



# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**



This report is a product of the ERC Fellows Program



The Ethics Resource Center (ERC) is America's oldest nonprofit organization devoted to the advancement of high ethical standards and practices in public and private institutions. Since 1922, ERC has been a resource for public and private institutions committed to a strong ethical culture. ERC's expertise also informs the public dialogue on ethics and ethical behavior. ERC researchers analyze current and emerging issues and produce new ideas and benchmarks that matter — for the public trust.





# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Overview.....	5
Grievance Resolution and Why it Matters.....	7
Study Methodology.....	10
The Reporting Experience.....	12
Does Procedural Justice Make a Difference in Acceptance?.....	15
The Impact of Procedural Justice Differs With the Issue.....	17
Procedural Justice Enhances Belief in the Company.....	19
Summary of Key Findings.....	20
Implications of Our Findings .....	22
References.....	24
Appendix.....	26

# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through Procedural Justice

**The ERC Fellows would like to thank the following  
Academic Fellows for their contributions to this study:**

**Tom R. Tyler**

Law School/Psychology Department  
Yale University

**Celia Gonzalez**

Kennedy School of Government  
Harvard University

**Debra L. Shapiro**

Robert H. Smith School of Business  
University of Maryland

**Linda K. Trevino**

Smeal College of Business  
Pennsylvania State University

*and*

**John Dienhart**

Albers School of Business and Economics  
Seattle University



# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

## OVERVIEW

Addressing employee concerns and workplace policies and practices is among business management's most significant responsibilities. Given the dual objectives of proper adjudication and achieving a degree of satisfaction for all parties involved, the relative success or failure of the resolution process can have a major impact on employee morale and the company's operating effectiveness.

When considering these objectives, a number of questions arise. First, can companies design mechanisms that encourage employees to share their concerns in order to help the company identify and correct problems before they become widespread? Once concerns are identified, can the company resolve complaints in a way that aggrieved employees will accept – even when the outcome is disappointing or when legal constraints may limit what the company can say about any actions taken? Do particular procedural techniques affect the way employees judge the final results? Are the same techniques universally effective for all types of concerns, or must companies tailor the process to fit specific categories of grievances?

A company that finds the right answers to these questions can improve its prospects in a number of ways. Employees who trust the complaint resolution process are more likely to share concerns so that management has an early warning of possible systemic issues. Satisfied employees are less likely to take their complaints to outsiders such as the news media or government, sparing the company from the bad publicity, distraction, or legal action that might result from external involvement. By instilling confidence that they will be treated fairly, effective grievance resolution can enhance employee loyalty and commitment to the company.

Conversely, an ineffective system for resolving disputes and grievances can undermine morale and erode loyalty. Because companies have a legal obligation to promote good ethics in the workplace, a deficient process can weaken a company's defense in the event of outside challenges or legal charges regarding its ethical standards.

In an attempt to address these questions, this paper examines employee attitudes at companies that operate dedicated



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

hotlines for employee reporting of workplace complaints, grievances, and possible misconduct. We surveyed employees who had used the hotline to report concerns, overlaid the responses with the outcome of their complaints, and also discussed the process with the company officials who reviewed the reports.

In particular, we focused on the concept of “procedural justice” and whether its consistent application in response to complaints might help win employee acceptance – even when the reporters are unhappy with the substantive outcome. What we found is good news for companies. It turns out that the way companies address complaints is often as important to employees as the outcome.

We found that a procedurally just process – defined as fair decision-making process and respectful treatment of employees and their concerns – substantially increases the chances that reporting employees will accept the outcome. To be sure, the impact of procedural justice varies with the nature of the dispute and its impact is not as strong in cases involving discrimination, harassment or violence. But, as a general rule, companies that work hard to provide procedural justice will greatly improve the odds that employees will accept the results of the handling of their ethics reports.

