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Abstract

Employees are concerned with the fairness of organizational outcomes they receive and the fairness of the decision-making processes used to determine how these outcomes are allocated in accordance with organizational policies. The present study focused on the distributive justice and procedural justice outcomes of disciplinary actions in workplace settings. This study assessed the effects of three levels of the severity of rule violation, severity of punishment, and decision-making processes utilized. The results indicated that conditions allowing participation in the decision-making process resulted in perceptions of greater procedural fairness to employees, but did not influence perceptions of distributive fairness. The moderately severe punishment was perceived to be more appropriate and more fair to the punished employee and his/her co-workers. Increased punishment severity was perceived as significantly more likely to deter future rule violations by the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers.
Introduction and Review of the Literature

Organizational justice is the term used to describe the role of fairness in the work place. It is concerned with how employees determine if they are being treated fairly in their jobs and how their perceptions influence other work-related factors. If employees believe they are being treated fairly with respect to how rewards and punishments are distributed, they will be more likely to have positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes, and their supervisors, and they will be more accepting of decisions that result in negative outcomes. Conversely, if employees believe they are not being treated fairly, they will be more likely to have negative attitudes that could result in behaviors such as aggression or reduced productivity. Specifically, justice in organizational settings focuses on the antecedents and consequences of the fairness of outcome distributions and the fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcome distributions.

Researchers have been prolific in the study of organizational justice in organizational settings. A meta-analysis of organizational justice research conducted by Colquitt and his colleagues consisted of 183 empirical studies that were conducted over the past 25 years (Colquitt, Wesson, Porter, Conlon, & Ng, 2001). The results of their analytic review suggested that different justice dimensions contribute to variance in fairness perceptions, and that there are relationships between distributive and procedural justice and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, withdrawal, and performance. The current research will draw upon the literature to develop an increased understanding of the bases for and implications of attitudinal
responses to specific punishment events in work settings. The model guiding this study is shown in Figure 1.

**FIGURE 1.** Proposed model of observers' reactions to punishment events in work settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Characteristics of the Punishment Event</th>
<th>Attitudinal Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Procedural Characteristics  
  - level of participation in decision-making  
| • Fairness of Procedure  
| • Fairness of Outcome  
| • Fairness to Violator  
  - Fairness to Co-Workers  
| • Appropriateness of Outcome  
| • Deterrence of Misconduct  
| • Distributive Characteristics  
  - severity of punishment  
| • Situational Characteristics  
  - severity of violation  

In the following literature review, the underlying dynamics of justice perceptions in organizational settings that provide the theoretical basis of the model in Figure 1 will be examined. The construct of punishment will be defined, and past organizational research examining this construct will be reviewed and discussed. The components of the construct of justice evaluation, procedural, distributive, and interactional justice will then be discussed in terms of findings from prior research in organizational settings. Additionally, the findings from prior research on the attitudinal outcomes shown in Figure 1 will be reviewed. Decision-making systems will be reviewed in the context of their relationships to the perceptions of the punishment events and attitudinal outcomes. Following the review and discussion of past research on the relevant concepts, the present study and proposed hypotheses will be introduced.
Punishment

Punishment in the work place has been defined as a negative action taken to change an employee’s undesirable behavior when he or she fails to conform to the rules of the organization (Greer & Labig, 1987). Punishment can be the removal of positive, rewarding outcomes or the presentation of aversive events in response to a wide range of behaviors that violate explicit rules, policies, or norms, including anything from tardiness to theft (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1992). Punishment may be delivered formally by supervisors through methods such as written warnings, suspensions, and terminations, or informally through verbal or nonverbal suggestions and actions (Greer & Labig, 1987).

Punishment in the work place is a widely used managerial strategy to influence behavior. It has had contradictory findings in organizational research as studies have found positive, negative, and nonsignificant relationships between punishment and job performance or satisfaction. Researchers suggest that other important variables, including how recipients react to and interpret a disciplinary action, need to be examined to understand how, and under what conditions, punishment can effectively control employee behavior (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994).

Employee reactions to disciplinary procedures include behavioral and affective responses. The primary behavioral response to a disciplinary procedure is whether or not the employee intends to discontinue the behavior as a result of the discipline. The affective responses to punishment include the employee’s emotional reaction, the employee’s perception of the appropriateness of the punishment, and the effect of the punishment on the employee’s relationship with his or her supervisor (Greer & Labig, 1987).
Components of Organizational Justice

The reactions of subordinates to punishment in the workplace have been shown to be related to their justice perceptions (Ball et al., 1994). There are three components of organizational justice: procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice. Procedural justice refers to perceptions of the fairness of the processes used to determine the allocation of rewards and punishments (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Elements such as the opportunity to express views and present evidence (process control) and the opportunity for voice have been found to be major determinants of procedural justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). Research suggests that employees have perceptions of greater procedural justice and are more accepting of decision outcomes when they are given an opportunity to express opinions, present their evidence, and believe that their opinions were adequately considered (Ball et al., 1992).

Regardless of the perceived fairness of the actual decision, research has shown that fair procedures result in more positive attitudes (Colquitt et al., 2001; Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995). Distributive justice is closely related to equity theory in that it refers to perceptions of the fairness of outcome distributions. Employees' perceptions of fairness are based upon a comparison of their outcomes with the outcomes received by others and their beliefs about what is just (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1993; Colquitt et al., 2001). Interactional justice refers to perceptions of the quality of interpersonal treatment received by the employee from the organization when outcomes are implemented, and primarily affects attitudes and behaviors toward the person administering the reward or punishment (Masterson et al., 2000). It includes perceptions of attributes such as truthfulness, respect, propriety of questions, and justification. Employees expect to be
treated in a forthright and respectful manner (Cropzano & Randall, 1993). Perceptions of politeness and respect enhance employees’ perceptions of fair treatment (Greenberg, 1993).

Although a proliferation of studies on organizational justice has resulted in a large accumulation of findings, there still remain questions that either have unclear findings or have not yet been addressed (Colquitt et al., 2001). The following literature review will examine how prior research literature has suggested that the procedural and distributive characteristics of punishment in an organizational setting affect attitudinal outcomes. The findings from the prior studies will demonstrate the role of perceptions of fairness in attitudinal outcomes, and the importance of these findings in developing and implementing effective disciplinary policies and procedures in workplace settings.

A 1994 study by Ball, Trevino and Sims illustrated the relationship between perceptions of justice and behavioral outcomes. The study examined whether procedural and distributive characteristics of punishment events had an effect on performance and citizenship behaviors. The participants in the study were 89 supervisor-disciplined subordinate dyads from 20 organizations in both the public and private sector. The supervisors completed questionnaires regarding the disciplined subordinates’ subsequent performance and citizenship behaviors since the disciplinary event. The subordinates completed questionnaires that contained measures of perceptions of the procedural and distributive characteristics of the disciplinary event.

