MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

An Examination of the Dysfunctional Consequences of Organizational Injustice and Escapist Coping

Authors: Kelly L. Zellars, Yongmei Lui, Virginia K. Bratton, Robert Brymer, and Pamela Perrewé

This is a postprint of an article that originally appeared in Journal of Managerial Issues in Winter 2004.

Zellars, Kelly L., Liu, Yongmei, Bratton, Virginia K., Brymer, Robert, & Perrewé, Pamela, (2004). An Examination of the Dysfunctional Consequences of Organizational Injustice and Escapist Coping. Journal of Managerial Issues, 16(4), 528-544. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604467

Made available through Montana State University's ScholarWorks
scholarworks.montana.edu

An Examination of the Dysfunctional Consequences of Organizational Injustice and Escapist Coping

Kelly L. Zellars
Associate Professor of Management
University of North Carolina — Charlotte

Yongmei Liu
Doctoral Student/Management
Florida State University

Virginia Bratton
Assistant Professor of Management
University of Melbourne

Robert Brymer
Professor of Hospitality Administration
Florida State University

Pamela L. Perrewé
Jim Moran Professor of Management
Florida State University

A considerable amount of research has been devoted to the manner in which individuals cope with stressful situations in daily organizational life. Coping includes behavioral, cognitive, and emotional efforts to manage external and/or internal demands and primarily aims to manage stress and restore equilibrium (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). As coping research has evolved, some researchers (see Lazarus, 1999) have focused on the trait-like aspect of coping, emphasizing the stable coping styles of individuals. Others have taken a state or situational approach, emphasizing the dynamic feature of coping and viewing coping as a process (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984; Billings and Moos, 1984). Still others take a middle ground, treating coping patterns as relatively stable, situation-specific

styles that individuals develop over time and deploy in stressful situations (Koeske *et al.*, 1993).

Coping strategies cannot be understood in a generalized sense (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984; Folkman *et al.*, 1986). Instead, coping is context-specific and, therefore, a coping strategy can be effective or ineffective, generating different consequences in different situations. Nevertheless, the preponderance of research in the coping literature has focused on individual differences such as personality types (e.g., Suls and David, 1996), negative affectivity (e.g., Lee *et al.*, 1993), self-efficacy (e.g., Jex *et al.*, 2001), and coping resources (e.g., Gowan *et al.*, 1999) as antecedents of coping strategies. Far less research has directly assessed the relationship between situational factors and individuals' choice of coping strategies. This is an important omission, for not only do individuals perceive and interpret potentially stressful cues from the environment (Lazarus, 1991), but context may also determine which coping strategy works best for individuals given the immediate situation (Koeske *et al.*, 1993; Palinkas and Browner, 1995). Thus, in order to address this issue, we examine one organizational context variable on an individual's choice of a particular coping strategy. Specifically, we examine the relationship between procedural justice and escapist coping. We also examine three affective outcomes of escapist coping: job satisfaction, strain, and intent to turnover. This study enhances the existing literature in two ways. First, to the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to explore the effect of perceived contextual factors (i.e., procedural justice), rather than individual differences on individual coping strategies. Second, it contributes to the turnover literature by examining the mediating process through which procedural justice influences intentions to turnover.

We begin with a brief discussion of procedural justice and escapist coping, followed by the proposed relationships to affective outcomes and intentions to turnover. We then present our expected hypotheses and findings. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the potential implications for managers and offer directions for future research.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

Procedural justice, the degree to which fair procedures are perceived to be present and used in an organization (Lind and Tyler, 1988), requires individuals be given the chance to participate in decision making, be given adequate explanations for decisions, and have a clear understanding of what their roles are (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997). In recent years, there has been a significant amount of research regarding the role of procedural justice on important organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (Spector and Fox, 2002; Moorman, 1991), organizational commitment (Rhoades *et al.*, 2001; Flaherty and Pappas, 2000), job satisfaction (Fields *et al.*, 2000), and intent to turnover (Roberts *et al*, 1999). Consistent findings indicate that procedural justice is related to positive individual and organizational outcomes and a lack of justice is associated with negative outcomes, including higher absenteeism (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997) and greater intentions to quit (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991). Despite these consistent

findings, very few studies have specifically looked at underlying psychological and affective mechanisms by which procedural justice functions. This is a significant omission because by understanding the underlying mechanisms generating turnover, companies can better predict actual turnover (Mobley *et al.*, 1979) and, therefore, manage it. We examine the role of procedural justice on coping strategies and ultimately intentions to turnover.