*We found that a procedurally just process – defined as fair decision-making process and respectful treatment of employees and their concerns – substantially increases the chances that reporting employees will accept the outcome.*



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION AND WHY IT MATTERS**

Businesses have numerous reasons for providing employees with a way to report problems in their workplace, and also for finding effective ways to address these concerns. First, such reports often reveal workplace deficiencies that, if remedied, can make the organization more efficient and effective. When employees report substantive problems through internal company mechanisms, management has an opportunity to nip them in the bud before they infect the system. If problems have been festering for some time, employee complaints offer a chance to limit the damage and prevent them from spreading further.

Learning about such issues in a timely fashion also may enable companies to avoid the negative publicity and cleanup costs that might result if unhappy employees take their concerns to the news media, government regulators, or post them on an online forum. Thus, companies have multiple incentives for providing an effective way for employees to report and resolve concerns internally.

Further, unhappy employees are not good workers. Irrespective of the merits of a report, an employee who files a complaint believes there is a real issue. Addressing this perception is a distinct issue separate and apart from whether there is a real underlying organizational issue that needs attention. Even if the complaint does not stand up under investigation, the company may still benefit from an effective response to the employee who made the report.

In addition to these operational reasons for responding to employee concerns, businesses are legally mandated to make efforts to identify and correct ethical problems. Establishing a viable mechanism for employee reporting combined with genuine efforts to address complaints and fix problems arguably demonstrates commitment to an ethical workplace and helps make the case that the company is working to meet its legal obligations.

With these benefits in mind, many companies have created “hotlines” or helplines for employee reporting. While these





# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

mechanisms are just one of several channels through which employees make reports,<sup>1</sup> they tend to be the primary means for companies to gather statistics about employee reporting. But helplines are effective only if employees actually use them, and that is not a given. One way to motivate employees to take advantage of hotlines is a commitment to procedural justice that ensures reports are handled fairly and reporters are treated with respect.

Research suggests that people react favorably to fair procedures, suggesting that if employees believe that their complaints will be handled fairly, they are more likely to report and to be satisfied with the reporting process (see Colquitt, 2008; Colquitt, Greenberg & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Huo, 2002; Jones & Skarlicki, 2003; Leventhal, 1980; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2000; Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2003, 2009).

But implementation of procedural justice-based management strategies is more challenging than might be expected because companies are often constrained by laws and policies that limit what they can say about their findings and what they've done about them.

Companies therefore face a conundrum: procedures that employees see as fair (i.e. transparency) are essential for building trust, but investigators cannot always be fully transparent. Sometimes investigators can share information about what evidence was gathered and what actions were taken, but often they cannot. Thus, procedural justice approaches are inherently handicapped because investigators often are blocked from creating conditions that promote trust.

Further, many reports of ethical concerns cannot be validated, whatever their merit, and even when they are substantiated, the actions taken are often confidential. The reporter is frequently unaware of what, if anything, happened in response to the report. Even when they know the complaint was pursued, they do not know the outcome beyond the vague assurance that “appropriate action was taken.”

---

1. For example, in the Ethics Resource Center's research, employees indicate several places where they tend to report misconduct, including supervisors, higher management, ombudsmen, and the ethics officer. See Ethics Resource Center (2012) *Inside the Mind of a Whistleblower*. Arlington, VA: Ethics Resource Center.





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

This conflict illustrates the paradox of ethics hotlines. They can enable companies to learn about problems and fix them, but confidentiality requirements may prevent employees from feeling satisfaction with the results and may discourage future reporting. Given that changing disclosure rules is generally unlikely, companies' best hope is that procedural justice or fairness can generate enough employee satisfaction to sustain hotlines' effectiveness. This study attempts to test that proposition by examining employees' actual experience and attitudes about reporting at companies where hotlines are the designated method for employee complaints.