The results of the study indicated that perceptions of harshness were found to be negatively related to subsequent performance. The findings also indicated that subordinate control was positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors, and
negatively related to anti-citizenship behaviors. The results suggested that punished subordinates reacted more positively to punishment when they perceived it to be fair. Ball and her colleagues suggested that punishment can positively influence subordinates’ subsequent behaviors if the disciplinary event is conducted in a particular manner. They opined that the positive outcomes reflected in their study resulted from the subordinates’ perceptions that the punishment was just. When the subordinates perceived that they had control over the disciplinary procedure and in determining the punishment, citizenship behaviors were more likely. Additionally, the disciplinary action was found to be more effective when the subordinate perceived it as consistent with what others received and as matching the infraction.

The relationship between perceptions of procedural justice and attitudinal outcomes was illustrated by research conducted by Bennett (1988). In that study, an in-basket task was used to test the effects of punishment magnitude and consistency on perceptions of procedural justice, change in the undesired behavior, anger, and aggressive behavior. Bennett found that punishment can be an effective tool for suppressing unethical behaviors; however it must be administered fairly. Individuals who received punishments that were allocated inconsistently were more likely to perceive that the procedure was less fair, and exhibit more anger and aggression than did those who received consistently allocated punishment. The magnitude of the punishment was found to have an effect on the amount of reduction in the undesired behavior; however, larger punishments also resulted in higher levels of anger. Participants who felt they were treated unfairly were more likely to react by taking out their frustration on a weaker
target. Bennett suggested that aggressive behavior appeared to be in response to the inconsistent allocation of punishment rather than the magnitude of the punishment.

The organizational justice perspective suggests that justice evaluations of punishment events determine behavioral and attitudinal reactions. Bennett’s findings imply that punishing subordinates inconsistently could result in stimulating aggression between subordinates. Additional support demonstrating the influence of justice evaluations on attitudinal outcomes was found by Greer and Labig (1987). They conducted an exploratory study to look at the associations between various aspects of meting out discipline and the reactions of 177 firefighters in eight cities. Most of the participants were entitled to utilize union grievance procedures and could not be terminated without just cause. The disciplinary actions were frequently related to extensive work rules that were usually based on safety procedures.

The participants’ ratings were used to determine the degree to which the targeted behavior was changed, the deterioration of the supervisor-subordinate relationship, the strength of the disciplined employees’ emotional reaction to the discipline, and the perceived appropriateness of the discipline. The independent variables were the privacy of the disciplinary setting, alternative behavior suggested, timing, and intensity.

The results suggested that the pleasantness with which the punishment is administered was the most important factor in reducing the punished employees’ emotional reactions and preventing deterioration of the supervisor-employee relationship. The perceived appropriateness of the punishment was related to the extent to which the supervisor-employee relationship was positive prior to the disciplinary event, the
accuracy of the supervisor’s perception of the infraction, and the supervisor presenting the employee with an explanation for the discipline.

Greer and Labig (1987) provided support for relationships between several variables and variance in employee reactions to discipline. They demonstrated that both interactional justice and distributive justice played a role in the attitudinal outcomes of the punishment events.

*Attitudinal Outcomes of Punishment Events*

Punishment can have either positive or negative outcomes. Observers react to punishment by processing social information to interpret the situation and its implications for them. A disciplinary event can influence observers’ conduct, their perceptions of procedural and distributive justice, and their work-related emotions, attitudes and behaviors. Punishment can uphold a group’s social norms, demonstrate appropriate and inappropriate behaviors to observers, deter misconduct, and create perceptions of the supervisor and the organization as just or unjust (Trevino, 1992).

A study conducted by Butterfield, Trevino and Ball (1996) illustrated the far-reaching effects of punishment. Looking at the effects of punishment from the perspective of supervisors, they found that supervisors are aware that punishment has effects that go beyond the punished violators to other members of the organization. Respondents stated that punishment incidents are viewed as instrumental in achieving objectives such as respect, vicarious learning, and personal learning. Supervisors view punishment as an opportunity to promote learning by delivering a message to all subordinates that certain behaviors will not be tolerated. Supervisors believe that their employees expect them to punish wrongdoing, and reported that punishment can
influence subordinates' perceptions of supervisors by demonstrating that the supervisors are competent. In this context, punishment can be used to improve working relations between supervisors and subordinates. Butterfield et al. also found that punishment incidents serve as a learning tool for supervisors and the organization because they provide an opportunity for supervisors to respond when there is a problem. With respect to the effects of punishment on the co-workers, Butterfield and colleagues found that supervisors believe that the co-workers of punished employees interpret what they observe and its implications for themselves and their group.

Bennett’s (1998) findings indicated that co-workers can be affected by punishment in another way. She found that punished employees who perceived themselves as victims of unfair punishment may target their aggression toward weaker or lower status individuals.

As illustrated above, the literature indicates that punishment is a complex process that is influenced by a number of variables. Subordinates’ reactions to disciplinary procedures suggest that justice cognitions and affect are salient to the effective use of punishment. There is agreement among many researchers that punishment can be effective in achieving change in behavior, and that subordinates react more positively to punishment that is perceived to be fair.

However, the organizational justice research does not provide a methodology on how to develop and implement policies and procedures for disciplining employees that will result in the desired attitudinal outcomes. There is a need to identify the specific factors that explain why employees develop certain fairness perceptions. With a clearer understanding of how employees evaluate and react to punishment, organizations will
have information that will allow them to design disciplinary programs that will be perceived as fair and therefore result in positive attitudinal outcomes.

Present Study

Properly administered punishment has been shown to be the most immediate, lasting, and effective method of reducing or eliminating undesirable behaviors (Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980). In addition, it has been suggested that punishment events have a direct influence on the subsequent misconduct of observers (Trevino, 1992). Observers of disciplinary events form punishment expectancies, resulting in a deterrence of punishable behaviors. Research results indicated that reactions to punishment events may be dependent upon how information regarding the specific disciplinary event is processed (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1992).

Research focusing on the attitudinal outcomes of disciplinary events has indicated that reactions to punishment events may depend upon how information regarding the disciplinary event is processed (Ball et al., 1993; 1994). It has been suggested that employees’ justice evaluations might provide the conceptual basis for understanding reactions to punishment events (Ball et al., 1992). The present study was an attempt to integrate past research on discipline and perceptions of organizational justice and apply it to the work place setting.

Because justice theory indicates that subordinates evaluate justice from the distributive and procedural justice perspectives, the present study examined the attitudinal outcomes of perceived procedural and distributive justice in work place settings. Specifically, the current study assessed attitudinal responses regarding the fairness and appropriateness of decision outcomes and procedures in disciplinary actions.
The outcomes addressed whether the punishments implemented would deter the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers from committing the same or similar policy violations in the future, as well as perceptions as to the fairness of the punishments implemented.

Furthermore, research on participatory decision-making in organizations has had ambiguous results with respect to its influence on attitudinal outcomes such as worker productivity and satisfaction (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). A taxonomy of decision-making processes developed by Vroom and Yetton (1973) defines differing levels of organizational decision-making that are designed to protect the quality and acceptance of a decision. Decision-making processes that may be used range from autocratic (AI, AII) to consultative (CI), to group process (GI, DI). The decision procedures developed by Vroom and Yetton for individual problems are as follows:

1. **Autocratic I (AI).** The leader solves the problem or makes the decision by him/herself, using information available to them at the time.

