Organizational Justice and Energy Dynamics: How Leadership Shapes Energy Intensity and Quality.

ABSTRACT

This paper develops a comprehensive theoretical and empirical account of organizational energy intensity and quality as fundamentally independent variables, a distinction first established by Bruch and Ghoshal (2003) and empirically operationalized by Cole, Bruch, and Vogel (2012). This paper explores what distinct mechanisms govern each dimension, and how does leadership operate on them differently? The answer, developed across ten sections, lies in organizational justice theory. Drawing on Colquitt's (2001) four-factor model, the paper demonstrates that distributive and procedural justice are the primary structural determinants of energy intensity, operating through motivational and trust-based mechanisms. Leadership behaviour including transformational and transactional styles as described by Bass (1985) is theorized as the proximate mechanism through which justice perceptions are produced and through which organizational energy zones are created, sustained, or destroyed. Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano& Mitchell, 2005; Blau, 1964) provides the relational architecture connecting leadership acts to collective energy outcomes. The paper concludes with an integrated model, testable propositions, practical leadership prescriptions, and a research agenda. Its core finding is that productive organizational energy the simultaneous achievement of high intensity and positive quality is a justice achievement before it is a performance achievement, and that no leadership intervention that fails to comprehensively address all four justice dimensions can reliably sustain it.

Keywords: Organizational energy, intensity, quality, organizational justice theory, leadership, social exchange theory, productive energy, emotional energy, relational energy

1. Introduction: The Independence Problem in Organizational Energy

Among the most consequential and most frequently misunderstood insights in the organizational energy literature is the claim by Bruch and Ghoshal (2003) that energy intensity and energy quality are independent variables. This is not a taxonomic distinction. It is a structural claim about the causal architecture of organizational performance: that the mechanisms which drive the strength of collective activation (intensity) are categorically different from those which determine its valence (quality), and that leaders who conflate these two dimensions will systematically miscalibrate their organizations.

The practical consequences of conflating them are severe and well-documented. A leader who uses fear to generate urgency may successfully raise intensity while catastrophically degrading quality, shifting the organization from comfortable energy to corrosive energy trading one dangerous state for another. A leader who builds warm, affirming culture may sustain quality while allowing intensity to decay, creating a pleasant but strategically insufficient comfortable energy zone. And a leader who assumes that high engagement automatically implies positive engagement or that positive culture automatically implies high performance will misread their organization's energy state entirely.

Yet despite the strategic importance of this independence, no existing theoretical framework has provided a comprehensive, empirically grounded account of why intensity and quality respond to different mechanisms, and how leadership acts specifically on each. This paper provides that account. The argument is developed through organizational justice theory, specifically the four-factor model established by Colquitt (2001), extending the foundational work of Adams (1965), Thibaut and Walker (1975), Leventhal (1980), Bies and Moag (1986), and Greenberg (1993). Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano& Mitchell, 2005) provides the relational architecture connecting justice perceptions to collective energy outcomes. Affective Events Theory (Weiss &Cropanzano, 1996) and Fairness Heuristic Theory (Lind, 2001) supply the psychological mechanisms through which justice perceptions are converted into the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural states that constitute organizational energy.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 recapitulates the organizational energy framework and the theoretical significance of its intensity-quality independence. Section 3 provides a structured overview of organizational justice theory. Section 4 develops the paper's core theoretical mapping: distributive and procedural justice intensity; interpersonal and informational justice → quality. Section 5 introduces Social Exchange Theory as the relational bridge. Section 6 analyses how specific leadership styles enhance or diminish each energy dimension. Section 7 examines treacherous interaction effects the cases where well-intentioned leadership interventions on one dimension inadvertently damage the other. Section 8 presents the integrated model and eight testable propositions. Section 9 offers practical prescriptions. Section 10 identifies the research agenda. A comprehensive reference list follows.

2. Organizational Energy: Intensity and Quality as Independent Constructs

2.1 The Emergence of Organizational Energy as a Scientific Construct

The concept of organizational energy entered the management literature through Bruch and Ghoshal's (2003) empirical research at companies including Lufthansa, Conoco, Centerpulse, ABB, and Balzers. They defined organizational energy as 'the force with which a company functions' deliberately echoing a physical rather than a metaphorical conception of energy. Their central empirical observation was that organizations differ not merely in how hard they work, but in the nature of their collective activation: some organizations exhibit high levels of emotionally committed, cognitively focused, behaviourally directed effort; others exhibit high levels of activated but destructively directed energy; others still exhibit low activation in both positive and negative forms.

Cole, Bruch, and Vogel (2012) gave this construct empirical precision in their landmark four-study measurement validation published in the Journal of Organizational Behaviour. They defined productive organizational energy (POE) as 'the shared experience and demonstration of positive affect, cognitive arousal, and agentic behaviour among unit members in their joint pursuit of organizationally salient objectives.' This definition established three constituent dimensions: emotional, cognitive, and behavioural and demonstrated through confirmatory factor analysis, cross-validation, and criterion-related validity testing that POE is a distinct collective construct that predicts unit effectiveness above and beyond individual-level predictors.

2.2 The Two-Dimensional Structure: Intensity and Quality

Bruch and Vogel (2011) organized organizational energy states along two orthogonal axes. Intensity refers to the degree of collective activation, the strength of the organization's emotional, cognitive, and behavioural mobilization. Quality refers to the valence of that activation: whether the energy is positively or negatively directed. The combination of these two dimensions produces four organizational energy zones, presented in Table 1 below.

