Organizational Justice and Employee Perception of Organizational Change

Isaac Onyeyirichukwu Chukwuma[1], Patrick Chukwunwike Chukwuma[2], Matthew Arinze Okeke[3], Kenneth Egwuatu Ogbonna[4]

[1]University of Port Harcourt
[2]University of Illinois
[3]Madonna University
[4]University of Nigeria

Abstract: This research investigated the association and relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change. Data were retrieved from 63 managers; the constructs underwent a reliability test using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The study utilized inferential statistic tools via deploying the Spearman correlation to investigate the association between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change, and a linear regression analysis was deployed to predict the relationship between the constructs using the IBM SPSS Statistics version 21. The discoveries of the study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change [p (.000) < 0.05, r = .991].

Keywords: organizational justice, employee perception, organizational change, dynamic capability view

I.   Introduction

The necessity for organizational change has been reinforced in extant literature (Madsen, Miller & John, 2005; Burke, 2017); these studies have provided insights and widened the range of our comprehension. Regardless of the role of organizational change in ensuring the relative sustainability and continuance of organizational goals, the defining factor for the exploration of the advantages inherent in executing changes in organizations is anchored on the employees' roles (Dobroviˇc and Loumova 2017; Denis, Kilroy & Bosak, 2019; Repovš et al. 2019; Milovanovic, Bubas & Cvjetkovic 2022), hence, employees perception/attitude to change is a defining factor to their level of engagement which possess a ripple effect on the success or failure of such initiated organizational change.

The issue of employee perception has become a topical discourse in today's organizations that constantly features a labyrinth of environmental variables. The need to fully understand it and explore means of effectively exploring it is vital to the advancement of organizational objectives. Irrespective of the extant papers on the study constructs, the peculiarity of the present study geography is a critical factor that must be captured in fully understanding the interplay of organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change.

This study fills the gap in the paucity of empirical work on the relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change with a bias to the geographical scope (i.e. Port Harcourt City, Nigeria); the paucity of an established empirical credence in this geographic scope enriches the relevant knowledge for effective decision making for both the academia and industry. The study explores the dynamics of the study constructs (organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change) and advances the postulation of the relationship within the Dynamic Capability framework. The study goes beyond the theoretical analogy to engage analytical processes that define empirical exploits.

The study discourse is framed as follows; a literature review of the study constructs and their relationship within the dynamic capability view. Next is the methodology segment which elaborates on the procedures executed in

the research design, research method, measures, and analysis. The result section specifies and interprets the study findings. The discussion section further explores insight into the empirical relationship between the study constructs. The study navigates the theoretical and practical implications of the constructs examined.

Research Objective

To determine the nature of the relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change in Port Harcourt City, Nigeria.

Research Question

What is the nature of the relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change in Port Harcourt City, Nigeria?

Research Hypothesis

Organizational justice has a positive relationship with employee perception of organizational change in Port Harcourt City, Nigeria.

Research Significance

The study adds to the body of relevant knowledge on the study constructs and advances its applicability. The study further fills the paucity of empirical credence on the relationship between the constructs in the defined geographical scope (Port Harcourt City, Nigeria). The study equips academia and industry with the requisite tools for advancing knowledge, making effective decisions, and optimizing change benefits in their organizations.

II.   Literature Review

Organizational Justice

Organizational Justice connotes employees' perception of organizational affairs and engagement protocol conformity to equity, equality, and fairness. The plethora of studies on organizational justice has established the interpretation of its theme is fundamentally subjective; as relatively perceived by individual organizational members and stakeholders. Hence, organizational justice is not an objective state or the standard of organizational functioning, but exclusively a subjective evaluation by organizational members of the protocols, outcomes, and interactions of organizational affairs (Przęczek, Rosiński & Manko, 2020). The trajectory of organizational justice perception for the individual employee is usually triggered from a self-focused and present/short-termed orientation to a selfless and future/long-term orientation (Skitka, Winquist & Hutchinson, 2003; Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007; Blader & Tyler, 2015). The articulation from extant literature has categorized organizational justice into three basic categorizations; distributive, procedural, and interactional (interpersonal and informational) justice; the perception of the distributive, procedural, and interactional (interpersonal and informational) justice operating in an organization is capable of influencing individual employees' behaviour and attitudes, as well as altering teams and organizational performance (Simons & Roberson, 2003; Hollensbe, Khazanchi & Masterson, 2008; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2015).