2. **Autocratic II (AII).** The leader obtains the necessary information from the subordinate, then decides on the solution to the problem. The leader may or may not tell the subordinate what the problem is in getting the information from him. His/her role in making the decision is clearly one of providing the necessary information to the leader, rather than generating or evaluating alternative solutions.

3. **Consultative (CI).** The leader shares the problem with the subordinate, getting his/her ideas and suggestions. Then the leader makes a decision, which may or may not reflect the subordinate’s influence.
4. Group I (GI) (joint decision-making). The leader shares the problem with
the subordinate, and together they analyze the problem and arrive at a
mutually agreeable decision.

5. Delegative I (DI). The leader delegates the problem to the subordinate,
providing him/her with any relevant information but giving him/her
responsibility for solving the problem on their own. The leader may or
may not request the subordinate to advise the leader on what solution was
reached.

The rules for the model are in the form of a decision tree that consists of yes/no
questions that lead to the appropriate decision process to use, or “feasible set” of
decision-making methods. In the present study, the construct of procedural justice was
operationalized through Vroom and Yetton’s AI, CI and GI decision-making processes.

Based on the foregoing literature review, in the present study we hypothesized the
following:

(H1) Conditions allowing participation or influence in the decision-making
process (CI, GI) would result in higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both
the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers.

(H2) Conditions allowing participation or influence in the decision-making
process (CI, GI) would result in higher perceptions of distributive fairness to both
the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers.

(H3) The moderately severe punishment would be perceived as more fair to
both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers than the high and low
severity punishments.
(H4) The moderately severe punishment would be perceived as more appropriate than will either the high or low severity punishments.

(H5) Punishment outcomes with increased severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future violator misconduct than would punishment conditions with less severe punishments.

(H6) Punishment outcomes with increased outcome severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future co-worker misconduct than would punishment conditions with less severe punishments.
Method

Participants

Participants were 366 volunteers who were either undergraduate students from a southeastern university or current employees of local business organizations. Manipulation checks were implemented to eliminate inattentive participants, resulting in 340 participants utilized for the analyses. Demographic information collected included gender, age, ethnic background, number of years in the workforce, supervisory experience, job title of those in supervisory positions, number of subordinates supervised, and educational background.

The 340 participants were comprised of 193 students and 147 employees. Approximately half of the student participants received extra credit points for their participation in this study. The remaining participants received no form of compensation. There were 101 males (30%) and 238 females (70%); one respondent did not report gender. Their ages ranged from 17 to 65 years, with a median age of 22 years; 305 participants were White, 24 were African American, 3 were Hispanic, 2 were Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 categorized themselves as “other,” and 1 did not indicate ethnicity. The number of years in the workforce ranged from 0 to 46, with a median of 6 years; 185 participants had experience supervising others, 153 did not have supervisory experience, and 2 participants did not respond to that question. The most frequently reported job title of participants with supervisory experience was manager/assistant manager (11%), followed by supervisor (7%), with the remaining having a variety of titles (e.g., line leader, attorney, etc.). The number of subordinates supervised ranged from 1 to 138 ($M = 13.52, SD = 20.93$). The participants’ educational backgrounds were as
follows: high school (8%), some college (67%), technical training/certification (4%), associate’s degree (5%), bachelor’s degree (9%), advanced degree (7%).

Design

A 3 (severity of violation: low, moderate, and high) x 3 (decision-making procedures: autocratic, consultative, participatory) x 3 (punishment outcomes: low, moderate, and high severity) factorial design was used. The 27 procedural justice, distributive justice, and punishment conditions were represented in hypothetical work policy violation scenarios.

Procedure

Scenario Development. Hypothetical work policy violation disciplinary scenarios were developed representing the conditions created by the 3 x 3 x 3 factorial design. Three levels of work policy violation (low, moderate, and high severity), together with three levels of participation in the outcome decision (autocratic, consultative, participatory), and three punishment outcomes (low, moderate, and high severity) were used in the scenarios. The 27 scenarios and other materials used for data collection may be found in Appendix A.

Participation in the outcome decision was operationalized in this study through the use of an abbreviated version of the Vroom and Yetton (1973) taxonomy of decision-making processes. The decision-making process used with no employee influence was the Autocratic I (AI) style in which the supervisor made the decision using only information available at the time. The decision-making process used with moderate employee influence was the Consultative (CI) style in which the supervisor consulted with the employee and then made the decision (which may or may not reflect the
employee’s influence). The third decision-making process used in this study was the Participative (GI) style in which the supervisor and the employee jointly made the decision. These decision-making processes were used in the present study to represent a continuum of employee influence in the decision outcome. The degree of severity of the rule violation and punishment outcomes were derived from a stimulus-centered rating study.

*Stimulus Rating Study.* The researchers generated a list of work place violations and punishments by reviewing organizational policy manuals listing rule violations and sanctions. A questionnaire was developed using the list of 20 work place policy violations and 10 punishments. The questionnaire was distributed to 45 individuals in work place settings and 95 undergraduate students at a southeastern university. The questionnaire consisted of 20 violations that were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = not severe to 5 = extremely severe. It also included 10 punishments rated on the same scale. The demographic information collected indicated that the sample used for the stimulus rating study had the following characteristics: gender: 63 males, 77 females; ethnicity: 99 White, 20 African American, 9 Hispanic, 2 Asian, 5 other; type of employment experience: 29 manufacturing, 58 retail, 27 professional, 34 service industry, 12 government, 28 clerical, 33 other; age: range 17 - 63 years, $M = 24$ years, $SD = 9.9$ years; educational background: 11 high school, 103 some college, 6 technical training, 10 associate’s degree, 5 bachelor’s degree, 4 post baccalaureate degree; supervisory experience: 68 no, 69 yes; and number of subordinates supervised: range 0 - 200, $M = 7.3$, $SD = 20.5$. The questionnaire, the mean ratings, and standard deviations for the violations and punishments may be found in Appendix B.
The stimulus-rating study results provided the basis for operationalizing the independent variables to be used in the current study. The rule-violation behaviors used in the scenarios were reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, leaving the premises during work hours without authorization, and placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. These behaviors were rated on the high, middle and low range of the scale, respectively. The punishments chosen were discharge, probation, and verbal warning/reprimand. They were also chosen because they were rated as high, moderate, and low severity, respectively, in the stimulus rating study.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the stimulus ratings by the subjects from the work place settings and the ratings by the subjects from the university setting, Pillai’s $F(1, 136) = .36, n.s$. The high severity violation of reporting to work under the influence of alcohol received mean ratings of 4.4 and 4.2 by the work place and university subjects, respectively, with an overall $M = 4.3, SD = 1.0$. The moderate severity violation of leaving the premises during work hours without authorization received mean ratings of 3.0 by both the work place and university subjects, with an overall 3.0, $SD = 1.1$. Work place and university subjects gave mean ratings of 1.9 and 2.0, respectively, for the low severity violation of placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission, with an overall $M = 1.9, SD = 1.0$ for the violation.

