



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

***Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice as
Predictors of Attitude Concerning Organizational
Reform***

Alireza Zamini

Master's Thesis
Spring Term 2014

Supervisor: Robert Holmberg

Abstract

The Swedish Institution of Education has recently been under debate. This is partly due to the matter that Swedish pupils' performances have dramatically worsened. In an international study conducted through the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), scholastic performance scores have dropped from being substantially above average to being below average compared to the 65 other countries involved in the study. To counteract this, the Swedish government implemented in 2013 a multi-billion SEK strategy called the "primary teacher reform" (Förstalärrarreformen). However, if it is to be successful it is essential that it is well received as research has shown that employee attitude towards organizational change can often dictate its success. The purpose of the present study was to investigate teacher attitudes toward the primary teacher reform. Based on previous research, the study hypothesis was that teacher perception of organizational justice and level of job satisfaction would be significant predictors of attitude toward reform. A sample of 437 primary school and upper secondary school teachers from across Sweden responded to a questionnaire. Organizational justice was measured using Price and Mueller's (1986) Distributional Justice Index, Daly's (1995) Procedural Justice Instrument, and Moorman's (1991) Interactional Justice Instrument. For the purpose of the study, items measuring "attitude toward reform" and a single-item measurement of job satisfaction were developed. The results of the study were in line with previous research as they accurately predicted attitude toward reform. However, this was in varying degrees, depending on gender and level of school.

Keywords: organizational justice, job satisfaction, attitude, organizational reform

Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice as Predictors of Attitude Towards Organizational Reform

In recent years, the educational system in Sweden has been under discussion as to how it can improve the quality of education, attract more qualified candidates to take on a teaching career and increase job satisfaction among the employees of schools (Läraryrskommittén, 2012). This has been a response to the troubling matter that Swedish pupils' academic performances are on the decline when compared internationally (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2013). To counteract this, the Swedish government has invested in what is called the "primary teacher reform". It is postulated that the reform could achieve the desired results, however there are organizational factors that should be considered in order for the reform to be successful. Specifically, organizational justice which pertains to the practical implementation of the reform since the reform will most likely mean that some will benefit more than others, moreover, the suggested linkage between organizational justice and job satisfaction can potentially influence employee attitudes towards the organization which affects acceptance to organizational change.

The present study aims to investigate the hypothesis that the perceptions of organizational justice and job satisfaction are related to employee attitudes towards the reform. Concepts of the study include organizational justice, attitude, affect, and job satisfaction under reform and these will be investigated and act as the basis of the study.

Theoretical Framework

In the coming section the research behind the concepts of organizational justice and job satisfaction and the connection between them will be discussed. It is important to understand these concepts as they are essential in the implementation of organizational change. Organizational justice can have a strong influence on the reception of the reform mainly because if employees doubt the fairness of the processes of the reform this will likely affect their attitude towards it.

Organizational Justice

Justice is a philosophical issue that dates back as far as the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates and Plato (Ryan, 1993). The term *justice* signifies how things ought to be, nonetheless, what is fair has been found to be very difficult to establish. For the purpose of this report the terms *just* and *fair* will be used interchangeably.

Society has created entire institutions dedicated to implementing and enforcing justice. It is important for individuals that justice is maintained and that one perceives that fair treatment is enacted. Interestingly, the notion of justice has been found to be largely applicable to the organizational context. Organizational justice has, since its inception, become a widely studied concept within the organizational sciences.

The concept of justice is considered to be a social construction. People in different roles will be in favour of dissimilar systems of justice; this has even been evident dating back to the writing of Aristotle (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). What is perceived as just is dependent on what the majority of a group consider it to be. This applies to all groups of people whether it may be in the greater context of society or simply a small collection of people (Colquitt et al., 2001). Therefore, organizational justice is defined as individuals' opinion of what is fair in the organization. Organizational justice is a multidimensional concept that signifies the typical perceived fairness of outcomes (e.g. pay, promotions etc.) of the organization. This research has mainly focused on the outcomes that result from workers perceiving various aspects of their organizational lives as just or unjust. Findings suggest that perceptions of fair decision outcomes relate to higher levels of organizational commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Martin & Bennett, 1996), job satisfaction (Martin & Bennett, 1996), turnover intentions (Dailey & Kirk, 1992) and individual work effort (Colquitt et al., 2001) and less absenteeism (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Furthermore, organizational justice is also an important precondition for increasing activity that is not formally part of any reward or compensation scheme, but does, however, promote the organization, also known as "organizational citizenship behaviour" (Dalal, 2005).

The conceptualization of organizational justice has at least three proposed subdimensions, that is, distributive justice, procedural justice and interpersonal justice (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007). The idea of justice in the organizational context was initially investigated by George C. Homans and led him to develop the concept of distributive justice (Homans, 1961). Adams (1966) investigated distributive justice by having employees compare their pay-off ratio (monetary or status) to their input of time and energy, contrasting it to that of their colleagues (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Conversely, procedural justice puts emphasis on the course of the decision-making process. Specifically, it shifts its focus from the outcome to the path leading to it (Hegtvedt & Markovsky, 1995). The concept of interactional justice is based on social exchange theory and the norm of social reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Recently, interactional justice has been conceptualized into

two subtypes, namely interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice pertains to the level of interpersonal sensitivity of treatment on behalf of the employees' superiors during the application of decisions. Informational justice, on the other hand, pertains to the rationalization provided to employees that explains the procedures and outcomes (Colquitt, 2001).

Recently a fourth dimension, affect, has become an increasingly researched concept in fairness perception. Adams' equity theory (1966) hypothesizes that inequity could result in the form of guilt, anger, distress etc. These feelings, in turn, motivate individuals to behave in ways meant to restore a sense of balance. These reactions have been proposed as being natural and automatic reactions to being mistreated; these reactions subsequently catalyse the assessment of injustice and can result in precarious and potentially destructive behaviour by the employee (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005). Other studies suggest that individuals formulate justice perceptions by applying rules to events, and that affect occurs only after individuals perceive that decision-making procedures or managerial actions are unfair (Sheppard, Lewicki, & Minton, 1992; Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993). Nevertheless, in both cases there is a consensus that affect is a central mechanism by which a sense of injustice is transformed into behaviour.

In order to comprehend why humans have an inherent desire for justice and its translation into behaviour the theoretical base point of social exchange theory (Homans, 1961) provides a valid suggestion. There are numerous rules of exchange; these rules dictate much of our social behaviour. The principle of reciprocity in the organizational context states that resources are optimally exchanged in a balanced reciprocal relationship (e.g., knowledge, services and money; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). These principles make up the core of what is known as organizational justice; that is, if a person perceives discrepancy of equilibrium in the exchange, one's condition will be viewed as unfair.