Dimension	High Intensity	Low Intensity	Justice Driver
Positive Quality	PRODUCTIVE ENERGY (Target zone)	COMFORTABLE ENERGY (Complacency trap)	Interpersonal + Informational Justice
Negative Quality	CORROSIVE ENERGY (Fear/anger driven)	RESIGNED INERTIA (Withdrawal trap)	Procedural + Distributive Justice (deficit)
Justice Driver	Distributive + Procedural Justice	Justice Deficit (all types)	Leadership is proximate cause

Table 1: The Organizational Energy Matrix (adapted from Bruch & Vogel, 2011; Bruch &Ghoshal, 2003)

The critical theoretical claim and the paper's starting point is that these two axes do not co-vary automatically. Intensity and quality are governed by different antecedents, respond to different leadership behaviours, and can move in opposite directions in response to the same intervention. This independence is not merely descriptive; it reflects the different psychological mechanisms through which activation strength and activation valence are determined.

2.3 The Components of Productive Energy and the Multilevel Architecture

Cole et al.'s (2012) three-dimensional operationalization maps the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural components of productive energy onto the intensity-quality framework in a theoretically coherent way. Emotional energy- the affective dimension contributes primarily to quality: it is the enthusiasm, excitement, and positive engagement that characterize high-quality energy. Cognitive energy- shared mental alertness directed toward common goals contributes to both dimensions: it amplifies intensity by maintaining focus and direction, and it supports quality by ensuring that high

activation is purposefully channelled rather than diffusely anxious. Behavioural energy- collective effort and stamina is the primary expression of intensity: it is the observable organizational activity that results from high motivation and commitment.

Baker (2019), in his multilevel model of organizational energy published in the Annual Review of Organizational Psychology, confirmed that energy operates simultaneously at individual, dyadic, team, unit, and organizational levels and that leadership behaviours constitute the primary mechanism of energy transfer across levels. This multilevel architecture is important for the present paper: justice perceptions, which are formed at the individual level through the experience of specific leadership behaviours, aggregate through social contagion (Barsade, 2002) and shared schema formation into collective energy states at the unit and organizational level.

3. Organizational Justice Theory: A Structured Overview

3.1 Historical Development

Organizational justice the study of employees' perceptions of fairness in their work organizations was formally introduced by Greenberg (1987), who defined it as the literature 'grown around attempts to describe and explain the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace.' The field built on two foundational bodies of research: distributive justice theory, tracing to Adams (1965) and his equity theory of motivation, and procedural justice theory, originating in Thibaut and Walker's (1975) ground breaking work on dispute resolution processes.

The subsequent three decades saw the field expand briskly. Leventhal (1980) extended procedural justice beyond legal contexts and identified six criteria for fair procedures: consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, representativeness, and ethicality. Bies and Moag (1986) identified a third dimension interactional justice concerning the quality of interpersonal treatment during procedure implementation. Greenberg (1993) further subdivided interactional justice into interpersonal justice (dignity and respect in treatment) and informational justice (adequacy and honesty of explanations). This four-factor structure was confirmed by Colquitt (2001) in the most comprehensive psychometric validation of justice dimensions to date, a meta-analytic study of 183 justice investigations.

3.2 The Four Dimensions

Distributive Justice (Adams, 1965) concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes: pay, promotions, recognition, assignments, and development opportunities. Employees evaluate distributive justice by comparing their input-output ratio to that of comparable referents. When the ratios are perceived as equal, distributive justice is experienced; when they diverge, employees experience either under-reward (triggering resentment and effort reduction) or over-reward (triggering guilt, though this is empirically less powerful). Cohen-Charash and Spector's (2001) meta-analysis of 190 justice studies confirmed that distributive justice is strongly related to job satisfaction, particularly satisfaction with specific outcomes.

Procedural Justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Leventhal, 1980) concerns the perceived fairness of the processes by which outcomes are determined. Employees evaluate procedural justice against Leventhal's six criteria, with particular emphasis on consistency (the same rules applied to all, across time) and voice (the opportunity to provide input before decisions are made). Colquitt et al.'s (2001) landmark meta-analysis established that procedural justice is the strongest predictor of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour, and trust in organizational authorities' outcomes that are direct expressions of sustained energy intensity.

Interpersonal Justice (Bies&Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993) concerns whether employees are treated with dignity, respect, and politeness by authorities implementing procedures. Bies (1987) documented the phenomenon of 'moral outrage' the intense negative emotional reaction provoked by interpersonal justice violations demonstrating that disrespectful treatment triggers affect that is qualitatively different from, and often more powerful than, disappointment over outcomes. This makes interpersonal justice the most immediate determinant of the emotional texture of organizational experience, and therefore of energy quality.

Informational Justice (Greenberg, 1993) concerns the adequacy, timeliness, and honesty of explanations provided about procedures and decisions. Shaw, Wild, and Colquitt (2003) demonstrated in their meta-analysis that adequate explanations reduce negative reactions to unfavourable outcomes by 43% an effect accomplished not by changing the outcome but solely by improving the informational justice of its communication. This finding has profound implications for leadership: it suggests that the energy quality consequences of necessary but disappointing decisions can be substantially mitigated by informational justice, even when distributional outcomes cannot be changed.

3.3 Why the Dimensions Are Independent Predictors

Colquitt's (2001) structural equation modelling confirmed that the four justice dimensions contribute incremental predictive validity over each other that is, each dimension predicts unique variance in organizational outcomes beyond what the other three dimensions predict. More explicitly, Masterson et al. (2000) and Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) demonstrated through multifocal analysis that procedural justice and interactional justice predict outcomes through different mediating pathways: procedural justice operates through perceived organizational support (POS), affecting organization-level outcomes; interactional justice operates through leader-member exchange (LMX) quality, affecting supervisor-referenced outcomes. This bifurcation of pathways is the empirical foundation of the paper's core mapping: intensity and quality respond to different justice dimensions because those dimensions operate through different psychological mechanisms.