This study looks at the effectiveness of hotlines by examining reporter's post-experience evaluations of their reporting experience. The procedural justice of that experience is linked to reporter satisfaction and willingness to accept the results of the investigation, as well as to the continued commitment of the employee to the organization. The impact of two aspects of the reporting experience is considered: first, whether reporters know the outcome of their report and whether procedural justice promotes acceptance when outcomes are not known; and second, whether or not the report was substantiated. The key issue is whether procedural justice can promote acceptance even when reporters are disappointed by, or unaware of, the outcome.

*Employees who trust the complaint resolution  
process are more likely to share concerns  
so that management has an early warning of  
possible systemic issues.*



# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

## STUDY METHODOLOGY

The study is based on hotline experience at five companies which agreed to ask reporters whether they would participate in a survey about their use of the hotline and the report management process. Admittedly, hotlines are only one means by which employees report misconduct. Nevertheless, we focused in this study on hotlines because they provided the companies involved the most effective means to access a representative pool of participants in a relatively controlled environment. According to ERC's previous research, only a small percentage of employee reports of misconduct are received through hotlines;<sup>2</sup> still, it is a reasonable expectation that the findings of this study are applicable to reports that come in through other channels.

The study is based upon reports from 612 respondents who completed a web based questionnaire. During the study period everyone who called to report an ethics concern was asked, after the usual report taking procedures were followed, if they were interested in participating in a survey about their experience with the report management process. Those who responded affirmatively provided an email address and were contacted by the researchers after their case had been resolved. Upon contact, potential respondents were asked to complete the short, confidential, on-line survey. Those who did not complete the survey after the initial invitation were sent an email reminder several weeks later to encourage their participation in the study.

Most of those who initially indicated an interest in participating in the study did not do so. The responses represent 13 percent of those who called and indicated an initial interest in the study. However, they do reflect a diverse set of employees. Respondents were 50 percent white; 26 percent female; 38 percent age 25 or younger; 79 percent age forty or younger; 44 percent college graduates or higher; and 53 percent with an income of less than \$20,000. We note that the low response rate suggests our data may not reflect the full range of reporting.

---

<sup>2</sup> In fact, in its 2011 National Business Ethics Survey report *Inside the Mind of the Whistleblower*, ERC researchers found that 5% of employees utilized the hotline to make a first report of observed misconduct. The percentage rose to 9% of employees when they made a second report of the same observed wrongdoing. See **Ethics Resource Center** (2012) *Inside the Mind of a Whistleblower*. Arlington, VA: Ethics Resource Center.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

In particular, an examination of the results suggests that people were particularly likely to complete the evaluation when they were dissatisfied with some aspect of their experience. Thus, it is possible that the impact of procedural justice is smaller in the study population than in the full universe of employees who file complaints through hotlines because the study did not capture the full range of reactions. Satisfied reporters may be less likely to be motivated to complete the survey. Put another way, it is possible that procedural justice has a greater impact than suggested by the study, raising questions for further inquiry.

In many cases, the survey responses were supplemented by the company with objective data regarding several parameters of each report. These parameters included the content area of the report, the priority level of the report, the ultimate substantiation of the report, and the amount of time it took for the report to be closed.

When both the objective and the subjective information were collected for a report, these two sets of data – the first drawn from the responses of reporters, and the second drawn from objective information concerning an investigation of the report – were combined to form a comprehensive representation of the reporting experience. The analysis presented below is based on this combined data set.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **THE REPORTING EXPERIENCE**

What shaped the willingness (or unwillingness) of reporters to accept the outcome of the investigation? Before trying to answer that question, we must first consider the factual data, specifically whether or not the investigator felt that there was enough evidence of a problem to potentially require company action and how the complaining reporters felt about the review process.