The principles of the effort-reward model also have a clear link to organizational justice. According to Siegrist (1996), it is natural to acquire self-esteem through performance, influence and subsequently receive intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The reciprocal exchange of one's effort and remuneration in the form of status, salary and regard is essential in this sense. The research on the effort-reward imbalance theory and organizational justice is not large; however, in their study Kivimäki, Vahtera, Elovainio, Virtanen, and Siegrist (2007) found a moderate correlation between effort-reward imbalance and procedural and interactional justice.

It has been hypothesized that there are gender differences in justice perception. Brockner and Wiesenfeld (1986) report in their study that there are dissimilarities in the way that males tend to react more strongly to distributive justice than females do. However, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) in their review argue that there are no such differences and that people, regardless of demographic variables such as age, gender, education level and tenure, view justice similarly.

There is also a significant amount of research linking organizational justice with health outcomes. Unfair treatment can be perceived as a threat to the individual's identity as it challenges one's efficacy and self-worth. The psychological damage it can cause is significant as unfair treatment implies that people do not care about one's individual circumstance (Oyserman, Uskul, Yoder, Nesse, & Williams, 2007). Moreover, the psychosocial processes which are catalysed by one's experiences affect self-efficacy and self-esteem to a great extent; the mere perception that one is treated unjustly exacerbates feelings of exclusion and social deprivation and can have detrimental effects on health (Siegrist, 2005). Link, Cullen, Frank, and Wozniak (1987) suggest that being treated unfairly restricts the prospects one has of achieving fulfilment in one's profession, which also has its detrimental effects.

It is well established in the literature that there is an important association between justice perceptions and job satisfaction (Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009; Fatt, Khin, & Heng, 2010; Malik & Naeem, 2011; Nojani, Arjmandnia). The connection between the two will be discussed in depth further on; nevertheless, the notion of job satisfaction and its underlying determinants ought to be discussed before moving on.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction occurs when a person experiences that their job permits realization of job values that are deemed important. These values may vary from person to person, yet there are values that can be generalized. The majority of people would prefer a job doing something that they find interesting at a personal level; moreover, the ability to accomplish success and see progress seems to apply for most people from Western cultures (Henne & Locke, 1985). Other values may include, but are not limited to, autonomy, role clarity, freedom from physical trauma, security of a stable income, fairness in the distribution of promotions, transparency in the process and opportunity to advance (Henne & Locke, 1985).

The interpersonal relationship with one's peers and superiors also plays a significant role in job satisfaction. Research has found that people prefer co-workers who share

comparable ideals and who enable work achievement, while superiors who are considerate, honest, fair and knowledgeable are preferred (Henne & Locke, 1985). Evidently, there seems to be a natural relationship surrounding job satisfaction and the justness of various processes.

Dissatisfied employees may revert to counterproductive behaviours such as poor quality of work, absenteeism and segregation (Henne & Locke, 1985). Furthermore, it has also been found that employees who are dissatisfied with their job have increased occurrences of physical and psychological ailments such as lassitude, hypertension, depression and insomnia (O'Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). Moreover, this can result in high turnover, which is often damaging for an organization, as the expenditure involved in the selection, recruitment, induction and training of new employees is usually a costly affair. Additionally, reduced morale, pressure on the existing employees and the loss of social capital are also associated with high turnover as a result of dissatisfaction (Dess & Shaw, 2001).

According to Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009), job satisfaction is theorised as consisting of three components, namely evaluation, cognition and affect. The evaluative component is the employee's general attitude towards the organization, which represents a like or dislike attitude toward the organization. A single-item measurement of one's job satisfaction will generally have the evaluation component governing the given answer. The cognitive component incorporates the beliefs, expectations and perceptions pertaining to the organization and the extent to which they are met. The cognitions an employee holds revolve around four primary inducement systems: firstly, reward inducement (expectation of pay and promotion), managerial inducement (expectations of how leaders should be and satisfaction with one's supervisor) and task inducement (role expectation and assigned tasks that cohere with one's cognition). Variables such as increased responsibility, autonomy and task identity generally cohere with higher levels of job satisfaction. Lastly, social inducement is one's appraisal of co-workers and whether they aid or obstruct job performance relative to expectations (Bakhshi et al., 2009).

The affective component pertains to the feelings aroused by the cognitions and associations to the organization. Positive feelings are induced by information, response, affirmation of one's importance to the company, and circumstances that reinforce and facilitate self-worth and self-concept. Furthermore, the four inducement systems are also largely involved in arousing affect (Bakhshi et al., 2009). The emotional response of being satisfied (or dissatisfied) with one's job is a response to the judgment of the aforementioned components by an employee. If the employee perceives that the above-mentioned are being

achieved at an acceptable level, that person will feel the pleasurable sensation of satisfaction; conversely, if they do not, the frustration will translate into dissatisfaction. The strength of these emotions is dependent on the importance of the component (Henne & Locke, 1985).

However, there are significant differences between the genders in terms of job satisfaction. Okpara, Squillace, and Erondu (2006) found that female university teachers in the United States have lower satisfaction in terms of salary, promotion, supervision and overall contentment with their job. It is suggested that there might be systematic differences in job-related values, meaning that the same job outcome might produce different levels of job satisfaction between the genders (Mason, 1995). According to this hypothesis females are more content with jobs where there is interaction with others in an encouraging cooperative way. The statement is based around the perception that women's values are communal by nature, where concern for others, selflessness and the desire to be at harmony take precedence; in contrast, males are preoccupied with self-assertion, self-expansion and the desire to dominate (Eagly, 1987). However, female job satisfaction might be more complex than initially supposed. A large-scale study by Clark (1997) investigated gender differences between males and females in Britain, reporting that females consistently reported higher levels of job satisfaction than males, regardless of the fact that women's jobs were found to be inferior to those of males in terms of employment and dismissal, job content, promotion opportunities, increased sexual harassment and higher levels of reported life stress (Clark, 1997; Clark & Oswald, 1994). Oshagbemi (2001) suggested that this could be due to the perpetuation of gender roles: in instances where gender roles are less salient, the values, attitudes and behaviours of both genders will be comparable

According to Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt and Roman (2005), it is important to understand why organizational justice and job satisfaction are inherently connected. To further advance our knowledge of justice and its comparative effects on workplace attitudes and behaviour, the connection between job satisfaction and organizational justice should be determined.