COPING STRATEGIES AND ESCAPIST COPING

Coping strategies have been defined and operationalized in a variety of ways. Suggesting that different coping strategies serve different functions such as avoiding, confronting, or analyzing, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) distinguished between emotion-oriented coping and problem-oriented coping. Using a similar classification, Latack (1986) distinguished control coping, often referred to as problem-solving, from escapist coping. Problem-solving coping refers to proactive actions and cognitive reappraisals that are take-charge in tone. Examples include devising schedules, setting priorities, and asking for qualified assistance. Escapist coping refers to coping patterns that suggest an avoidance mode, characterized by cognitive reappraisals or actions intended to escape a situation or the accompanying feelings.

Disengaging or intending to move away from the stressor reflects the direction of coping taken by the individual (Begley, 1998) and resonates with an escapist/avoidant coping style (Latack, 1986). Coping efforts reflecting this style include attempts to stop or cover up the feelings generated by the stressor, and removing thoughts of the stressor from one's mind (Begley, 1998). Thus, escapist coping, in contrast to problem-solving coping, excludes any efforts to change or adapt to the stressor, but instead includes engaging in wishful thinking and emotional adjustment, or trying to avoid the stress-inducing situation through passive behavioral, cognitive and/or emotional responses.

Individuals use both problem-solving and escapist forms of coping (Cohen and Edwards, 1989). Research on coping effectiveness has consistently found that, in general, escapist coping is not as effective for reducing experienced stress as control-oriented coping (e.g., Billings and Moos, 1984; Latack, 1986). Some evidence suggests control-oriented strategies act as work stress buffers and individuals who rely exclusively on avoidant or escapist strategies report higher levels of negative consequences, including burnout, job dissatisfaction, physical symptoms, and intentions to quit (Koeske *et al.*, 1993). To a large extent, escapist coping is considered an inadequate way of coping since it is directly and positively related to both physical and mental dysfunction (De Jong and Emmelkamp, 2000), increased burnout, and leaving one's profession (Anshel, 2000; Leiter, 1991). However, other research (e.g., Latack and Havlovic, 1992) suggests that escapist coping is not necessarily a negative strategy. For example, studies (Howard *et al.*, 1975; Seiler and Pearson, 1984) suggest exercise and relaxation techniques are helpful in the overall coping process. Additionally, cognitive approaches to escapist coping may be valuable in situations where the individual is not

ready to actively undertake the problem, or where the situation is resistant to change (Buunk and Ybema, 1995; Latack and Havlovic, 1992; Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). We now turn our focus to examining the relationship between coping styles and perceptions of organizational justice at work.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND ESCAPIST COPING

Situational factors may strongly influence an individuals' choice of coping strategies. Individuals actively seek social cues and norms for appropriate behaviors. For example, Dutton, Ashford, O'Neill, Hayes, and Wierba (1997) found that in response to organizational change, middle managers assess context favorability before they decide whether or not to sell issues to top management, and that middle managers are less likely to push an issue when they believe that there are risks of hurting their images in doing so. Similarly, individuals may deploy certain coping strategies in assessing and reacting to some stressful situations. Different coping strategies carry different "costs and benefits," and a particular coping strategy becomes attractive when the benefits outweigh the costs (Schoenpflug and Battmann, 1988). Considering the influence of situational factors on an individual's coping reactions, it is reasonable to expect that, in situations characterized with either high or low procedural justice, an individual is likely to use certain types of coping strategies with different frequencies.

We expect greater procedural justice is associated with decreased use of escapist coping. First, procedural justice enhances employees' trust in the organization and their supervisors and, therefore, facilitates a harmonic working environment (Kim and Mauborgne, 1998), in which they feel "safe" to take charge. Fair procedures, reflecting trust and respect, are associated with increased cooperation (Aquino *et al.*, 1997). Thus, situations characterized by procedural justice and, therefore, trust and mutual support, enable individuals to perceive more support for their efforts, which makes problem-solving efforts more likely and escapist coping less attractive.

Second, greater procedural justice gives clear cues regarding desirable and punishable behaviors. People who perceive greater procedural justice are likely to believe that abiding by the rules increases the likelihood of achieving desired goals. Therefore, they are more likely to take overt, goal-directed actions, and engage in proactive activities rather than avoidance when confronted by stressful situations. Such an expectation is consistent with conflict management literature (Rahim *et al.*, 2000) suggesting that employees who perceive the presence of organizational justice use positive and cooperative behaviors more frequently.

