the few studies directly comparing criteria of equity, equality, and need between two Western countries (Steiner et al., 2006). The study involved American and French participants, who were tasked with allocating funds to students applying for financial aid at their university. According to Hofstede's typology, French values are less individualistic and less masculine than those of the United States. Consequently, the researchers hypothesised that Americans would prioritise the equity criterion (distribution based on academic excellence), while the French would place more emphasis on both equality (equal financial aid for each student) and need (considering the family's financial difficulties in funding the student's education). However, the salience of the notion of aid was such that participants from both countries deemed the distribution based on need to be the most fair in both experiment

In addition to all previous statements,(Ballet Jerome,2010) added also another element that challenges the static view of culture ;according to which ,cultural values can evolve rapidly in unexpected ways. Chen (1995) explains his surprising results by noting that, during periods of economic upheaval in the organization , Chinese employees increasingly prioritize productivity goals over their traditional values.

This shift leads them to favor new compensation criteria aligned with these objectives, even when such criteria conflict with their established traditions.

As far as procedural justice is concerned, studies collectively illustrate that while it's a universally valued principle, the specific judgments individuals make about fairness can be heavily influenced by contextual factors such as perceived hostility, the nature of the relationship between parties, and the competitive or cooperative nature of the situation. (Morris, Leung, and Iyengar (2004)) found that even when cultural values differ, participants from different backgrounds (e.g., Chinese and American) can respond similarly to particular contexts. For example, when one party perceives the other as uncooperative or hostile, both groups favoured more formal conflict resolution methods, such as autocratic decision-making, rather than negotiation. This suggests that situational cues can override cultural preferences. Moreover, Leung (1987) while comparing conflict resolution preferences among American and Hong Kong participants, found that both groups valued criteria that reduced animosity and provided control. However, the preferred models to be applied varied based on the specific context of the conflict, highlighting how situational factors can influence procedural justice judgments.

Along with situational variables and individual similarity concerns, studying culture while linked to justice field, obliges us to consider also the evolutionary character of culture, the intra culture variations and the role of peers' perceptions of justice in the constructing process of individual fairness perception, also known for The phenomenon of social contagion in perceptions of justice. This element refers to how individuals' views on fairness and justice can spread through social interactions, influencing one another's opinions and behaviours. This concept highlights the interconnectedness of social dynamics and individual perceptions, suggesting that one's sense of justice can be shaped by the attitudes and beliefs of those around them (Van der Linden, S., & Elffers, H. (2011)), and this is one of the reasons why measuring justice by perception can introduce biases.

Conclusion: A researcher's Reflexion on how to embrace intercultural justice

In light of previous findings, and as a researcher in this field, one may easily feel submerged and overwhelmed by the divergent empirical findings, to an extent that, trying to examine them through some comparative or aggregative approach, might seem to lead more to confusion than to clarity. In addition to that, we've come to a conclusion that this field is characterised by numerous distinct avenues of research and that it has developed into a multifaceted domain with various branches.

When a researcher conducts a literature review, the primary goal is to understand the current state of knowledge. This involves identifying existing research, trends, gaps, and key debates. However, it doesn't seem like this field is ready for such examination. Since it lacks elements that would allow considering it as whole integrated field, and by that we mean solemnly, the theoretical framework.

Despite significant efforts to theoretically integrate the two academic domains of organizational justice and culture, new researchers today are guided by the effective-still-random progress of findings and conclusions in this field. As mentioned in the first section, what made the findings relatively unpractical for theoretical progress, especially in the first era of the timeline, was in our opinion the inadequately formulated question to which the authors tried to find answer.

To rephrase, those studies were certainly able to answer questions but couldn't find answers to the right question. At this level of reflexion, we suggest that instead of wondering whether the justice is universal, by trying to measure the variability of north American findings in other non north American countries

,authors would rather ask : does justice ,as a social construct , have the same meaning across the world ,this , as far as our opinion is concerned would've helped a theoretical framework development , and also , a better management for scientific effort .In this case, mitigated findings across the world should have served as a starting point for more constructive research approaches, as also recommended by Greenberg (2001, p. 369): '...which makes them more useful for theory development than for theory testing.'"

With no pessimistic intention to neglect the importance and usefulness of all the quantitative studies conducted till today in this field , and while mentioning that our main concern is to help new researchers ,take benefit from the actual state of knowledge we've overviewed above ,We cannot help but emphasize that the first era of culture-justice research development was an unintended act of imposing the North American (NA) definition of justice by attempting to validate NA justice outcome models in other countries and cultures.