4. The Core Mapping: Justice Dimensions as Determinants of Intensity and Quality

Table 2 presents the paper's central theoretical contribution: a systematic mapping of each justice dimension to its primary energy outcome (intensity or quality), its positive psychological mechanism, and the energy consequences of its violation.

Justice Dimension	Energy Variable	Positive Mechanism	When Violated → Energy Effect
Distributive Justice (Adams, 1965)	Energy INTENSITY	Equity motivation; effort calibrated against perceived outcome fairness; input-output ratio	Disengagement, effort withdrawal, resigned inertia
Procedural Justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Leventhal, 1980)	Energy INTENSITY	Organizational trust and commitment; POS (perceived organizational support); sustained investment	Cynicism, reduced OCB, low commitment, corrosive or resigned energy
Interpersonal Justice (Bies&Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993)	Energy QUALITY	Affective Events Theory; positive treatment generates positive affect; disrespect generates corrosive emotion and moral outrage	Corrosive energy; resentment, anger, burnout, emotional exhaustion
Informational Justice (Greenberg,	Energy QUALITY	Fairness Heuristic Theory; candid information creates	Corrosive energy; rumor, cynicism,

1993)		cognitive trust; opacity breeds distrust and cynicism	defensive orientation, withdrawal

Table 2: Justice Dimensions as Independent Determinants of Energy Intensity and Quality

4.1 Distributive Justice → Energy Intensity

Adams's (1965) equity theory established that employees monitor their input-output ratio relative to comparable others, and that perceived under-reward motivates a compensatory reduction of inputs. In organizational energy terms, this reduction of inputs is a direct behavioural energy intensity decrease. The mechanism is expectancy-theoretic: employees invest effort when they believe that effort will produce outcomes they value and receive equitably (Vroom, 1964). When distributive justice is violated when outcomes are perceived as unfair relative to contribution the motivational calculus breaks down and behavioural intensity falls.

The meta-analytic evidence is clear. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found strong associations between distributive justice and job satisfaction ($\rho = .56$), confirming that outcome fairness is the primary determinant of employees' satisfaction with what they receive from the organization. Cropanzano, Rupp, and Byrne (2003) linked distributive injustice to emotional exhaustion the depletion of affective resources that signals energy intensity collapse. Shkoler and Tziner (2017) demonstrated that perceived distributional injustice escalates into burnout, which is the organizational expression of sustained energy depletion. Importantly, these effects operate primarily on intensity: an employee who feels underpaid may remain positive in interpersonal interactions (quality preserved) while systematically reducing behavioural investment (intensity fallen).

4.2 Procedural Justice → Energy Intensity

The relationship between procedural justice and energy intensity operates through a different mechanism than distributive justice: not expectancy motivation, but organizational trust and commitment. Procedural justice builds the perception that the organizational system as a whole is reliable that future outcomes will be fair even when current outcomes are disappointing, that voice will be given before decisions are made, and that the rules applied today will be applied consistently tomorrow. This systemic trust is what converts episodic effort into sustained behavioral intensity over time.

Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis established that procedural justice is a stronger predictor of organizational commitment ($\rho = .45$) and organizational citizenship behavior ($\rho = .41$) than distributive justice — outcomes that directly reflect sustained intensity investment. The mechanism runs through perceived organizational support (Masterson et al., 2000; Eisenberger et al., 1986): when procedures are fair, employees infer that the organization values their contribution and cares for their well-being, which activates the reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano& Mitchell, 2005) and sustains high levels of effort and engagement. When procedures are perceived as unfair when rules are applied inconsistently, when employees are denied voice, when decisions are made without explanation the inferred message is that the organization does not value employees, which triggers the withdrawal of the sustained commitment that underlies intensity.

4.3 Interpersonal Justice → Energy Quality

Interpersonal justice operates on energy quality through the mechanism described by Affective Events Theory (Weiss &Cropanzano, 1996). According to this framework, discrete workplace events activate discrete affective reactions that accumulate into stable mood states and, over time, into dispositional orientations. Interpersonal justice violations discourteous treatment, dismissiveness, condescension, public humiliation, or the failure to acknowledge employees' humanity are powerful negative affective events. Bies (1987) termed the emotional response to such violations 'moral outrage': an intense, identity-threatening reaction that persists long after the precipitating event and that colors subsequent interpretations of all organizational interactions.

The consequences for energy quality are profound. Moral outrage converts positive affect the emotional substrate of high-quality productive energy into anger, resentment, and contempt. Through the emotional contagion mechanism documented by Barsade (2002) and Kelly and Barsade (2001), these negative affects spread through social networks, converting individually experienced interpersonal injustice into collective negative energy. The research on the organizational justice-stress link confirms the mechanism: Ndjaboue, Brisson, and Vézina (2012) found that lack of interactional justice particularly interpersonal and procedural was associated with psychological distress, burnout, and self-rated health deterioration, all markers of energy quality degradation.

Conversely, consistent interpersonal justice treatment characterized by dignity, respect, and genuine regard for employees' humanity generates the positive affect that Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory predicts will build durable cognitive, social, and psychological resources. These accumulated positive emotional resources are the psychological substrate of high-quality

organizational energy. Lind and Tyler's (1988) Group Engagement Model further demonstrates that respectful treatment signals to employees that they are valued group members, activating identity-based motivation that sustains positive collective engagement above and beyond purely instrumental motivations.