In their review of the most accurate global rating of job satisfaction, Scarpello and Campbell (1983) concluded that a five-point scale, single-item questionnaire that asks "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?" was the most accurate. It has been frequently argued that multiple-item questionnaires may disregard job components that are important to an employee (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997). Another benefit of a single-item approach is that it is shorter and as a result it is more likely to be completed by an employee. Furthermore, single-

item measures require a minimum amount of space and are, financially speaking, less intrusive (Wanous et al., 1997). Thus, Nagy (2002) argues that the use of a single measurement of job satisfaction is by all requirements sound.

Organizational justice and job satisfaction

Organizational justice and job satisfaction have been studied frequently and consistently and a significant correlation has been identified between the two (Cedwyn & Awamleh, 2006; Colquitt et al., 2001; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Shokerkon & Neamii, 2003; Witt & Nye, 1992).

Research has mainly focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and distributional and procedural justice. Though both are important prerequisites for job satisfaction, there has been some debate over which is most important. Procedural justice pertains to the individual's appraisal of the organization and its establishments and processes, which also have a strong correlation with organizational citizenship (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). On the other hand, distributive justice has significance when remuneration and staff turnover are of concern (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987).

Perception of distributive justice is notably correlated with overall job satisfaction (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Perceived fairness in the distribution of organizational rewards such as promotion, increased salary, status and performance evaluation have been found to have a considerable effect on job satisfaction and overall organizational effectiveness (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). According to McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), distributional justice is the main precursor to job satisfaction due to its capacity to predict employee attitudes concerning personal outcomes. They suggest that employees retain the belief that fairness in distribution will subsequently lead to greater individual outcome as they suppose that fair distribution also means favourable distribution. McFarlin and Sweeney's (1992) investigation of 675 bank workers showed that distributional justice has a strong correlation with job satisfaction, and secondly, distributional justice, compared to procedural justice, is a superior predictor.

The research on procedural justice and its effect on job satisfaction has postulated that if employees doubt the justness of procedures leading up to promotion, or any sort of advancement of position, and believe that they are not based on fair procedure but on influenced intentions, their reason to perform will diminish, and subsequently so will their

work motivation (Cobb & Frey, 1996; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). However, Tyler and Lind (1992) maintain that the extent to which an individual places importance on procedural justice is to a significant degree determined by the amount of association that the individual feels with the workplace and colleagues. Their hypothesis derives from social identity theory and postulates that recognizing that they are highly regarded members of an esteemed group makes up part of people's self-esteem. What is more, these individuals also perceive that if one is being treated fairly this also means being treated favourably. This might seem as a paradox, however, if a group authority is concerned enough to consistently treat a person fairly, this will reflect respect for that person's integrity, which will enhance self-esteem. As a result, strongly connected individuals seek affirmation from the organization and associates in order to maintain and augment self-esteem and self-concept. Conversely, employees who do not feel strongly connected tend to care less about procedural justice (Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt, & Roman, 2005; Lind & Tyler, 1988). In contrast to McFarlin and Sweeney's (1992) study, Alexander and Ruderman (1987) report that procedural justice was found to be a significantly better predictor of job satisfaction than distributive justice in their study of 2800 state employees. Furthermore, Brockner, Tyler, and Cooper-Schneider (1992) found that individuals that have had outcomes favourable to them were also more inclined to perceive procedural processes as fair.

The research of interactional justice and linkage to job satisfaction is scarce, yet it is an important facet in job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001). There is research suggesting that people are affected by the conduct of treatment they receive from an authority figure and the sufficiency of reasons given as a result of official decision-making (Bies, Shapiro, & Cummings, 1988). In this context, the social exchange theory expounds that workers retain the expectancy to be treated fairly, honestly and courteously by the organization and its representatives. The norm of reciprocity states that if an employee perceives that he or she is being treated fairly, that person will automatically be more positively inclined towards the organization. Consequently, this will have significant effects on adherence to the organizational culture, motivation, job satisfaction, enhanced organizational citizenship and decreased withdrawal behaviours (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Effects of organizational justice and job satisfaction on attitudes toward organizational change

Lind and Tyler (1988) suggest that the strongest predictor of attitude is procedural justice the perception of unfair procedures and allocation of resources and promotions will eventually lead to an employee sensing lower trust and commitment toward the organization. These negative emotions can eventually lead the employee to feel apathy and loss of incentive to work, as well as loss of belief in the ambitions of the organization (Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Austin and Walster (1974) found that distributional justice perception was a significant predictor in the cognition and affection generating attitudes towards the organization. However, the strong affective value of interactional justice and its emphasis on communal relationships may result in the employees projecting their emotions of their supervisor onto the organization (Eagly, 1987).

According to equity theory (Adams, 1966), employees relate their skills and performance to the outcome based on their contribution. If there is inequity in the balance due to the individual feeling that they have been “underpaid” or “did not get the promotion”, equity must be resolved by way of attitudinal and behavioural responses. This can be achieved in several ways, such as increases in disingenuous absence from work, lower work performance, and decreased commitment and trust (Greenberg, 1988). In Sweden, females receive around 7% less pay for the same job than males, and have on average 15% less monthly income than males across trades. This inequity and discrimination can impair job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, commitment, motivation and trust, as the extent of the inequity increases (Okpara et al., 2006).

The primary teacher reform (Förstelärrarreformen)

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) was developed as a scholastic evaluation study aimed at assessing the performance of 15-year-old school pupils in over 65 countries. The project is developed and run by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the evaluation is carried out every three years and aims to test and evaluate schoolchildren’s performance around the world, in order to achieve better teaching methods and better results (OECD, 2010). The evaluation primarily investigates four areas – mathematics, science, reading and problem solving.

The PISA study of 2009 was the first time that Swedish students' ranking dropped significantly compared to the three previous instances of the study, yet they still attained an average result compared to the other 65 participating countries (OECD, 2010). However, the most surprising decline in ranking occurred in the PISA study of 2012 where Sweden received a below-average score compared to the other 65 countries in the study. This in contrast to 2003, the first year of the PISA study, Swedish pupils scored almost 10% lower and went from being significantly above average to being significantly below average in all tested subjects (OECD, 2004, 2010, 2013).

There are no simple explanations for this decline, however one of the most important factors is the teachers in Swedish schools. According to a recent study Swedish teachers have among the lowest levels of job satisfaction of all professions in Sweden (Sveriges företagshälsor, 2013) and it seems likely that this is an important contributor to the quality of education. Moreover, according to most recent OECD study, nine out of ten teachers in Sweden are dissatisfied with their current salary (OECD, 2013). As a result, Statistics Sweden (Statistiska Centralbyrån) has estimated that 37,500 teachers have left the profession due to low salaries and low job satisfaction. Statistics Sweden has also assessed that by the year 2020 the Institute of Education will have a shortage of approximately 43,000 teachers, and 59,000 by 2030 (Läraryrket, 2012). Consequently, a strategy is necessary to increase attraction, improve job satisfaction and reduce the staggering number of teachers leaving the profession.