Alternatively, Edwards (1992, 1998) offers an explanation of how a lack of procedural justice may lead to individual tendencies to use escapist coping. In Edwards' model, the discrepancy between the current state of the individual and the desired state affects psychological well-being and activates coping, which seeks to restore well-being directly or alter the source of stress. For example, when employees perceive that organizational policies are not followed (i.e., low procedural justice), they are likely to perceive little or no control.

Feelings of powerlessness will, in turn, spur individuals to find a method of coping that restores a sense of cognitive and emotional balance. In sum, actual or perceived low procedural justice constrains an individual's ability to alter the source of stress, making escapist coping the more accessible option.

Finally, inequities can arise from low procedural justice, generating stress for employees (Spector and Goh, 2001). As stress levels increase, individuals rely on less objective information and focus more on negative cues conveyed by the situation (Staw *et al.,* 1981). In such circumstances, negative emotions, such as anxiety and fear, emerge, further motivating avoidance thoughts and actions in individuals (Spector and Fox, 2002; Scheck and Kinicki, 2000). Perceptions of low perceived procedural justice and the accompanying frustration can enhance beliefs about the difficulty to take action to change a situation (Spector, 1975). Thus, a lack of procedural justice may lead to feelings of diminished control and increased levels of stress and, therefore, an increased use of escapist coping.

Hypothesis 1: Procedural justice is negatively associated with escapist coping.

ESCAPIST COPING AND AFFECTIVE OUTCOMES

For organizations, the damaging effects of the negative relationship between justice and escapist coping emerge through employees' affective reactions and ultimately greater intentions to turnover. Based on previous studies (i.e., Koeske *et al.*, 1993), we expected escapist coping to influence how people feel about their jobs, specifically in terms of job satisfaction and felt strain. As a passive coping strategy, escapist coping focuses on the "self" in dealing with stressors and leaves the source untouched. Since escapist coping does not involve proactive behaviors that try to alter the stressor, the stressor continues to spawn negative emotions for the individual.

Job satisfaction is the pleasant emotional or affective state resulting from the positive appraisal of one's job experience (Locke, 1976; Weiss, 2002). Positive emotions may increase job satisfaction, whereas negative emotions are likely to increase job dissatisfaction (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). Failing to attempt to alter the stressor, individuals using more escapist coping are more likely to continue experiencing negative emotions. For example, employee problem drinking may minimize one's felt stress for a few hours, but inevitably the negative emotions return as the effects of alcohol fade. Because the source of the stress is unchanged, using such a strategy may decrease an individual's self-esteem and self-efficacy and negatively influence job performance (Mangione *et al.*, 1998). Over time, people may attribute negative outcomes to the work environment (Ames, 1992) and feel less job satisfaction. Thus, focusing on escapist coping may contribute to negative emotions and, therefore, job dissatisfaction.

These relationships have been supported by previous research. For example, Parasuraman and Hansen (1987) found that escapist coping strategies such as emotion-focused and self-protective behaviors were associated with decreased job satisfaction and increased felt stress. Previous research has also reported a significant relationship between escapist coping strategies and job dis-

satisfaction (Koeske *et al.*, 1993; Mikkelsen *et al.*, 2000). Consistent with previous research, we expect escapist coping to be associated with negative personal outcomes.

Hypothesis 2: Escapist coping is negatively associated with job satisfaction (H2a) and is positively associated with job strain (H2b).

Hypothesis 3: Escapist coping mediates the effects of procedural justice on job satisfaction (H3a) and job strain (H3b).

AFFECTIVE OUTCOMES AND TURNOVER

The relationships between coping strategies and turnover have received little attention (Begley, 1998). It is reasonable to expect the coping strategies that induce negative affect will prompt intentions to leave. Numerous studies have reported job dissatisfaction as a significant antecedent to intentions to quit. Strains, such as emotional exhaustion, are also antecedents to employee absence and turnover (e.g., Firth and Britton, 1989). We propose that negative affective outcomes of escapist coping mediate between coping and intent to turnover. Such mediating effects are partially supported by Dubinsky, Dougherty, and Wunder (1990), who found a sequential relationship from role stress, to job dissatisfaction, to intention to resign.

Hypothesis 4: Affective reactions (i.e., job satisfaction and job strain) mediate the effect of escapist coping on intentions to quit.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

Hotel managers working throughout the southern and northeastern United States voluntarily completed anonymous surveys after regularly scheduled staff meetings. A total of 107 questionnaires were distributed and completed. Due to missing data, the sample size was 105. The mean age was 35, 55% of the respondents were female, and average tenure on the job was 14.5 years. Eighty-five percent of the sample worked more than 40 hours per week.