The categorization of organizational justice (i.e. distributive, procedural, and interactional) was captured by the divergent means by which organizational members judge equity and equality in organizational activities, affairs, and decisions (Lavelle et al. 2009; Fortin et al. 2020). Hence, organizational member's perception of organizational justice is based on the outcomes of the decision (distributive justice), how the determination of the outcome was attained (procedural justice), the outcome in relation to the information shared, and how organizational members are treated (interactional justice) (Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022).

Distributive Justice

This articulates organizational members' interpretation of the actual distribution protocol for the deployment of resources. Hence, organizational members are concerned with the equity (outcomes are commensurate with contribution), equality (organizational members get the same outcome irrespective of individual contribution), and need (resource distribution anchored on functional needs) level of organizations' decision outcomes (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007). Organizations' ability to effectively communicate distributive justice in such a matter that it is accurately interpreted is capable of significantly influencing organizational members' performance (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Barclay et al. 2020; SimanTov-Nachlieli & Bamberger, 2021).

Procedural Justice

Organizational members also seek to comprehend and judge the process via which decisions are made and articulated in their organization. Hence, irrespective of the validity of decisions via their possible potentials and outcomes, organizational members are interested in determining how fair, just, and ethical such decision process was (Goldman, 2003; Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Hence, organizational members analyze the fairness, consistency, accuracy, and sufficient representativeness of the decision process, and the extent to which they are ideal to their organizational members' perception (Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). Also, diverse stakeholders (i.e. applicants) and potential organizational members evaluate organizational procedure justice by their strategic interactions with the organization's processes and engagement protocols (Bauer et al. 2001; Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007; Lind, 2019). The resultant effect of the organizational members' perception is capable of influencing their engagement either positively or negatively (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Wiesenfeld, Swann Jr, Brockner & Bartel, 2007; Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2013; Kim & Park, 2017; Dar, 2020).

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice connotes organizational members' perception of how individuals are properly equipped with timely and sufficient information (informational justice) and effective professional relationship (interpersonal justice) (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007; Bies, 2015; Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). Regardless of the central theme in the denotation of interactional justice, certain scholars have recognized its components (informational justice and interpersonal justice) as distinct organizational justice categories and even proposed them as antecedents to distributive justice and procedural justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al 2001; Lind, 2019). Informational justice is reflected in justification for selected decisions and effective dissemination of information necessary for organizational members' optimal performance, alternatively, interpersonal justice is reflected in the quality of individual organizational members' relationship with supervisors, management, and other organizational members in line with their alignment/misalignment to the established social values (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Conlon, Meyer & Nowakowski, 2005; Mullen & Okimoto, 2015; Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022).

Employee Perception of Organizational Change

Organizational change is how organizations relatively transmute from an existing positioning to a desired or induced positioning to advance its chance of relevance in its industry. The organization's environment is rarely stable, and most volatile, uncertain, ambiguous, and complex, the trajectory of these variables demands that change will be a recurrent feature of any organization's life; as organizations proactively or passively respond/react to their environmental variables, change at some scales must occur. Organizational change is a requisite for continuous competition, value proposition, and relevance in their industry (Yu, 2009; Burke, 2017; Milovanovic, Bubas & Cvjetkovic, 2022). Effective change initiative, navigation, and execution are dependent on employees' acceptance, preparedness, engagement, and execution of change protocol (Madsen, Miller & John, 2005). Hence, a positive or negative employee perception/attitude to change is capable of influencing the success or otherwise of the change objectives.

