

# Cultures of Injustice: Dimensions and Organisational Correlates of Unjust Employment Relationships

HARLOS Karen P.  
University of Otago  
kharlos@commerce.otago.ac.nz

BEST PAPER AWARD

Harlos, K. (1999). Cultures of Injustice: Dimensions and Organisational Correlates of Unjust Employment Relationships. In N. Jimmieson, M. Griffin, B. Kabanoff, P. Bordia, L. Bradley & A. Neal (Eds). The Third Australian Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference Proceedings, Brisbane, Australia: Australian Psychological Society.

This article reports the results of an inductive study into the events and processes that underlie employees' experiences of organisational injustice. Findings point to organisational culture as a significant factor that appears to both produce and be produced by the phenomenon of injustice at work. Across diverse industries and work settings, six dimensions of injustice cultures and several organisational correlates emerge as recurrent features associated with employment relationships perceived as unjust. These dimensions draw on extant knowledge of cultures in organisations but extend their meaning beyond contexts of fairness to those within employment relationships that are not consensually understood as right or just. In addition, data analysis reveals five images that cut across descriptions of work settings associated with organisational injustice perceptions. The functional (i.e., job-related) and affective impact on participants of both cultures of injustice and their correlates is also discussed.

*It was very much a 'toe the line' company and there was a lot of butt-kissing, 'yes sir' 'no sir,' because of that. I had seen others who didn't toe the line, who spoke out on issues with opinions different from senior management - they got ostracised, sent to corporate Siberia....It was chaotic, unorganised, short-term in its focus: make your numbers for the quarter, month or week. There was no leadership, no vision.*

*It was not a good atmosphere.*

Andrew, sales manager, pharmaceutical company

So one employee described his experience of working for an organisation within an employment relationship that he considered unjust. Recent research has examined the range and complexity of workplace unfairness (Ashforth, 1997; Greenberg, 1986; Harlos & Pinder, in press). These and other studies suggest that the impact of organisational injustice on both individuals and organisations is significant. For example, perceptions of mistreatment appear related to stress-related disability claims (Bies, 1987), workplace violence (Allen & Lucerno, 1996; Folger & Baron, 1996), theft and sabotage (e.g., Greenberg & Scott,

1996; LaNuez & Jermier, 1994), as well as poor performance (Harlos, 1998; Lind, Kanfer & Earley, 1990). However, these studies offer few insights about cultural aspects concerning the practices, values and meanings of work in organisations associated with perceived injustice.

Similarly, research on organisational cultures (for reviews see Martin, 1992; Trice & Beyer, 1993) sheds little light into the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of organisational members who have experienced what they regard as mistreatment at work. The concept of workplace culture itself is widely regarded as elusive, defying convention in its study and consensus in its definition (see Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg & Martin, 1991; Martin, 1992) with conceptualisations ranging from an objective, observable phenomenon manifested by organisational practices to a subjective, hidden set of deeply-held assumptions and values. Organisational cultures are determined by multiple factors such as national cultures, industry, organisational structure (e.g., Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohay & Sanders, 1990), as well the personality of organisational founders (Schein, 1990). Furthermore, within any given organisation culture is both uniform and diverse. This paradox makes sense if we accept that a dominant culture may mask smaller subcultures (Jermier, Slocum, Fry & Gaines, 1991; Sackmann, 1992; Van Maanen, 1991) and that culture is a complex, heterogeneous blend of competing perceptions whose essence is fully captured when the plurality of its elements are adopted (Bartunek & Moch, 1991; Martin, 1992).

As one subculture, the perceptions of employees who believe they have been mistreated at work have been largely unexamined. Although previous studies have examined the impact of hostile environments on individual and organisational functioning, these are usually restricted to sexual harassment cases (e.g., Paetzold & O'Leary-Kelly, 1996). To date, work environments within which other forms of injustice have been experienced have not been widely studied. As well, while recent research supports the concept of an injustice climate (Folger, Robinson, Dietz, McLean Parks & Baron, 1998), studies on climate typically

do not gather data beyond behavioural indicators. However, climate is only a surface manifestation of culture; to examine the more complex, 'deeper' concept of culture, methods that probe more covert indicators such as meanings and assumptions were required (Schein, 1990).