4.4 Informational Justice → Energy Quality

Informational justice operates on energy quality through cognitive appraisal rather than affective response. Lind's (2001) Fairness Heuristic Theory proposes that employees face a fundamental uncertainty in organizational life: they cannot fully verify whether the authorities they depend on are trustworthy. In the absence of sufficient information about decisions and procedures, employees use available justice cues as heuristics to form rapid judgments about trustworthiness. When these heuristics suggest fairness, when explanations are timely, accurate, and demonstrate genuine regard for employees' concerns employees form confident, positive cognitive orientations toward the organization. When explanations are absent, misleading, or inadequate, the default heuristic is distrust.

Sustained distrust is the cognitive architecture of corrosive energy. Employees who do not trust their organization's information environment cannot invest positively they remain defensively activated, interpreting all organizational communications through a threat lens, spending cognitive resources on monitoring and self-protection rather than on productive goal pursuit. The informational justice deficits create the rumour-saturated, cynicism-laden organizational climate that characterizes the transition from productive to corrosive energy. Shaw et al.'s (2003) finding that 43% of negative reactions to unfavourable decisions are eliminated by adequate explanation demonstrates the extraordinary leverage of informational justice as a quality management tool: it can transform the quality of collective affect surrounding a necessary but unwelcome decision without altering the decision itself.

5. Social Exchange Theory: The Relational Bridge Between Justice and Energy

The mapping of justice dimensions to energy dimensions raises a theoretical question: what is the mechanism by which individual justice perceptions aggregate into collective energy states? The answer lies in Social Exchange Theory (SET), specifically as developed by Blau (1964) and elaborated in organizational contexts by Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005).

SET holds that social relationships including employment relationships are governed by the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960): when one party treats another well, the recipient feels an obligation to reciprocate. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) established SET as the theoretical infrastructure of the justice-outcome relationship in organizations: justice perceptions constitute the initiating action in the exchange cycle, and employee behavioural and attitudinal responses constitute the reciprocating action. The quality of the exchange its perceived fairness, its relational warmth, its informational openness determines the nature of the reciprocation.

For organizational energy, SET provides the aggregation mechanism. Each justice-relevant interaction between a leader and an employee is an exchange event. When the leader provides fair outcomes (distributive justice), transparent processes (procedural justice), respectful treatment (interpersonal justice), and honest information (informational justice), the employee reciprocates with high intensity positive engagement the substance of productive energy. When the leader fails in any of these dimensions, the employee reciprocates with the energetic response that matches the deficit: effort withdrawal for distributional failures, commitment withdrawal for procedural failures, emotional withdrawal and resentment for interpersonal failures, and cognitive distrust for informational failures.

The accumulation of these individual exchange cycles at the collective level through emotional contagion (Barsade, 2002), shared schema formation (Lind, 2001), and social network effects (Baker, 2019) produces the organizational energy state. Leaders who consistently provide justice across all four dimensions create an organizational exchange environment characterized by positive reciprocity, which sustains and amplifies productive energy. Leaders who systematically violate justice norms create negative reciprocity spirals (Cropanzano et al., 2017) that drive energy toward corrosive or resigned inertia states.

Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996) confirmed that employees develop parallel exchange relationships one with the organization as an institution (mediated primarily by procedural and distributive justice and expressed as POS) and one with their immediate supervisor (mediated primarily by interactional justice and expressed as LMX quality). This dual exchange architecture means that organizational energy is shaped by both institutional justice (system-level intensity determinants) and leader-level justice (interpersonal quality determinants), and that deficits at either level produce energy consequences that the other level cannot compensate for alone.

6. How Leadership Styles Enhance or Diminish Intensity and Quality

Leadership style is the primary proximate determinant of organizational energy because it is the primary proximate determinant of all four justice dimensions. Table 3 provides a systematic analysis of six major leadership styles and their distinct effects on energy intensity and quality through the justice mechanisms.

Leadership Style	Energy Effect	Justice Mechanism	Risk / Limitation
Transformational Leadership	Both dimensions ↑	Vision articulation raises intensity; individualized consideration and inspirational motivation raise quality through interpersonal and informational justice	Overemphasis on inspiration without procedural fairness may create emotional intensity without sustained behavioral intensity
Transactional Leadership (Contingent Reward)	Intensity ↑; Quality neutral/↑	Distributive justice fulfilment — clear performance-reward linkages sustain behavioral energy and equity perceptions	Without interpersonal dignity, contingent reward creates instrumental rather than affective engagement; quality remains fragile
Abusive/Toxic Leadership	Intensity ↑ short-term; Quality ↓↓	Fear may create short-term high activation (corrosive energy) but destroys interpersonal justice; triggers moral outrage and emotional exhaustion	Rapid transition to resigned inertia as exhaustion deepens; permanent quality damage even after leader removal
Laissez-Faire / Passive Leadership	Both dimensions ↓	Procedural and informational justice deficits accumulate; employees lack voice and transparency; distributive inequities go unaddressed	Comfortable energy collapses to resigned inertia over time; trust erodes through neglect
Authentic Leadership (Avolio& Gardner, 2005)	Intensity ↑; Quality ↑↑	Informational justice via radical transparency; interpersonal justice via congruent values-behavior alignment; builds psychological capital and	May lack urgency-generation mechanisms; complementary transactional elements needed for sustained intensity

		trust	
Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977)	Quality ↑↑; Intensity contextual	Strong interpersonal justice; developmental attention sustains quality; procedural fairness embedded in follower-first orientation	Without urgency signals, can drift toward comfortable energy; challenge-orientated practices needed

Table 3: Leadership Styles and Their Differential Effects on Energy Intensity and Quality via Justice Mechanisms

6.1 Transformational Leadership: The Dual-Dimension Raiser

Bass (1985), building on Burns (1978), defined transformational leadership as leadership that raises followers beyond self-interest toward higher purpose through four dimensions: idealized influence (inspiring trust and admiration), inspirational motivation (articulating a compelling vision), intellectual stimulation (encouraging novel thinking), and individualized consideration (attending to each follower's developmental needs). Meta-analytic evidence consistently confirms that transformational leadership is the strongest leadership predictor of organizational commitment and performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Bass et al., 2003).