Here are the bare facts:

- 38 percent of the reports were “unsubstantiated.” They did not stand up under initial scrutiny by [ethics officials] and were effectively dismissed without further action;
- 21 percent were fully substantiated;
- 12 percent were partly substantiated at the initial stage;
- 29 percent were referred by ethics officials to the human relations or legal department for additional inquiry. In three quarters of these cases (75 percent) the objective outcome was unfavorable to the complainant;<sup>3</sup>
- Still, reporters were generally positive about the process;
- 42 percent said the investigative procedures were fair<sup>4</sup>;

- .....
3. To determine outcome favorability reporters were asked whether the outcome gave them what they wanted and how the outcome compared to their expectations.
  4. Questions were asked about the reporter’s perception of the fairness of the procedures used in the process of how to handle the specific issues raised in the report, how the reporters viewed the fairness of their personal treatment, and their overall view of the fairness of the report handling procedure.





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

- 40 percent said that decisions were made fairly<sup>5</sup>;
- 50 percent indicated that they had been treated fairly<sup>6</sup>.

The favorability ratings, which are seemingly high considering the preponderance of negative outcomes, support the theory that fair treatment can help mitigate the influence of unfavorable or unknown investigations. The procedural justice approach rests on the idea that people accept reports because of the process of the investigation, not its outcome. In the cases studied, the reporters rated the procedures as fair much more often than they approved of the outcome. These responses indicate that reporters are sufficiently open-minded to recognize a fair process even when they dislike the outcome. They also suggest that focusing on fair procedures may satisfy large numbers of employees no matter what the outcome.

As an initial test of the notion that fair procedures can shape acceptance, reporters were asked to indicate how willing they were to accept the outcome.<sup>7</sup> The survey numbers were mixed.

About two thirds (68% percent) of those who reported expressed a general unwillingness to accept the outcome. However, of this group only 39 percent of respondents indicated that they would continue to press the issue further internally and

- 
5. Questions were asked about whether the decisions made were factually based, whether the investigator was neutral and unbiased, whether the rules were applied consistently, whether consideration was given to the issues raised by all parties, whether appropriate evidence was gathered in the decision making process, and whether the reporter's concerns were addressed by the investigation.
  6. Questions were asked about whether the reporter felt their rights were respected, whether they were treated with respect and dignity, whether the procedures were clearly explained, whether the investigator cared about their needs and concerns, whether the investigator wanted to do what was best for the reporter, and whether the investigator considered what was said in the initial report before acting.
  7. Questions were asked about whether the reporter was pleased with how the report was handled, how willing they were to accept the current resolution of the issue(s), if a similar issue came up in the future, how likely would they be to report it, if another issue came up in the future, how willing would they be to have it handled with a similar process, how likely is it that they would try to find ways to appeal the decision or otherwise further pursue the issue within the company, and how likely it was that they would try to find ways to go outside of the company to pursue this dispute.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

only 31 percent said that they would consider going outside the organization.<sup>8</sup> There were, therefore, a number of people who were reluctant to accept the outcome, but who decided to stop acting on their concerns despite their reservations.

In considering the nature of the reporting process, it is important to remember that only those with a grievance or problem turn to the hotline. People do not call to express appreciation. As with any agency that manages problems (e.g. the courts, the police) it is impossible to resolve every problem in a way that will be satisfactory to the reporter and, in our survey, there was often dissatisfaction with both the outcome and the procedure. However, the majority of reporters indicated that they would neither try to appeal internally nor consider going outside the organization. So the handling of hotline reports was successful enough that most employees kept their concerns within the company. Of course, it is also possible that employees simply gave up. We will address this later in the report when we look at the impact of the reporting experience on people's relationship to their company.

---

8. Of course these actions are not mutually exclusive and a reporter could pursue both courses of action.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **DOES PROCEDURAL JUSTICE MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN ACCEPTANCE?**

To determine the impact of the procedures, we used regression analysis to compare the relative influence of outcome favorability and perceived procedural justice on the way reporters evaluated the process (see Table 1). Surprisingly, whether or not their complaint was substantiated by the investigators had little impact on reporter perceptions of the process. On the other hand, and not surprisingly, complainants were much more likely to accept outcomes they thought were favorable.<sup>9</sup>