Here, I report a portion of findings from a larger inductive study that focused on the events and processes (i.e., social and organisational) that underlie perceptions of organisational injustice (Harlos, 1998) to generate a grounded theory (see Glaser, 1992; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of workplace mistreatment. This study takes its place in an emerging stream of research applying grounded theory to organisational analysis that include studies of punishment (Butterfield, Trevino & Ball, 1996), leadership (Hunt & Ropo, 1995), technological change (Prasad, 1993) and organisational caregiving (Kahn, 1993).

## METHOD

From late 1996 to early 1997, part-time graduate business students and members of the general population were approached in person, by mail and telephone, as well as through the publication of a newspaper article describing the study. Participation was restricted (with one exception<sup>1</sup>) to those who had directly experienced or were experiencing injustice themselves. Interview data gathered by a retrospective critical incident technique ("tell me what happened; what's the worst story of injustice that you heard?") were used to analyse cultural aspects of injustice perceptions. In addition, questions about work environments were asked (e.g., "describe what it was like to work there"). Interviews ranged from 45 to 180 minutes, averaging 90 minutes in length. To a large degree, participants controlled the order and focus of their responses, extending them at will (Mishler, 1986) and determining among perspectives (i.e., behavioural, affective, cognitive) how they described their experiences.

**Sample characteristics.** Thirty-two participants from managerial/professional and clerical/line positions, each representing different organisations, described 33 cases of injustice in research interviews<sup>2</sup>. Nineteen women and 13 men whose average age at the time of the interview was 37 years (ranging from 23 to 71) participated in the study. Their educational standings ranged from Grade 10 equivalency (one) to a doctorate (one) at the time of the interview with the majority having a graduate business or professional degree (14). The sample was ethnically diverse with 24

Caucasian, six Asian, one East Indian and one Middle Eastern participant split proportionally across genders.

Some participants experienced injustice immediately upon joining their respective organisations while others worked up to 2 years before offensive treatment occurred. They cited experiences of mistreatment that were ongoing — i.e., current jobs to which they returned immediately following the interview — to 24 years previously. Approximately 8 of 32 participants remained employed with the organisation in question, seven were dismissed or laid-off, two were on medical leave and 15 had quit, most citing the injustice as the primary factor in their decisions to quit. On average, the experiences they described occurred 3 years and 5 months in the past.

The organisations in which the events occurred represented over 12 industries and ranged in size from two employees to over 5,000 employees. Most organisations (14) were small (between 1 and 100 employees), 10 organisations were moderate (between 101 to 500 employees) while six organisations employed over 500 employees<sup>3</sup>. Most were private-sector, for-profit organisations, although some were non-profit. Five were public-sector organisations. Seven of the organisations were unionised and of the positions described therein, three were unionised. Most organisations were based in one city, although a few were located in other cities and some of these were in other provinces.

**Analytic procedures.** The units of analysis were the 33 interview cases. These interview data were inductively analysed using grounded theorising (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987) to generate propositions and to integrate them into a framework that accounted for employees' injustice experiences. Each interview was tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim, stored in computer files and printed out. Preliminary patterns and themes were revealed following repeated readings of portions of the transcripts in which participants described what it was like to work in organisations associated with unjust employment relationships. At the same time, I compared emergent patterns with the literature on organisational culture to recursively collect, code and interpret data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Locke, 1996). When continued analysis of the data failed to introduce unidentified patterns, I determined that the essence of employees' descriptions of work environments associated with mistreatment were accounted for and thus that theoretical saturation had been reached (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

1 The exception was one participant whose witnessing of and involvement in the injustice experienced by a fellow employee significantly affected her sense of security and morale in the workplace.