In response to this, a large investment in career services has been initiated by the government named the "primary teacher reform" (förstaläraryrket). The aims of the reform are primarily to increase job satisfaction among teachers, improve attraction to the profession, enhance the quality of teaching and expand the opportunities to progress for both teachers and students (Regeringen, 13 September 2013). It is expected that upwards of 15,000 positions, about one for every six teachers, should be available by the end of 2014. There are two levels of promotion. A teacher has the opportunity to become either a "primary teacher" or "lecturer", the latter being the superior position. The promotion brings with it a number of additional responsibilities, including responsibility for the introduction of new teachers, mentoring other teachers, instigating pedagogical dialogues, and project administration on top of one's primary responsibilities (Regeringen, 13 September 2013). The advancement also means a significant increase in salary, with primary teachers getting approximately 5000 SEK and lecturers receiving around 10,000 SEK more each month. To achieve this promotion the

teacher needs, in addition to being qualified, to have shown particularly good ability in improving student performance, a strong interest in the development of teaching, and to have completed postgraduate studies in a subject that is relevant for teaching in conjunction with at least four years' service as a teacher (Regeringen, 2013).

For the reform to be successful it is important that the many teachers it concerns receive this large-scale change positively. Perception of justice and level of job satisfaction has been found to be strongly associated with attitude towards the organization and trust when reform is being implemented.

The present study

The success of the primary teacher reform will partly depend on the way that it is implemented and how contextual factors in the organization facilitate or block constructive implementation of the reform, this essentially being affected if the processes of the reform are perceived as fair. Since there are a limited number of positions available, the discrepancy between those who have and those who may not cause problems and trigger segregation among colleagues. Moreover, the distribution and procedures on which they are based might be perceived as unjust.

The purpose of the current study is to investigate teachers' attitudes towards the reform, and quantify how job satisfaction and perception of organizational justice among teachers in Sweden correlate with attitudes towards the reform. More importantly, how do the teachers who are affected by it receive the reform? The questions asked are: does perception of organizational justice affect the reception of the reform? And does job satisfaction affect attitude toward the reform? These questions are important because the reform means that new positions will be created, and the belief that the distribution of promotions and the processes they are based on are fair should affect attitude and hence implementation of the reform. Based on the aforementioned research, the following hypothesis is assumed.

Hypothesis. The study hypothesis is that job satisfaction and organizational justice perceptions serve as significant predictors of attitude toward the reform for both male and female teachers in both primary and upper secondary schools.

Method

Data Collection

Data was collected using a combination of previously proven questionnaires and questionnaires specifically developed for this study. The form consisted of three sections looking at different facets of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and attitude towards reform. The first section concerned perceived job satisfaction, the second looked at attitudes towards the reform and the last section focused on perceived organizational justice. The job satisfaction facet and the attitude towards the reform facet questions were developed using the methods as explained by Nagy (2002). To collect data on the three dimensions of perceived organizational justice, established scales were employed. Data was collected using the Price and Meuller (1986) Distributive Justice Index, the Daly (1995) Procedural Fairness Instrument and the Moorman (1991) Interactional Justice Instrument. The present study utilized the Swedish translations of the instruments carried out by Liljegren (2008).

Participants

Participants were gathered by utilizing a mixture of snowball sampling and random sampling. Initially, various principals of upper secondary schools were contacted with information and a link to the survey in the third largest city of Sweden, Malmo. They were also recruited by asking them to distribute the survey among their head-of-school colleagues. Moreover, the survey was distributed to teachers directly having acquired their email addresses from various school websites across Sweden. The survey was also sent to the Swedish teachers' coalition, who distributed the survey among its members. Approximately 2000 teachers were invited to complete the questionnaire; as a result of this invitation, 437 teachers participated in the study, with a response rate of 21.6%. The majority of the participants were female at 61.1%, while 38.9% were males ($M = 1.6$, $SD = 0.5$). The sample distribution in terms of gender quite closely resembles the national distribution, where approximately 69% are female and 31% are male (Statistiska Centralbyrån, 2013). Of the participants, 276 (63%) were upper secondary school teachers and 161 (37%) primary school teachers. Primary school is defined as classes from 1st grade to 9th grade, in contrast to upper secondary school, which is defined as 10th to 12th grade ($M = 1.4$, $SD = 0.5$). The distribution in term of level of school was not representative of the national distribution where 71% are primary school teacher and 29% are upper secondary school teacher (Statistiska Centralbyrån, 2013). Participant age ranged from 21 to 30 (6.5%), 31 to 40 (24.8%), 41 to 50 (29.6%), 51 to

60 (25.7%) and 60+ (13.4%) ($M = 3.1$, $SD = 1.1$). A total of 83.5% of the schools had implemented the reform ($M = 1.2$, $SD = 0.5$).

Instruments

Single-item measurement of job satisfaction. For the purpose of the present study, a single-item measurement of job satisfaction was developed using the single-item, discrepancy-based method proposed by Nagy (2002). The item has a five-point Likert scale response parameter and is a combination of two discrepancy questions into one (e.g., “How satisfied are you?” and “How satisfied do you wish you were?”). The use of this is suggested to be superior to the conventional method of investigating a person’s attitude since it allows the responder to deliberate over all the aspects he or she finds important regardless of factors being excluded by a multiple-item questionnaire. This single-item approach offers a more comprehensive and inclusive picture of satisfaction (Nagy, 2002). With all of these factors taken into consideration, item 4 of the questionnaire is “How content are you with the level of satisfaction you currently have with your job in comparison with the level of satisfaction you want?”

Attitude towards reform. Items 6–9 of the questionnaire measure the attitude towards reform facet and were developed specifically for the purpose of this study. They consist of four questions that aim to investigate perceptions of the reform pertaining to the teacher as an individual, to the students and to an overall outlook on the reform. The items were developed in collaboration along with an upper secondary school teacher and a primary school teacher. For the purpose of scoring, all items are summed up for each respondent; the “very fair” categories are given a “1” and the “very unfair” categories are given a “5”. The internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of the items was found to be .90. An example of an item found in the attitude toward reform section is “To what extent will the primary teacher reform affect the quality of teaching at the school?”

