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The present study examined the effects of punishment given to the most valued team member who has committed a company rule violation. The team is working on an important project where the contribution by that valued member is critical to project completion. The study assessed the effects of the severity of rule violation, the severity of the punishment, the consistency of the punishment, and who is impacted by the punishment. The results indicated that when a valued employee has committed a rule violation, applying consistent punishment is perceived as more fair and appropriate by the teammates. However, when that valued employee receives the punishment is also important. Punishment that removes the valued employee from the team and inhibits completion of important team projects is not perceived as fair or appropriate. The participants viewed the implementation of punishment for the valued employee more fair when the punishment was applied after the completion of a team project, allowing contribution by the most valued team member for the duration of the project. The punishment was more likely to deter future violations when the punishment matched the severity of the violation.
Introduction

Employees at all organizational levels are concerned with the fairness and justice of issues such as pay, schedules, treatment by supervisors, and punishment. Perceptions of fairness of organizational issues is referred to as organizational justice. If an employee feels either he/she or a co-worker is treated fairly, they will be more likely to hold positive attitudes about their work and their work outcomes. Perceived justice can affect one’s feelings of respect and self-esteem. Increased self-worth, enhanced through fair treatment on the job, is likely to lead to feelings of achievement and job satisfaction, which in turn lead to stronger aspirations to perform well, attend work, and remain with the organization (Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998). Knovsky and Cropanzano (1991) found perceptions of a fair organizational justice system can lead to increased organizational commitment. Equitable distribution of outcomes strengthens the loyalty employees have toward their company. Perceptions of justice can also lead employees to be proud of and identify with their organization. Furthermore, Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) meta-analytically linked procedural justice to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, and job performance.

Perceptions of fair justice in an organization can be the difference between a leading competitive company or a failing company on the brink of collapse. The current study will expand the organizational justice literature to increase the understanding of employee perceptions of fairness in the distribution of punishment. Specifically, this research will study perceptions of fairness when exceptions to punishment rules are made for the most valuable member of a work team and how punishment impacts the team.
The construct of organizational justice, defined by three types (procedural, distributive, and interactional), will be discussed. Next the literature on consistency of treatment in organizations will be covered followed by a review of research on punishment in organizations. The present study and proposed hypotheses will be introduced next. Finally, the results will be covered followed by a discussion of the study.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice, at a general level, is an area of psychological inquiry that focuses on perceptions of fairness in the workplace, the psychology of justice applied to organizational settings (Cropanzano & Randall 1993). Beugre (1998) contended that organizational justice refers to the fairness of exchanges in organizations which can be social or economic, involving the individual in his or her relations with supervisors, subordinates, peers, and the organization as a social system. The implication is that outcomes of rewards and punishments and the recipient’s relationships with other employees are taken into account when assessing fairness in organizations. Justice exists when employees receive that which they deserve. For example, an employee who is hired by a large bank with the clear expectation that she will be moved quickly through a series of new and challenging jobs will feel a sense of injustice if these reassignments are not forthcoming (Pinder, 1998).

Perceived fairness by employees is a perceptual phenomenon and not an objective state (Beugre, 1998). The matter of importance here is not reality itself, but the perceptions of reality. This means perceptions of fairness are subjective; what one employee perceives as fair may be perceived as unjust by a different employee.
However, minimal standards may be applied that are perceived as fair by most people or employees.

Greenberg (1990) posited that employee’s perceptions of fairness are determined mainly by (a) how decisions affecting them are made and (b) the outcomes of these decisions. The suggestions is that there are two components to organizational justice: procedural or the decisional processes, and distributive justice or whether the consequences of the decisions are fair. Greenberg argued that procedural and distributive justice are independent determinants of perceived fairness. Although some research says the two concepts are very similar (Orpen, 1994; Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001), we will review and consider each one as independent of the other. Additionally, Bies and Moag (1986) developed the concept of interactional justice, the social aspects of treatment in organizations, which will also be discussed. However, we will not refer to interactional justice as a third component of justice as there is an ongoing debate whether interactional justice is actually separate from procedural justice.

Procedural Justice

A procedure is a series of sequential steps used to guide allocation judgments (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001). Procedural justice involves how decisions were made in the implementation of outcomes. In organizational justice, procedural justice refers to the fairness of the means by which an allocation decision is made. Distributive justice deals with the results, whereas procedural justice deals with the means to generate that result.

Procedural justice is important to employees because people prefer to have control over decisions and the processes affecting themselves (Thibaut & Walker, 1975).
Who makes the decisions is not as important to employees as who controls the process by which the decisions are made. The amount of process control or “voice” in the decision process influences perceptions of equity. Fairness perceptions increase when people are allowed to offer inputs or when they influence decisions processes that affect them.

Leventhal, Karaza and Fry (1980) stated that people will choose allocations that lead to their personal goals and that they prefer procedures that help them reach those goals. Therefore participation or having a “voice” in choosing the process will be perceived as more fair.

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice concerns perceptions of decision outcomes in organizations. An important aspect of distributive justice is equity. Equity refers to whether employees believe the outcomes (distributions) they receive are in proportion to their inputs (Adams, 1965; Rahim, 2000). Employees also evaluate the input/outcome ratio of their co-workers with their own ratio to determine fairness. If the ratios are equal, the employee doing the comparing experiences feelings of justice. If an employee believes that relative to others their outcomes are not fair, feelings of inequity result. If a discrepancy between the two ratios exists, feelings of injustice should result (Beugre, 1998). When an employee experiences feelings of inequity, the employee may engage in inequity-reduction behaviors (Adams, 1965).

Interactional Justice

“While people are concerned about the formal procedures used in a decision-making process, they are also concerned about the interpersonal treatment they receive from another person” (Bies, 2001, p. 91). These concerns are referred to as interactional
justice. Bies and Moag (1986) argued that interactional justice refers to peoples’ concerns about the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of organizational procedures. The focus is on interpersonal treatment and, as such, is separate from procedural justice, making interactional justice a third form of organizational justice. However, Greenberg (1993a) held interactional justice in the context of decision-making and therefore concluded it comes under the social aspects of procedural justice. Greenberg’s argument is embedded in the idea that both the formal procedures and the interpersonal interactions jointly compromise the process that leads to an allocation decision (Greenberg, 1997). This idea clearly put interactional justice under the umbrella of procedural justice. Empirical studies by Knovsky and Cropanzano (1991) found the correlation between procedural and interactional justice (.62) just higher than the correlation between procedural and distributive justice (.53). If there is no call for integrating procedural and distributive justice, the two coefficients reported in this study do not give clear reason to integrate procedural and interactional justice. Regardless of where interactional justice falls in the construct of organizational justice (i.e., a separate component or not), when interpersonal treatment conveys disrespect, a sense of injustice is aroused (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Research on Organizational Justice

Hendrix et al. (1998) studied the effects that positive perceptions of procedural and distributive justice has on turnover. The study examined primary paths from procedural and distributive justice perceptions to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work group performance, attendance motivation, turnover intentions, and, in turn, turnover. Questionnaires were completed by 310 full-time work team members
from a textile product plant. Turnover was operationalized as individuals still on the job or those who had left within one year after collecting the data. The results of the study suggested that both procedural and distributive justice affect employee job satisfaction, commitment, and attendance (Hendrix et al., 1998). In short, ensuring positive justice perceptions should result in employees with higher levels of job satisfaction and commitment, which in turn can increase desire to perform well in groups, attend work, and remain with the organization. Distributive justice also had a direct effect on turnover intentions.

Williams (1999) assessed the effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on task performance. Participants were 60 business students who were asked to complete a 30-minute proofreading exercise. Quantity was measured by the total number of lines completed and quality was measured by the ratio of mistakes to total number of lines completed. Two outcomes were available: time off with pay (all five extra credit points for only 20 minutes of work rather than the scheduled 30 minutes) or bonus pay (completion of all 30 minutes with a bonus of six extra credit points). Procedural justice situations involved students having a voice in which outcome they would receive. Distributive justice was operationalized in how much extra credit was given. Interactional justice was given as one of two justifications: justification as task performance feedback on why they receive the amount of extra credit they got or no justification of task performance, where the participants were simply told which process they must perform. The results of this study were contradictory to previous research on procedural justice (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1992). Participants who experienced higher levels of procedural justice were not more likely to have higher levels of perceived
fairness. Procedural justice was found to have no effect on task performance. Also, no correlation was found between procedural and distributive justice. Distributive justice was found to have an effect on task performance. As participants’ perceptions of equity increased, so did task performance. Also, interactional justice was found to increase task performance. This performance change indicates that increased justification or an explanation as to why individuals receive their consequences has a positive effect on task performance.