2 One participant reported two cases of injustice that occurred in two different organizations.

3 Data on organizational size was not available for 3 of 33 organizations.

4 As indicated earlier, little research exists against which to compare either these particular details of cultural dimensions of injustice or the more general concept of cultures associated with unfair work settings. Given the paucity of systematic accounts of workplace injustice, this non-traditional source of data for academic research has been included for its rich, if preliminary, portraits of perceived mistreatment in organizations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Dimensions of Injustice Cultures*

Across diverse work settings, a cultural configuration emerged that represented a pattern of shared meanings of work contexts surrounding perceptions of mistreatment. This configuration, comprised of six dimensions listed in Table 1, suggests that there are common cultural dimensions to work settings within which unjust employment relationships occur. Collectively, these dimensions formed a composite picture of what can be considered as a 'culture of injustice.' As indicated earlier, these dimensions resulted from theoretical interplay between both the data and empirical studies of organisational culture (e.g. Hofstede et al., 1990; O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). Each dimension in Table 1 is rated using a scale which approximates the number of participants citing it as an element of their injustice experience. The relative frequencies of dimensions is a measure, albeit indirect, of their relative importance. In addition, Table 1 outlines both properties of dimensions and their consequences for participants.

The emergent cultural configuration suggests that intense control, suppressed conflict, a valuing of job relations rather than human relations, an emphasis on results and production, and a competitive and self-oriented individualism are common features of cultures of injustice. The quotation that introduces this article captured these

features well. In this case and others, low conflict tolerance emerged as a pivotal norm (Schein, 1980): there were strong expectations by bosses and/or senior management to suppress conflict or disagreement. Violating this norm by publicly expressing dissent threatened one's group and/or organisational membership. As Consuela said:

*There was the general joke: 'what's the easiest way to get fired? Just say no to the CEO.' So if you wanted to keep your job, you just shut up. The general consensus was that you were stupid if you bought into...the notion that they cared about what you thought and actually asked questions with substance that made them squirm.*

Many workplaces were marked by a strong sense of individualism with little supervisory or peer support. Employee-management relations were typically depicted as neutral at best and adversarial at worst. Relations with fellow employees were not supportive, although there were isolated pockets of support among some co-workers. Generally, supervision from superiors and attention from colleagues were inconsistent and participants frequently felt ignored. Faith said of her organisation of 100 employees:

*It is very cold....I say good morning to the two fellows on either side of my cubicle and if I didn't, they wouldn't say good morning to me. If I am there first, they don't say good morning when they come in. I did an experiment one day - I didn't say good morning to anybody to see if anybody would speak to me. And a whole day went by and no one spoke to me at all.*

**TABLE 1: Dimensions of Injustice Cultures**

Dimensions	Properties	Individual Consequences	
		Functional	Emotional
Control (H)	tight	↓ autonomy ↓ innovation	resentment, resistance
Conflict tolerance (H)	low	↓ problem-solving ↑ conformity	fear, resentment, apathy
Supportiveness (H)	low	↑ disengagement	abandonment, alienation
Organizational mission, goals (M)	unarticulated, ambiguous	↓ confusion about work priorities ↓ collective identity	disconnection, isolation
Team orientation (M)	low	↓ interdependence ↓ collaboration	alienation, isolation
Outcome orientation (M)	high	↓ long-range planning, strategic thinking	dehumanization stress,

Frequency of participants citing condition: (H)igh = 7+, M(edium) = 4-6

In sum, conformity, compliance and coldness emerged as key descriptors of cultures of injustice, along with control, suppressed conflict and individualism. The six dimensions of injustice cultures introduced here are consistent with elements of three organisational cultures labeled as abusive by (Wright & Smye, 1996)<sup>4</sup>. These include cultures of sacrifice, of win/lose and of blame. In particular, conformity and compliance characterise the culture of sacrifice while a cold and unfriendly atmosphere reflect the highly competitive win/lose culture.