From an organizational justice perspective, transformational leadership produces simultaneous enhancements to both energy dimensions, but through different mechanisms. Vision articulation and inspirational motivation generate what Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) called 'job crafting at the highest level' the alignment of individual work with meaningful collective purpose. This creates procedural justice of meaning: employees perceive that their efforts are part of a fair and worthy collective enterprise, sustaining intensity through purpose-based rather than merely incentive-based motivation. Individualized consideration directly embodies interpersonal justice the individualized leader-member relationship treats each employee as a worthy, seen, and respected individual sustaining the positive affect that underpins quality.

However, transformational leadership carries an important energy risk. Its emphasis on inspiration and vision can create emotional intensity that outpaces the distributional and procedural justice architecture. When transformational leaders generate enthusiasm for a mission but fail to ensure that the workload, recognition, and procedural fairness that accompany the mission are equitable, the resulting state can shift from productive energy toward corrosive energy: high activation in the

service of a purpose that employees nonetheless experience as exploiting rather than serving them. The 'acceleration trap' documented by Bruch and Vogel (2011) in which relentless challenge without recovery creates burnout is, from a justice standpoint, a distributive injustice: inputs demanded exceed outputs received.

6.2 Transactional Leadership: The Intensity Sustainer

Transactional leadership, particularly its contingent reward dimension, operates on intensity through distributive justice. By establishing clear performance-reward linkages clarifying what outcomes follow from what behaviors transactional leaders create the expectancy conditions (Vroom, 1964) and the equity conditions (Adams, 1965) that sustain behavioral energy intensity. Employees who understand and trust the performance management system invest sustained effort, knowing that the distributional contract will be honored.

Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis supports this mechanism: the procedural regularity of performance management systems their consistency, accuracy, and representation of multiple stakeholder interests is itself a procedural justice contribution of transactional leadership, sustaining the organizational trust that keeps intensity investments rational. Research by Schermuly et al. (2022) confirms that transactional leadership's contingent reward component positively predicts job performance, particularly in structured work contexts where clear performance criteria are available.

The quality limitation of transactional leadership follows from its justice profile: it excels at distributive and procedural justice, but provides weaker interpersonal and informational justice signals. The contingent reward contract is fundamentally instrumental it specifies what employees receive for what they do but it does not inherently communicate that employees are valued as persons, that their concerns are worthy of explanation, or that their humanity matters to the organization beyond their productive contribution. Without supplementary interpersonal and informational justice inputs, transactional leadership sustains behavioural intensity while leaving emotional quality fragile.

6.3 Abusive and Toxic Leadership: The Quality Destroyer

Abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) defined as sustained hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours, excluding physical contact chronic interpersonal justice violation. It is the direct organizational correlate of the 'moral outrage' mechanism identified by Bies (1987): it produces persistent intense negative affect through repeated signals that employees are not valued, respected, or safe. Tepper's

(2000) research established that abusive supervision is associated with diminished job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and organizational commitment, and heightened family conflict, anxiety, and turnover intention a comprehensive energy quality destruction profile.

The energy dynamics of toxic leadership are particularly dangerous because they create a short-term intensity effect through fear activation. Fear is a high-arousal negative affect: it sustains behavioural activity (employees work hard to avoid punishment) while simultaneously poisoning emotional quality. This is the definitional profile of corrosive energy an apparently productive-looking activation state that is actually consuming the organization's psychological resources at a rate that cannot be sustained. Maslach and Leiter (2016) documented the trajectory: sustained abusive supervision produces emotional exhaustion that progresses through depersonalization (quality destruction) to eventual disengagement (intensity collapse), ending in resigned inertia. The energy zone transition is: productive → corrosive → resigned, driven entirely by the interpersonal justice deficit of the leader.

Critically, the quality damage inflicted by toxic leadership persists even after the leader is removed. Kelly and Barsade's (2001) research on group emotion demonstrates that negative emotional contagion creates lasting affective schema and relational norms that continue to shape energy quality long after their precipitating cause has departed. Organizations recovering from toxic leadership face a quality rebuilding challenge that requires sustained interpersonal and informational justice investment to overcome the accumulated affective damage.

6.4 Authentic Leadership: The Quality Champion

Authentic leadership (Avolio& Gardner, 2005), characterized by self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced information processing, and internalized moral perspective, directly embodies informational justice through its commitment to transparent, honest communication. Authentic leaders do not manage impressions or filter information strategically; they share their genuine assessments, reasoning, and uncertainties. This informational transparency creates the cognitive safety that Lind's (2001) Fairness Heuristic Theory identifies as the cognitive precondition of positive energy quality.

The relational transparency and internalized moral perspective of authentic leadership further constitute a powerful interpersonal justice commitment: employees experience authentic leaders as genuinely regarding their worth and treating them with consistency, dignity, and moral seriousness.