Colquitt, Noe, and Jackson (2002) assessed perceptions of procedural justice in 88 automobile parts manufacturing work teams. The relationship between team level procedural justice and team effectiveness was examined. Team effectiveness was operationalized in terms of team performance and absenteeism. Procedural justice was defined as a distinct team level cognition regarding how fairly the team is treated procedurally, or climate level. Climate had two levels: high or low. Teams with a high climate level believed their procedures to be more fair than teams with a low climate level. Procedural justice climate level was found to be related to team performance and absenteeism. Teams with favorable procedural justice climates tended to perform better and engage in less absenteeism. The size of the teams had an effect on climate level. Larger teams were associated with a less favorable climate whereas smaller more collective teams had a more favorable climate.

Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003) assessed attitudes regarding the fairness and appropriateness of distributive and procedural justice in disciplinary actions. This study addressed whether the punishment implemented would deter the punished employee and the other co-workers from committing the same or similar rule violations in the future.
Perceptions regarding the fairness of the punishment were also assessed. Procedural justice was operationalized by Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) taxonomy of decision-making process. Decision-making processes ranged from autocratic to consultative to group process. Participants were 366 volunteers who were either undergraduate students or employees of a business organization.

Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003) found that for high severity rule violations, any severity punishment (low, moderate, or higher) was perceived as fair to the punished employee. High severity punishment was perceived as less fair when a low or moderate rule infraction occurred. High severity punishment given to a high severity rule infraction was seen as appropriate and a low severity punishment given to a low severity rule infraction was perceived as appropriate, indicating that the participants were concerned that the “punishment fits the crime.” Also, results indicated that the more severe the punishment, the more likely future deterrence of the same or a similar rule infraction would occur. For procedural justice fairness perceptions, situations that allowed for participation or influence in the decision-making process were perceived as more fair to the punished employee and the co-workers. However, conditions in which employees were allowed participation or influence in the decision-making process did not result in higher perceptions of distributive fairness to both the punished employee and the co-workers. The implication was that the decision-making process had no effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment implemented.

Consistency Research

Leventhal (1980) maintained that people should be treated consistently. For example, it would be unfair to give one employee a voice but not others. If there are
procedures or outcomes that treat people differently, perceptions of injustice result (Leventhal, 1980).

Smith and Spears (1996) found consistency to be important to both procedural and distributive justice. In their study students could earn $10 by achieving a certain performance level. The students were split into two groups, personally advantaged and disadvantaged. The personally advantaged students could earn the money by working on an easy task. The personally disadvantaged students worked on a difficult task.

The results on perceptions of fairness indicated the advantage manipulation could be seen as either procedural or distributive injustice. As procedural injustice, the perceptions of injustice resulted because the two groups were treated inconsistently; different performance criteria (task difficulty) were being appraised. The distributive injustice perceptions resulted because equity was violated; the personally disadvantaged students had to do more work in order to receive the same pay. These findings demonstrated that consistent treatment is equally important to both procedural and distributive justice.

Specht (2000) studied perceptions of distributive fairness on conditions representing two levels of severity of punishment (severe or moderate), two levels of distribution of punishment (consistent or conditional), and two levels of punishment severity (severe or moderate) on a sports team star player. They found that consistently applied punishment across all team members, including the star player, was perceived as more fair than conditionally applying punishment. These results support equity theory and Leventhal’s (1980) ideas of consistency in that all members would receive similar outputs.
Specht (2000) also found more severe punishment would deter future misconduct for the other team members but not the star player. However, this finding resulted from the fact that the severe punishment was dismissal from the team, which did not allow the star player the opportunity to commit future misconduct. These results also indicated that others who observe punishment in a social context will be less likely to engage in similar misconduct as that performed by the star player.

Shoenfelt and Bucur (2002) studied perceptions of distributive fairness in similar conditions of misconduct (severe or moderate), distribution of punishment (consistent or conditional) and punishment severity (severe or moderate). The participants in this study were 131 NAIA soccer players as opposed to undergraduate students. This study again found that consistently applying punishment to all team members, including the star player, was perceived as more fair to the punished player and the other team members – again supporting equity theory and Leventhal’s (1980) ideas of consistency. Making an exception to a rule in order to spare the star player was perceived as less fair to both the star player and the other team members. It was also found that future deterrence would not result for both the star player and the other team members where an exception was made for the star player. Severe punishment was found to be more effective in deterring future misconduct over moderate punishment for both the star player and the other team members. The authors also found that the punishment should match the severity of the misconduct. A moderate punishment would deter future misconduct when given for a moderate rule infraction. A severe misconduct was more likely to be deterred when severe punishment was applied.
Punishment

Punishment has been defined as the presentation of an aversive event or the removal of a positive event following a response which decreases the frequency of that response (Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980). Therefore a relationship exists between the response and the aversive presentation, meaning a noncontingent aversive stimulus does not represent punishment. Punishment exists under two conditions. The first condition is the addition of aversive stimuli following the behavioral response. The second condition is the removal of a future positive expectation made after the behavioral response.

Within the context of organizations, punishment is defined as the manager’s application of a negative consequence or the withdrawal of a positive consequence from someone under his or her supervision (Trevino, 1992; Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball, 1996). Examples of the two conditions in which punishment occurs include the application of a negative consequence such as verbal reprimands, suspensions, or terminations and the withdrawal of a positive outcome such as withholding a pay raise or bonus. It should be noted that managers are not the only originators of punishment. Co-workers can also impose punishment; however, we will focus on punishment implemented by managers.

Previously punishment was not thought to be an effective means of reducing undesirable behaviors. Fears of negative emotional side effects, aggression toward the punishing agent, theft, or absenteeism were thought to be associated with punishment. According to Arvey and Ivancevich (1980), the empirical evidence regarding these fears is weak. In their review of the literature, improvements in behavior resulted following
certain punishments situation. However, these certain situations in the work place had not been identified.

Bennett (1998) tested punishment in organizations to identify situations where undesirable behaviors will diminish. Here the effects of punishment magnitude and allocation consistency on changes in undesirable behavior, anger, perceptions of procedural justice, and aggressive behaviors were studied. Using role-playing scenarios, 263 college students responded to a hypothetical situation regarding punishment. The magnitude of punishment (harshness) had a direct effect on the amount of reduction in unethical behavior. Participants who received inconsistent allocations of punishment were much more likely to report feelings of anger and perceived less fairness in procedural justice. Participants who did not benefit from the inconsistent punishment were more likely to retaliate against the punishing agent. Overall, this study found those individuals who feel they have been treated unfairly will react with anger and frustration, and those who have been treated fairly will have a reduction in undesirable behaviors. This study demonstrated that punishment can be an effective tool without having negative side effects.

Ball, Trevino, and Sims (1993) analyzed 79 disciplined employees' perceptions to the punishment they received. One-on-one interviews were conducted based on voluntary participation. Attitudinal reactions were measured based on distributive and procedural justice, trust in the supervisor, satisfaction with the supervisor, and intention to leave the organization. Perceived harshness negatively influenced perceptions of distributive and procedural justice, trust in the supervisor, and organizational commitment. Under procedural justice, counseling (which incorporates supportive
behavior on the side of managers) influenced intention to leave. This study demonstrated that fairness should be an important consideration in designing effective discipline as to reduce misconduct without a host of negative side effects.

A 1992 study by Trevino illustrated that observers (i.e., individuals in the relevant social context who take an interest in the punishment of a co-worker) are also impacted by a punished employee in terms of deterring undesirable behaviors. Punishment can be viewed as a social phenomenon that influences observers’ cognitions and actions. Trevino found that observers’ understanding of punishment has an influence on their perceptions of procedural and distributive justice, attitudes, work performance, and organizational commitment. Also, the possibility that observers will engage in misconduct will be lessened when the punishment is seen as severe, although, the severity threshold is not known. Overall, Trevino’s research illustrated that punishment considerations should include observers, as their thoughts and behaviors are affected as well. In fact, given the greater number of observers, the perceptions of the observers may be more important than those of the punished employee.