Measures

Procedural Justice. Respondents used a five-point scale to indicate their agreement with five items adapted from Moorman (1991). The items were: "The policies and procedures are free of personal biases," "Policies and procedures in my company are fair," "I have input into the policies and procedures," "The policies and procedures are applied consistently," and "Overall, my company's policies and procedures are fair." Higher scores indicate greater perceived procedural justice.

Escapist Coping. Respondents were asked to think about the most stressful situation at work they experienced during the past week. They responded to the eight items of the *Ways and Coping Questionnaire* (Folkman and Lazarus, 1988). Items were scored on a five-point scale, where higher scores indicate the respondents used escapist or avoidant coping to a greater extent.

Job Strain. Respondents used a seven-point scale to indicate their agreement with five items adapted from House and Rizzo (1972). An example item is "I feel a great deal of tension from my job." Higher scores indicate greater job strain.

Job Satisfaction. Respondents used a seven-point scale to indicate their agreement with three items developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979; unpublished

work, available by contacting lead author). One item was reverse coded. An example item is "All in all, I am generally satisfied with my job." Higher scores indicate greater job satisfaction.

Intentions to Turnover. Respondents used a seven-point scale to indicate their agreement with two items measuring intent to quit (Mobley *et al.*, 1978; Mowday *et al.*, 1984). The items were, "I often think about quitting my job" and "I will probably look for a new job in the next year." Higher scores indicate a greater intent to turnover.

Control Variables

Problem-solving Coping. Given that individuals use both problem-solving and escapist coping, we controlled for problem-solving coping in order to make our tests more conservative. We asked respondents to think about the most stressful situation at work they experienced during the past week. They responded to the six items of the *Ways and Coping Questionnaire* (Folkman and Lazarus, 1988). Items were scored on a five-point scale, where higher scores indicate the respondents reported more problem-solving efforts.

Negative Affectivity (NA). Consistent evidence suggests NA influences individuals' reactions to stressful conditions (e.g., Brief *et al.*, 1988; Parkes, 1990; Spector *et al.*, 2000). Further, researchers report that NA is negatively related to the use of problem-focused, control-oriented coping (Lee *et al.*, 1993), and positively related to escapism and avoidance (Strutton and Lumpkin, 1993). Therefore, we controlled for NA using the ten-item PANAS scale (Watson *et al.*, 1988). Respondents used a five-point scale to indicate the degree to which they generally felt the way the item indicated. Sample items included "irritable," "nervous," and "upset." Higher scores indicate higher levels of negative affectivity.

Years of Full-Time Employment. Because job tenure is consistently negatively associated with voluntary turnover, we controlled for full-time years on the job. A space was provided for the managers to indicate the number of years they have worked full-time.

RESULTS

Prior to testing our hypotheses, we examined the data for completeness and reliability. Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study variables. Alpha reliability coefficients are shown along the diagonal and all were greater than .70, indicating an adequate level of agreement. Hypothesis 1 predicted procedural justice is negatively associated with escapist coping behaviors. Regression results are shown in Table 2. The overall model was significant ($F = 7.36$, $p < .01$). Controlling for years worked, NA, and problem-solving coping, respondents perceiving higher procedural justice reported using less escapist coping ($p < .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 3 reports the results for hypotheses 2 and 3. Hypothesis 2 predicted that escapist coping is negatively associated with job satisfaction (H2a) and positively associated with job strain (H2b). Using hierarchical regression to test the hypotheses, we entered years worked, NA, problem-solving coping, and procedural justice in step 1, followed by escapist coping in step 2. The results were significant for both job satisfaction (F =

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

Variable	M	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Years full time	14.6	9.1								
2. Negative affectivity	1.5	.5	-.11	(.81)						
3. Procedural justice	3.6	.9	.27**	-.31**	(.81)					
4. Escapist coping	1.9	.6	-.14	.45**	-.36**	(.70)				
5. Problem solving	3.6	.7	.15	-.21*	.19*	-.16	(.77)			
6. Job strain	3.0	1.3	.12	.61**	-.17	.47**	-.02	(.80)		
7. Job satisfaction	5.9	1.2	.14	-.28**	.54**	-.37**	.11	-.32**	(.82)	
8. Intent to turnover	2.4	1.8	-.04	.47**	-.48**	.47**	.16	.61**	-.56**	(.80)

N = 95-106
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 2
Regression Analysis for Escapist Coping

Independent Variable	β	se
Years full time	-.05	.01
Negative affectivity	.36**	.13
Procedural justice	-.22*	.07
Problem solving	-.06	.09
Model F	7.36**	
Overall R^2	.25	