Distributive Justice. Distributional justice was measured using the Price and Mueller Justice Index (DJI) (1986). Items 10–15 of the questionnaire pertain to the employees’ remunerations, relative to the level of education/training, exertion, pressure, responsibilities and quality of work. The items of the DJI have a Likert scale response parameter ranging from “very fair” to “very unfair”. For the purpose of scoring, all items are summed up for each respondent; the “very fair” categories are given a “1” and the “very unfair” categories are given a “5”.

Validity and reliability. The DJI was analysed together with items measuring job opportunities, pay, routinization, centralization, downward instrumental communication, promotion prospects, importance of income, and external resources for not quitting one's job; subsequently, the DJI was found to be significantly correlated with the above-mentioned components (Liljegren, 2008). Price and Mueller (1986) stated that the index has an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) between the items of .94, which is consistent with the finding of this study.

Procedural Justice. Procedural justice was measured by the Daly Procedural Fairness Instrument (PFI) (1995). Items 15–19 investigate the respondents' perception of the organizational decision-making process. For the purpose of scoring, all items are summed up for each respondent; the "very fair" categories are given a "1" and the "very unfair" categories are given a "5". It is important to note that the first two items are in reverse and were therefore inverted before analysis.

Validity and reliability. Daly and Geyer (1994) report that fairness in procedure as measured by the PFI correlated with measurements of outcome fairness. Through the analysis of covariances, i.e. structural equation models (SEM), they postulate a standard maximum likelihood estimate of .57. What is more, Daly (1995), in his study, reports that the DJI was related to measurements of outcome fairness ($r = .41, p < .01$). In terms of reliability, Daly (1995) and Daly and Geyer (1994) state an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of .88 between the four items of the instrument. This is consistent with the findings of this study (.89).

Moorman Interactional Justice Instrument. Perceived interactional justice was measured utilizing the Moorman Interactional Justice Instrument (IJI) (1991). Items 20–25 of the questionnaire look mainly at the conduct of the supervisor but also the justice perception of the organization's official processes as it interacts with the employee (Moorman, 1991). For the purpose of scoring, all items are summed up for each respondent; the "very unfair" categories are given a "1" and the "very fair" categories are given a "5".

Validity and reliability. The study by Moorman (1991) found that the IJI was correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .43, p < .01$), distributive justice ($r = .60, p < .01$), formal procedures ($r = .66, p < .01$), altruism ($r = .16, p < .05$), courtesy ($r = .32, p < .01$), sportsmanship ($r = .29, p < .01$) and conscientiousness ($r = .32, p < .01$). In terms of reliability, Moorman (1991) reported an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) between the items of .93;

however, for the Swedish version of the instrument the Cronbach's alpha was found to be slightly lower at .88.

Translation of the DJI, PJI and IJI. The Swedish version of the instruments was translated and evaluated as part of a doctoral dissertation by Liljegren (2008). The translation was conducted by three different translators and later combined in a unanimously agreed method. This version was later back-translated by a final translator and then compared with the original. The complete questionnaire with numbered items is presented in Appendix A.

Results

Descriptives. Analysis of the data was conducted utilizing IBM SPSS software version 22. The four items of the attitude towards reform section were transformed into indices and analysed. The calculated means and standard deviations for all participants (N=437) was found to be $M = 3.10$, $SD = .94$ for attitude toward reform, $M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.03$ for distributional justice, $M = 2.99$, $SD = .43$ for procedural justice, $M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.10$ interactional justice, and $M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.10$ for job satisfaction.

Table 1 illustrates the results from the MANOVA that was conducted to see whether there were any significant differences between genders, and between levels of school. There was only a statistically significant difference between genders pertaining to attitude towards the reform.

Table 1

MANOVA comparing between genders and between levels of school

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	Distribution	1.302	1	1.302	1.207	.273	.003
	Attitude	7.043	1	7.043	8.115	.005*	.018
	Procedure	.029	1	.029	.153	.696	.000
	Interaction	.001	1	.001	.002	.966	.000
	Job Satisfaction	.456	1	.456	.388	.534	.001
School	Distribution	.249	1	.249	.231	.631	.001
	Attitude	.805	1	.805	.928	.336	.002
	Procedure	.065	1	.065	.347	.556	.001
	Interaction	.131	1	.131	.170	.681	.000
	Job Satisfaction	.297	1	.297	.253	.615	.001

Table 2 illustrates correlations between the variables. The organizational justice indices were found to have significant correlation between each other, the job satisfaction item and the attitude towards reform index.

Table 2

Correlation coefficient between indices of organizational justices and job satisfaction

		Attitude	Distribution	Interaction	Procedure	Satisfaction
Pearson	Attitude	-				
Correlation	Distribution	.447*	-			
	Interaction	.423*	.634*	-		
	Procedure	.458*	.638*	.602*	-	
	Satisfaction	.363*	.607*	.480*	.493*	-

Note. * p < .001

On the first three items about the attitudes to the reform, 49.5% of the participants responded that the reform will not affect the quality of the education, 57.8% reported it will not affect teachers’ opportunities to develop their work, and 57.1% that it will not affect students’ opportunities to develop. However, the fourth item is the one of most interest as it captures the overarching general attitude of the respondent. It asks, “Overall, how do you see the primary teacher reform?” Less than a third of the respondents (28.9%) answered “mainly negative”, and a further 20.2% viewed the reform as slightly more negative than positive. Conversely, 21.6% of the respondents viewed the reform as being slightly more positive than negative, with 14% mainly positive and 15.5% believed that it would do neither.

Multiple regression analysis. Standard multiple regression analysis was utilized to ascertain organizational justice and job satisfaction, which served as superior predictors of attitude toward the reform. Analysis was conducted with attitude toward reform as the dependent variable, while job satisfaction and distributional, procedural and interactional justice served as the independent variables. Multiple regression analysis was also conducted separately for genders and between teachers and upper secondary school teachers to highlight any variance in predictive value of the independent variables. Analysis was carried out using SPSS REGRESSION and SPSS EXPLORE for evaluation of assumptions.

Testing for homoscedasticity was conducted to ensure primary assumptions of the data. The Breusch-Pagan test was employed to check for heteroscedasticity in the sample and was found to be $X^2=8.960$ $p=.428$. The significant value of the test ($p = >.05$) indicated that the data was homoscedastic.

Reliability analysis was conducted on all items. The items of distributional justice, interactional justice and attitude towards reform were found to have an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of $r = .7$, therefore four indices were created representing each facet. A missing values analysis was conducted and found no missing values; $N = 437$. Multiple regression analysis was used to test whether the different types of justice in conjunction with job satisfaction could predict participants' ratings of attitude toward reform at a significant level. The results of the regression were $R^2 = .267$, $F(3, 433) = 39.343$ $p < .01$. The adjusted R^2 takes into account the sample size and was reduced to .260, which postulates that 26% of the variability in attitude towards reform could be predicted by organizational justices. Table 3 illustrates the unstandardized regression coefficient (B), the standardized regression coefficient (β) and the semipartial correlation (sr_i^2) and shows that all facets of organizational justice are significant predictors of attitude towards the reform for the entire sample; job satisfaction on the other hand was not a significant variable.