As illustrated above, the literatures indicates that punishment and perceptions of organizational justice are complex. People are concerned with how they are treated based on their inputs (Adams, 1965) and how others in their social surroundings are treated (Trevino, 1992). Multiple studies done on organizational justice have indicated that positive perceptions of procedural justice do not affect the final decision or distributive justice. Additionally, employees generally will report more positive feelings when treatment by managers is consistent (Shoenfelt & Bucur, 2002; Bennett, 1998). Research has shown us that effective punishment can be used in organizations. To deter future
misconduct, more severe punishment should be implemented. However, employees report more satisfaction when the punishment matches the infraction (Shoenfelt & Phillips, 2003).

Although Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003) and Williams (1999) found that distributive fairness perceptions did not increase as procedural participation increased, Colquitt et al. (2002) found team task performance suffered under conditions of negative perceptions of procedural justice. This finding indicates more research needs to be done on the distributive side of organizational justice in work team settings. Brockner, Ackerman, and Fairchild (2001) recognized the importance of consistent treatment, and pointed to a lack of research when compared to other aspects of organizational justice. These authors believed that more research needs to be done on Leventhal’s (1980) ideas of consistency. Therefore the present study will focus on consistency treatment in distributive justice.

Circumstances are different across situations, and what is perceived to be fair tends to change with the circumstances. Managers may want to be equitable in some situations but egalitarian in other situations. The equity rule suggests that employees should receive outcomes or distributions based upon inputs. Therefore, at times, it may be considered just to treat people differently (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001). Consider the situation of a shy employee who requires development. The manager may want to increase this employee’s self-confidence and performance by involving him/her in participation (Vroom & Jago, 1988). This situation leads the manager to accommodate the shy employee’s needs, giving this person conditional treatment because of a lack of
skills. This process violates both procedural and distributive justice consistency as identified by Leventhal (1980).

Present Study

The present study attempted to identify certain situations where exceptions to consistency may be perceived as fair by expanding on Specht’s (2000) and Shoenfelt and Bucur’s (2002) research on fairness perceptions of distributive justice. The present study was done in the context of a work team setting where the most valuable member (star player) has just committed a rule infraction. The team is currently working on a project deadline that will likely not be completed on time without the most valuable member. Participants received a scenario that described either consistent or an exception condition of punishment to the most valuable team member after he or she commits a rule infraction. Consistent treatment was punishment given based on what company policy suggested; exception treatment was less severe treatment given because of the status of being the most valuable team member. The rule infraction was either moderate or severe and the punishment was either moderate or severe. How the punishment impacted the team was also examined. Impact was one of two situations: immediate punishment impacts the team as the most valuable player is not able to continue work on the project; punishment implemented after project deadline allows the most valuable member to continue work on the project.

Participants rated their perceptions of fairness and appropriateness to the star player, other team members, and other workers in the organization based on the punishment given and when it will be implemented. Additionally, the likelihood of
deterrence for future misconduct for the most valuable team member, other team
members, and other workers in the organization were also rated.

The following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. There will be a main effect for consistency of punishment: Giving
punishment that is consistent with company policy will be perceived as more fair
and appropriate than giving an exception to company policy to the most valuable
team member, the teammates, and other workers in the company.

Hypothesis 2. There will be a main effect for impact of implementation:
Implementation of punishment that impacts the team will be perceived as less fair
and less appropriate to the most valuable team member, the teammates, and other
workers in the company.

Hypothesis 3. There will be an interaction between severity of punishment and
severity of rule violation. If the punishment matches the rule violation, more
fairness and appropriateness will be perceived to the most valuable team member,
teammates, and other workers in the organization. If the punishment does not
match the infraction, less fairness and appropriateness will be perceived to the
most valuable team member, teammates, and other workers in the organization
than if the punishment matches the infraction.

Hypothesis 3 will be tested as:

3A. A moderate punishment given to a moderate infraction will be
perceived as more fair and appropriate than 3B or 3C.

3B. A moderate punishment given to a severe infraction will be
perceived as less fair and appropriate than 3A or 3D.
3C. A severe punishment given to a moderate infraction will be perceived as less fair and appropriate than 3A or 3D.

3D. A severe punishment given to a severe infraction will be perceived as more fair and appropriate than 3B or 3C.
Method

Participants

Participants were 317 undergraduate and graduate students in psychology classes at Western Kentucky University. At the instructor's discretion, extra credit was given to the students for participating in the study. Participation was completely voluntary and manipulation checks were implemented to eliminate inattentive participants. Demographic information was collected regarding gender, age, ethnic background, educational status, and job status.

Design

A 2 (severity of rule infraction: moderate and high) x 2 (severity of punishment: moderate and high) x 2 (impact: punishment impacting the team vs. impacting the most valuable team member) x 2 (consistency of distribution: consistent vs. exception) factorial design was used. The severity of infraction, severity of punishment, impact and distribution conditions was represented in hypothetical work team scenarios where the star team member has committed an infraction.

Scenario development: The calibration of severity of rule infraction and punishment is based on Shoenfelt and Phillips (2002). Company manuals were reviewed to generate a list of 20 rule infractions and 10 punishments. A questionnaire was developed to rate the severity of each infraction and punishment on a five-point scale with one being not severe to five being severe. The questionnaire, mean ratings and standard deviations for the infractions and punishments may be found in Appendix A.

In the current study, rule infractions were selected based on low variances in the ratings and means that fell in the mid range of moderate and high severity ratings. The moderate severity infraction was chosen from items whose means ranged from 3.00 to
3.99. “Insubordation, such as refusing to perform assigned work” had a variance of .98 and had a mean of 3.36. The high severity infraction was selected from those infractions with mean ratings ranging from 4.00 to 4.99. “Theft or removing company property or another employee’s property” had a variance of .87 and a mean of 4.31.

The current researchers used similar criteria in choosing the two levels of punishment outcomes. Moderate severity of punishment was chosen from punishments whose means ranged from 3.00 to 3.99. “Demotion” was selected as it had the lower variance and the middle mean, making it the best choice. For high severity, there were only two punishments in the 4.00 to 4.99 range. “Legal action taken by company” was selected, as it had the lower variance.

The independent variable impact was operationalized by implementing the punishment such that it will either impact the entire team or only the star teammate. In half the scenarios the punishment was implemented immediately, preventing the star teammate from continuing work on the team project. In the other scenarios the punishment was implemented after the project deadline, which allowed the star teammate to continue to contribute to the team project.

The independent variable consistency of distribution was operationalized by either consistently applying the punishment to all employees including the most valuable member or by making an exception to the rule and deviating from company policy. In the consistent condition the star teammate received either the moderate or high severity punishment. In the star player treatment condition the star teammate received only a two-day suspension, simply because he/she is the most valuable team member.
Procedure

The scenario-based questionnaires were distributed to students during class time. Confidentiality was guaranteed as the students participated in the study anonymously. Participants signed an informed consent document indicating voluntary participation. These forms were collected independently to keep the names separate from the surveys. The participants first were asked to complete the background information. Each participant responded to only one randomly distributed scenario, out of 16. After reading the scenario, the participants rated their perception of the fairness of the punishment to the most valuable team member, the teammates, and other workers in the company. The appropriateness of punishment was also rated. The perception of fairness and appropriateness were rated on seven-point scales with “1” being very unfair to “7” being very fair. The participants were also asked to rate the likelihood, on a similar seven-point scale, that the punishment will deter Pat and the teammates from committing future company rule violations.

For academic interest, the participants were asked to rate on a seven-point scale with “1” being very unlikely to “7” being very likely how likely the punishment implemented will increase job satisfaction and commitment of the most valuable team member, the teammates, and other workers in the company. The time to complete the questionnaire was approximately 15 minutes. Each participant returned the completed questionnaire to the researcher.
Results

Manipulation Checks

Participants were asked to state the rule infraction that occurred, the punishment that was given, whether the punishment was consistent with company policy, and when the punishment will be implemented. Of the original 317 participants, 277 passed the manipulation check by responding correctly to all four questions. Additional descriptive statistics were analyzed on the background information for those who failed, as there were a higher number for those who failed than anticipated. Only the data from the participants who passed the manipulation checks were used to test the hypotheses.