Diverse studies on employee perceptions/attitudes to organizational change have articulated variables that influence employees' perception to change; there is arguably a consensus that these variables are mostly subjectively multi-faceted experiences of change (Oreg, 2006). Employees' perception of organizational change considers the following which has the potential of influencing their engagement level, these considerations include; perceived adverse consequences of change, leader behavior, insecurity about roles and careers, anxiety or fear, communication, new roles, skills, and relationships, sort of change being executed (i.e. incremental change and radical change), etc. (Ashford, 1988; Gersick, 1994; Rubenstein et al., 1996; Dent and Goldberg, 1999; Lewis, 2000; Terry et al., 2001).

Regardless of the nobility and necessity of organizational change, the reality of organizational change has been proven to disrupt the framework of organizational affairs concerning organizational members' work relationships, organizational hierarchy, group dynamics and boundaries, and functional areas (Paulsen et al., 2005; Terry & Jimmieson, 2003). Effective change initiative, navigation, and execution are dependent on employees' acceptance, preparedness, engagement, and execution of change protocol (Madsen, Miller & John, 2005), hence, organizations need to be deliberate in strategically routing employees to possess a mutual understanding of the need for organizational change; the effective execution of this role by organizations will significantly decline the threats that limits employee acceptance and engagement in the organizational change protocol (Dobroviˇc and Loumova 2017; Repovš et al. 2019). The strategic influencing of employee perception/attitude to change should be harnessed as a default culture in an organization. Employees should not be allowed to navigate the labyrinth of organizational change on their own, such

allowance has been reported to increase fear, uncertainty, resistance, exit, non-compliance, etc. which has resulted in a waste of organizational resources and opportunities (Dobroviˇc and Loumova 2017; Denis, Kilroy & Bosak, 2019; Milovanovic, Bubas & Cvjetkovic 2022). In culturing the employee perception/attitude to align with the organizational objectives for change, organizations should properly articulate the deployment of processes and practices that sync with employee's intentions, attitudes, beliefs, relationships, and understanding (Armenakis et al. 1993; Eby et al. 2000; Repovš et al. 2019).

Dynamic Capability View

The Dynamic Capability View (DCV) advocates that organizations attain competitive benefits from their capability to build, amalgamate, and reconfigure external and internal competencies (i.e. optimized execution of organizational justice) to react and respond to changing organizational environment by strategically positioning its resource base (i.e. employees) to optimize organizational objectives (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Teece, 2007; Helfat, 2007). Dynamic capabilities (DCs) are considered high-level capabilities (i.e. organizational justice) with the potential to influence all organizational affairs (i.e. employee orientation to change) (Helfat & Winter, 2011); these capabilities are deliberately advocated and supported by organizations' management.

DCs are composed of sensing [i.e. identification and evaluation of threats and opportunities; in line with organizational strength (i.e. organizational justice)], seizing [i.e. mobilize resources (i.e. enabling employees with the right orientation) to exploit opportunities and manage threats and harnessing values], and transforming/reconfiguring (i.e. continuous renewal of organizational justice protocol in line with relevant feedback from employees that influence industrial changes) capabilities that are essential to organizational change (Teece, 2007, Hodgkinson & Healey, 2011; Teece, 2012), and these are anchored on the employees as a fulcrum to navigating other organizational resources to effectively exploit the opportunities inherent in the change navigation.

The identification of threats or opportunities from the environment allows organizational management with the requisite time to optimally position adequate organizational justice as a strategic capability to influence and position employee perception/attitude to the possibilities of alterations in organizational affairs that must be leveraged to exploit the identified opportunities or manage the recognized threats; hence, the adoption of a proactive method in gaining competitive benefits (Tabaklar et al., 2021; Zahoor et al., 2022). Organizations with refined DCs (i.e. organizational justice) are better positioned to advance their strategic agility; hence possess the capability to optimize their internal assets (i.e. employees and their potentials) in alignment with organizational objectives (Doz & Kosonen, 2010; Matarazzo et al., 2021), to effectively explore changes in the organization.

III.   Methodology

Research Design

The study design deployed the descriptive research approach. This approach is suitable to express employee perception of change and its dynamics under an organization's justice engagement. This enables the researchers to comprehend and clarify the dynamic and pragmatic results association between the constructs.