**Origins.** The means by which this cultural configuration develops is, at present, unclear. However, previous research indicates that identification with leaders is a critical mechanism for culture formation (Schein, 1990).

Specifically, Schein argues that leaders' values and beliefs shape emerging culture in their internalization by employees. In the present study, this mechanism may explain the impact of several owner-operators whose values appeared consistent with Theory X (McGregor, 1960). These founders, responsible for establishing and monitoring policies and practices, demonstrated low tolerance for conflict, a strong outcome orientation and low supportiveness for others. By identifying with such leaders, participants appeared to have internalized some measure of Theory X beliefs that they (or others) were unproductive and stupid. Within this belief system, a culture that relied on management practices of close yet uncaring supervision to keep lazy, untrustworthy staff in line was justified.

**TABLE 2: Organisational Correlates Associated with Cultures of Injustice**

Correlates	Properties	Individual Consequences
<b>STRUCTURAL</b>		
Hierarchy of authority (H)	Ambiguous	↑ role ambiguity ↓ commitment
Centralization (H)	High	↓ autonomy
Pay (mixed)	a) satisfactory (H) b) unsatisfactory (L)	a) ↑ commitment b) ↑ disengagement
Formalization (M)	Low	↑ job involvement ↑ commitment
Physical work setting (L)	a) open, communal b) close, individual	↓ privacy ↓ autonomy
<b>PROCEDURAL</b>		
Managerial style (H)	Authoritarian	↓ autonomy
Communication (H)	minimal, unidirectional, unclear	↑ intra-sender role conflict ↑ confusion
Performance appraisal (H)	general, personal, unsubstantiated	↑ confusion about expectations, work priorities
Individual and organizational decision-making (H)	Haphazard, irrational, idiosyncratic	↑ ambiguity ↑ inefficiencies ↑ disengagement
Routinization (mixed)	a) <b>high</b> : formal, rigid, structured (H) b) <b>low</b> : informal, chaotic, disordered (L)	a) ↓ autonomy ↓ initiative b) ↑ confusion about expectations, work priorities
Socialization (M)	Weak	↓ commitment
Hiring and Promotions (M)	informal, unclear selection and/or placement criteria	unrealistic job previews ↑ procedural ambiguity ↓ self-efficacy

Frequency of participants citing condition: (H)igh = 7+, M(edium) = 4-6; L(ow) = 1-3.

## ORGANISATIONAL CORRELATES OF INJUSTICE CULTURES

Despite the diversity of organisational settings that included differences across industries, jobs and payment systems (i.e., both salaried and waged positions), there were recurring patterns to organisational characteristics — notably structural (5) and procedural (7) — that were associated with cultures of injustice. These organisational correlates are listed in Table 2.

**Structural correlates.** Organisational cultures are determined, in part, by organisational structure (cf. Hofstede et al., 1990). In the present study, structural characteristics related to cultures of injustice included hierarchy of authority (i.e., allocation of authority and reporting structures; (Weber, 1947), centralisation (i.e., decision-making authority placed at the top of the organisational hierarchy; (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings & Turner, 1968) and formalisation (i.e., degree of standardisation of jobs and their protocols throughout the organisation; Pugh et al., 1968). As Table 2 indicates, ambiguous hierarchy of authority, high centralisation and low formalisation were common structural characteristics across work settings of employees perceiving mistreatment. Taken together, these attributes combined to yield workplaces that were experienced as rigid yet disordered in their functioning.