Hereby, we wouldn't consider it appropriate to judge the validity of such conclusions, since they are based on culturally insensitive definition of justice .A way to avoid that, was by integrating Hofstede's dimensions to the preexisting justice definition /model .However the main question remained unanswered ,Since all we could derive from such an approach is a set of inconsistent predictive models that link Hofstede's dimensions to « generic » justice dimensions and outcomes, which again lack adequate consideration of what justice truly means in those cultures .

Our vision here is that, for the sake of scientific validity, it would be challenging to measure a construct using a scale that does not adequately represent that specific construct. For instance, a study might conclude that fairness is perceived positively within a sample (using North American measurements), while maybe , the sample's actual definition of fairness might not be accurately measurable by that scale.

In this regard, the overall fairness questions emerge as significant elements , especially if confronted to multi facets justice questions in the same scale.Another approach to strengthen the cultural definition of justice ,while using the NA justice dimensions and overall justice perception , is to integrate the justice sensitivity variable to scales ,which will allow researchers embrace the weight of each facet in the overall justice appreciation.

What we would suggest at this level of analysis ,is for any new researcher to engage in less comparative approaches as a starting point, and to engage more in comprehensive ones.To do so , researchers from different countries, should conduct qualitative studies in a bottom-up strategy , in order to build a set of cultural definitions of justice . Ethnographic techniques , aiming to understand the lived experiences, behaviours, social interactions, and cultural practices of a group from the insiders' point of view ,seem to be the most adapted and needed tools, considering the current state of knowledge in this field.

Regarding inconsistent findings, it may be wise to view them as enriching rather than confusing. This perspective is possible only if we consider that the literature in this field is not yet mature enough to rely solely on empirical findings. Analysing these findings will be more interesting and enriching if we explore cultural definitions of justice. Alongside this position, other factors may emerge as potential explanations for this situation. For instance, the interaction between cultural variables and situational variables, as well as the interplay of cultural factors with personal traits, or the interaction between different facets of justice can lead to different interpretations of situations.

Moreover, cultural values should not be seen as the sole predictors of justice perceptions. To engage in a comparative approach, researchers must ensure that a wide range of culturally independent variables are controlled .

Another noteworthy ,element that could be recommended ,is to consider confronting individual level cultural values ,with consolidated proxy , in order to Assess how individuals within a culture may hold differing values, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of cultural influences ;this will also allow Isolating the effects of specific cultural values on outcomes of interest, helping to clarify causal relationships and then Facilitate more accurate comparisons across groups by accounting for individual differences rather than relying solely on aggregate cultural traits.

As a matter of fact, even though culture is acknowledged as a powerful variable, it should not be considered in isolation from a wide range of other elements. We believe that researchers take a considerable risk when measuring the predictability of cultural variables in the field of justice. This does not contradict the notion that justice remains a cultural construct; rather, it highlights that other factors also influence the shaping process of justice.

Here again, the predictive ability of culture in the field of justice must be linked to conjectural and historical references. For instance, its progressive and unstable nature may be emphasized, as it cannot be isolated from historical or current economic and political data.

At this level of reflexion, we suggest that even Hofstede's model of cultural categorisation, should be taken as open to continual updates and especially dimensions enlargement ,so here again , constructive approach might also emerge as significant in the national culture theoretical domain.The goal here would be to make sure all the old and new elements of a certain cultural cluster are being covered , before engaging in linking them to justice perception process.

If we consider each research study separately, we strongly believe that all efforts are valuable and that all studies help enrich knowledge. However, we suggest that it would be more efficient if researchers focused on aligning their studies with the current needs of the literature, which will enable them to effectively generate helpful managerial implications.

Accordingly , we think that what managers really need in the current phase, is an answer to two main questions

- What are the updated elements that describe to the best the cultural values in a chosen country ?
- What are the updated elements that describe to the best the justice needs in that chosen country?

Once these two questions answered ,it will be possible to engage the comparative Studies by confronting culturally different individuals to the same situations ,in order to embrace the extent to which real cultural values are able to justify and predict real justice perceptions.More over , we would recommend ,as for cultural values ,confronting justice perception to supervisor outcome ratings Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. K., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000).

The aggregation of all or some of the elements mentioned above (as recommendations) is likely to generate new research perspectives through various possible combinations. In future researches, Confronting results from these different perspectives is highly recommended, as it may reveal new elements that interact with the concept of justice.