Research Method

The quantitative method was deployed in this study. The quantitative method is invaluable in ascertaining measurable influence association between the constructs under examination. The study utilized a convenience sampling approach in disseminating the questionnaire to 63 managers (14 females and 49 males) from the service sectors who were involved in an executive business class. The focus on this set of examinees narrowed possible response bias that could result from interactions in the workplace environment (Spector, 2006). The issued questionnaires were completely retrieved and properly filled.

Measures

Constructs measurement was scaled at a 5-point Likert scale that begins from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Organizational justice. In this research, the examinees were instructed to choose the observed reality of "organizational justice" in their organization on a 30-item organizational justice scale adopted from the study of Colquitt (2001).

Employee perception/attitude of organizational change. In this research, the examinees were instructed to choose the observed reality of "employee perception/attitude of organizational change" in their organization on a 15-item employee perception/attitude of organizational change scale adopted from the study of Oreg (2006).

Analysis

The questionnaires were subjected to content validity, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was deployed to ascertain the instruments' reliability. The research adopted inferential statistics, particularly Spearman correlation in quantifying the association, strength, and direction of the constructs. A linear regression analysis was further engaged to predict the subject constructs' relationship. The execution of these statistical tools was anchored based on the data set aligning to the assumption for the utilization of the tools. The data analyses were demonstrated via tables, and the decision rule was to reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than 0.05 (i.e. $p < 0.05$); do not reject the null hypothesis if otherwise.

Results

Table 1 illustrates Cronbach's alpha of "organizational justice" $\alpha = .929$, and that of "employee perception of organizational change" $\alpha = .857$, which reveals a high internal consistency of the scales, which is reliable in extracting the substance of the construct. Table 2 demonstrates the Spearman correlation result between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change; from the finding in Table 2, it is scientifically evident that organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change possess a strong positive association ($r = .975$), and a positive significant association between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change [p (.000) < 0.05]. To predict the relationship and degree of variance in employee perception of organizational change that may be explained by organizational justice, the study engaged a simple linear regression analysis, as shown in Table 3, 98.1% of the variability in employee perception of organizational change can be explained by the engagement of organizational justice; this is also reinforced by the fact that since p (.000) < 0.05, $r = .991$ there is a positive significant relationship between organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change.

Table 1: Reliability results for organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Organizational Justice	.929
Employee Perception of Organizational Change	.857

Table 2: Spearman's correlation results for organizational justice and employee perception of organizational change (*n* = 63)

Construct	Category	Organizational Justice	Employee Perception of Organizational Change
Organizational Justice	Spearman's rho	1.000	.975**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	63	63
Employee Perception of Organizational Change	Spearman's rho	.975**	1.000
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	63	63

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Linear regression analysis results, where organizational justice is the independent variable, and employee perception of organizational change is the dependent variable

Variable	Organizational Justice					
	R	*R²*	*F*	*β*	*T*	*P*
Employee Perception of Organizational Change	.991	.981	3176.424	.995	56.360	.000

R, R-value; R², R-squared value; F, F-value; *β,* beta-value; *P,* significance.

IV.   Discussion

This study explored the association and relationship of organizational justice on employee perception of organizational change. The study is particularly relevant within the defined geographical scope, as the concept and reality of justice are perceived with some iota of doubt, unpredictability, and are generally relative to the interest at hand, as well as the caliber of the person concerned with such interest.

The result of the study has provided empirical credence to the significance of organizational justice in granting accurate navigation to the accomplishment of the goal of organizational change, by ensuring transparency, accountability, and involvement of employees in the change process, hence, granting employees the requisite tools for the right perception of the change. The right perception is capable of optimizing opportunities in the change initiative, and can also limit or manage the threats in such change initiatives.

The study further enriches literature in solidifying the necessity for organizational justice in dealing with social entities (i.e. employees) in a social construct (i.e. organization). The optimization of organizational interest is anchored on utilizing organizational justice in ensuring the accurate perception of justice by the employee, to advance the holistic organizational goal.