Research by Walumbwa et al. (2008) confirmed that authentic leadership predicts organizational citizenship behaviour and follower commitment through psychological capital the positive psychological resources (confidence, hope, optimism, resilience) that are the building blocks of high-quality organizational energy.

7. Critical Interaction Effects: When Leadership Interventions Backfire

7.1 The Fear-Urgency Trap: Raising Intensity While Destroying Quality

The most common and destructive leadership error in the organizational energy matrix is the use of fear or threat to generate urgency. Fear is a high-arousal negative affect that reliably raises behavioralactivation employees under threat work hard, move quickly, and comply visibly. For leaders who monitor activity levels as their primary energy indicator, fear-based urgency appears highly effective. The catastrophic error is in mistaking activity for productive energy.

From a justice standpoint, fear-based urgency is sustained by a combination of distributional threat (performance consequences of non-compliance) and interpersonal injustice (the disrespectful, dehumanizing character of fear activation). Skarlicki and Folger (1997) demonstrated the key interaction: when distributive outcomes are unfavourable, low interactional justice triggers the strongest retaliation behaviours. This means that leaders who combine high performance demands (distributional pressure) with low interpersonal dignity (interactional injustice) are creating the maximum-retaliation-risk environment the organizational conditions most likely to generate corrosive rather than productive energy. Employees do not merely withdraw; they actively sabotage, retaliate, and spread corrosive affect through the organization.

> Proposition P1
>
> The combination of high distributive and procedural justice demands with low interpersonal justice will produce corrosive energy, not productive energy, even when behavioural activation appears high to external observers. The quality degradation will outpace the intensity gain, producing negative net organizational performance over time.

7.2 The Warmth-Without-Stakes Trap: Quality Without Intensity

The converse leadership error is the maintenance of high relational and informational justice without sufficient distributive and procedural challenge. Leaders who excel at warmth who are genuinely respectful, transparent, and personally attentive to employees often create organizational cultures of high emotional quality and low behavioural urgency. Employees feel valued, informed, and respected; they do not feel challenged, accountable, or driven. The comfortable energy zone results.

The justice mechanism is a distributive expectation mismatch: employees know they are receiving good interpersonal treatment, but have no clear expectation that high effort will produce meaningfully different outcomes than moderate effort. Without performance differentiation (distributive justice with meaningful variance), the expectancy motivational circuit does not activate, and behavioural intensity remains at the comfortable rather than productive level. Bruch and Ghoshal's (2003) research confirmed that companies in the comfortable energy zone are paradoxically at high strategic risk: they feel stable and positive, but they lack the urgency that drives adaptation and innovation.

> Proposition P2
> High interpersonal and informational justice without sufficient distributive and procedural challenge will produce comfortable energy rather than productive energy. Quality will be high but intensity will be insufficient for radical performance improvement or strategic adaptation.

7.3 The Acceleration Trap: Intensity Collapse Through Distributional Injustice

Bruch and Vogel's (2011) acceleration trap in which relentless high demands without recovery create burnout is, from an organizational justice perspective, a form of distributive injustice. Employees are required to provide inputs (effort, time, emotional labour, cognitive resource) that exceed their received outputs (recognition, compensation, recovery, development, meaning). Adams's (1965) equity theory predicts the response: employees will restore equity by reducing inputs which means reducing behavioural and cognitive intensity or by exiting the exchange relationship entirely.

Cropanzano, Rupp, and Byrne (2003) established the empirical pathway: perceived injustice produces emotional exhaustion, which reduces performance and organizational commitment. Wright and Cropanzano (1998) confirmed that emotional exhaustion is a significant predictor of voluntary turnover the ultimate intensity withdrawal. The acceleration trap is therefore not primarily a resource

management problem; it is a distributive justice problem. Leaders who perpetuate it are, systematically and often unknowingly, violating the equity contract that sustains behavioural energy investment.

> Proposition P3
> Organizations in the acceleration trap will exhibit simultaneous high behavioural intensity and declining quality, as distributional injustice (input-output imbalance) depletes emotional resources and produces burnout, creating a trajectory from productive energy through corrosive energy to resigned inertia.

7.4 The Procedural Void: Intensity Collapse Without Explanation

A fourth critical interaction occurs when leaders attempt to sustain intensity through distributional incentives alone, without adequate procedural or informational justice. When processes are opaque, when decisions are made without explanation, and when employees lack voice and appeal mechanisms, the distribution of outcomes however fair in absolute terms is experienced as unjust. Lind and Tyler's (1988) group engagement model explains why: without procedural justice, employees cannot trust that their positive outcomes today will continue, because they see no reliable system governing future distributions. This uncertainty drains the commitment that sustains long-term behavioural intensity.

> Proposition P4
> Distributive justice without procedural justice will produce short-term intensity but long-term intensity decay, as the absence of process transparency creates systemic distrust that erodes organizational commitment and the sustained behavioral investment it supports.

8. An Integrated Model and Testable Propositions

8.1 The Integrated Model

The evidence synthesized in this paper converges on an integrated model with the following structure. Leadership behavior is the proximate cause of organizational energy states, operating through four justice dimensions that constitute two distinct pathways to organizational energy:

Intensity Pathway: Leadership → Distributive Justice + Procedural Justice → Perceived Organizational Support (POS) + Organizational Trust → Energy Intensity (behavioral and cognitive activation)

Quality Pathway: Leadership → Interpersonal Justice + Informational Justice → Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Quality + Psychological Safety → Energy Quality (positive vs. negative emotional valence)

Social Exchange Theory provides the relational mechanism through which justice acts and energy states are connected: each justice-relevant interaction is an exchange event that generates a reciprocal response positive reciprocity for justice fulfilment, negative reciprocity for justice violation. The accumulation of these individual-level exchange events produces collective energy states through emotional contagion, shared schema formation, and social network diffusion.