References :

- (1). Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). "Voice and justified decisions: Procedural justice as fairness." *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 49-99.
- (2). Brockner, J. (2002). "Making sense of procedural justice: A group-identity perspective." In *Organizational Justice: The Search for Fairness in the Workplace* (pp. 171-199).
- (3). Brockner, J., & Siegel, P. A. (1996). "Understanding the interactions between procedural and distributive justice: Progress and prospects." *Social Justice Research*, 9(4), 303-323.
- (4). Brockner, J., De Wit, L., & Grover, S. (2001). "The influence of group identity and the perceived similarity of decision-makers on justice perceptions across cultures." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(5), 409-427.
- (5). Chen, C. C., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). "Cultural dimensions of organizational justice." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(5), 481-497.
- (6). Cohen, A., & Elizur, D. (2007). "The role of justice in work relationships." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(5), 948-964.
- (7). Colquitt, J. A. (2001). "On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- (8). Cropanzano, R., & Wright, T. A. (2001). "When a 'happy' worker is really a 'happy' worker: A review of the literature on affect and job satisfaction." *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 53-86.
- (9). Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- (10). Gonzalez, A., & Zubieta, E. (2012). "Cultural dimensions and organizational justice." *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 12(1), 5-19.
- (11). Graham, J. W. (1991). "An essay on organizational justice." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(3), 239-250.
- (12). Greenberg, J. (1987). "A taxonomy of organizational justice theories." *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- (13). Greenberg, J. (1990). "Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow." *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.

- (14). Greenberg, J. (2001). "Studying organizational justice cross-culturally: Current research and future directions." In *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 241-278). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- (15). Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). "What's the difference? A critical review of diversity, diversity, and performance." *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 10-50.
- (16). Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Sage Publications.
- (17). Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill.
- (18). Hui, C., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). "Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17(3), 227-248.
- (19). Kim, P. H., & Kuo, S. (2015). "The role of social networks in the relationship between leadership and team effectiveness." *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9(3), 18-30.
- (20). Kim, P. H., & Leung, K. (2007). "Culture and procedural justice: The impact of cultural dimensions on justice perceptions in teams." *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(4), 334-357.
- (21). Kim, S., & Mauborgne, R. (1997). "Fair Process: Managing in the Knowledge Economy." *Harvard Business Review*, 75(4), 65-75.
- (22). Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). "The impact of cultural values on the effectiveness of teams." *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 1(1), 27-46.
- (23). Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). "From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research." *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(3), 211-236.
- (24). Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1989). "On the empirical identification of dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A confirmatory factor analytic approach." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20(2), 133-150.
- (25). Mäkelä, L., & Häkkinen, L. (2002). "The effects of leadership styles on team performance: A case study in the Finnish military." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(1), 16-27.
- (26). Mikula, G. (2003). "The perception of justice in social relationships." In *Social Justice: A Handbook* (pp. 141-160).
- (27). Morris, M. W., & Leung, K. (2000). "Justice and culture: The influence of cultural contexts on the perception of justice." *Social Justice Research*, 13(4), 347-366.
- (28). Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books.

- (29). Patterson, M. G., & Kelliher, C. (2012). "The role of organizational justice in fostering organizational citizenship behavior." *Journal of Business Research*, 65(4), 546-552.
- (30). Robinson, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson.
- (31). Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. Free Press.
- (32). Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). "The interactance of personal and contextual factors in the prediction of performance." *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 167-176.
- (33). Shao, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2009). "Cross-cultural differences in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(4), 825-841.
- (34). Shao, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2013). "The role of organizational justice in shaping employees' commitment: A cross-cultural perspective." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(5), 963-981.
- (35). Shao, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Bhal, K. T. (2010). "Cultural values and organizational justice: A comparative study of the USA and China." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(3), 424-447.
- (36). Skitka, L. J. (2003). "Of different minds: The effects of decision mode on procedural justice." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(3), 244-251.
- (37). Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- (38). Tziner, A., & Vardi, Y. (1982). "Individualism and collectivism in organizational behavior." *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(1), 41-54.
- (39). Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). "Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 349-361.
- (40). Vandenberghe, C., & Tremblay, M. (2008). "The role of organizational justice in the relationship between trust and employee outcomes." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(4), 591-607.
- (41). Van den Bos, K. (2001). "The psychology of procedural justice: A review of the literature." In *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 85-110).
- (42). Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). "The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243-274.