MANOVA also determined that there were no statistically significant differences between the work place subjects and university subjects in their stimulus ratings of the severity of the punishments, Pillai’s $F(1, 134) = .21, n.s$. The high severity punishment of discharge from the company received mean ratings of 4.7 and 4.6 by the work place
and university subjects, respectively, and an overall $M = 4.6, SD = .9$. The work place and university subjects gave mean ratings of 2.7 and 2.8, respectively, to the moderate severity punishment of being placed on probation, with an overall $M = 2.8, SD = 1.0$. The low severity punishment of receiving a verbal warning/reprimand was given mean ratings of 1.7 and 1.9 by the work place and university subjects, respectively, and an overall $M = 1.8, SD = 1.0$.

**Questionnaire Distribution.** The scenario-based questionnaires were distributed to employee participants at their work places and to student participants during class meetings. In the work place settings, participants were assured that the questionnaire was for research purposes only and that their individual responses would not be shared with their employers. The participants reported demographic information and were randomly assigned one hypothetical scenario to read. After reading the scenario, they were asked to rate their perceptions of the fairness of the punishment procedure and outcome portrayed in the scenario with regard to both the employee who violated the rule and to the employee’s co-workers. They were also asked to rate the appropriateness of the punishment and the likelihood that the punishment would deter future violations by both the violator and co-workers. The questionnaires were completed in approximately 15 minutes. Participants were asked to return the scenarios to the researcher before they left the room.
Results

Manipulation Checks

Participants were asked to state the rule that was violated, the punishment that was given, and the decision-making procedure that was used to determine the punishment outcome. Of the original 366 participants, 340 passed the manipulation check by responding correctly to the three items. Only the data from the participants who passed the manipulation check were used for the following analyses.

Descriptives and Correlations

Descriptive statistics and correlational analyses were used to investigate bivariate relationships. Means, standard deviations, and inter-item correlations are provided in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the four fairness dependent variables and the appropriateness dependent variable were significantly correlated. The two deterrence dependent variables were significantly correlated. Additionally, both deterrence dependent variables were significantly correlated with the dependent variables for procedural fairness to co-workers and fairness of punishment to co-workers. There was a significant negative correlation between the dependent variable for deterrence to co-workers and fairness of punishment to employee.

Analyses for Fairness and Appropriateness

Based upon the intercorrelated dependent variables, a 3 (severity of rule violation: low, moderate, high) x 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high) x 3 (decision-making procedure: low = autocratic, moderate = consultative, high = participative) MANOVA was utilized to determine the effects of the three independent variables on fairness and appropriateness. The severity of the rule violation had a significant
Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for All Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 Procedure</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fairness of Procedure</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fairness of Punishment</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fairness of Punishment</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Appropriateness of</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deterrent to Employee</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Deterrent to Co-Workers</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.78**</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 = 340
**p < .01.

multivariate effect, Pillai’s $F (10, 620) = 4.43, p < .001$; as did the severity of the punishment implemented, Pillai’s $F (10, 620) = 8.67, p < .001$; and the decision-making process, Pillai’s $F (10, 620) = 5.83, p < .001$. Additionally, a significant interaction effect was found between the severity of the rule violation and the severity of the punishment, Pillai’s $F (20, 1248) = 4.0, p < .001$.

*Fairness of Procedure to Employee.* Following the significant MANOVA, univariate ANOVAs were conducted to test the hypotheses. The results of the ANOVA
on the fairness to the employee of the procedure used to determine the punishment are presented in Table 2. Significant main effects were found for the punishment severity, the decision-making process, and the interaction between those two variables.

A Tukey’s post-hoc test for the significant main effect of punishment severity indicated that the high severity punishment differed significantly from the low and moderate severity punishments ($p < .05$), whereas the moderate and low severity punishments were not significantly different from each other. Participants rated the high severity punishment as significantly less fair to the punished employee ($M = 4.8, SD = 2.0, N = 141$) than the moderate ($M = 5.5, SD = 1.7, N = 134$) and low severity ($M = 5.9, SD = 1.2, N = 65$) punishments.

The Tukey’s post-hoc test for the significant main effect of decision-making procedure indicated that the autocratic decision-making process differed significantly from the consultative and the participative methods ($p < .05$), whereas the consultative and participative methods were not significantly different from each other. Participants rated the autocratic decision-making process significantly less fair to the punished employee ($M = 4.3, SD = 1.9, N = 114$) than the consultative ($M = 5.6, SD = 1.4, N = 107$) and participative ($M = 6.0, SD = 1.5, N = 119$) procedures.

The interaction indicated that the main effect for procedure, that is that the autocratic procedure is seen as significantly less fair than the other two procedures, becomes greater as the severity of the punishment increases (see Figure 2). The autocratic procedure that results in moderate severity punishment was perceived to be less fair than when it resulted in low severity punishment and least fair when it resulted in high severity punishment.
FIGURE 2. Interaction of decision-making procedure and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of fairness of decision-making procedure to employee.

Fairness of Procedure to Employee's Co-Workers. The results of the ANOVA on participants' perceptions of fairness of the decision-making procedure to the employee's co-workers are illustrated in Table 3. The ANOVA showed significant main effects for the decision-making procedure and for the interaction between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment.

A Tukey's post-hoc test revealed that the autocratic method differed significantly ($p < .01$) from the consultative and participative methods, but there was no significant difference between the consultative and participative procedures. The autocratic decision-making process was perceived as significantly less fair to the employee's co-workers ($M = 4.3, SD = 1.8, N = 114$) than were the consultative ($M = 5.2, SD = 1.3, N =$
Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Procedure to Employee

<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 (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>14.67***</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.97</td>
<td>22.12***</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>3.24*</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*p < .05.  ***p < .001.

107) and participative decision-making processes (M = 5.0, SD = 1.6, N = 119). As illustrated by the graph in Figure 3, a significant interaction was found between the severity of the rule violation and the severity of the punishment. When there was a low severity violation, the low severity punishment was perceived as more fair to the employee’s co-workers, but when there was a high severity violation, the low severity punishment was perceived as less fair to co-workers than the moderate or high severity punishment.
FIGURE 3. Interaction of rule violated and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of fairness of decision-making procedure to employee’s co-workers.

In sum, the significant main effects for the decision-making process supported Hypothesis 1, which stated that conditions that allow for participation or influence in the decision making process (i.e., the participative and consultative methods) would result in higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers. The significant Tukey’s post-hoc test indicates that the participative and consultative decision-making processes resulted in perceptions of greater procedural fairness to the punished employee than did the autocratic decision-making process. Additionally, the participative and consultative decision-making processes resulted in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness to the punished employee’s co-workers than did the autocratic decision-making process.
Table 3

*Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Procedure to Employee's Co-Workers*

<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 (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>4.21**</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

*Fairness of Outcome to Employee.* An ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of the independent variables on perceptions of the fairness of the punishments to the punished employee. As shown in Table 4, the severity of the rule violation and the severity of the punishment had a significant effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment. However, the decision-making procedure did not have a significant effect on the perceptions of fairness. A significant interaction was found between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment. When there was a low severity rule violation, the high severity punishment was perceived as significantly less fair to the employee than the moderate or low severity punishments. When there was a high severity rule violation,
Table 4

*Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Outcome to Employee*

<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 (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>6.44**</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.48</td>
<td>26.24***</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>8.13***</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

**p < .01. ***p = .001.

the moderate severity punishment was perceived as the most fair outcome to the employee (see Figure 4).