For example, whether organisations were large or small, ambiguous hierarchy of authority evidenced by unclear reporting structures was widespread. Brenda, a clerk in an owner-operated company of six employees said that after 4 months on the job, "even now I'm not entirely sure who I report to. I'm often quite confused who to go to, so I'll pick one and they'll say, 'no, go to the other' - it's kind of complicated." Similarly, after 6 months' employment, Faith said of her organisation of 100 employees "I have no idea who I report to. Either it's the head writer, but there are two of those, or the head of the department. It's just not clear and it should be." Jennifer echoed a similar theme in describing her organisation of 150 employees: "It was a weird reporting structure because the work leader was actually responsible for the day-to-day work and who did what, when. But we were both responsible to the departmental supervisor who I didn't really have any contact with."

In those organisations with clear reporting structures, low formalisation and satisfactory pay, participants enjoyed the considerable discretion and autonomy on the job; they called the work itself fun, interesting or challenging. However, these intrinsically-motivating aspects of jobs became a significant source of frustration and conflicted feelings as participants' displeasure due to unjust treatment increased. As well, low formalisation and good salaries did

not seem to induce high levels of innovation and initiative. Instead, the combination of high centralisation and ambiguous hierarchy of authority mitigated the potential benefits one might expect from relatively unstandardised jobs and good pay. Specifically, high centralisation structurally excluded participants from decision-making while ambiguity in reporting structures reduced their efficacy and increased their stress. Together, high centralisation and ambiguous hierarchy of authority created frustration, stress and confusion among participants about their role and others' expectations.

**Procedural correlates.** Table 2 lists seven procedural correlates of cultures of injustice and their properties. Of these, authoritarian management styles, poor communication, poorly-conducted performance reviews and haphazard decision-making appeared to be significantly related to perceptions of organisational injustice. Like structural correlates, procedural ones emphasised widespread ambiguity and disorganisation in organisational functioning. Jennifer's effort to clarify her organisational and job priorities was illustrative:

*I would ask them a question, like 'what are your expectations, how would you like me to function?' and there would just be silence - they just wouldn't say anything. It was not a two-way dialogue. I was not getting any feedback on what I asked, if my ideas or attitudes were appropriate. I felt really uncomfortable.*

Similarly, decision-making was described as disorganised, irrational and ill-informed, as consistent with (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972) concept of 'organised anarchy' with ambiguous goals or solutions, few cause-effect relationships and limited employee participation. Also, the socialisation process was typically disordered with little demonstrable effort to assist participants' adaptation to the workplace. Hiring procedures were likewise often unclear and irregular. Specifically, unrealistic job previews (Premack & Wanous, 1985) were a significant source of injustice perceptions; as job candidates, participants were often not informed of either desirable or undesirable aspects of work). Catriona described her experience of being misled during hiring:

*In the interview process I was asked how I felt about supervision. So I talked about my philosophy of equality...and that I believe in personal autonomy so I have a hands-off approach to supervision. They all nodded and wrote this down on their little pads of paper...But their perception of supervision was the exact opposite of what I had articulated in my interview.*

Similarly, Karl's hiring interview at an engineering firm was illustrative:

*At my second interview I met with my boss. [Like the owner], he seemed really laid back and there was no real discussion of defined*

*responsibilities...I knew I had a job, I knew it was in a field I was interested in, but I wasn't really sure about [my] responsibilities. I didn't really understand how exactly I would fit in. Even my job title wasn't discussed.*

Consequently, Karl made assumptions which to his detriment later proved false. He explained, "I just presumed that they knew what they were talking about, that they probably had their systems in place. You don't expect to be held by the hand, but you do expect that systems are there so that you don't necessarily crash and burn." Unfortunately, he did 'crash and burn' with the failure of the project for which he was responsible: "without a system there in the beginning and work increasing threefold, it was impossible to control. And so I burned out. Psychologically, I really suffered because your esteem is shot, people are pointing fingers at you." In sum, these unrealistic job previews created false expectations that were reported as significant aspects of injustice perceptions and as significant factors in decisions to quit or in participants' dismissals.