Productive organizational energy is the simultaneous achievement of high intensity and positive quality which requires comprehensive justice provision across all four dimensions. No single justice dimension is sufficient. No three dimensions can compensate for failure in the fourth. And no leadership intervention that targets intensity without attending to quality, or quality without attending to intensity, can reliably achieve or sustain the productive energy zone.

8.2 Additional Testable Propositions

> Proposition P5
>
> Leaders who score high on distributive and procedural justice behaviours but low on interpersonal and informational justice behaviours will produce teams with high behavioural energy intensity but low emotional energy quality, resulting in corrosive rather than productive organizational energy, particularly under high-stress conditions.

> Proposition P6
>
> Leaders who score high on interpersonal and informational justice behaviours but low on distributive and procedural justice behaviours will produce teams with high emotional energy quality but low behavioural energy intensity, resulting in comfortable rather than productive organizational energy, particularly in stable, low-challenge environments.

514

> Proposition P7
>
> Organizational justice climate the aggregation of individual justice perceptions to the unit level will mediate the relationship between leadership style and organizational energy state, such that justice climate accounts for a significant portion of the leadership-energy relationship beyond individual-level perceptions.

515

> Proposition P8
>
> The trajectory from corrosive energy to productive energy through leadership intervention will require a sequenced justice repair: interpersonal justice restoration (to reduce negative affect) must precede procedural justice restoration (to rebuild trust), which must precede distributional recalibration (to restore motivational investment), with each stage producing distinct measurable improvements in the corresponding energy dimension.

516

517 9. Practical Leadership Prescriptions

518 The theoretical model translates into a structured set of practical prescriptions, organized by
519 leadership goal and justice mechanism. Table 4 presents these prescriptions, linking each goal to the
520 specific justice pathway, leadership action, and practical diagnostic or intervention tool.

521

Leadership Goal	Justice Mechanism	Specific Leadership Action	Practical Tools
Build Intensity Without Destroying Quality	Use Procedural + Distributive Justice	Communicate genuine external challenges; apply fair, consistent performance standards; create voice mechanisms and recognition aligned with contribution	Urgency through shared purpose, not fear; reward equity audits; 360-degree procedural reviews
Improve Quality Without Losing Intensity	Use Interpersonal + Informational Justice	Model respectful conduct daily; deliver difficult decisions with candid, timely,	Communication protocols for adverse decisions; leader coaching in

		and thorough explanations; maintain dignity under pressure	interpersonal conduct; transparency audits
Escape Corrosive Energy	Redirect negative force via all four justice dimensions	Acknowledge injustices explicitly; create reparative procedural events; rebuild psychological safety through consistent interpersonal respect	Justice climate assessment; leader behaviour feedback; structural equity reviews to address distributional grievances
Prevent Comfortable Energy Drift	Refresh Procedural + Distributive stakes	Introduce meaningful performance differentiation; make consequences of performance visible; create aspirational challenges connected to shared purpose	Stretch goals tied to fair reward; procedural accountability systems; transparent performance feedback
Sustain Productive Energy over Time	Comprehensive justice architecture + recovery systems	Monitor all four justice dimensions continuously; build recovery periods into work systems; develop energy-aware leadership culture at all levels	Organizational energy diagnostics (Cole et al., 2012 PEM tool); justice climate surveys; leadership development focused on justice behaviours

Table 4: Practical Leadership Prescriptions by Energy Goal and Justice Mechanism

9.1 Diagnosing the Energy-Justice State

Before prescribing interventions, leaders must accurately diagnose their organization's energy state and the justice deficits that are sustaining it. Cole et al.'s (2012) Productive Energy Measure (PEM) provides a validated 14-item instrument for assessing emotional, cognitive, and behavioural energy dimensions at the unit level. Colquitt's (2001) organizational justice scale provides validated measurement of all four justice dimensions. Used together, these instruments enable leaders to identify which energy dimension is deficient and which justice dimension deficit is causing it enabling targeted, theory-driven intervention rather than undifferentiated engagement initiatives.

9.2 The Sequencing Principle

A critical practical insight from the integrated model is that justice interventions must be sequenced appropriately. Organizations in corrosive energy states where quality is negative and interpersonal damage has accumulated cannot be successfully moved to productive energy by addressing distributive or procedural justice alone. Interpersonal justice repair must come first: leaders must demonstrate, through consistent respectful conduct, that the emotional environment has changed before employees can process procedural or distributional improvements as credible rather than cynical. This sequencing principle mirrors the organizational change literature's insight (Lewin, 1947; Tushman& O'Reilly, 1996) that unfreezing must precede change: the affective freeze of corrosive energy must be thawed by interpersonal justice before the cognitive and behavioural dimensions can be recalibrated.

9.3 The Dual Mandate of Leadership Development

The framework implies a dual mandate for leadership development programs. Leaders must be developed not just as visionaries, strategists, or relationship builders, but as justice architect’s individuals who understand the structural impact of their daily behaviours on the four justice dimensions and the energy states they produce. Skarlicki and Latham's (1997) experimental research demonstrated that leaders trained specifically in organizational justice behaviours showed significant increases in followers' citizenship behaviour a direct energy intensity indicator. Similar training focused on interpersonal justice behaviours has demonstrable quality effects through the reduction of the interpersonal justice violations that generate moral outrage and corrosive effect.