A Tukey’s post-hoc comparison revealed that low (4.72, SD = 1.9, N = 57) and moderate (M = 4.9, SD = 1.9, N = 139) severity rule violations significantly differed ($p < .05$) from the high (M = 5.6, SD = 1.6, N = 144) severity rule violation with respect to perceptions of fairness of the punishment to the employee. Punishment meted out in response to the violation of a high severity rule was perceived as more fair to the employee than were disciplinary actions taken in response to low or moderate severity rule violations.
FIGURE 4. Interaction of rule violated and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of fairness of punishment to employee.

The Tukey's post-hoc comparison also showed that low (5.75, SD = 1.6, N = 65) and moderate (M = 5.7, SD = 1.5, N = 134) severity punishments significantly differed (p < .05) from the high (M = 4.4, SD = 1.9, N = 141) severity punishment with respect to perceptions of fairness of the punishment to the employee. The low and moderate severity punishments were perceived as more fair to the employee than the high severity punishment.

Fairness of Outcome to Employee’s Co-Workers. An ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of the independent variables on perceptions of the fairness of the punishments to the punished employee’s co-workers. As illustrated in Table 5, the severity of the rule violation had a significant effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment. However, the decision-making procedure did not have a significant effect
on the perceptions of fairness. As shown in Figure 5, a significant interaction was found between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment. The high severity punishment was perceived as most fair to co-workers when the employee had violated a high severity rule. Conversely, when the employee received a low severity punishment in response to a high severity rule violation, the outcome was perceived as significantly less fair to the punished employee’s co-workers.

*FIGURE 5.* Interaction of rule violated and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of fairness of punishment to employee’s co-workers.
A Tukey’s post-hoc comparison indicated that the low $(M = 4.8, SD = 1.5, N = 57)$, moderate $(M = 4.7, SD = 1.7, N = 139)$ and high $(M = 4.6, SD = 1.8, N = 144)$ levels of severity of rule violation did not significantly differ $(p < .05)$ from each other with respect to their effect on perceptions of the fairness of the punishments to the employee’s co-workers.

These results failed to support Hypothesis 2, which stated that conditions allowing participation or influence in the decision-making process would result in higher perceptions of distributive fairness to both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers. The results of this study indicated that the decision-making process had no effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment to either the employee or the employee’s co-workers.

However, these results provided partial support for Hypothesis 3, which stated that the moderately severe punishment would be perceived as more fair to both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers than the high and low severity punishments. The results indicated that the moderate severity punishment $(M = 5.7, SD = 1.5, N = 134)$ was perceived as significantly $(p < .05)$ more fair to the employee than the high severity punishment $(M = 4.4, SD = 1.9, N = 141)$. Additionally, the results indicated that the low severity punishment $(M = 5.7, SD = 1.6, N = 65)$ was also perceived as more fair to the employee than the high severity punishment. More specifically, severe punishment was perceived to be less fair when there was a low or moderate severity rule violation. However, as illustrated in Figure 4 above, the significant interaction between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment indicated that when there was a high
severity rule violation, all three levels of punishment were perceived as equally fair to the employee.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Outcome to Employee’s Co-Workers

<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 (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.034</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>13.49***</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.24 *</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.425)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*p < .05. ***p < .001.

Additional support for Hypothesis 3 is found in the ANOVA results that indicated the severity of punishment had an effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment on the employee’s co-workers. The moderately severe punishment \( (M = 4.8, SD = 1.6, N = 134) \) was revealed to be perceived as significantly \( (p < .05) \) more fair to co-workers than the low severity punishment \( (M = 4.3, SD = 2.0, N = 65) \); however the high severity punishment \( (M = 4.7, SD = 1.6, N = 141) \) was not shown to be significantly different from the moderate punishment.
**Appropriateness of Punishment.** An ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of the independent variables on the perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment implemented in response to the rule violation. As illustrated in Table 6, the level of severity of the punishment produced a significant main effect for perceptions of appropriateness of the punishment. Again, a significant interaction between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment was also found. As illustrated in Figure 6, the low severity punishment in response to the low severity rule violation was perceived as appropriate, whereas a high severity punishment was perceived as appropriate for a high severity rule violation.

*FIGURE 6.* Interaction of rule violated and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of appropriateness of punishment.
With respect to perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment outcomes, a Tukey’s post-hoc comparison indicated that low severity punishment ($M = 4.4$, $SD = 2.0$, $N = 65$) differed significantly ($p < .05$) from moderate severity punishment ($M = 5.2$, $SD = 1.7$, $N = 134$), while high severity punishment ($M = 4.8$, $SD = 1.9$, $N = 141$) did not significantly differ from either low or moderate. The moderate severity punishment was perceived as more appropriate than the low severity punishment. The significant interaction between severity of rule violation and severity of punishment indicated that a low punishment outcome for a high severity rule violation was not perceived as appropriate. Similarly, a high severity punishment outcome implemented in response to a low severity rule violation was not perceived as appropriate.

These results provided partial support for Hypothesis 4, which stated that the moderately severe punishment outcome would be perceived as more appropriate than either the high or low severity punishment outcomes.

*Analyses for Deterrence*

Because the dependent variables for deterrence were intercorrelated, a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ (severity of rule violation: low, moderate, high) MANOVA was utilized to determine the effects of the three independent variables on the deterrence dependent variables. Severity of rule violation had a significant main effect, Pillai’s $F (4, 340) = 6.27$, $p < .05$. The severity of the punishment implemented also had a significant multivariate effect, Pillai’s $F (4, 340) = 29.21$, $p <$
Table 6

*Analysis of Variance for Appropriateness of the 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 (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td><strong>3.41</strong>*</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.99</td>
<td><strong>15.03</strong>*</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.794)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*p < .05. **p < .001.

A significant interaction effect was found between the severity of the punishment and the decision-making procedure used, Pillai’s $F(8, 340) = 2.06, p < .05$. However, severity of rule violation did not produce a significant main effect for deterrence of future violations.

Following the significant MANOVA, univariate ANOVAs were conducted to test the effects of severity of punishment, severity of rule violation, and decision-making procedure on perceptions of the likelihood that the punishment implemented would deter future rule violations by both the employee and the employee’s co-workers. The results in Tables 7 and 8 show that the severity of the rule violation and the severity of the
punishment had significant main effects for perceptions of deterrence of future violations by the employee and the employee’s co-workers. The decision-making procedure was shown to have a main effect for perceptions of deterrence of future violations by the employee’s co-workers, but not for the employee.

In addition, there was a significant interaction effect between the severity of the punishment and the decision-making procedure with respect to the perceptions of deterrence of future violations by the employee’s co-workers. As shown in Figure 7, the consultative method was perceived to be a greater deterrent to co-workers when a low severity punishment was implemented; however, all three procedures were equally perceived as deterrents when the high severity outcome was implemented.