Descriptive and Frequencies

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the participants’ background information variables. Of the participants who passed the manipulation check; 68% (188) were employed, 32% (89) were not employed; 69% (190) were female, 31% (87) were male; 90% (249) were white, 8% (22) were African American, 1% (3) were Hispanic, .4% (1) was Asian, .7% (2) checked other; 85% (234) had at least some college education, 7% (19) had a bachelor’s degree, 5% (14) had an associate’s degree, 3% (9) had some graduate classes, .4% (1) had a technical training certificate; the minimum age was 18 with a maximum of 50, the mean age was 21.19 (SD = 4.06). Of the participants who failed the manipulation checks; 65% (26) were employed, 35% (14) were not employed; 5% (22) were female, 43% (17) were male; 85% (34) were white, 10% (4) were African American, 3% (1) checked other; 78% (31) had at least some college education, 10% (4) had a bachelor’s degree, 10% (4) had an associate’s degree, 3% (1) had a technical training certificate; the minimum age was 18 with a maximum of 34, the mean age was
21.3 (SD = 2.68). Participants who failed the manipulation checks did not differ in terms of employment, gender, race, education, or age from those who passed the manipulation checks.

Correlations

A correlation analysis was run to determine bivariate relationships. Inter-item correlations, means, and standard deviations are provided in Table 1. The three fairness and one appropriateness dependent variables were all significantly correlated. All three deterrence dependent variables were also significantly correlated. Additionally all fairness and appropriateness variables were significantly correlated with all the deterrence variables.

Analyses for Fairness and Appropriateness

A univariate 2 (severity of rule violation: moderate or high) x 2 (severity of punishment: moderate or high) x 2 (consistency of punishment: consistent or exception) x 2 (impact: individual or team) ANOVAs were conducted to test Hypotheses 1-3.

*Fairness of Punishment Given to Pat.* The results of the ANOVA on the fairness of the punishment to the employee are presented in Table 2. Significant effects were found for the consistency of punishment main effect and the interaction between consistency and rule violation severity. The 4-way interaction between severity of rule violation, punishment severity, consistency of punishment, and impact of implementation of punishment was significant. Support was found for Hypothesis 1, but not for Hypotheses 2 or 3.
Table 1

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for dependent variable of fairness, appropriateness, and deterrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fairness of punishment to Pat</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fairness of punishment to teammates</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fairness of punishment to other workers</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriateness of punishment</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Likely punishment will deter Pat from committing future rule violations</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Likely punishment will deter Pat’s teammates from committing future Rule violations</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Likely punishment will deter other workers from committing future rule violations</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ratings were made on 7-point scales (1 = very unfair or very unlikely, 7 = very fair or very likely).

N = 317, *p < .01

Consistent punishment was perceived to be more fair (M = 5.72, SD = 1.35) than when an exception was made (M = 4.68, SD = 2.05). The interaction between severity of rule violation and consistency indicates that making an exception for the star player (Pat)
is seen as fair when the rule violation is moderate. When the star player violates a severe rule, being consistent is perceived as more fair by the participants. Less fairness is perceived when a severe rule is violated and an exception is made for Pat (see Figure 1).

Table 2

Analysis of variance for fairness of punishment to Pat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.72</td>
<td>25.51***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>4.25**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>4.82*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(2.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Fairness of Punishment to Pat’s Teammates. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted for perceptions of fairness of the punishment to Pat’s teammates. The results may be found in Table 3. Significant main effects were found for severity of rule
violation, consistency of punishment, and impact of when the punishment will be implementation. No significant interactions were found.

FIGURE 1.

*Interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment for fairness to Pat*

The results indicate that more fairness is perceived when a severe rule violation is committed (M = 4.07, SD = 1.94) than when a moderate rule infraction is committed (M = 3.56, SD = 1.91). When Pat received consistent punishment, more fairness was perceived (M = 4.30, SD = 1.86) than when an exception was made (M = 3.32, SD = 1.90). Also, less fairness was perceived when the punishment impacted the team (M = 3.25, SD = 1.67) than when the punishment impacted only the individual who committed the rule violation (M = 4.41, SD = 2.02). Thus, there was support for Hypotheses 1 and 2 and no support for Hypothesis 3.
Table 3

Analysis of variance for fairness of punishment to Pat’s teammates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>6.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.07</td>
<td>23.54***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.42</td>
<td>31.17***</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Fairness of Punishment to Other Workers in the Company. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted to analyze perceptions of the fairness of the punishment to other workers in the company. The results of the ANOVA on the fairness to other workers in the company are presented in Table 4. A significant main effect was found for consistency of punishment. There also was a significant interaction for severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment. Support was found for Hypothesis 1.
Table 4

*Analysis of variance for fairness of punishment to other workers in the company*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>593.78</td>
<td>315.14***</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>7.18*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(1.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

For consistency of punishment, when Pat received consistent punishment more fairness was perceived (M = 5.13, SD = 1.55) than when an exception was made (M = 2.18, SD = 1.18). The interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency indicates that making an exception for the star player (Pat) is seen as significantly more fair to other workers when the rule violation is moderate (M = 2.40, SD = 1.09) than when it was severe (M = 1.97, SD = 1.24; see Figure 2).
FIGURE 2

Interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment for fairness to other workers in the company

Appropriateness of Punishment. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted to analyze participant's perception of the appropriateness of the punishment given to Pat (see Table 5). A significant main effect was found for consistency of punishment. There were two 2-way interactions found, severity of rule violation with consistency of punishment and consistency of punishment and impact of implementation. There also was a significant 3-way interaction found for severity of rule violation, severity of punishment, and consistency of punishment.
Table 5

Analysis of variance for appropriateness of punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>743.99</td>
<td>400.19***</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td>19.91***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

More appropriateness was perceived when consistent punishment was applied (M = 5.92, SD = 1.33) than when an exception was made (M = 2.63, SD = 1.50), supporting Hypothesis 1. The interaction found for appropriateness of punishment is similar to the interaction found for fairness of punishment to Pat and to other workers in the company. The interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency indicates that making an exception for Pat is seen as more fair when the rule violation is moderate (M = 3.04, SD
When consistent punishment is applied, it is perceived to be significantly more fair for severe rule violations (M = 6.24, SD = .96) than for moderate rule violations (M = 5.60, SD = 1.55; see Figure 3).

**Figure 3**

*Interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment on appropriateness of punishment*

When consistent punishment is used, it is perceived as more appropriate when the punishment implementation impacts the team (M = 6.19, SD = 1.24) than when impacting only the individual (M = 5.63, SD = 1.36). These results fail to support Hypothesis 2. For situations where an exception is made, it is perceived as less appropriate regardless of the impact (individual, M = 2.68, SD = 1.55; team, M = 2.57, SD = 1.45; see Figure 4).
Figure 4

Interaction of consistency of punishment and impact of implementation on appropriateness of punishment

For the interaction between severity of rule violation, severity of punishment, and consistency of punishment please see Figures 5 and 6. When an exception is made to company policy, severe punishment for a moderate rule violation (M = 3.41, SD = 1.67) is perceived as more appropriate than moderate punishment (M = 2.67, SD = 1.45). However, when there is a severe rule violation and an exception is made to company policy (see Figure 5), it is perceived as less appropriate regardless of the severity of the punishment (moderate punishment, M = 2.24, SD = 1.14; severe punishment, M = 2.19, SD = 1.42). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported when an exception is made to company policy. When the company implements punishment that is consistent with policy (see Figure 6), severe punishment for a severe violation (M = 6.37, SD = .81) is
perceived as more appropriate than moderate punishment ($M = 6.11, SD = 1.09$). With a moderate rule violation, moderate punishment ($M = 5.80, SD = 1.41$) is perceived as more appropriate than a severe punishment ($M = 5.40, SD = 1.68$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported when punishment is applied consistent with company policy.

Figure 5

*Interaction of rule severity and punishment severity when an exception is made to company policy on appropriateness of punishment*

![Graph showing interaction of rule severity and punishment severity]
Analyses for Deterrence

Even though there were no specific hypotheses offered for deterrence, those data were analyzed. Again, 2 (severity of rule violation: moderate or high) x 2 (severity of punishment: moderate or high) x 2 (consistency of punishment: consistent or exception) x 2 (impact: individual or team) ANOVAs were conducted to test the effects for deterrence.