Table 3

Summary of multiple regression analysis for variables predicting attitude toward reform for all participants

All respondents (N = 437)			
Variable	B	$SE B$	β
Distribution	.115	.104	.159*
Procedure	.217	.164	.227***
Interaction	.103	.105	.144*
Job Satisfaction	.060	.067	.086
R^2		.260**	

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

Table 4 illustrates the standard regression analysis looking separately at male and female teachers. Males $R^2 = .174$, $F(4, 165) = 8.666$ $p < .01$, adjusted $R^2 = .154$, females $R^2 = .351$, $F(4, 262) = 35.414$ $p < .01$, adjusted $R^2 = .341$, which suggests that the model could explain 15.4% of the male variability and 34.1% of the female variability among teachers.

Table 4

Summary of multiple regression analysis for variables predicting attitude toward reform separately for male and female teachers

Variable	Male (N = 170)			Female (N = 167)		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Distribution	.049	.043	.063	.140	.128	.202*
Procedure	.200	.154	.198*	.228	.172	.252***
Interaction	.058	.055	.078	.140	.150	.205**
Job Satisfaction	.118	.141	.176*	.018	.575	.026
Adjusted R^2		.154**			.341**	

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

Lastly, Table 5 illustrates the standard regression analysis which was performed separately for primary school teachers to upper secondary school teachers. Primary school teachers $R^2 = .310$, $F(4, 156) = 17.515$ $p < .01$, adjusted $R^2 = .292$, and upper secondary school teachers $R^2 = .256$, $F(4, 271) = 23.372$ $p < .01$, adjusted $R^2 = .246$, which suggests that the model could explain 29.2% of the primary school and 24.6% of the upper secondary school variability.

Table 5

Summary of multiple regression analysis for variables predicting attitude toward reform for upper secondary and primary school teachers

Variable	Upper secondary (N = 276)			Primary School (N = 161)		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Distribution	.168	.151	.228**	.040	.036	.057
Procedure	.170	.126	.170*	.295	.230	.334***
Interaction	.059	.057	.080	.151	.165	.225*
Job Satisfaction	.092	.103	.130*	.010	.551	.015
Adjusted R^2		.246			.292**	
		**				

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

Discussion

Previous studies have investigated job satisfaction and organizational justice and indicate the importance of considering both as vital aspects of organizations, important for both the efficacy of the organization and of the individual, in addition to its importance for the self-concept and health of its employees. The purpose of this study has been to investigate the importance of organizational justice and job satisfaction and their effect on attitude, specifically under a large-scale reform. Swedish teachers have previously been found to have low job satisfaction, and the subsequent connection between job satisfaction, perception of organizational justice and attitude has been clear in previous research. The large investment that has been made by the Swedish government in order to reform the educational institution has been a vast undertaking and has the potential to create positive change. Thus it is important to understand how attitudes affect its reception, as this could be imperative for the reform to be successful (Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Austin and Walster, 1974). The aim of this study has been to further understand how organizational justice and job

satisfaction can predict attitude toward the reform. In line with previous research, it was found that the predictors could account for a significant portion of the variance in attitude.

The findings of the present study support the hypothesis that organizational justice is a predictor of attitude toward the reform, though not all facets of justice were found significant. The data suggests that there are differences between males and females, and upper secondary and primary school teachers in terms of what facet of justice is the best predictor of attitude. Moreover, job satisfaction's predictive value regarding attitude toward reform was only found to be significant for males and upper secondary school teachers. However, the data suggests that there are only small dissimilarities between the genders pertaining to degree of job satisfaction. Previous research suggests that females have equal to or better job satisfaction than males (Clark, 1997; Clark & Oswald, 1994), though in the present study there were only minor differences not statistically significant. Lastly, differences between levels of schools were explored; again there were no statistically significant differences between means. Nevertheless, the data suggests that there is a significant difference in terms of what variables serve as the best predictors of attitude. Procedural justice was regularly found to be the primary or secondary in determining attitude toward the reform, distributional justice was found to be significant for both upper secondary school teacher and males and females however not for primary school teachers. Interactional justice was found as a significant variable for primary school teacher and females however not for males and upper secondary school teachers. The research by Mason (2005) suggests that females put more emphasis on interaction and thus it seems reasonable that interactional justice is found to be a determinant of job satisfaction and accordingly a predictor of attitude toward reform. However, why it is not significant for upper secondary school teacher is yet to be determined. Further investigations regarding hierarchy within the primary school system may shed light on the issue.

The responses of the attitude towards reform for the fourth item, "Overall, how do you see the primary teacher reform?" found that almost half (49.2%) of the respondents see the reform as undesirable, which indicates that teachers have not been persuaded of the positive change that the reform is suggested to bring. And considering the cost of implementing the reform, it is an interesting find that so many are negative towards it.

However, it is essential to understand that it is not uncommon for people to resist change, even if it may be for the better. Change means venturing into something that is different, and it is natural that it is initially met with a negative attitude and resistance.

Coghlan (1993), Scott and Jaffe (1988) and Steinburg (1992) explain that there are four stages: initial denial, resistance gradual exploration, and eventual commitment when organizational change is of concern. Nonetheless, though it is a natural response, employee attitude and resistance have often been directly attributed to the success or failure of organizational reform (Maurer, 1997; Spiker & Lesser, 1995). In a long-term study by Waldersee and Griffiths (1996) of over 500 organizations, when executing change or reform, employee resistance was the most regularly reported problem. Handling resistance is of greater concern for those who implement it and is perhaps, more than any other, the variable that is most essential for the success or failure of change (O'Connor, 1993).

The hypothesis that perception of organizational justice affects attitude (Colquitt et al., 2001; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Okpara et al., 2006; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) was confirmed by the data. In a large-scale organizational reform specifically involving the creation of new positions, the distribution of these and the underlying processes are logically important for one's attitude. For the sample, distributional, procedural and interactional justice were all found to be significant predictors of attitude toward reform. Procedural justice contributed most to the model followed by distributional justice; this was expected and is in accordance with previous research. As a result, the model predicted 26% of the variability for the sample.