**FIGURE 7.** Interaction of decision-making procedure and punishment outcome with respect to perceptions of deterrence to employee’s co-workers.
Tukey’s post-hoc analyses were conducted to address Hypotheses 5 and 6, which stated that punishment outcomes with increased outcome severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future rule violations by the employee and by the employee’s co-workers, respectively.

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Deterrence to Employee

<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</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>11.50***</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.55</td>
<td>37.31***</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation X Severity of Punishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation X Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment X Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation X Severity of Punishment X Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

***p < .001.

The results supported Hypothesis 5. The Tukey’s post-hoc comparison indicated that all three punishment outcomes were significantly (p < .05) different from each other.
More specifically, regarding deterrent to the employee, the low severity punishment \((M = 3.6, SD = 1.8, N = 65)\) was perceived to be the least effective deterrent to future rule violations, the moderate severity punishment \((M = 4.6, SD = 1.6, N = 134)\) was perceived as more likely to deter future rule violations than the low severity punishment, and the high severity punishment outcome \((M = 5.7, SD = 1.5, N = 141)\) was perceived as the strongest deterrent to future rule violations by the employee.

Table 8

*Analysis of Variance for Deterrence to Employee's Co-Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(\text{Eta}^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Rule Violation (RV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>10.03***</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Punishment Outcome (PO)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143.16</td>
<td>71.65***</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure (DP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>3.07*</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO x DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV x PO x DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

\(*p < .05. \quad ***p < .001.\)

The results of the post-hoc analyses also supported Hypothesis 6. Again, all three punishment outcomes were significantly \((p < .05)\) different from each other. In the
ANOVA for deterrent to the employee’s co-workers, the low severity punishment ($M = 3.2, SD = 1.7, N = 65$) was perceived to be the least deterrent to future rule violations, the moderate severity punishment ($M = 4.5, SD = 1.5, N = 134$) was perceived as more likely to deter future rule violations than the low severity punishment, and the high severity punishment outcome ($M = 5.9, SD = 1.3, N = 141$) was perceived as the strongest deterrent to future rule violations by the employee’s co-workers.
Discussion

Employees are concerned about the punishment outcomes they receive and the decision-making processes implemented to determine the allocation of punishments. Both the outcome and the process of disciplinary actions can be evaluated in terms of fairness. The literature on organizational justice and punishment suggests that perceptions of the fairness of a punishment outcome will affect employees’ behavioral and attitudinal reactions to disciplinary actions. These reactions to disciplinary events can include subsequent performance, future violations, perceptions of the fairness of the outcome and procedure to both the individual who is punished and the other members of the organization, and perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment outcome with respect to the rule violation (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1993).

The organizational justice literature has proposed that allowing participation in the decision-making process can increase both perceptions of the fairness of outcomes and acceptance of the outcomes. In the present study, it was first hypothesized that conditions allowing increased participation or influence in the decision-making process would result in higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers. Participation was operationalized on a continuum where supervisors used low (autocratic condition), moderate (consultative condition), and high (participative condition) levels of employee influence in the decision-making process. Hypothesis 1 was supported in that both the consultative and participative decision-making conditions resulted in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers than did the autocratic condition.
The second hypothesis proposed that conditions allowing participation or influence in the decision-making process would result in higher perceptions of distributive fairness (i.e., fairness of punishment outcome) to both the punished employee and the employee's co-workers. However, the results of this study did not support Hypothesis 2. The decision-making process did not have a significant effect on perceptions of the fairness of the punishment outcome to either the punished employee or the employee's co-workers. This finding departed from findings reported in the organizational justice literature that indicate that both procedural and distributive factors influence perceptions of fairness (Ball et al., 1993).

The organizational justice literature suggests that perceptions of the fairness of punishment outcomes are based on the individuals' beliefs about the appropriate levels of punishment that fit an infraction (Trevino, 1992). The third hypothesis predicted that the moderately severe punishment outcome would be perceived as more fair to both the punished employee and the employee's co-workers than would the high and low severity punishment outcomes. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported. The results indicated that the moderate severity punishment was perceived as more fair to the punished employee than the high severity punishment; however, the results also indicated that the low severity punishment was also perceived as more fair to the employee than the high severity punishment. There was no support to indicate that the severity of punishment had an effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment outcome to the punished employee's co-workers.

Additionally, participants in this study were concerned with having the punishment outcome "fit the crime." The severe punishment outcome was perceived to
be less fair when there was a low or moderate severity rule violation. Moreover, when there was a high severity rule violation, all three levels of punishment were perceived as equally fair to the employee.

In Hypothesis 4 it was predicted that the moderately severe punishment outcome would be perceived as more appropriate than would either the high or low severity punishment outcomes. The results provided partial support for this hypothesis. The level of severity of the punishment outcome produced a significant main effect for perceptions of appropriateness of the punishment. As predicted, the moderate severity punishment outcome was perceived as more appropriate than the low severity punishment outcome. However, the high severity punishment outcome did not significantly differ from the moderate (or low) severity punishment. The results also indicated that the severity of the rule violation influenced perceptions of the appropriateness of the outcome. A low punishment outcome for a high severity rule violation was perceived as less appropriate, whereas a high severity punishment implemented in response to a low severity rule violation was also seen as less appropriate.

Trevino (1992) suggested that punishment outcomes induce punishment expectancies, and subsequently deter misconduct only if the punishment is severe enough to be attended to by potential violators. More specifically, if an employee believes that a particular behavior will be punished, and perceives the severity of the punishment to outweigh the benefits of the misconduct, the employee will be less likely to engage in the misconduct. Hypotheses 5 and 6, respectively, proposed that punishment outcomes with increased outcome severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future misconduct by the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers than would
punishment conditions with less severe punishments. The results supported both hypotheses. All three punishment outcomes were significantly different from each other, and increased outcome severity was perceived as significantly more likely to deter future misconduct by both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers. More specifically, the low severity punishment outcome was perceived to be the least deterrent to future rule violations, the moderate severity punishment outcome was perceived as more likely to deter future rule violations than the low severity punishment outcome, and the high severity punishment outcome was perceived as the strongest deterrent to future rule violations. These results suggest that the degree of punishment severity will determine the degree to which the punishment will deter future rule violations.

*Future Directions*

The results of this study contradicted findings of previous research with respect to the role of procedural factors in determining perceptions of the fairness of the punishment outcome. The present study found that the decision-making procedure used did not have a significant effect on the participants’ perceptions of distributive fairness. Future research on discipline events in workplace settings should further investigate the importance of procedural fairness in perceptions of distributive fairness.

Another result of this study that should be further investigated is the finding that the moderately severe punishment outcome was perceived as more fair to the punished employee, but not to the employee’s co-workers. Future research should investigate possible causes for the different perceptions of distributive fairness for the two groups.
Implications

The results of the present study have implications for developing an increased understanding of the bases for and implications of attitudinal and behavioral responses to punishment events in work place settings. As previously discussed, if employees believe that they are receiving just treatment with respect to the distribution of punishments, they will be more accepting of decisions that have negative outcomes. They will also be more likely to have positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes, and their supervisors.