The study further implicates the activities of the organization, in their daily operations to ensure that organizational justice is cultured within their operational engagement protocol. This ripples the effect of optimized performance and commitment of the employee to the needed change.

V.   Conclusion

Perception is critical to the level of engagement, reaction, and response deployed; employee performance (i.e. level of engagement, reaction, and response) is relatively a function of the perception of the organizational justice engagement protocol to change initiative. Hence, organizational management must be proactive and effectively responsive in deploying organizational justice elements as a strategic tool to accurately engage, allocate, and inform employees of the necessity for change to optimize employee performance before, during, and after change protocol optimization.

References

[1]   Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2, 267-299.

[2]   Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703.

[3]   Ashford, S. J. (1988). Individual strategies for coping with stress during organizational transitions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 24*(1), 19-36.

[4]   Barclay, L., Tripp, T., Bies, R., Graso, M., Palanski, M., Shin, E., Aquino, K., Bobocel, R., Difonzo, N., Howard, C., & Nurmohamed, S. (2020). The management of identity-based conflicts: New directions in justice research. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 1.

[5]   Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J. M., Ferrara, P., & Campion, M. A. (2001). Applicant reactions to selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology, 54*(2), 387-419.

[6]   Bies, R. J. (2015). Interactional justice: Looking backward, looking forward. In the oxford handbook of justice in the workplace; Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 89-108.

[7]   Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extra role behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(2), 445-464.

[8]   Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2015). Relational models of procedural justice. In the oxford handbook of justice in the workplace; Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 351-370.

[9]   Burke, W. W. (2017). Organizational Change Theory and Practice, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

[10]   Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278-321.

[11]   Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

[12]   Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness, and employee reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organization Behavior, 2*, 75-99.

[13]   Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445.

[14]   Conlon, D., Meyer, C., & Nowakowski, J. M. (2005). How does organisational justice affect performance, withdrawal, and counterproductive behaviour. In Handbook of Organizational Justice; Routledge: London, UK.

[15]   Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M. (2015). Organizational justice: Where we have been and where we are going. In The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace; Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 3-14.

[16]   Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of management perspectives*, *21*(4), 34-48.

[17]   Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(4), 34-48.

[18]   Dar, M. A. (2020). Organizational justice: The transpiring journey from relative deprivation to integrative justice. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*(1), 23-41.

[19]   Denis, C., Kilroy, S., & Bosak, J. (2019). The role of change readiness and colleague support in the role stressors and withdrawal behaviors relationship among health care employees. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 32*, 208-223.

[20]   Dent, E. G., & Goldberg, S. G. (1999). Challenging 'resistance to change.' *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 35*(1), 25-41.

[21]   Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 137-149.

[22]   Dobroviˇc, J., & Loumova, V. (2017). Examination of factors affecting the implementation of organizational changes. *Journal of Competitiveness, 9*, 5-17.

[23]   Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning, 43*(2), 370-382.

[24]   Eby, L. T., Adams, D. M., Russell, J. E. A., & Gaby, S. H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team based selling. *Human Relations, 53*(3), 419-442.

[25]   Fortin, M., Cropanzano, R., Cugueró-Escofet, N., Nadisic, T., & VanWagoner, H. (2020). How do people judge fairness in supervisor and peer relationships? Another assessment of the dimensions of justice. *Human Relations, 73*(12), 1632-1663.

[26]   Gersick, C. J. G. (1994). Pacing strategic change: The case of a new venture. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(1), 9-45.

[27]   Goldman, B. M. (2003). The application of referent cognitions theory to legal-claiming by terminated workers: The role of organizational justice and anger. *Journal of Management, 29*(5), 705-728.

[28]   Helfat, C. E. (2007). *Dynamic capabilities. Understanding strategic change in organizations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

[29]   Helfat, C. E., & Winter, S. G. (2011). Untangling dynamic and operational capabilities: Strategy for the (N)ever-changing world. *Strategic Management Journal, 32*(11), 1243-1250.

[30]   Hodgkinson, G. P., & Healey, M. P. (2011). Psychological foundations of dynamic capabilities: Reflexion and reflection in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 32*(13), 1500-1516.