In an unusual twist, Joe's efforts to accurately preview the job had serious implications for that organisation's selection process. He was in charge of hiring for his department. Believing his work environment to be unjust, he avoided hiring candidates who were promising or experienced for fear "they wouldn't last" and he looked instead for "people who were tough enough to handle the abuse and hang on." Thus, the hiring process was subverted to perpetuate the organisation's unjust treatment of employees. Not surprisingly, across interviews there was evidence of weak 'person-culture fits' (O'Reilly et al., 1991), indicated by profound feelings of isolation and alienation among participants.

In sum, structures and procedures indicated that organisations with cultures of injustice were rigid, ambiguous and disorganised. Work settings were experienced as stressful, frustrating environments marked by uncertainty. The design of this study does not permit inferences about the causality of correlates outlined here. However, these characteristics appeared at times to both precede and result from injustice perceptions.

### IMAGES OF ORGANISATIONAL INJUSTICE

According to (Berg, 1985), organisational culture can be construed as a symbolic field made up, in part, of images and language. This section reports on five images and language associated with them that recurred throughout descriptions of workplace mistreatment as a means of supplementing knowledge of injustice cultures.

**Confinement.** One dominant image portrayed the experience of organisational injustice as confinement, as

indicated by language associated with prisons and policing. For instance, his co-workers couldn't believe when Joe finally quit because "everybody thought that I (Joe) was a lifer." Similarly, meetings with bosses were likened to criminal interrogations. Images of enslavement dramatised the sense of confinement, whether at the hands of individuals ("he was beating us to be these obedient, subservient slaves") or of the organisation ("we are slaves to the organisation"). Andrew's experience was of being "trapped and quarantined." After quitting, however, he and others reported a sense of freedom and self-liberating movement ("I'll walk if he has to") in new employment relationships that was in sharp relief to experiencing injustice as oppressive confinement.

**Aggression.** Images of guns, weaponry and hostile engagement were common. For example, Nancy said that employees' needs were often "shot down" during management meetings and one manager responsible for firing employees was called "the Axeman." Victor described his work life as a "constant battle" to convince the fraudulent stock promoters with whom he worked that the product he was marketing did, in fact, need to be manufactured. Nevertheless, the prospect of "making the big killing" with stock options made leaving the organisation difficult. In another case, Gwen called her boss a perfectionist who "inflicted her standards on others" while several others labeled their bosses as bullies. Similarly, Jennifer said that the organisation "brought in the big guns" for her first performance feedback. Denise "felt battered" by an employee assistance counsellor from whom she expected help:

*It seemed like I was getting beat up at work and then at the session I was getting beaten up too...She (the employee assistance counsellor) kept standing up for him (the boss), taking his side, asking me about all the things that I did that might have ticked him off. She even made fun of me at one point...I almost needed counselling to get over the counsellor.*

As well, Denise's strategy to avenge her perceived mistreatment entailed three stages of sabotage, each increasing in grievousness and culminating in the third stage of "all-out, full-scale war."

**Isolation.** Images of isolation ranged from geographic, professional and emotional in nature. In an illustrative case, Suzanne worked alone as a project engineer in a trailer in a remote part of the province with periodic supervision from her sexually-harassing boss: "I basically worked by myself with David. Initially it never bothered me but after awhile it started to bother me - he dealt with everything external, and it was only us at lunch." She was isolated geographically and professionally as a female engineer in a male-dominated industry and job site. She was also without co-workers with whom to talk, problem-solve or

confide. Suzanne's isolation appeared to be part of a deliberate effort by her boss to facilitate her harassment:

*David said he didn't want me to get caught up in the politics and all the things that were going on. He wanted me to be able to focus on the project and that made sense, but I always felt that I was kind of isolated from everybody else, including his boss and Human Resources.*

In other cases, the sense of isolation was more ambiguous, although no less intense. Eva explained: "the management is no help and the union is no help. You're on your own. There is no court of law that will touch it. She (the supervisor) can do whatever she wants with you, practically."