This research demonstrated that conditions providing participation in the decision-making process were perceived as more procedurally fair than the autocratic condition that allowed no employee participation in the decision-making process. Thus, supervisors should consider this factor when determining how to proceed in response to a rule violation because the results could affect attitudinal and behavioral reactions of both the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers.

The results of the present study also illustrated the role of punishment severity in terms of whether or not the punishment will serve as a deterrent to future violations. If an organization is going to use punishment as a method to deter rule violations, then the discipline policies it develops should ensure that the severity of the punishment will serve as a deterrent.

Conclusions

The conceptual framework for this study was presented in Figure 1. The model of observers’ reactions to punishment events in work settings suggested that perceptions of procedural and distributive characteristics of punishment events in work place settings
would determine individual attitudinal outcomes with respect to the fairness and appropriateness of the punishment, and its ability to deter subsequent rule violations.

The procedural and distributive characteristics of the disciplinary event had a significant effect on the participants’ perceptions the procedure’s fairness to the punished employee and the employee’s co-workers. However, the procedural characteristics of the punishment did not produce a significant effect on their perceptions of the fairness of the outcome. As previously discussed, this finding departed from the organizational justice literature which suggests that both procedural and distributive characteristics play important roles in determining fairness perceptions (Ball et al., 1993).

With the exception of the procedural characteristic’s failure to produce a significant effect on perceptions of the fairness of the outcome, the findings of this study are consistent with the reactions to punishment events depicted in Figure 1. Both procedural and distributive characteristics play an important role in determining perceptions of fairness of disciplinary events in work place settings. Future research might address whether or not the current findings on observers’ attitudinal reactions to punishment generalize to employees who work in team settings.
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Appendix A
Informed Consent Document

Project Title: Perceptions of Fairness of Discipline Events in the Workplace
Investigator: Debra Phillips, Psychology Department – 745-3820; Advisor: Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt, Psychology Department – 745-4418; Dr. Phil Myers, HSRB Coordinator, 745-4652 project approved April 9, 2002.

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project. The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have. If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:** to study perceptions of the fairness of discipline events in the workplace.

2. **Explanation of Procedures:** You will be asked to fill out a background questionnaire. You will then read a scenario depicting a violation of a workplace policy and the discipline the employee received, and answer questions about the fairness of the disciplinary action.

3. **Discomfort and Risks:** no anticipated risks or discomfort are expected from participating in this study.

4. **Benefits:** You will receive the satisfaction that comes from contributing to human behavior research.

5. **Confidentiality:** Absolute anonymity is guaranteed. No identifying information (name, social security number, etc.) will ever be linked to the questionnaires you are filling out.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:** you are free to withdraw from this study at any time with no penalty to you at all.

Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. I understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

Signature of Participant ___________________________ Date ____________

Witness ___________________________ Date ____________

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
TELEPHONE: 270-745-4652
Work place Justice Study

This research is examining perceptions of the fairness of punishment in the work place. Justice evaluations of punishment are important because they affect workers’ behavioral and attitudinal reactions to punishment. These reactions have implications regarding attitudes about work, work outcomes, and supervisors. The researchers are interested in whether or not there are differences in opinions of different groups of individuals such as supervisors versus non-supervisors, males versus females, older versus younger individuals, etc. In order to answer these important research questions, we need the demographic information requested on this part of the questionnaire.

Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

1. Work Experience

Number of years in work force (past and present employment): Total

Have you supervised others? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how many people have you supervised? ______

What was your title when you supervised others? ____________________________

2. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

3. Age: ______

4. Ethnicity: _____ African American _____ Asian/Pacific Islander

_____ White _____ Hispanic

_____ Other: __________________________

5. Education:

_____ High School _____ Technical Training/Certification _____ Bachelor’s Degree

_____ Some College _____ Associate’s Degree _____ Advanced Degree

DIRECTIONS:

On the following page is a hypothetical but realistic scenario depicting a situation involving an employee in the work place. Please read the directions carefully and respond to the questions that follow. It is very important that you pay close attention to the details of the scenario and respond as honestly as possible to each of the questions that follow. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to me. When you are finished, you will be free to leave.

AGAIN, PLEASE READ THE SCENARIO AND QUESTIONS CAREFULLY. THANK YOU
Scenario: Lee is an employee at Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. They decided that Lee would be put on probation for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ______________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ______________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
     very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely

H/P/M
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be discharged for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision   supervisor & employee together made decision   supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company violation from violating this rule in the future?

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

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
**Scenario:** Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee's punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 somewhat unlikely
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat likely
   - 6 likely
   - 7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 somewhat unlikely
    - 4 neutral
    - 5 somewhat likely
    - 6 likely
    - 7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated?__________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented?__________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1 very unlikely  2 unlikely  3 somewhat unlikely  4 neutral  5 somewhat likely  6 likely  7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1 very unlikely  2 unlikely  3 somewhat unlikely  4 neutral  5 somewhat likely  6 likely  7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision   supervisor & employee together made decision   supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimanded for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?

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

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by reporting to work under the influence of alcohol. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for reporting to work under the influence of alcohol.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
**Scenario:** Lee is an employee at Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ____________________________

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 somewhat unlikely
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat likely
   - 6 likely
   - 7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 somewhat unlikely
    - 4 neutral
    - 5 somewhat likely
    - 6 likely
    - 7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. They decided that Lee would be put on probation for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision   supervisor & employee together made decision   supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be discharged for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision   supervisor & employee together made decision   supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee's punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 somewhat unlikely
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat likely
   - 6 likely
   - 7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 somewhat unlikely
    - 4 neutral
    - 5 somewhat likely
    - 6 likely
    - 7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of ABC Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee's punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? 
2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? 
3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?

very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimanded for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ___________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision        supervisor & employee together made decision    supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair  2 unfair  3 somewhat unfair  4 neutral  5 somewhat fair  6 fair  7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   very unlikely  2 unlikely  3 somewhat unlikely  4 neutral  5 somewhat likely  6 likely  7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    very unlikely  2 unlikely  3 somewhat unlikely  4 neutral  5 somewhat likely  6 likely  7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? __________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? __________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by leaving the premises during work hours without authorization. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for leaving the premises during work hours without authorization.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? __________________________ (fill in the blank)
2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? __________________________ (fill in the blank)
3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

- supervisor made decision
- supervisor & employee together made decision
- supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?

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

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee at Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee together made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. They decided that Lee would be put on probation for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _______________________________ (fill in the blank)
2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)
3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision   supervisor & employee together made decision   supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the violation from violating this rule in the future?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor had a meeting with Lee to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor and Lee made the determination of the punishment given to Lee. Together they decided that Lee would be discharged for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

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

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

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

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company violation from violating this rule in the future?

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

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee’s punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimand for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?

   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?

   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?

   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?

   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?