Listwise deletion (N = 93)
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (one-tail)

8.70, $p < .01$) and job strain (F = 13.91, $p < .01$). Greater use of escapist coping was negatively related to job satisfaction ($p < .05$) and positively related to job strain ($p < .01$), providing support for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that escapist coping mediates the effects of procedural justice on job satisfaction (H3a) and job strain (H3b). Following Baron and Kenny (1986), the results are shown in Table 3. First, procedural justice significantly predicted job satisfaction but failed to significantly predict job strain. Therefore, we were able to test for a mediating relationship for the job satisfaction outcome only. Secondly, as discussed above, escapist coping significantly predicted job satisfaction. Finally, an examination of the coefficient for procedural justice in Table 3 indicates that when escapist coping is entered into the model, the effect of procedural justice decreases but remains significant. Thus, we found a partially mediating effect for the job satisfaction outcome (H3a), but no support for the job strain outcome (H3b).

Hypothesis 4 predicted that job satisfaction and job strain mediate the relationship between escapist coping and intent to turnover. The results are reported in the first block of Table 4. Following Baron and Kenny (1986), we found that after controlling for years of work, NA, problem solving, and procedural justice in step 1, escapist coping is positively ($p < .01$) related to intentions to leave (F = 12.13, $p < .01$) (see step 2). Job satisfaction negatively ($p < .01$) and job strain positively ($p < .01$) predict intentions to leave in step 3 (F = 16.93, $p < .01$). Finally, a review of the coefficients and significance of escapist coping in steps 2 and 3 indicates that escapist coping is no longer significant when the affective outcomes are included in the model, providing support for the mediating relationship of H4.

To further analyze the results of the mediating role of job satisfaction and job strain, and to discern if the

Table 3
Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction and Job Strain

Dependent Variable	Job satisfaction				Job strain			
	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se
Step 1:								
Years full time	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.17*	0.01	0.19	0.01
Negative affectivity	-0.13	0.25	-0.06	0.26	0.61**	0.24	0.51**	0.25
Procedural justice	0.50**	0.13	0.45**	0.13	-0.06	0.13	-0.06	0.13
Problem solving	0.01	0.16	-.01	0.16	0.07	0.16	0.07	0.16
Step 2:								
Escapist coping			-0.19*	0.19			0.28**	0.19
Model F	9.66**		8.70**		13.90**		13.91**	
Overall R^2	0.30		0.33		0.39		0.45	
ΔR^2	-		0.03*		-		0.06**	

For job satisfaction, N = 95 (Listwise deletion); for job strain, N = 91 (Listwise deletion).
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (one-tail)

two mediators exhibited similar effects with escapist coping, we conducted two additional regression analyses using only job satisfaction (second block of Table 4) or only job strain (third block of Table 4) as a mediator. Examining the results in steps 2 and 3 indicates job satisfaction partially mediated the effect of escapist coping on intentions to leave (i.e., note the reduced significance of the standardized beta). The results in the third block of Table 4 indicate that escapist coping is no longer significant in step 3. Therefore, job strain fully mediated the effect of escapist coping on intentions to leave.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the relationship among procedural justice, escapist coping, and individuals' subsequent affective and cognitive reactions in an attempt to illuminate the underlying psychological and affective mechanisms by which procedural justice functions. An important contribution of the study is our finding that after controlling for coping efforts, individuals are more likely to use escapist coping when they perceive their workplace to be low in procedural justice. These individuals, seeking to escape and avoid an unjust workplace, experience negative affective outcomes such as job dissatisfaction and strain. Escapist coping behaviors are both directly and indirectly linked to their intentions to quit. Finding that job satisfaction partially mediated the relationship between escapist coping and turnover intentions supports a direct relationship between escapist coping and turnover intent. In other words, regardless of the affective outcome, individuals who engage in escapist coping are more likely to want to quit their jobs. However, we also found evidence of an indirect relationship in that individuals who resort to escapist coping behaviors have greater intentions to quit arising from feelings of job dissatisfaction and strain. Given that withdrawal cognitions significantly predict actual turnover (Aquino *et al.*, 1997), these results underscore the importance of fairness in the workplace through its impact on employees' affect and cognitions.

The results are tempered, however, by the limitations of our study. First, we have exclusively used self-report data. Future research may consider using objective measures of procedural justice to assess such contextual factors. However, given that individuals may perceive the same situation differently, and only when the objective environment is perceived does it enter into an individual's construed reality, self-report data may reveal the relationships in a way more practically relevant. The cross-sectional nature of the study is a second limitation. It is reasonable to expect that the influence of escapist coping on negative affective experiences will become stronger over time when the stressors accrue. In addition, it will be useful to determine through longitudinal data whether, over time, lack of procedural justice, escapist coping and negative affective experiences lead to higher rates of actual turnover. At a minimum, replications are needed to further substantiate the results reported here given that respondents in the current study represented only one specific industry (e.g., hospitality).