Paradoxically, the alienating effects of injustice were countered by its potential to bring people together. Although Irene described working in her organisation as a lonely experience, "the only time we got along was (in agreeing) this is a hellish place to work at so we will kind of stick it out for now."

**Dehumanisation.** One recurring image depicted organisational injustice as dehumanisation or objectification. Denise said, "I was treated like a piece on a Monopoly board or a chess piece." Nancy described the atmosphere in her organisation: "In the phone room we were an expendable commodity - you were fired on a moment's notice. There were always resumés, you were told, 'if you have a problem there is a whole file cabinet full of resumés and that was held over our heads.'" Physical settings sometimes contributed to this sense of dehumanisation. For example, in Nancy's workplace telephone operators worked in tight, crowded stalls where "you are elbow-to-elbow with the person beside you with a bit of a wall, a narrow space that moved so that if you moved your chair back a bit you would hit the person behind you." Also, Nancy's organisation introduced a dress code despite the fact that clients never saw the telephone operators. Some employees sported unusual hair colours, some had shaved heads while others had parts of their bodies pierced. Nancy deplored that her co-workers "became robots right before my eyes" by immediately changing their hair, removing jewelry and covering tattoos to meet the conditions of the dress code.

**Surveillance.** Images of close scrutiny were common. For instance, in one organisation where a union drive was underway, managers "hovered like hawks" and "patrolled with attitude rather than guns" as they tried to prevent pro-union lobbying: "you couldn't even whisper because the walls could talk." In another case, Karl complained that "everything was a penny watch from the owner of the company." While recuperating at home from a serious workplace injury, Joanne reported that "she (her boss)

would call me up to make sure I wasn't talking (to her rehabilitation team) about anything that happens there (at work)." As with images of dehumanisation, the physical settings of workplaces sometimes contributed to a sense of being watched. For example, the tightly-packed stalls described earlier by Nancy facilitated what she experienced as 'the managerial gaze.' However, others experienced intense scrutiny despite more open and communal work settings. Paradoxically, Jennifer felt the lack of physical boundaries as invasive:

*I'd be on the phone talking to a client and all of a sudden the person next to me would start shouting out responses that I was supposed to give. Suddenly I would know that everybody is listening to my every word on the phone.*

## CONCLUSION

In sum, this study generates knowledge of cultures on the basis of real behaviour in organisations (Schein, 1996) and contributes to the plurality of perspectives from which to view culture. Fundamentally, this study supports the notion that cultures of injustice exist within and across organisations. Moreover, organisational culture appears to be a significant factor affecting individuals and organisations that both produces and is produced by the phenomenon of injustice at work. Specifically, such cultures share six common dimensions that collectively emphasise control, conformity, confusion, isolation and producing results. In turn, these dimensions are related to structural and procedural aspects of organisational functioning, although the exact nature of this relationship remains unclear. Further study is needed to establish the validity and directional influence of the cultural dimensions introduced here to other contexts of injustice, especially toward assessing the relative impact of these dimensions on injustice perceptions and their collective influence on the general notion of cultures of injustice.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, R. E. & Lucerno, M. A. 1996. Beyond resentment: Exploring organizationally targeted insider murder. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5(2): 86-103.
- Ashforth, B. 1997. Petty tyranny in organisations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14: 126-140.
- Bartunek, J. & Moch, M. 1991. Multiple constituencies and the quality of working life: Intervention at FoodCom. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organisational culture*: 1-14. CA: Sage Publications Inc.