Significantly, the primary factor influencing the degree of acceptance was whether or not reporters felt the procedure used to handle their report was fair. Broken down further, reporters indicated that the quality of decision-making was slightly more important to acceptance than the quality of the personal treatment they received, but that positive perceptions of both of those elements contributed to acceptance. The regression equation shown in Table 1 indicates that procedural justice was central to acceptance ( $\beta = 0.49$ ); while perceived outcome favorability played a secondary role ( $\beta = 0.35$ ). The crucial management issue is whether those dealing with reports can rely on fair procedures to help resolve conflicts and address the issues that underlie employee reports. Our analysis suggests that the answer is “yes.” Over and above reporters’ reactions to the outcomes of the process, experiencing fair report management makes it more likely they will willingly accept investigators’ decisions.

That’s particularly impressive when one considers that most people who report a problem or grievance begin the process with some dissatisfaction about events in the workplace and might be predisposed to be unhappy about outcomes, especially when they do not like the final resolution.

---

9. The correlation between the objective and perceived outcome was  $r=0.19$ .



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

Further, the investigators at the companies studied were not specifically trained in procedural justice. This suggests that employee perceptions will improve even more, provided investigators are given the tools to ensure and effectively present fairness.

*The crucial management issue is whether those dealing with reports can rely on fair procedures to help resolve conflicts and address the issues that underlie employee reports. Our analysis suggests that the answer is “**YES.**” Experiencing fair report management makes it more likely they will willingly accept investigators’ decisions.*





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **THE IMPACT OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE DIFFERS WITH THE ISSUE**

While procedural justice is always important, it is not always decisive. In some types of cases, especially where a personal threat is significant and/or ongoing, outcomes are more important than procedural fairness in influencing employee acceptance.

Our analysis was possible because investigators coded their reports to reflect the type of issue covered by the report, as shown in Table 2. All told, we reviewed 612 reports in four categories. The first category (261 reports) involves job related decisions with a personal impact – transfers, promotions, termination, performance reviews and job conditions. The second (89 reports) involves work policy issues – hours and wage policy; leave policy; payroll and employment law concerns. Another 166 reports were about interpersonal conflicts with one's supervisor or coworkers. The fourth, and most alarming, category with 96 reports concerned violence, harassment, and discrimination.

Table 2 shows that procedural justice is always relevant and generally important, but that in cases of violence, harassment and discrimination people put more weight on the outcome ( $\beta = .47$ ) than the procedure ( $\beta = .43$ ). Otherwise, procedural justice effects are strong and resilient across issues. For example, on “work policy issues,” the influence of procedural justice ( $\beta = .57$ ) overwhelmed outcome ( $\beta = .16$ ). These breakdowns tell us that procedural justice is a generally good framework for managing hotline reports, and even in cases of violence and discrimination, procedural justice matters. However, they also suggest that in more extreme cases, the outcome is relatively more important.

We also considered how employees react when their report is not substantiated (Table 3) or when the outcome is not known (Table 4). Our analysis shows that in both cases, a belief that the review process was fair is a critical influence in shaping acceptance and outweighs outcome favorability. That's significant because it strongly suggests that fair procedures are a valuable tool when addressing transparency limits and other constraints on the review process. The positive impact of procedural justice is therefore a welcome partial remedy for the conflict between confidentiality rules and transparency of the hotline investigatory process.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

Procedural justice also appears to exert a positive influence in difficult cases where there is insufficient evidence to substantiate a claim that may, in fact, have merit. Despite the deep disappointment that may be felt by a complainant in this circumstance, our findings suggest that fair procedures boost the odds of acceptance.

*The positive impact of procedural justice is therefore  
a welcome partial remedy for the conflict between  
confidentiality rules and transparency of the hotline  
investigatory process.*



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE ENHANCES BELIEF IN THE COMPANY**

Ideally it would be possible to manage hotline reports in ways that minimize damage to the organization and perhaps even build organizational commitment. To test the role of procedural justice in shaping reporter's broader relationship to the company, participants in the were asked about their post-reporting view of their company's commitment to ethics<sup>10</sup>; their degree of organizational commitment<sup>11</sup>; and their level of voluntary job related helping behavior (extra-role behavior)<sup>12</sup>.