The information yielded in our study provides valuable insight nonetheless, contributing to the literature in several ways. First, this study is the

Table 4
Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction and Job Strain on Intent to Turnover

	Mediating effect of job satisfaction and job strain						Mediating effect of job satisfaction						Mediating effect of job strain					
Independent Variable	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se	β	se
Step 1:																		
Years full time	.11	.02	.13	.02	.06	.02	.12	.02	.14	.02	.13	.02	.12	.02	.13	.02	.04	.02
Negative affectivity	.39**	.40	.32**	.38	.09	.38	.37**	.36	.28**	.37	.26**	.34	.39**	.36	.32**	.38	.08	.39
Procedural justice	-.41**	.20	-.36**	.18	-.23**	.18	-.40**	.19	-.34**	.19	-.16*	.19	-.41**	.18	-.36**	.18	-.36	.16
Problem solving	.05	.23	.07	.22	.03	.19	.06	.23	.08	.23	.08	.21	.05	.23	.07	.22	.03	.20
Step 2:																		
Escapist coping			.23**	.28	.06	.25			.26**	.28	.18*	.26			.23*	.28	.10	.26
Step 3:																		
Job satisfaction					-.28**	.13					-.39**	.14						
Job strain					.40**	.14											.47**	.14
Model F	13.11**		12.13**		16.93**		11.57**		11.32**		14.03**		13.11**		12.13**		16.46**	
Overall R^2	.38		.42		.59		.35		.40		.50		.38		.42		.55	
ΔR^2	-		.04*		.17**		-		.05**		.10**		-		.04*		.13**	

Listwise deletion (N = 90-94)
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (one-tail)

first to link perceptions of procedural justice to coping strategies. Future research should explore other contextual variables that influence choice of coping strategies, such as climate, social support, and organizational politics. A second contribution of this study is its examination of the mediating role of coping and affective outcomes in the procedural justice—intention to turnover relationship.

The implications of this study to practice are many. Past research has demonstrated that factors influencing employee well-being can have a substantial impact on the financial health and profitability of an organization (Cooper and Cartwright, 1994; Danna and Griffin, 1999). The findings of this study suggest that procedural justice is one factor that may indirectly shape the well-being of employees through dissatisfaction, strain, and intentions to leave the organization. Therefore, the benefits of ensuring fair organizational practices, and the perception thereof, may result in significant savings to an organization.

Previous research suggests that companies should train their employees to be more proactive in coping with workplace stress. For example, De Jong and Emmelkamp (2000) reported evidence that in an eight-week stress management program, individuals improved their coping skills and reported less psychological distress. However, our results suggest that situational conditions may significantly influence employees' coping strategies. Thus, managers have a strong incentive to identify factors in the organization environment that may contribute to employees' perceptions of procedural injustice prior to investing in such training. Finally, these findings imply that managers may be able to better predict and prevent employee turnover by monitoring employees' perceptions of procedural justice and taking appropriate actions to improve these perceptions.

References

Ames, G. M. 1992. "Research and Strategies for the Primary Prevention of Workplace Alcohol Problems." *Alcohol Health and Research World* 17: 19-27.

Anshel, M. H. 2000. "A Conceptual Model and Implications for Coping with Stressful Events in Police Work." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 27: 375-400.

Aquino, K., R. Griffith, D. Allen and P. Hom. 1997. "Integrating Justice Constructs into the Turnover Process: A Test of a Referent Cognitions Model." *Academy of Management Journal* 40: 1208-1227.

Baron, R. M. and D. A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 1173-1182.

Begley, T. M. 1998. "Coping Strategies as Predictors of Employee Distress and Turnover after an Organizational Consolidation: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 71: 305-329.

Billings, A. G. and R. H. Moos. 1984. "Coping, Stress, and Social Resources Among Adults with Unipolar Depression." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46: 877-891.

Brief, A. P., M. J. Burke, J. M. George, B. S. Robinson and J. Webster. 1988. "Should Negative Affectivity Remain an Unmeasured Variable in the Study of Job Stress?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 73: 193-199.

Buunk, B. P. and J. F. Ybema. 1995. "Selective Evaluation and Coping With Stress: Making One's Situation Cognitively More Livable." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 24: 1499-1519.