Deterrence of Future Violations for Pat. The results of the ANOVA for deterrence of future violations for Pat are presented in Table 6. Significant main effects were found for consistency of punishment and impact of implementation. Also, the
interaction between consistency of punishment and rule violation severity was significant, as was as the 3-way interaction between severity of rule violation, punishment severity, and consistency of punishment.

Table 6

*Analysis of variance for deterrence of future violations for Pat*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>369.96</td>
<td>174.96***</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>6.94*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>6.29**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The punishment was perceived to more likely deter Pat from committing future violations when the punishment was consistent (M = 5.40, SD = 1.42) than when an exception was made (M = 3.07, SD = 1.53). Punishment was perceived to more likely
deter Pat from committing future rule violations when the implementation impacted the team (M = 4.51, SD = 1.85) than when the implementation impacted only Pat (M = 4.00, SD = 1.87).

The pattern of the interaction found for deterrence of future rule violations for Pat is similar to significant interactions found for the fairness and appropriateness. The interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency indicates that making an exception for Pat is seen as more of a deterrence to future rule violations when the rule violation is moderate (M = 3.27, SD = 1.46) than when the violated rule is severe (M = 2.88, SD = 1.58). When the punishment is consistently applied, it is a greater deterrence when severe rules are violated (M = 5.65, SD = 1.32) than when moderate rules are violated (M = 5.16, SD = 1.48; see Figure 7).

**Deterrence of Future Violations for Pat’s Teammates.** An ANOVA was conducted to test the effects for deterrence of future violations for Pat’s teammates. The results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 7. Significant main effects were found for consistency of punishment and impact of implementation. There was a significant interaction found between consistency of punishment and impact.

When punishment was consistent with company policy, deterrence of future rule violation for Pat’s teammates was higher (M = 5.32, SD = 1.43) than when the punishment was in exception to company policy (M = 3.28, SD = 1.38). When the implementation impacted the team, the likeness of deterring Pat’s teammates from committing future rule violations was higher (M = 4.54, SD = 1.81) than for when the implementation impacted only Pat (M = 4.09, SD = 1.63).
Figure 7

Interaction of severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment for deterrence of future rule violations for Pat

When a consistent punishment is allocated, it is perceived as more likely to deter future rule violations if the implementation impacts the team (M = 5.71, SD = 1.25) than if it impacts only the individual (M = 4.90, SD = 1.49). For situations where an exception is given, it is perceived as less likely to deter future rule violations regardless of the impact (individual, M = 3.28, SD = 1.34; team, M = 3.28, SD = 1.42; see Figure 8).
Table 7

Analysis of variance for deterrence of future violations for Pat’s teammates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>282.41</td>
<td>147.96***</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>5.96*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>5.87*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(1.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Deterrence of Future Violations for Other Workers in the Company. An ANOVA was conducted for deterrence of future violations for other workers in the company. The results of the ANOVA may be found in Table 8. Significant main effects were found for consistency of punishment and impact of implementation. When the punishment was consistent with company policy, the likelihood of deterring future rule violations for other workers in the company was higher (M = 5.18, SD = 1.39) than when the
punishment was in exception to company policy (M = 2.97, SD = 1.22). When the punishment impacted the team (M = 4.28, SD = 1.78), it was perceived as more likely to deter future rule violations than if the punishment impacted only the individual (M = 3.90, SD = 1.62). No significant interactions were found.

Figure 8

*Interaction of consistency of punishment and impact for deterrence of Pat's teammates*

Additional Analysis

Additional analyses were conducted to obtain a better understanding of the data. The 3-way interaction found for severity of rule violation, punishment severity, and consistency of punishment (see Figures 5 & 6) suggests that when a company policy exception is made, it is more appropriate to give a severe punishment to a moderate rule violation and not relatively inappropriate to use either punishment for a severe rule violation. The interactions found between consistency and impact (see Figures 4 & 8)
Table 8

*Analysis of variance for deterrence of future violations for other workers in the company*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment (SP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Punishment (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333.82</td>
<td>199.55***</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact if Implementation (II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV x SP x CP x II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

suggests that punishment in exception to company policy is inappropriate and ineffective in deterring future violations. When consistent punishment is applied, it is seen as more appropriate and more likely to deter future violations. When an exception is made to policy, the punishment is perceived to be inappropriate and unlikely to deter future violations regardless of the other characteristics of the situation. For exploratory purposes, the exception data were dropped from the data set. These analyses follow:
Fairness of Punishment to Pat. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was run. There were no significant interactions. However, there was a main effect found for the severity of rule violations (F (1, 133) = 8.87, p < .01). When the punishment is consistent, it was perceived to be more fair to punish a severe violation (M = 6.06, SD = 1.19) than to punish a moderate violation (M = 5.39, SD = 1.43). When Pat breaks a severe rule, it is perceived as more fair to receive punishment, whether severe or moderate.

Fairness to Pat's Teammates. As with the first analysis for fairness to Pat's teammates, a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA revealed main effects for severity of rule violation (F (1, 133) = 4.21, p < .05; severe violation M = 4.61, SD = 1.73; moderate violation M = 4.00, SD = 1.95)) and impact of implementation (F (1, 133) = 10.04, p < .05; impacts the individual M = 4.79, SD = 1.93; impacts the team M = 3.85, SD = 1.68)). There also was a significant interaction between severity of punishment and impact of implementation (F (1, 133) = 5.92, p < .05; see Figure 9). When consistent punishment is given that impacts the individual, more fairness is perceived when the punishment is moderate (M = 5.18, SD =1.76) than when severe (M = 4.43, SD = 2.03). However, when consistent punishment is given that impacts the team, more fairness is perceived when the punishment is severe (M = 4.23, SD = 1.66) than when moderate (M = 3.50, SD = 1.64).

Fairness to Other Workers in the Company. There were no main effects or significant interactions found. The participants did not perceive the fairness of consistent punishment to have any effect on other workers in the organization. When the exception scenarios were included in the analysis, consistency of punishment had a main effect, indicating the perceived importance of being consistent with company policy.
Interaction of punishment severity and impact of implementation on fairness to Pat's teammates (exception scenarios removed from analysis)

Appropriateness of Punishment. There was a main effect found for the severity of rule violation ($F(1, 133) = 8.89, p < .01$) and for impact of implementation ($F(1, 133) = 6.47, p < .01$). No significant interactions were found. When the punishment is consistent, it was perceived as more appropriate to punish a severe violation ($M = 6.24, SD = .96$) than to punish a moderate violation ($M = 5.60, SD = 1.55$). When Pat breaks a severe rule, it is perceived as more appropriate to receive at least some punishment.

Deterrence for Pat. There were main effects found for severity of rule violation ($F(1, 133) = 4.63, p < .05$) and impact of implementation ($F(1, 133) = 6.76, p < .01$).
There also was a significant interaction found for severity of rule violation and
punishment severity ($F(1, 133) = 4.03, p < .05$).

The likelihood of deterring Pat from committing future violations was higher for
when the violation was severe ($M = 5.65, SD = 1.32$) than for a moderate violation ($M = 5.16, SD = 1.48$). The likelihood of deterring Pat from committing future violation was
also higher if the implementation impacted the team ($M = 5.70, SD = 1.23$) than if it
impacted only Pat ($M = 5.09, SD = 1.54$). For the interaction between severity of rule
violation and punishment severity (see Figure 10), the perceived likelihood of deterrence
for Pat is greater when the punishment fits the violation. When a severe rule has been
broken, the probability of deterrence is higher if the punishment is severe ($M = 5.94, SD = 1.06$) than if the punishment is moderate ($M = 5.36, SD = 1.50$). When a moderate rule
has been broken, the probability of deterrence is higher if the punishment is moderate ($M = 5.34, SD = 1.19$) than if the punishment is severe ($M = 4.97, SD = 1.72$). Removing
the exception scenarios elevated the dynamics of deterrence under consistent conditions.