The data shows that there is a notable gender difference pertaining to attitude towards the reform, where males were less positive about the reform compared to females, however this was the only variable that was statistically significant. There was a divergence between genders pertaining to which variable predicted attitude best. Job satisfaction and procedural justice were the best predictors of attitude toward reform for males, accounting for 15.4% of the variability. On the other hand, for females, all the organizational justice variables were significant predictors, but as with the males, procedural justice was the most accurate followed by interaction justice and lastly distributional justice. The model's accuracy of prediction was higher than that of the males, being able to predict 34.1% of the variability. This finding is in order with previous research which suggest that females place greater value on interactions compared to males. For this reason it seems vital that contact and communication are open and transparent for teacher reform to be successful, this being particularly important for female employees.

Lastly, the data suggest that there is a discrepancy between the variables that were most accurate at predicting attitude in primary school and upper secondary school. For primary school teachers, all organizational justice variables were significant predictors, with

distributional justice being the best followed by procedural justice and job satisfaction. Conversely, primary school teachers had procedural justice as the most important predictor followed by interactional justice. As a result, the model accurately predicted 25.6% of the variability for upper secondary and 31% for primary school teachers. Procedural justice is consistently either the most important or second most important variable, thus the findings of this study are in line with those of previous research (Austin and Walster, 1974; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Nonetheless, the reason for there is discrepancy between primary and upper secondary school teacher is an issue for further research.

Limitations, further directions and implications

There are several limitations to this study. The study managed to receive a fair sample to analyse; however, the response rate of 21.6% was below what was expected. An explanation for this could be that the study was conducted at an inappropriate period of time to receive optimal response rate. I received an email from a teacher stating: *“Though the questionnaire only takes 10 minutes to complete, most of us cannot even spare that much as this is the busiest time of the semester for us teachers.”*

It was found that only males and upper secondary teachers had job satisfaction as a significant variable; the study failed to understand why the majority did not have job satisfaction as a significant predictor. Instinctively one would think that the significance of job satisfaction as a predictor for upper secondary school teachers is due to the mostly male respondents; however, this was not the case as only 48 out of the 276 upper secondary school teacher respondents were male. By definition this is not a limitation; however, if similar results were to be found in a future study it would be important to understand why. Which leads to another drawback: the sample size of male upper secondary school teachers.

The limited time also contributed to the size of the sample; more accurate and representative predictions could have been made with a larger sample. Lastly, the respondents were from all over the country, and this made it difficult to pinpoint where there could have been better or worse perceptions on justice and job satisfaction, since the implementation in many ways is dependent on the municipalities of schools implementing them. Therefore, better localization of participants is a limitation of the study and could be suggested as an area for further research. As aforementioned, the sample was representative of Sweden in terms of gender; however, there was a difference in term of level of school. The majority of the samples were upper secondary school teachers (63%) but only 29% of Swedish teachers are

upper secondary school teachers. This could be possibly be problematic since the majority of Swedish teachers are primary school teachers and since there were differences in what justice facet were significant predictors. Conversely, it might be irrelevant since there was no significant difference in attitude towards the reform between primary and upper secondary school teachers.

It is suggested that more studies look at specific professions and how they are affected by the employees' perceptions of justice and job satisfaction. Also, further research should investigate the professions that are most vulnerable to low justice perceptions and low job satisfaction. Furthermore, studies similar to that of Clark (1997) looking at the job satisfaction discrepancies between genders in Sweden would create comprehension of if and why these exist. Lastly, investigating generational differences pertaining to perception of justice and job satisfaction through cohort studies would highlight differences in age groups and how generational differences affects justice perceptions and job satisfaction.

This study contributes to the scientific community in a way that job satisfaction and organizational justice are continually important in the development of attitudes specifically when implementing organizational change. Moreover, the practical relevance of the study is that the Swedish administrators of the reform will consider the findings of this study and take into consideration the implication of negative attitudes and what they are founded on.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1966). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267–299.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 177–198.
- Austin, W., & Walster, E. (1974). Participants' reactions to "equity with the world." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 528–548.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154.
- Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 629–643.
- Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 286–295.
- Bies, R. J., Shapiro, D. L., & Cummings, L. L. (1988). Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: Is it enough to say it's not my fault? *Communication Research*, 15, 381–399.
- Brockner, J., Tyler, T. R., & Cooper-Schneider, R. (1992). The influence of prior commitment to an institution on reactions to perceived unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Sciences, Q.* 37(2): 241–261.
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 189-208.
- Cedwyn, F., & Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organizational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management research News*, 29(11), 701–712.
- Cobb, A.T., & Frey, F.M. (1996). The effects of leader fairness and pay outcomes on superior/subordinate relations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 1401–26.
- Coghlan, D. (1993). A person-centered approach to dealing with resistance to change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 14(4), 10–14.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278–321.

- 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*, 425–445.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386–400.
- Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (1994). Unhappiness and unemployment. *The Economic Journal, 104*, 424, 448.
- Clark, A. E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work?. *Labour Economics, 4*(4), 341–37.
- Clay-Warner, J., Hegtvedt, K. A., & Roman, P. (2005). Procedural justice, distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on work attitudes. *Social Psychology, 68*, 89–102.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31*, 6, 874.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations, 45*(3), 305–317.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241–1255.
- Daly, J. P. (1995). Explaining changes to employees: The influence of justifications and change outcomes on employees' fairness judgments. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 31*, 415–429.
- Daly, J. P., & Geyer, P. D. (1994). The role of fairness in implementing large-scale change: Employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 623–638.
- Dess, G. G., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital, and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(3)446-456.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Fatt, C. K., Khin, E. W., & Heng, T. N. (2010). The impact of organizational justice on employee's job satisfaction: The Malaysian companies perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 2*(1), 56-63.

- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115–130.
- Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity and workplace status: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 606–13.
- Hegtvedt, K. A., & Markovsky, B. (1995). Justice and injustice. In Cook, K., Fine, G. A., and House, J. (eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, pp. 257–280.
- Henne, D., & Locke, E. A. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 1, 221–240.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of the job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14, 193–200.
- Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Elovainio, M., Virtanen, M., & Siegrist, J. (2007). Effort-reward imbalance, procedural injustice and relational injustice as psychosocial predictors of health: Complementary or redundant models? *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 64, 659–665.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698–707.
- Konovsky, M. A., Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1987). Relative effects of procedural and distributive justice on employee attitudes. *Representative Research and Social Psychology*, 17, 15–24.
- Läraryrörbundet. (2012). *Perspektiv på lärarlöner, del 9: Varifrån ska alla nya lärare komma?* Retrieved 15 May, from http://res.cloudinary.com/lararforbundet/image/upload/v1387548483/814d519babd9e24fa5ebabd0ad5ab9fca1c528f5/lonerapport_nr9.pdf
- Liljegren, M. (2008). *Health at work* (Doctoral Dissertation): *the relationship between organizational justice, behavioural responses, and health*. Linköping: Linköping Universitet, 2008. Linköping.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Plenum, New

York.