- Berg, P. 1985. Organisational culture as a symbolic transformation process. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organisational culture*: 281-299. CA: Sage.
- Bies, R. 1987. The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research on Organisational Behaviour*: Vol. 9: 287-319: JAI Press.
- Butterfield, K., Trevino, L. & Ball, G. 1996. Punishment from the manager's perspective: A grounded investigation and inductive model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6): 1479-1512.
- Cohen, M., March, J. & Olsen, J. 1972. A garbage can model of organisational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.
- Folger, R. & Baron, R. 1996. Violence and hostility at work: A model of reactions to perceived injustice. In G. VandenBos & E. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions*: 51-85. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Folger, R., Robinson, S., Dietz, J., McLean Parks, J. & Baron, R. 1998. When colleagues become violent: Employee threats and assaults as a function of societal violence and organisational injustice. *Best Paper Proceedings of the Academy of Management Conference*, San Diego, CA.
- Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lundberg, C. & Martin, J. (Eds.). 1991. *Reframing organisational culture*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Glaser, B. 1992. *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, W. & Strauss, A. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies of qualitative research*. London: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson.
- Greenberg, J. 1986. Organisational performance appraisal procedures: What makes them fair? In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organisations*: Vol. 1: 25-41. CT: JAI Press.
- Greenberg, J. & Scott, K. 1996. Why do workers bite the hand that feeds them? Employee theft as a social exchange process. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organisational Behaviour*: Vol. 18: 111-156. CT: JAI Press.
- Harlos, K. 1998. *Organisational injustice and its resistance using voice and silence*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation University of British Columbia Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
- Harlos, K. & Pinder, C. 1998. *Patterns of organisational injustice: A taxonomy of what employees regard as unjust*.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. & Sanders, G. 1990. Measuring organisational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 286-316.
- Hunt, J. & Ropo, A. 1995. Multi-level leadership: Ground theory and mainstream theory applied to the case of General Motors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3): 379-412.
- Jermier, J., Slocum, J., Fry, L. & Gaines, J. 1991. Organisational subcultures in a soft bureaucracy: Resistance behind the myth and facade of an official culture. *Organisation Science*(May): 170-194.
- Kahn, W. 1993. Caring for the caregivers: Patterns of organisational caregiving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 539-563.
- LaNuez, D. & Jermier, J. 1994. Sabotage by managers and technocrats. In J. Jermier, D. Knights, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power in organisations*: 219-251. London: Routledge.
- Lind, E., Kanfer, R. & Earley, P. 1990. Voice, control and procedural justice: Instrumental and non-instrumental concerns in fairness judgements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 952-959.
- Locke, K. 1996. Rewriting The Discovery of Grounded Theory after 25 years? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5(3): 239-245.
- Martin, J. 1992. *Cultures in organisations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McGregor, D. 1960. *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mishler, E. G. 1986. *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. MA: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Reilly, C., Chatman, J. & Caldwell, D. 1991. People and organisational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organisation fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 487-516.
- Paetzold, R. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. 1996. The implications of U.S. Supreme Court and circuit court decisions for hostile environment sexual harassment cases. In M. Stockdale (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers and response strategies*: Vol. 5: 85-104. CA: Sage.
- Prasad, P. 1993. Symbolic processes in the implementation of technology change: A symbolic interactionist study



- of work computerization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 1400-1429.
- Premack, S. & Wanous, J. 1985. A meta-analysis of realistic job preview experiments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(706-710).
- Pugh, D., Hickson, D., Hinings, C. & Turner, C. 1968. Dimensions of organisational structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13: 65-105.
- Sackmann, S. 1992. Culture and subcultures: An analysis of organisational knowledge. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1992(March): 140-161.
- Schein, E. 1980. *Organisational psychology* (2nd ed.). NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schein, E. 1990. Organisational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45: 109-119.
- Schein, E. 1996. Culture: The missing concept in organisation studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 229-240.
- Strauss, A. 1987. *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Trice, H. & Beyer, J. 1993. *The cultures of work organisations*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Van Maanen, J. 1991. The smile factory: Work at Disneyland. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organisational culture*: 58-76. CA: Sage Publications.
- Weber, M. 1947. *The theory of social and economic organisations* (A. Henderson T. Parsons, Trans.). NY: Free Press.
- Wright, L. & Smye, M. 1996. *Corporate abuse*. ON: Key Porter Books.