*Deterrence for Pat’s Teammates.* A $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA indicated a main
effect for impact of implementation ($F(1, 133) = 12.48, p < .001$) and a significant
interaction between severity of rule violation and punishment severity ($F(1, 133) = 5.92,$
p $< .01$). The likelihood of deterring Pat’s teammates from committing future rule
violations is higher if the implementation impacts the team ($M = 5.71, SD = 1.25$) than if
it impacted only Pat ($M = 4.90, SD = 1.49$). The interaction between severity of rule
violation and punishment severity (see Figure 11) indicates the perceived likelihood of
deterrence for Pat’s teammates is greater when the punishment fits the violation. When a
severe rule has been broken, the likeness of deterrence is higher if the punishment is
severe (M = 5.77, SD = 1.00) than if the punishment is moderate (M = 5.08, SD = 1.46).

When a moderate rule has been broken, the probability of deterrence is higher if the punishment is moderate (M = 5.46, SD = 1.46) than if the punishment is severe (M = 4.97, SD = 1.62). Again, the removal of the exception scenarios revealed effects not evidenced before.

Figure 10

*Interaction of severity of violation and punishment severity on deterrence of future violations by Pat (exception scenarios removed form the analysis)*

---

*Deterrence for Other Workers in the Company.* A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA indicated only a main effect for impact of implementation (F (1, 133) = 6.88, p < .01).

No significant interactions were found. The likelihood of deterring Pat’s teammates from committing future rule violations is higher if the implementation impacts the team (M = 5.47, SD = 1.29) rather than impacting only Pat (M = 4.87, SD = 1.42).
Figure 11

*Interaction of severity of violation and punishment severity for deterring Pat's teammates*

(exception scenarios removed from the analysis)
Discussion

Our first hypothesis, consistent punishment would be perceived as more fair and more appropriate, was supported for all four dependent variables. When Pat received consistent punishment: (a) more fairness was perceived to Pat, Pat’s teammates, and other workers in the company and (b) the punishment was perceived as more appropriate. This finding replicates previous research on consistency (Shoenfelt & Bucur, 2002; Specht, 2000; Smith & Spears, 1996). A greater likelihood of deterring future violations for the guilty employee, the teammates, and other workers in the company occurred when the punishment was consistently applied.

It appears that we overestimated the effect of impacting only the individual and impacting the team. Our hypothesis was supported on only one of the four dependent variables (i.e., fairness of punishment to Pat’s teammates). When the punishment was given immediately and Pat, the star player, was no longer able to contribute to the team project, it was perceived to be less fair only to the teammates and not to Pat or other workers in the company. However, the analyses for deterrence indicated the participants perceived that Pat, the teammates, and other workers in the company were less likely to commit future rule violations when the punishment impacted the team (not allow Pat to continue work on the project) than when the punishment did not impact the team (delaying the punishment till after the completion of the team project). The suggestion is that it is perceived to be fair to the teammates to delay the punishment so the team may complete the project; however, in order to better deter future violations the punishment should be implemented immediately (taking the star player off the team and inhibiting
project completion). It may be that taking the star player off the project may be viewed as a severe punishment in its own right.

There were no significant interactions found for severity of rule violation and punishment severity on any of the fairness variables that provided no support for Hypotheses 3. There was a significant 3-way interaction with consistency for the appropriateness variable. When punishment is consistently applied, punishment that matches the infraction was perceived as more appropriate. Thus, there was only limited support for Hypothesis 3. There also were no significant interactions found for severity of rule violation and punishment severity of the deterrence questions. The failure to find support for Hypothesis 3 may be because making an exception to company policy seemed to impact perceptions of many variables. When the exception scenarios were removed, there were no significant interactions between rule severity and punishment severity on fairness and appropriateness; however, there were for two of the three deterrence variables (likelihood of deterrence for Pat and Pat’s teammates). Thus, if the company wants to deter future rule violations for the star player and the teammates, the company should use consistent punishment that “fits the crime.” A severe punishment should be given to a severe rule violation, and a moderate punishment should be given to a moderate rule violation. This finding is consistent with Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003) and Shoenfelt and Bucur (2002).

Overall, the results suggest that when exceptions are made, the rules go out the door. If the company is not allocating consistent punishment then it does not matter what
punishment is given; it is less likely to be perceived as fair and less likely to deter future rule violations. However, even when exceptions are made, punishment that impacts the team is perceived as less fair than punishment impacting only the individual.

There was an interaction between severity of rule violation and consistency of punishment for fairness to Pat, fairness to other workers, appropriateness of punishment, and likeness of deterring Pat from rule violations in the future. If the company has to apply an exception to policy, it will be perceived as more fair to the guilty employee, more appropriate, and more likely to deter that employee from committing future violations if the rule violation is moderate. If the rule violation is severe and an exception is applied, very low fairness, low appropriateness, and a low possibility of deterring that employee in the future will result. Williams (1999) found interactional justice can increase task performance. Bies and Moag’s (1986) contended that interactional justice can increase individuals’ perceptions of fairness and justice. Thus, if a company is in a situation in which an exception must be made, an explanation of why may help increase perceived fairness to the guilty employee, the teammates, and other workers in the company.

Severity of rule violation, punishment severity, and consistency of punishment had a significant interaction for appropriateness of punishment. In situations where consistent punishment is being applied, it is perceived to be more appropriate to give a severe punishment to a severe rule violation than to give a moderate punishment to a severe violation. Likewise, it was perceived as more appropriate to give a moderate punishment to a moderate rule violation. This finding provided support for Hypothesis 3, that punishment severity should match violation severity.
When a severe rule violation has been committed, it is important that at least some punishment be applied, but it is more fair, appropriate, and more likely to deter if a severe punishment is given. When a moderate rule violation has occurred, it is more fair and appropriate if a moderate punishment were applied than a severe punishment. These findings are again consistent with that of Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003).

There also was an interaction between severity of rule violation, punishment severity, and consistency of punishment for the probability of deterring Pat from committing future rule violations. When consistent punishment is being applied, the likelihood of deterring the violation for the employee in the future is higher when a severe punishment is given to a severe rule violation than when a moderate punishment is given to a severe rule violation. Again, the participants were concerned that the punishment "fits the crime," and that if an employee violates a severe rule there should be at least some punishment to deter that behavior in the future.

A high level of perceived fairness, appropriateness, and deterrence occurred when a severe rule violation had been committed that received either severe or moderate punishment. When the exception scenarios were taken out, four of the seven dependent variables had a main effect for severity of rule violation (fairness to Pat, fairness to teammates, appropriateness, and deterrence for Pat). In situations where a severe rule violation had been committed, if any type of punishment was applied (severe or moderate), more fairness, appropriateness, and likelihood of deterrence occurred than when a moderate rule has been violated. This finding does not imply one should not grant an exception to moderate rule violations, rather it indicates that severe violations should receive consistent punishment. When the exception scenarios were included in
the analysis, the main effect for severity of rule violation was found only for fairness of
punishment to teammates. It is very important to teammates that a person who commits a
severe rule violation receives some punishment.

Overall, employees are very concerned with the consistency of punishment
decisions. When rules are violated, employees prefer that consistent punishment be
applied, however, possibly not in the case when working on a team project and the most
valued employee has committed that rule infraction. If the consistent punishment dictates
that the most valued employee will be removed from the team and the completion of the
project becomes jeopardized, employees would prefer that punishment not be
implemented until the completion of the project. We did not specify whether or not
delaying the punishment until the project is completed (impacting the individual) is an
exception to company policy (i.e., no company policy was stated in the questionnaire as
to when a punishment must be implemented). Thus, we cannot conclude whether we
have identified a situation where an exception (i.e., delaying implementation) is
perceived as fair. If the delaying of the punishment is really not consistent with company
policy, support can be lent to Cropanzano and Ambrose's (2001) assertion that it may be
just to sometimes treat employees differently.

Given our findings on consistency, it appears that Leventhal (1980) was correct in
his assertion that people should be treated consistently. We found that when a company
is faced with a situation in which a valuable employee has violated a rule, the teammates
would prefer that the guilty employee continue working on the project and receive a
consistent punishment after completion.
Limitations

This study suffers from the limitations of any laboratory study. It was a laboratory experiment, not done in the workplace, and the participants were college students responding to hypothetical scenarios. The scenario was a hypothetical work situation that had no real consequences for the participants. Findings may be different for real world situations where an employee has violated a rule and there are real consequences if the project is not completed (e.g., loss of contract, loss of client/customer, or loss of capital). Another limitation was that not all participants are employed. Those who are currently employed may have a stronger opinion about the scenario. Another possible limitation is that some of the participants just completed a test previous to completing the questionnaire. That test may have had an effect on the answers because their motivation to concentrate may have decreased.