- Link, B. G., Cullen, F. T., Frank, J., & Wozniak, J. F. (1987). The social rejection of former mental patients: Understanding why labels matter. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 1461–1500.
- Malik, M. E., & Naeem, B. (2011). Role of perceived organizational justice in job satisfaction: Evidence from higher education institutions of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(8), 662-673.
- Martin, C. L., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organizational Management*, 21(1), 84–104.
- Mason, E. S. (1995). Gender differences in job satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 2, 143–51.
- Maurer, R. (1997). Transforming resistance, *Human Relations Focus*, 74(10), 9–10.
- 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, (3), 626–637.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845–855.
- Nagy, M. (2002). Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 1, 77-86.
- Nojani, M. I., Arjmandnia, A. A., Afrooz, G. A., & Rajabi, M. (2012). The study on relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in teachers working in general, special and gifted education systems. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2900-2905.
- O'Connor, C. A. (1993). Resistance: The repercussions of change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 14, (6), 30–6.
- O'Driscoll, M. P., & Beehr, T. A. (1994). Supervisor behaviors, role stressors and uncertainty as predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 141–155.

- Okpara, J., Squillace, M., & Erondy, E. (2006). Gender differences and job satisfaction: A study of university teachers in the United States. *Human Resources Abstracts*, 41, 1.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development & Programme for International Student Assessment. (2004). *Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Programme for International Student Assessment. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: What students know and can do*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Programme for International Student Assessment. (2013). *PISA 2012 results*. Paris: OECD.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2001). Gender differences in the job satisfaction of university teachers. *Women in Management Review*, 15, 7, 343–331.
- Oyserman, D., Uskul, A. K., Yoder, N., Nesse, R. M., & Williams, D. R. (2007). Unfair treatment and self-regulatory focus. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 505–512.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, Massachusetts, USA: Pitman Publishing Inc.
- Regeringen. (2013). *Promemoria Regeringen 13 september 2013*. Retrieved 15 May 2014, from <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/22/36/29/0a4f4eca.pdf>
- Ryan, A. (1993). *Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 577-6.
- Scott, C. D., & Jaffe, D. T. (1988). Survive and thrive in times of change. *Training and Development Journal*, 25–7.
- Sheppard, B. H., Lewicki, R. J., & Minton, J. W. (1992). *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the work-place*. New York: Lexington.
- Shokerkon, H., & Neamii, A. (2003). Survey simple regression and multiple regression between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Psychology*, 201, 57–70.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 27–41.
- Siegrist, J. (2005). Social reciprocity and health: New scientific evidence and policy implications. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30, 1033–1038.

- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 434–443.
- Smith, C. A., Haynes, K. N., Lazarus, R. S., & Pope, L. K. (1993). In search of the “hot” cognitions: Attributions, appraisals, and their relation to emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 916–929.
- Spiker, B. K., & Lesser, E. (1995). We have met the enemy. *Journal of Business Strategy, 16*, (2), 17–21.
- Statistiska Centralbyrån. (2013). *Lärare och skolledare i grundskolan och gymnasieskolan 2012/13*. Retrieved from http://www.scb.se/sv_/Hitta-statistik/Temaomraden/Jamstallldhet/Fordjupningar/Utbildning-och-forskning/Larare-och-skolledare/Larare-och-skolledare-i-grundskolan-och-gymnasieskolan-201112/
- Steinburg, C. (1992). Taking charge of change. *Training and Development, 46*, 3, 26–32.
- Sveriges Företagshälsor. (2013). *Jobbhälsobarometern, Delrapport 2013:2*. Retrived from <http://www.foretagshalsor.se/foretagshalsovard/jobbhalsobarometern>
- Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers’ evaluations of the ends and the means: An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Process, 55*, (1), 23–40.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 115–191.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers. A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 247–252.
- Waldersee, R., Griffiths, A., & Centre for Corporate Change. (1996). *The changing face of organizational change*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.
- Witt, L. A., & Nye, L.G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, (6), 910–917.

Appendix

Hej! Tack för att ni tar tiden för att fylla denna enkät. Denna undersökning är viktigt för att sedan implementering av förstälärrarreformen i Sverige har det inte undersökts vad just Ni lärare anser om detta och därför kommer denna undersökning bidra med viktig information om vad Ni lärare tycker om reformen.

Enkäten består av 20 frågor och tar cirka 5 min att göra. Enkäten är givetvis helt anonym och går ej att spåras, all given information kommer att hanteras konfidentiellt. Genom att fylla i enkäten ger ni er samtycke för att all insamlad data kan användas till ett Master's examensarbete som kan eventuellt publiceras i en vetenskaplig journal. Tack för ert deltagande!

Så här fyller du i pappersenkäten

Nedan ser du hur du markerar ett svarsalternativ, och hur du avmarkerar ett redan gjort val.

- Korrekt markerat svarsalternativ
- Inkorrekt markerat svarsalternativ, krysset ska vara mitt i rutan
- Inkorrekt markerat svarsalternativ, krysset är alltför kraftigt
- Ångrat val, svarsalternativet räknas inte som markerat

Vet ej

5. Hur nöjd är du med den nivå av tillfredsställelse du för närvarande har med ditt jobb i jämförelse med den nivå av tillfredsställelse du vill ha?

- Våldigt missnöjd
- Missnöjd
- Vaken nöjd eller missnöjd
- Nöjd
- Våldigt nöjd

ositivt eller negativt

- Något mer positivt än negativt
- Övervägande positivt

10. Hur rättvis tycker Du att den uppskattning Du fått från Din arbetsgivare har varit i förhållande till det ansvar Du har?

- Mycket orättvist
- Orättvist
- Varken rättvist eller orättvist
- Rättvist
- Mycket rättvist

ler orättvist

- Rättvist
- Mycket rättvist

15. Beslut i den här organisationen fattas på ett sätt som är orättvist för mig

- Instämmer inte alls
- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

ämmer inte alls

- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

15. Beslut i den här organisationen fattas på ett sätt som är orättvist för mig

- Instämmer inte alls
- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

ämmer inte alls

- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

20. Din arbetsledare har en förmåga att dämpa sina förutfattade meningar och personliga åsikter

- Instämmer inte alls
- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

r inte alls

- Instämmer inte till en viss del
- Neutral åsikt
- Instämmer till en viss del
- Instämmer helt