Our analysis suggests that procedural justice helps to build a positive organizational climate. Those who believe that their report was handled fairly have a more positive view of their companies' commitment to ethics, and they are more likely to think that reporting problems is a good idea. They also have a more positive level of commitment to the company. The impact on voluntary help in the workplace is not as strong. That finding may reflect the fact that such volunteerism is generally confined to a small subset of workers to begin with. However, it reinforces the suggestion that experiencing fair treatment in response to making a report builds a positive identification with one's company.

As would be expected, one experience with reporting does not fully explain an employee's orientation toward the company, which is shaped by numerous factors over a long period of time. But that orientation is clearly influenced, for good and ill, by the employees' perceptions about the degree of procedural justice they experienced.

- 
10. We asked reporters whether they have given up trying to make suggestions for improvements, whether they think efforts to make improvements in this company usually fail, whether they feel attempting to change what they think is wrong in the company is more trouble than it is worth, if they tried to stop misconduct in the company things would get worse, and whether reports of misconduct are given careful consideration in the company.
  11. We asked reporters if they are happy working at their company, if they really enjoy the work they do, if they view their job as "great" as compared to most jobs, if they intend to stay at their present job, if they feel their company is one of the best in the field, if they can think of another company they would rather work for, if they are proud to tell others where I work, if when someone compliments their company it feels like a personal compliment, if working at their company is really important to the way they think of themselves as people and how often they think about quitting.
  12. We asked reporters how often they volunteer to do things that are not required in order to help, volunteer to orient new employees, help others with work related problems, put in an extra effort to do their job well, and share their knowledge with others.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS**

This report supports five conclusions:

1. Whether people accept the resolution of an ethics investigation and disposition does not wholly depend on whether their report is substantiated and/or whether they received the outcome they wanted. Acceptance also is linked to whether they believe that a fair procedure was used to handle their report. In fact, such procedural justice judgments have an influence that is distinct from, and usually stronger than, the impact of both the objective outcome and the reporters' perceptions of the outcome.
2. In considering whether the process was fair, reporters focused on two issues: the quality of the company's decision making (neutral, factual, unbiased, consistent) and trust in the investigatory team (whether they considered the reporter's concerns and sincerely tried to do the right thing). Courtesy and respect also were important to reporters.
3. The procedural justice effect is robust. It is found across different types of reports. And, it occurs even when reporters receive negative outcomes or have no information about what type of outcomes have occurred. In other words, it works within the context of rules that restrict the actions of investigators in work settings.
4. Procedural justice has a positive impact on broader feelings about the company. As one might anticipate, the quality of the reporting and investigatory experience affects the way employees feel about the company. When the process is marked by fairness, reporters are more likely to credit the company with caring about ethical issues and taking complaints seriously. A positive experience also makes it more likely employees will report future problems or concerns. This finding should allay managers' concerns that the investigatory process itself can negatively affect attitudes and behavior because reporters feel alienated from their company and workgroup. Fair handling of their report can increase loyalty and commitment to the company, and is generally more important than the substantive outcome.





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

5. The procedural justice benefit was less significant with reports of violence, harassment and discrimination. In those instances, which relate to the employee's sense of personal comfort and security on a day-to-day basis, the final outcome, not fairness, is the more important factor in acceptance. While fairness remains important, this finding is a noteworthy exception to the general findings. It also tells us that extra care is appropriate for these issues and suggests that companies may want to prioritize distinct procedural elements for each type of issue category.