Cohen, S. and J. R. Edwards. 1989. "Personality Characteristics as Moderators of the Relationship Between Stress and Disorder." In *Advances in the Investigation of Psychological Stress.* Ed. R. W. J. Neufeld. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 235-283.

Cooper, C. L. and S. Cartwright. 1994. "Healthy Mind: Healthy Organizations." *Human Relations* 47: 455-471.

Cropanzano, R. and J. Greenberg. 1997. "Progress in Organizational Justice: Tunneling Through the Maze." In *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* Eds. C. L. Cooper and I. Robertson. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 317-372.

Danna, K. and R. W. Griffin. 1999. "Health and Well Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature." *Journal of Management* 25: 357-384.

De Jong, G. M. and P. M. G. Emmelkamp. 2000. "Implementing a Stress Management Training: Comparative Trainer Effectiveness." *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology* 5: 309-320.

Dubinsky, A. J., T. W. Dougherty and R. S. Wunder. 1990. "Influence of Role Stress on Turnover of Sales Personnel and Sales Managers." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 7: 121-133.

Dutton, J., S. Ashford, R. O'Neill, E. Hayes and E. Wierba. 1997. "Reading the Wind: How Middle Managers Assess the Contest for Selling Issues to Top Managers." *Strategic Management Journal* 18: 407-423.

Edwards, J. R. 1998. "Cybernetic Theory of Stress, Coping and Well Being." In *Theories of Organizational Stress.* Ed. C. L. Cooper. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. pp. 122-152.

_____. 1992. "A Cybernetic Theory of Stress, Coping, and Well Being in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 17: 238-274.

Fields, D., M. Pang and C. Chiu. 2000. "Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Employee Outcomes in Hong Kong." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21: 547-562.

Firth, H. and P. Britton. 1989. "Burnout, Absence and Turnover Amongst British Nursing Staff." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 62: 55-59.

Flaherty, K. E. and J. M. Pappas. 2000. "The Role of Trust in Salesperson-Sales Manager Relationships." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* 20: 271-278.

Folkman, S., R. S. Lazarus, C. Dunkel-Schetter, A. DeLongis and R. J. Gruen. 1986. "Dynamics of a Stressful Encounter: Cognitive Appraisal, Coping, and Encounter Outcomes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50: 992-1003.

Folkman, S. and R. S. Lazarus. 1988. *Ways of Coping Questionnaire.* Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Gowan, M. A., C. M. Riordan and R. D. Gatewood. 1999. "Test of a Model of Coping with Involuntary Job Loss Following a Company Closing." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84: 75-86.

House, R. J. and J. R. Rizzo. 1972. "Toward the Measurement of Organizational Practices: Scale Development and Validation." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 56: 388-396.

Howard, J. H., P. A. Rechnitzer and D. A. Cunningham. 1975. "Coping with Job Tension — Effective and Ineffective Methods." *Public Personnel Management* 4: 307-326.

Jex, S. M., P. D. Bliese, S. Buzzell and J. Primeau. 2001. "The Impact of Self-Efficacy on Stressor-Strain Relations: Coping Style as an Explanatory Mechanism." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 401-409.

Kim, W. C. and R. Mauborgne. 1997. "Fair Process: Managing in the Knowledge Economy." *Harvard Business Review* 75: 65-75.

_____ and _____. 1998. "Procedural Justice, Strategic Decision Making, and the Knowledge Economy." *Strategic Management Journal* 19: 323-338.

Koeske, G. F., S. A. Kirk and D. Koeske. 1993. "Coping with Job Stress: Which Strategies Work Best?" *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 66: 319-335.

Konovsky, M. A. and R. Cropanzano. 1991. "Perceived Fairness of Employee Drug Testing as a Predictor of Employee Attitudes and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76: 698-707.

Latack, J. C. 1986. "Coping with Job Stress: Measures and Future Directions for Scale Development." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 73: 377-385.

_____ and S. J. Havlovic. 1992. "Coping with Job Stress: A Conceptual Evaluation Framework for Coping Measures." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13: 479-508.

Lazarus, R. S. 1999. *Stress and Emotion.* New York, NY: Springer.

_____ and S. Folkman. 1984. *Stress, Appraisal and Coping.* New York, NY: Springer.

_____. 1991. *Emotion and Adaptation.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lee, C., S. J. Ashford and L. F. Jamieson. 1993. "The Effects of Type A Behavior Dimensions and Optimism on Coping Strategy, Health, and Performance." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 14: 143-157.