Future Directions

Results of this study support findings on punishment and deterrence. When the punishment fits the crime, a higher possibility of deterrence is likely to result. Also, when a severe rule violation has occurred, some level of punishment should be implemented. The present study found that employees want a guilty person to receive punishment consistent with that of company policy. However, when that guilty employee is the most valued team member and a project deadline is approaching, delaying the punishment until completion of the project is acceptable. The downside of this approach is that the possibility of deterring future violations will be compromised when the implementation of punishment does not impact the team.
This study did not directly address the issue of whether delaying implementation is an exception to company policy. If the scenario were to specify that a delayed implementation of punishment is an exception, Cropanzano and Ambroses' (2001) contention that it is sometimes just to treat employees differently could be directly tested. It is unknown to what extent the exception scenarios introduced noise into the overall analyses. Future research in which the punishment given matches the infraction, a delayed implementation of the punishment should be explicitly stated as an exception to policy, and consistency should be operationalized as immediately implementing the punishment that would remove the star player from the project. Such a design would provide further insight to the role of exceptions.

Williams's (1999) conclusion suggests that increased interactional justice has positive effects. Thus, situations where exceptions are given may be more fair if used in conjunction with increased interactional justice. If a company is in a situation where it must allocate an exception to company policy, increasing the interactional justice may increase the perceived fairness and appropriateness. Future studies may want to assess this type of situation to determine if increased interactional justice may provide support to Cropanzano and Ambroses' (2001) view that it may at times be just to treat employees differently.

This study is among the first to address the role of who is impacted in distributive justice. We have concluded that employees prefer the punishment be implemented for a valued person after a project is completed, not impacting the team. The findings on consistency duplicates previous research (Specht, 2000; Shoenfelt & Bucur, 2002). When the exception scenarios were removed from the analysis, punishment that matched
the infraction was more likely to deter future rule violations, again similar to previous research (Bennett, 1998; Shoenfelt & Phillips, 2003). These findings do not, however, clarify the effects of consistency. Perhaps in the future, more detailed scenarios on company policy can be utilized that assesses whether Cropanzano and Ambrose (2001) were correct in their assertion.

**Implications and Conclusions**

Employees are concerned with consistency of punishment and how that punishment may impact their situation. Guilty employees should receive consistent punishment according to company policy; however, the impact the punishment may have on the work team should be considered. If it is possible to delay the implementation of the punishment so that it does not impact the team, such as allowing the guilty employee to continue working on an important project until completion, all steps should be taken to hold off the punishment. It is important to implement that punishment when the possibility of impacting the team has been removed, such as immediately after the project has been completed. However, delaying the punishment may lessen the effectiveness of the punishment deterring future rule violations. To increase the likelihood of deterring future rule violations, match the punishment to the rule violation. Also, if a company is in a situation where it must allocate an exception to company policy on punishment, it should be done only when a moderate rule violation has occurred. Further research is needed on when exceptions to company policy may be acceptable.
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Appendix A:

Mean ratings and standard deviations for the infractions and punishments reviewed in Shoenfelt and Phillips (2003)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULE VIOLATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possession or use of weapons, illegal drugs, or alcohol on company property</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theft or removing company property or another employee's property</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making unwelcome or inappropriate sexual advances or harassment to another employee</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting to work while under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falsifying company records or deliberately giving false information which becomes a part of company record</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misusing abusing or destroying company tools, equipment, property, vending machines, records, etc., either deliberately or through gross negligence</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using profane, threatening or abusive language to any employee or member of management</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating in immoral conduct or indecent acts</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conviction of a felony or serious misdemeanor</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making an unsatisfactory effort to produce quantity or quality work or in any way deliberately restricting production</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insubordination, such as refusing to perform assigned work</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having excessive or unacceptable absenteeism or lateness for any reason 140 1 5 3.32 1.07

Violating safety rules or common sense safety practices 140 1 5 3.30 1.15

Failing to notify the company prior to your shift when you are absent from work 140 1 5 3.06 1.06

Leaving assigned work area or the premises during work hours without authorization or your supervisor 140 1 5 3.03 1.12

Taking excessive personal time while at work 140 1 5 2.95 1.08

Violating tobacco free regulations in unauthorized areas 139 1 5 2.76 1.18

Performing personal work on company time or using company telephones for personal business without the permission of your supervisor 139 1 5 2.42 1.05

Discussing company business in the presence of non-employees 139 1 5 2.18 1.07

Placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission from Human Resources 140 1 5 1.94 1.02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>legal action taken by company</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-day suspension without pay</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotion</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to make restitution</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put on probation</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign to undesirable shift or work assignment</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandatory participation in an Employee Assistance Program</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written reprimand placed in personnel file</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given verbal warning/reprimand</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Severe rule violation

-Severe punishment

-Consistent punishment

-Implementation impacts the team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____ No ____

2. **Gender:**
   Male ____ Female ____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____ Asian ____
   White ____ Hispanic ____
   Other ______________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____ Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor’s Degree ____ Some College ____
   Associate’s Degree ____ Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to take legal action against the employee. Even though Pat is the most valuable team member, the company decides to take legal action which will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle** the correct answer

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   - A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   - B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   - C. Stole company property
   - D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   - A. Two-day suspension
   - B. Legal action taken by company
   - C. Given a verbal warning
   - D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How **fair to Pat** was the punishment?
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How **fair to Pat’s teammates** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How **fair to other workers in the company** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Given the company policy and the violation** committed by Pat, **how appropriate** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How likely is this punishment to **deter Pat** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How likely is this punishment to **deter Pat’s teammates** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very unlikely  somewhat neutral  somewhat likely  very likely

unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  likely
Appendix C

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Severe rule violation
-Severe punishment
-Consistent punishment
-Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____  No ____

2. **Gender:**  Male ____  Female ____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____  Asian ____
   White ____  Hispanic ____
   Other ______________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____  Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor’s Degree ____  Some College ____
   Associate’s Degree ____  Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to take legal action against the employee. Even though Pat is the most valuable team member, the company decides to take legal action which will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

Please answer the follows questions about the situation:

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   [Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness]

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair unfair neutral somewhat fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair neutral fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair neutral fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair neutral fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely
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Appendix D

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Severe punishment
- Exception treatment
- Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**  
   Are you presently employed? Yes ___ No ___

2. **Gender:**  
   Male ___ Female ___

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**  
   African American ___ Asian ___  
   White ___ Hispanic ___  
   Other ____________________________

5. **Education:**  
   High School ___ Technical Training/Cert ___  
   Bachelor’s Degree ___ Some College ___  
   Associate’s Degree ___ Post Baccalaureate Degree ___

---

**Punishment in the Workplace Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to take legal action against the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the following questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   - A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management  
   - B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project  
   - C. Stole company property  
   - D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   - A. Two-day suspension  
   - B. Legal action taken by company  
   - C. Given a verbal warning  
   - D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How **fair to Pat** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How **fair to Pat’s teammates** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How **fair to other workers in the company** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how **appropriate** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How **likely is this punishment to deter Pat** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How **likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
Appendix E

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Severe punishment
- Exception treatment
- Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes _____ No _____

2. **Gender:**
   Male ____  Female ____

3. **Age:** ______

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____  Asian ____
   White ____  Hispanic ____
   Other __________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____  Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor’s Degree ____  Some College ____
   Associate’s Degree ____  Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to take legal action against the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy
4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair unfair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely
Appendix F

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Moderate punishment
- Consistent treatment
- Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____ No ____
2. **Gender:**
   Male ____ Female ____
3. **Age:**
4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____ Asian ____
   White ____ Hispanic ____
   Other ______________________
5. **Education:**
   High School ____ Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor’s Degree ____ Some College ____
   Associate’s Degree ____ Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to demote the employee. Even though Pat is the most valuable team member, the company demotes Pat. This punishment will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) **How fair to Pat** was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair unfair fair fair fair

2) **How fair to Pat’s teammates** was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) **How fair to other workers in the company** was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, **how appropriate** was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) **How likely is this punishment to deter Pat** from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) **How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates** from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
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Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Moderate punishment
- Consistent treatment
- Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____  No ____