### *A Procedurally Just Process:*

- Clearly explains the company's procedures for investigation and resolution of reports;
- Consistently follows those stated procedures;
- Treats reporters with dignity, respect, and concern for their well-being;
- Takes into account the issues raised by all parties;
- Conducts investigations in a neutral and unbiased manner;
- Explains the resolution of the case based on the facts.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

### **IMPLICATIONS OF OUR FINDINGS**

Our findings represent good news for companies and employees alike. On the one hand, emphasis on procedural justice should encourage employee reporting, which helps companies identify and repair problems in a timely fashion. Secondly, to the extent companies rely on a procedural justice strategy – and our analysis suggests it's in their self-interest to do so – employees can expect a fair shake when they pursue grievances and other workplace concerns through internal mechanisms such as hotlines.

For companies, a viable system for identifying and resolving ethics issues has both internal and external benefits. Internally, the company can address organizational problems before they become an undermining factor. Externally, companies want to have a viable program as a legal defense in the event of any litigation involving their ethical commitments. Under Federal Sentencing Guidelines, the severity of penalties will be shaped at least in part by the company's efforts to create an organizational structure capable of detecting and repairing problems. Developing self-monitoring mechanisms is a defense for when ethics problems arise.

The first problem for companies has been developing an effective way to encourage ethics reporting. Our findings suggest that procedural justice approaches provide such a mechanism because they generally increase the chances that employees will accept the outcome and believe it is worthwhile to report problems in the future. Of course, to be effective, this strategy must be backed by sufficient resources to ensure hotline reports are dealt with in a fair fashion. The company would also benefit from training the relevant staff in procedural justice models of management (Colquitt, 2012; Noe & Colquitt, 2002; Skarlicki & Latham, 1007).

Some managers may question the allocation of resources for managing ethics complaints, but the study's findings demonstrate the value. Beyond the desire to have a mechanism for identifying potential ethics issues, our findings suggest that procedural fairness strengthens loyalty and commitment to the company among employees who make reports. Furthermore, because work colleagues tend to share their attitudes, there is likely a beneficial spillover to a larger group of employees. Hence, procedural justice addresses the issues of discontent and alienation that can follow from an unsatisfactory result after reporting a grievance.



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

As noted previously, our findings suggest that a hotline backed by procedural justice strengthens the legal defense against challenges to a company's ethical commitment. A procedural justice strategy can serve as strong evidence that a company is meeting its legal obligation to unearth ethical concerns and correct them.

Procedural justice also provides a better work environment for employees. The opportunity to raise concerns that will be fairly addressed by the company provides employees a genuine opportunity to improve job quality. Research shows that when reporting goes up, ethical lapses or rules violations tend to go down. A fair process that encourages reporting can, thus, unleash a virtuous circle in which good behavior feeds on itself.

Even when the outcome of the complaint process does not meet the employee's hopes (or is unknown), our findings indicate that procedural justice still has a beneficial impact on the reporter's attitudes. The mere fact that the complaint receives serious, fair, and respectful treatment builds trust. It signals that the process is worth pursuing if new concerns arise down the road and that there is a fair chance of substantive justice in addition to procedural justice, a result that seems likely to boost morale.

*The first problem for companies has been developing an effective way to encourage ethics reporting. Our findings suggest that procedural justice approaches provide such a mechanism because they generally increase the chances that employees will accept the outcome and believe it is worthwhile to report problems in the future.*



## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

### REFERENCES

- Blader, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2003).** A four component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a “fair” process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 747-758.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009).** Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes and extra-role behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 445-464.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2012).** Organizational justice. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 526-547). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005).** What is organizational justice? An historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2008).** Two decades of organizational justice: Findings, controversies directions. In C. L. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior: Volume 1 - Micro Approaches* (pp. 73-88). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Huo, Y.J. (2002).** Justice and the regulation of social relations: When and why do group members deny claims to social goods? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 535-562.
- Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2003).** The relationship between perceptions of fairness and voluntary turnover among retail employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33 (6), 1226-1243.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980).** What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, and R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange* (pp. 27-55). N.Y.: Plenum.





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

**Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988).** *The social psychology of procedural justice*. NY: Plenum.