[31]   Hollensbe, E. C., Khazanchi, S., & Masterson, S. S. (2008). How do I assess if my supervisor and organization are fair? Identifying the rules underlying entity-based justice perceptions. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(6), 1099–1116.

[32]   Kim, W., & Park, J. (2017). Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organizational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior for sustainable organizations. *Sustainability, 9*(2), 205.

[33]   Lavelle, J. J., Brockner, J., Konovsky, M. A., Price, K. H., Henley, A. B., Taneja, A., & Vinekar, V. (2009). Commitment, procedural fairness, and organizational citizenship behavior: A multifoci analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(3), 337-357.

[34]   Lewis, L. K. (2000). 'Blindsided by that one' and 'I saw that one coming': The relative anticipation and occurrence of communication problems and other problems in implementer hindsight. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*(1), 44-67.

[35]   Lind, E. A. (2019). The study of justice in social psychology and related fields. *In Social Psychology and Justice*; Lind, E., Ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 1-20.

[36]   Madsen, S. R., Miller, D., & John, C. R. (2005). Readiness for organizational change: Do organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace make a difference? *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16*, 213-234.

[37]   Matarazzo, M., Penco, L., Profumo, G., & Quaglia, R. (2021). Digital transformation and customer value creation in made in Italy SMEs: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *Journal of Business Research, 123*, 642-656.

[38]   McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 626-637.

[39]   Milovanovic, B., Bubas, Z., & Cvjetkovic, M. (2022). Employee readiness for organizational change in the SME internalization process: The case of a medium-sized construction company. *Social Sciences, 11*(131), 1-14.

[40]   Mullen, E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2015). Compensatory justice. *In the Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*; Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 331-350.

[41]   Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(1), 73-101.

[42]   Paulsen, N., Callan, V. J., Grice, T., Rooney, D., Gallois, C., Jones, E., Bordia, P., & Jimmesion, N. (2005). Job uncertainty and personal control during downsizing: A comparison of survivors and victims. *Human Relations, 58*(4), 463-496.

[43]   Przęczek, C., Rosiński, J., Manko, B. (2020). Research review in organizational justice. *Journal for Perspectives in Economic, Political and Social Integration, 26*(1-2), 49-68.

[44]   Repovš, E., Drnovšek, M., & Kaše, R. (2019). Change ready, resistant, or both? Exploring the concepts of individual change readiness and resistance to organizational change. *Economic and Business Review, 21*, 308-337.

[45]   Rubenstein, L. V., Lammers, J., Yano, E. M., Tabbarah, M. & Robbins, A. S. (1996). Evaluation of the VA's pilot program in institutional reorganization toward primary and ambulatory care: Part II, a study of organizational stresses and dynamics. *Academic Medicine, 71*(7), 784-792.

[46]   Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89*(1), 925-946.

[47]   SimanTov-Nachlieli, I., & Bamberger, P. (2021). Pay communication, justice, and affect: The asymmetric effects of process and outcome pay transparency on counterproductive workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*(2), 230-249.

[48]   Simons, T., & Roberson, Q. (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: The effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 432-443.

[49]   Skitka, L. J., Winquist, J., & Hutchinson, S. (2003). Are outcome fairness and outcome favorability distinguishable psychological constructs? A meta-analytic review. *Social Justice Research, 16*, 309-341.

[50]   Spector, P. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 221-232.

[51]   Tabaklar, T., Sorkun, M. F., Yurt, O., & Yu, W. (2021). Exploring the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities for social innovation in a humanitarian aid supply network setting. *Industrial Marketing Management, 96*, 147-162.

[52]   Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319-1350.

[53]   Teece, D. J. (2012). Dynamic capabilities: Routines versus entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(8), 1395-1401.

[54]   Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

[55]   Terry, D. J. & Jimmieson, N. L. (2003). A stress and coping approach to organizational change: Evidence from three field studies. *Australian Psychologist, 38*(2), 92-101.

[56]   Terry, D. J., Carey, C. J. & Callan, V. J. (2001). Employee adjustment to an organizational merger: An intergroup perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(3), 267-280.