2. **Gender:**  Male ____  Female ____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   - African American ____
   - Asian ____
   - White ____
   - Hispanic ____
   - Other __________________

5. **Education:**
   - High School ____
   - Technical Training/Cert ____
   - Bachelor’s Degree ____
   - Some College ____
   - Associate’s Degree ____
   - Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to demote the employee. Even though Pat is the most valuable team member, the company demotes Pat. This punishment will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   - A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   - B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   - C. Stole company property
   - D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   - A. Two-day suspension
   - B. Legal action taken by company
   - C. Given a verbal warning
   - D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How **fair to Pat** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How **fair to Pat’s teammates** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How **fair to other workers in the company** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat,** how **appropriate** was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How **likely is this punishment to deter Pat** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How **likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates** from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
   unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
   unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
   unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
    unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
    unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
    unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
    unlikely  unlikely  likely  likely
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Appendix H

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Moderate punishment
- Exception treatment
- Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   - Are you presently employed? Yes ____  No ____

2. **Gender:**
   - Male ____  Female ____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   - African American ____  Asian ____
   - White ____  Hispanic ____
   - Other ______________________

5. **Education:**
   - High School ____  Technical Training/Cert ____
   - Bachelor’s Degree ____  Some College ____
   - Associate’s Degree ____  Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to demote the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   - A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   - B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   - C. Stole company property
   - D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   - A. Two-day suspension
   - B. Legal action taken by company
   - C. Given a verbal warning
   - D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair unfair unfair fair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
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Appendix I

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Severe rule violation
- Moderate punishment
- Exception treatment
- Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes __ No ___

2. **Gender:**
   Male ___ Female ___

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   - African American ___
   - Asian ___
   - White ___
   - Hispanic ___
   - Other ________________________

5. **Education:**
   - High School _____
   - Technical Training/Cert _____
   - Bachelor’s Degree _____
   - Some College _____
   - Associate’s Degree _____
   - Post Baccalaureate Degree _____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just been caught stealing company property. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on stealing is to demote the employee which would take Pat off the team. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   - A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   - B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   - C. Stole company property
   - D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   - A. Two-day suspension
   - B. Legal action taken by company
   - C. Given a verbal warning
   - D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy
4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely
Appendix J

Questionnaire scenario of:

- Moderate rule infraction
- Severe punishment
- Consistent treatment
- Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____ No ____

2. **Gender:**
   Male ____ Female ____

3. **Age:** ______

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____ Asian ____
   White ____ Hispanic ____
   Other ____________________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____
   Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor’s Degree ____
   Some College ____
   Associate’s Degree ____
   Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to take legal action against the employee. The company decides to take legal action against Pat because of committing the insubordination. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat's punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat's punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat's vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) **How fair to Pat was the punishment?**

   
   
   
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very fair

2) **How fair to Pat's teammates was the punishment?**

   
   
   
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very fair

3) **How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?**

   
   
   
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very fair

4) **Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?**

   
   
   
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very fair

5) **How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?**

   
   
   
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely

6) **How likely is this punishment to deter Pat's teammates from committing future company rule violations?**

   
   
   
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
Appendix K

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation

-Severe punishment

-Consistent treatment

-Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ___ No ___

2. **Gender:**
   Male ___ Female ___

3. **Age:**
   ___

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ___ Asian ___
   White ___ Hispanic ___
   Other _________________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ___ Technical Training/Cert ___
   Bachelor’s Degree ___ Some College ___
   Associate’s Degree ___ Post Baccalaureate Degree ___

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to take legal action against the employee. The company decides to take legal action against Pat because of committing the insubordination. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

Please answer the follows questions about the situation:

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat's punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat's punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat's vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat's teammates was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat's teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
Questionnaire scenario of:

- Moderate rule violation
- Severe punishment
- Exception treatment
- Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes _____ No _____

2. **Gender:**
   Male _____ Female _____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American _____ Asian _____
   White _____ Hispanic _____
   Other ____________________________

5. **Education:**
   High School _____ Technical Training/Cert _____
   Bachelor’s Degree _____ Some College _____
   Associate’s Degree _____ Post Baccalaureate Degree _____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to take legal action against the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will make an exception to the policy and only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

CIRCLE the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely
Appendix M

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation

-Severe punishment

-Exception treatment

-Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____ No ____

2. **Gender:**
   Male ____ Female ____

3. **Age:** ______

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____ Asian ____
   White ____ Hispanic ____
   Other ______________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____ Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor's Degree ____ Some College ____
   Associate's Degree ____ Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat's contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to take legal action against the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will make an exception to the policy and only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat's teammates' job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker's job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
unlikely unlikely likely likely
Appendix N

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation
-Moderate punishment
-Consistent treatment
-Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes __ No __

2. **Gender:**
   Male ___ Female ___

3. **Age:** ______

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ___ Asian ___
   White ___ Hispanic ___
   Other ____________________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ___ Technical Training/Cert ___
   Bachelor's Degree ___ Some College ___
   Associate's Degree ___ Post Baccalaureate Degree ___

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to demote the employee. The company decides to demote Pat because of committing the insubordination which will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely neutral likely likely
Appendix O

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation

-Moderate punishment

-Consistent treatment

-Implementation impacts individual
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ____ No ____

2. **Gender:** Male ____ Female ____

3. **Age:**

4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ____ Asian ____
   White ____ Hispanic ____
   Other ______________________

5. **Education:**
   High School ____ Technical Training/Cert ____
   Bachelor's Degree ____ Some College ____
   Associate's Degree ____ Post Baccalaureate Degree ____

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat's contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to demote the employee. The company decides to demote Pat because of committing the insubordination which will take Pat off the team. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment be implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair neutral fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation

-Moderate punishment

-Exception treatment

-Implementation impacts team
1. **Work Status:**
   Are you presently employed? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. **Gender:**
   Male ☐ Female ☐
3. **Age:**
4. **Ethnicity:**
   African American ☐ Asian ☐
   White ☐ Hispanic ☐
   Other ☐
5. **Education:**
   High School ☐ Technical Training/Cert ☐
   Bachelor’s Degree ☐ Some College ☐
   Associate’s Degree ☐ Post Baccalaureate Degree ☐

---

**Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire**

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to demote the employee. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place immediately, meaning Pat will no longer be able to contribute to the team project.

**Please answer the follows questions about the situation:**

**Circle the correct answer**

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy

4) When will Pat’s punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair somewhat neutral somewhat fair very unfair unfair fair fair

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very unlikely unlikely likely likely
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unlikely somewhat neutral somewhat likely very likely
unlikely unlikely likely likely
Appendix Q

Questionnaire scenario of:

-Moderate rule violation

-Moderate punishment

-Exception treatment

-Implementation impacts individual
Punishment in the Work Place Questionnaire

It is Wednesday. Your work team is facing a Friday deadline on an important project. Your most skilled worker, Pat, has just committed insubordination by refusing to complete assigned task not part of the team project. Without Pat’s contribution, project completion will take longer and be much more difficult to complete. It is unlikely your team could complete the project on time without Pat. The company policy on insubordination is to demote the employ. Because Pat is the most valuable team member, the company will only suspend Pat for two days. This disciplinary action will take place the next Monday, meaning Pat will be able to continue work on the team project.

Please answer the follows questions about the situation:

Circle the correct answer

1) What rule infraction did Pat commit?
   A. Used profane and abusive language to a member of management
   B. Refused to perform an assigned task that was not part of the team project
   C. Stole company property
   D. Violated safety rules while on the job

2) What punishment did Pat receive?
   A. Two-day suspension
   B. Legal action taken by company
   C. Given a verbal warning
   D. Demotion
3) Pat’s punishment was:
   A. Consistent with company policy
   B. In exception to company policy
4) When will Pat’s punishment by implemented?
   A. Immediately
   B. After the project is completed
   C. At the end of the month
   D. During Pat’s vacation

   **Circle the number that reflects your rating of fairness**

1) How fair to Pat was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How fair to Pat’s teammates was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How fair to other workers in the company was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Given the company policy and the violation committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>somewhat unfair</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>very fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How likely is this punishment to deter Pat’s teammates from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How likely is this punishment to deter other workers in the company from committing future company rule violations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase Pat’s teammates’ job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will increase other worker’s job commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>somewhat neutral</td>
<td>somewhat likely</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>