**Noe, R.A. & Colquitt, J.A. (2002).** Planning for training impact: Principles of training effectiveness. *Creating, implementing, and managing effective training and development* (pp. 53-79). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

**Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G.P. (1997).** Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behavior within a labor union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 617-634.

**Tyler, T.R. (2000).** Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35, 117-125.

**Tyler, T.R. & Blader, S. L. (2000).** *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

## APPENDIX

**Table 1. What Factors Mattered?**

	Acceptance	
Objective outcome (substantiated?)	-.01	-.02
Perceived outcome favorability	.35***	.39***
Overall perceived procedural justice	.49***	---
Perceived quality of decision-making	---	.27***
Perceived quality of interpersonal treatment	---	.20**
Adjusted R.-sq.	62%	60%

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

**Table 2. Factors That Matter For Different Types Of Reports**

	Personnel issues	Work policy issues	Interpersonal conflicts	Violence, harassment discrimination
Substantiated?	0.03	-.11	-.02	0.05
Perceived outcome favorability	0.29***	0.16	0.32***	0.47***
Perceived procedural justice	0.55***	0.57***	0.55***	0.43***
Adjusted R.-sq.	60%	46%	64%	68%
Number of respondents	261	89	166	96

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

**Table 3. What Factors Mattered When The Outcome Was Poor?**

	Acceptance	
	Unsubstantiated	
	No (62%)	Yes (38%)
Perceived outcome favorability	0.36	0.33
Perceived procedural justice	0.50	0.46
Adjusted R.-sq.	64%	50%

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

**Table 4. What Factors Mattered When The Outcome Was Unknown?**

	Acceptance	
	Know something about the outcome?	
	Nothing (45%)	Something (55%)
Objective outcome	0.04	-.04
Perceived outcome favorability	0.25	0.29
Perceived procedural justice	0.51	0.57
Adjusted R.-sq.	46%	64%

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.





## Encouraging Employee Reporting Through **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

**Table 5. The Impact Of Procedural Justice  
On Commitment To The Company**

	Ethical climate in company	Commitment to company	Voluntary behavior to help company
Objective outcome	-.07	0.00	0.02
Perceived outcome favorability	0.26***	0.13*	0.07
Perceived procedural justice	0.29***	0.29***	0.14*
Adjusted R.-sq.	26%***	15%***	4%***

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

# Encouraging Employee Reporting Through PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

**Table 6. Factors Shaping The Perception  
That The Procedures Were Fair**

	Overall	Personnel issues	Work policy issues	Interpersonal conflicts	Violence, harassment discrimination
Voice	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.05
Quality of decision making	0.45***	0.40***	0.58***	0.37***	0.51***
Courtesy, respect	0.20***	0.24***	0.13	0.18**	0.19**
Trust	0.29***	0.22***	0.30***	0.41***	0.25***
Outcome favorability	0.09***	0.18***	0.01	0.05	0.10
Adjusted R.-sq.	88%	85%	88%	88%	0.88%
Number of respondents		261	89	166	96

Note. Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

# THE ERC FELLOWS PROGRAM

Research ■ Working Groups ■ Professional Networking ■ Policy



**Are you** a senior ethics & compliance professional? Interested in expanding your knowledge? Looking to meet professional peers?

*Check out The ERC Fellows Program*

The Fellows Program brings together senior ethics professionals from the worlds of business, government, nonprofits and academia to share insights and advance the cause of ethical leadership.

*For more information, contact:*

Moira McGinty Klos

571-480-4401

[moira@ethics.org](mailto:moira@ethics.org)

[www.ethics.org/fellows](http://www.ethics.org/fellows)





For more information, please contact:

Ethics Resource Center  
2345 Crystal Drive, Suite 201  
Arlington, VA 22202  
USA

Telephone: 703.647.2185  
FAX: 703.647.2180  
Website: <http://www.ethics.org>  
Email: [ethics@ethics.org](mailto:ethics@ethics.org)