[57]   Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*(4), 349-361.

[58]   Tyler, T., & Blader, S. (2013). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement.* Routledge: New York, NY, USA.

[59]   Wiesenfeld, B. M., Swann Jr, W. B., Brockner, J., & Bartel, C. A. (2007). Is more fairness always preferred? Self-esteem moderates reactions to procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1235-1253.

[60]   Wiseman, J., & Stillwell, A. (2022). Organizational justice: Typology, antecedents and consequences. *Encyclopedia, 2,* 1287-1295.

[61]   Yu, M. (2009). Employees' perception of organizational change: The mediating effects of stress management strategies. *Public Personnel Management, 38*(1), 17-32.

[62]   Zahoor, N., Golgeci, I., Haapanen, L., Ali, I., & Arslan, A. (2022). The role of dynamic capabilities and strategic agility of B2B high-tech small and medium-sized enterprises during COVID-19 pandemic: Exploratory case studies from Finland. *Industrial Marketing Management, 105,* 502-514.

Organizational Justice Measure Items

Procedural Justice
The following items refer to the procedures used to arrive at your (outcome). To what extent:

PC1. Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?
PC2. Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?
PC3. Have those procedures been applied consistently?
PC4. Have those procedures been free of bias?
PC5. Have those procedures been based on accurate information?
PC6. Have you been able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?
PC7. Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?

Distributive Justice
The following items refer to your (outcome). To what extent:

DJ1. Does your (outcome) reflect the effort you have put into your work?
DJ2. Is your (outcome) appropriate for the work you have completed?
DJ3. Does your (outcome) reflect what you have contributed to the organization?
DJ4. Is your (outcome) justified, given your performance?

Interpersonal Justice
The following items refer to (the authority figure who enacted the procedure). To what extent:

IPJ1. Has (he/she) treated you in a polite manner?
IPJ2. Has (he/she) treated you with dignity?
IPJ3. Has (he/she) treated you with respect?
IPJ4. Has (he/she) refrained from improper remarks or comments?

Informational Justice

The following items refer to (the authority figure who enacted the procedure). To what extent:

IJ1. Has (he/she) been candid in (his/her) communications with you?

IJ2. Has (he/she) explained the procedures thoroughly?

IJ3. Were (his/her) explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?

IJ4. Has (he/she) communicated details in a timely manner?

IJ5. Has (he/she) seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals' specific needs?

Outcome: Instrumentality

OI1. If I perform well for my organization, I am usually rewarded

OI2. I see a clear linkage between my performance and the rewards I receive

Outcome: Group Commitment

OGC1. I really feel this organization's goals are my own

OGC2. I feel emotionally attached to this organization

OGC3. I feel a sense of belonging to this organization

Outcome: Helping Behavior

OHB1. I put more effort into helping my coworkers than is generally expected of me

OHB2. I frequently help my coworkers when they have heavy work loads

Outcome: Collective Esteem

OCE1. I feel I am an important member of this organization

OCE2. I have high status in this organization

OCE3.   My organization values my role

Employee Perception/Attitude to Change Measure Items

Affective Perception

The following items involve positive and negative feelings towards the specific change:

AP1.   I was afraid of the change

AP2.   I had a bad feeling about the change

AP3.   I was quite excited about the change

AP4.   The change made me upset

AP5.   I was stressed by the change

Behavioural Perception

The following items addressed employees' intention to act against (or for, where **negatively worded items** were involved) the change:

BP1.   I looked for ways to prevent the change from taking place

BP2.   I protested against the change

BP3.   I complained about the change to my colleagues

BP4.   I presented my objections regarding the change to management

BP5.   I spoke rather highly of the change to others

Cognitive Perception

The following items involved employees' evaluation of the worth and potential benefit of the change:

CP1.   I believed that the change would harm the way things are done in the organization
CP2.   I thought that it's a negative thing that we were going through this change
CP3.   I believed that the change would make my job harder
CP4.   I believed that the change would benefit the organization
CP5.   I believed that I could personally benefit from the change