    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee's punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee's punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? __________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? __________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

- supervisor made decision
- supervisor & employee together made decision
- supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unfair  unfair  somewhat unfair  neutral  somewhat fair  fair  very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    very unlikely  unlikely  somewhat unlikely  neutral  somewhat likely  likely  very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee's supervisor and Lee had a meeting to decide what Lee's punishment would be. After consulting with Lee, the supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee's co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee's co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 somewhat unlikely
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat likely
   - 6 likely
   - 7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 somewhat unlikely
    - 4 neutral
    - 5 somewhat likely
    - 6 likely
    - 7 very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor made the decision as to what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be given a verbal warning/reprimanded for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - supervisor made decision
   - supervisor & employee together made decision
   - supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 somewhat unfair
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat fair
   - 6 fair
   - 7 very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 somewhat unlikely
   - 4 neutral
   - 5 somewhat likely
   - 6 likely
   - 7 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee's co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 somewhat unlikely
    - 4 neutral
    - 5 somewhat likely
    - 6 likely
    - 7 very likely
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Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor made the decision as to what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be put on probation for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision  supervisor & employee together made decision  supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - very unfair
   - unfair
   - somewhat unfair
   - neutral
   - somewhat fair
   - fair
   - very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - very unfair
   - unfair
   - somewhat unfair
   - neutral
   - somewhat fair
   - fair
   - very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - very unfair
   - unfair
   - somewhat unfair
   - neutral
   - somewhat fair
   - fair
   - very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - very unfair
   - unfair
   - somewhat unfair
   - neutral
   - somewhat fair
   - fair
   - very fair

8) Given the company policy violation committed by Lee, how appropriate was the punishment?
   - very unfair
   - unfair
   - somewhat unfair
   - neutral
   - somewhat fair
   - fair
   - very fair

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?
   - very unlikely
   - unlikely
   - somewhat unlikely
   - neutral
   - somewhat likely
   - likely
   - very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?
    - very unlikely
    - unlikely
    - somewhat unlikely
    - neutral
    - somewhat likely
    - likely
    - very likely
Scenario: Lee is an employee of Acme Company. Lee violated company policy by placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission. Because of this violation, Lee’s supervisor decided what Lee’s punishment would be. The supervisor decided that Lee would be discharged for placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 3 questions, please answer based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _____________________________

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _____________________________

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   supervisor made decision supervisor & employee together made decision supervisor consulted with employee before making decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished employee or the perspective of the employee’s co-workers. (Circle one answer for each of the following questions.)

4) How fair to the punished employee was the procedure used in determining the punishment?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

5) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the procedure used in determining the punishment?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished employee was the actual punishment that was implemented?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

7) How fair to the employee’s co-workers was the actual punishment that was implemented?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   very unfair unfair somewhat unfair neutral somewhat fair fair very fair

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

Additionally, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee who committed the company policy violation from violating this rule in the future?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the employee’s co-workers from committing this company policy violation in the future?  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
    very unlikely unlikely somewhat unlikely neutral somewhat likely likely very likely
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Appendix B
Discipline in the Work Place Questionnaire

Most companies have rules that guide employees' behavior which employees are expected to follow. Below you will find, listed in random order, a number of company rule violations (i.e., infractions) that employees might commit. Please evaluate each infraction in the context of a company employee. Think in terms of the implications of the infraction for the individual employee and the company as a whole. Please use the following rating scale and circle the rating for each infraction that reflects your opinion of the severity of that infraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Severe</td>
<td>Moderately Severe</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Very Severe</td>
<td>Extremely Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the number that reflects your rating of each infraction:

1  2  3  4  5  Theft or removing company property or another employee’s property
1  2  3  4  5  Insubordination, such as refusing to perform assigned work
1  2  3  4  5  Discussing company business in the presence of non-employees
1  2  3  4  5  Reporting to work while under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs
1  2  3  4  5  Performing personal work on company time or using company telephones for personal business without the permission of your supervisor
1  2  3  4  5  Failing to notify the company prior to your shift when you are absent from work
1  2  3  4  5  Possession or use of weapons, illegal drugs, or alcohol on company property
1  2  3  4  5  Conviction of a felony or serious misdemeanor
1  2  3  4  5  Violating safety rules or common sense safety practices
1  2  3  4  5  Violating tobacco free regulations in unauthorized areas
1  2  3  4  5  Participating in immoral conduct or indecent acts
1  2  3  4  5  Falsifying company records or deliberately giving false information which becomes a part of company record
1  2  3  4  5  Taking excessive personal time while at work
1  2  3  4  5  Leaving assigned work area or the premises during work hours without authorization of your supervisor
1  2  3  4  5  Having excessive or unacceptable absenteeism or lateness for any reason
1  2  3  4  5  Making an unsatisfactory effort to produce quantity or quality work or in any way deliberately restricting production
1  2  3  4  5  Using profane, threatening or abusive language to any employee or member of management
1  2  3  4  5  Misusing, abusing or destroying company tools, equipment, property, vending machines, records, etc., either deliberately or through gross negligence
1  2  3  4  5  Placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission from Human Resources
1  2  3  4  5  Making unwelcome or inappropriate sexual advances or harassment to another employee
Most companies have “punishments” that are administered to employees that violate company rules. Below you will find listed in random order a number of disciplinary actions (i.e., punishments). Please evaluate each punishment in the context of a place of employment. Think in terms of the punishment for the individual employee and the company employees as a whole. Please use the following rating scale and circle the rating for each punishment that reflects your opinion of the severity of that punishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Severe</td>
<td>Moderately Severe</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Very Severe</td>
<td>Extremely Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the number that reflects your rating of each punishment:

1  2  3  4  5  Put on probation  
1  2  3  4  5  Written reprimand placed in personnel file  
1  2  3  4  5  Demotion  
1  2  3  4  5  Assign to undesirable shift or work assignment  
1  2  3  4  5  Mandatory participation in an Employee Assistance Program (e.g. sensitivity training, anger management, substance abuse, etc.)  
1  2  3  4  5  3-day suspension without pay  
1  2  3  4  5  Discharge  
1  2  3  4  5  Given verbal warning/reprimand (performance discussion)  
1  2  3  4  5  Required to make restitution (docking pay)  
1  2  3  4  5  Legal action taken by company

The researchers are interested in whether or not there are differences in opinions of different groups such as supervisors versus non-supervisors, males versus females, older versus younger individuals, etc. In order to answer these research questions, we need the demographic information requested below.

1. **Work Experience:**

   Number of Years in Work Force (past and present employment): Total ________
   Number of years as full-time employee ________
   Number of years as part-time employee ________

Type of employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Service Industry</td>
<td>Other ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you supervised others? ________ Yes ________ No

How many people did you supervise? ________

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
<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>
<tr>
<td>having excessive or unacceptable absenteeism or lateness for any reason</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violating safety rules or common sense safety practices</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failing to notify the company prior to your shift when you are absent from work</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaving assigned work area or the premises during work hours without authorization or your supervisor</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking excessive personal time while at work</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating tobacco free regulations in unauthorized areas</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing personal work on company time or using company telephones for personal business without the permission of your supervisor</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing company business in the presence of non-employees</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placing notices on company bulletin boards without permission from Human Resources</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>