Leiter, M. P. 1991. "Coping Patterns as Predictors of Burnout: The Function of Control and Escapist Coping Patterns." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 12: 123-144.

Lind, E. A. and T. R. Tyler. 1988. "*The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice.*" New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Locke, E. A. 1976. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* Ed. M. D. Dunnette. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Mangione, T. W., J. Howland and M. Lee. 1998. *New Perspectives for Worksite Alcohol Strategies: Results from a Corporate Drinking Study.* Boston, MA: JSI Research and Training Inc.

Mikkelsen, A., T. Ogaard and N. Lovrich. 2000. "Modeling the Effects of Organizational Setting and Individual Coping Style on Employees' Subjective Health, Job Satisfaction and Commitment." *Public Administration Quarterly* 24: 371-397.

Mobley, W. H., R. W. Griffeth, H. H. Hand and B. M. Meglino. 1979. "Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process." *Psychological Bulletin* 86: 493-522.

_____, S. O. Horner and A. T. Hollingsworth. 1978. "An Evaluation of Precursors of Hospital Employee Turnover." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 63: 408-414.

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.

Mowday, R. T., C. S. Koberg, and A. W. MacArthur. 1984. "The Psychology of the Withdrawal Process: A Cross-Validation Test of Mobley's Intermediate Linkages of Model Turnover in Two Samples." *Academy of Management Journal* 27: 79-94.

Palinkas, L. W. and D. Browner. 1995. "The Effects of Prolonged Isolation in Extreme Environments of Stress, Coping, and Depression." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 25: 557-578.

Parasuraman, S. and D. Hansen. 1987. "Coping With Work Stressors in Nursing: Effects of Adaptive Versus Maladaptive Strategies." *Work and Occupations* 14: 88-105.

Parkes, K. R. 1990. "Coping, Negative Affectivity, and the Work Environment: Additive and Interactive Predictors of Mental Health." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75: 399-409.

Rahim, M. A., N. R. Magner and D. L. Shapiro. 2000. "Do Justice Perceptions Influence Styles of Handling Conflict with Supervisors? What Justice Perceptions, Precisely?" *International Journal of Conflict Management* 11: 9-31.

Rhoades, L., R. Eisenberger and S. Armeli. 2001. "Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 825-836.

Roberts, J. A., K. R. Coulson and L. B. Chonko. 1999. "Sales Person Perceptions of Equity and Justice and Their Impact on Organizational Commitment and Intent to Turnover." *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 7: 1-16.

Scheck, C. L. and A. J. Kinicki. 2000. "Identifying the Antecedents of Coping with an Organizational Acquisition: A Structural Assessment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21: 627-648.

Schoenpflug, W. and W. Battmann. 1988. "The Costs and Benefits of Coping." In *Handbook of Life Stress, Cognition and Health.* Eds. S. Fisher and J. Reason. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 699-713.

Seiler, R. E. and D. A. Pearson. 1984. "Dysfunctional Stress Among University Faculty." *Educational Research Quarterly* 9: 15-26.

Spector, P. E. 1975. "Relationships of Organizational Frustration with Reported Behavioral Reactions of Employees." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60: 635-637.

_____ and S. Fox. 2002. "An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior: Some Parallels Between Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)." *Human Resources Management Review* 12 (Special issue): 269-292.

_____ and A. Goh. 2001. "The Role of Emotions in the Occupational Stress Process." In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being.* Eds. P. L. Perrew and D. C. Ganster. Oxford, UK: JAI Press, Elsevier Science, Inc. pp. 195-232.

_____, D. Zapf, P. Y. Chen and M. Frese. 2000. "Why Negative Affectivity Should Not Be Controlled in Job Stress Research: Don't Throw Out the Baby With the Bath Water." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21: 79-96.

Staw, B., L. Sandelands and J. Dutton. 1981. "Threat-Rigidity Effects in Organizational Behavior: A Multi-Level Analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26: 501-524.

Strutton, D. and J. R. Lumpkin. 1993. "The Relationship Between Optimism and Coping Styles of Salespeople." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* 13: 71-82.

Suls, J. and P. D. David. 1996. "Coping and Personality: Third Time's the Charm?" *Journal of Personality* 64: 993-1005.

Watson, D., L. A. Clark and A. Tellegen. 1988. "Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scale." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54: 1063-1070.

Weiss, H. M. 2002. "Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and Affective Experiences." *Human Resource Management Review* 12: 173-194.

_____ and R. Cropanzano. 1996. "Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of the Structure, Causes and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work." In *Research in Organizational Behavior,* Vol. 18. Eds. B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings. Greenwich, CT: JAI. pp. 1-74.