10. Research Agenda and Limitations

10.1 Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite the strength of the theoretical framework developed here, several research gaps remain. First, no study has directly and simultaneously measured all four justice dimensions, both energy dimensions, and the mediating psychological mechanisms in a single longitudinal design. Such a study ideally using the Cole et al. (2012) PEM alongside Colquitt's (2001) justice scale and measures of POS, LMX, psychological safety, and emotional exhaustion would provide the comprehensive empirical test the framework requires.

Second, the dynamics of energy-justice transitions remain poorly understood. The propositions developed in Section 8 imply that different energy zone transitions require different justice repair

sequences, but no study has tracked these transitions in real time. Experience sampling methodology, combined with network-analytic approaches to emotional contagion, would enable researchers to trace how justice events propagate through social networks to produce collective energy state shifts.

Third, the moderating roles of organizational culture, industry context, and national culture in the justice-energy relationship require investigation. The relationship between specific leadership justice behaviours and energy outcomes is likely to be moderated by cultural justice expectations (Pillai, Scandura, & Williams, 1999), industry-specific performance norms, and organizational history of justice experience. Cross-cultural and cross-industry comparative designs would enable the boundary conditions of the framework to be specified.

Fourth, the interaction between leadership styles and justice dimensions particularly whether different combinations of transformational and transactional leadership produce different justice profiles and therefore different energy outcomes represents a rich empirical program. The augmentation hypothesis (Bass, 1985) that transformational leadership adds value beyond transactional leadership can be theoretically reinterpreted as the hypothesis that interpersonal and informational justice add value to the distributive and procedural justice provided by transactional leadership.

10.2 Limitations

The framework developed in this paper is primarily theoretical and integrative. While it draws on extensive empirical evidence from the justice, leadership, and organizational energy literatures, it is subject to several limitations. First, the mapping of justice dimensions to energy outcomes is based on existing empirical findings from separate literatures, and direct testing of the proposed pathways is still required. Second, the framework assumes that justice perceptions are accurately formed in response to leadership behaviors but research on attribution processes (Greenberg, 1993) suggests that the same leadership behavior may be interpreted very differently by different employees, and that emotional states can bias justice perception (Barsky& Kaplan, 2007). Third, the framework does not fully address the role of follower characteristics personality, justice sensitivity, equity sensitivity in moderating the justice-energy relationship.

11. Conclusions

This paper has developed a comprehensive theoretical account of organizational energy intensity and quality as independent variables, governed by different justice dimensions through different psychological mechanisms, and enacted through leadership behaviour as the proximate cause of organizational energy states. The core contributions are:

First: The independence of intensity and quality is not merely descriptive but structural it reflects the categorical difference between equity-motivational and trust-based mechanisms (governing intensity) and affective-appraisal and cognitive-heuristic mechanisms (governing quality). No leadership intervention that fails to distinguish these mechanisms can reliably manage both dimensions simultaneously.

Second: Organizational justice theory provides the most empirically grounded and theoretically coherent account of how leadership behaviours produce energy states. The four justice dimensions' map onto the two energy dimensions with specificity: distributive and procedural justice determine intensity through motivational and commitment pathways; interpersonal and informational justice determine quality through affective and cognitive appraisal pathways.

Third: Social Exchange Theory establishes the relational architecture through which individual justice interactions aggregate into collective energy states. Leaders are the primary initiating actors in this exchange cycle, and the justice quality of their initiating actions determines the reciprocating energy response of their employees.

Fourth: The most dangerous leadership errors are those that raise one energy dimension while destroying the other. Fear-based urgency raises intensity while destroying quality; warmth without accountability sustains quality while allowing intensity to decay. Understanding the independence of these dimensions is the prerequisite for avoiding these systematic traps.

Fifth: Productive organizational energy the simultaneous achievement of high intensity and positive quality is a justice achievement before it is a performance achievement. Leaders who provide comprehensive justice across all four dimensions create the organizational conditions in which productive energy is not merely possible but natural. Productive energy follows justice as surely as trust follows fairness.

The challenge for organizational leadership in the contemporary era of rapid change, workforce fragmentation, and heightened employee expectations is not primarily strategic or technical it is fundamentally a justice challenge. Organizations that wish to sustain the productive energy required for breakthrough performance, innovation, and adaptation must develop leaders who are, above all else, justice architects: individuals who understand that every decision they make, every process they design, every interaction they conduct, and every explanation they provide or withhold is an act with measurable consequences for the collective energy on which organizational performance depends.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

Adamovic, M. (2023). Organizational justice research: A review, synthesis, and research agenda. European Management Review, 20(2), 263–289. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12564

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315–338.

Baker, W. E. (2019). Emotional energy, relational energy, and organizational energy: Toward a multilevel model. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 6, 373–395.

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(4), 644–675.

Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. A. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice judgments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(1), 286–295.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., &Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(2), 207–218.

Bies, R. J. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. Research in Organizational Behavior, 9, 289–319.

Bies, R. J., &Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B. H. Baseman (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.

Bruch, H., &Ghoshal, S. (2003). Unleashing organizational energy. MIT Sloan Management Review, 45(1), 45–51.

Bruch, H., & Vogel, B. (2011). Fully charged: How great leaders boost their organization's energy and ignite high performance. Harvard Business Review Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86(2), 278–321.

Cole, M. S., Bruch, H., & Vogel, B. (2012). Energy at work: A measurement validation and linkage to unit effectiveness. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33(4), 445–467.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 425–445.

Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58(2), 164–209.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900.

Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2008). Social exchange theory and organizational justice: Job performance, citizenship behaviors, multiple foci, and a historical integration of two literatures. In S. W. Gilliland, D. P. Skarlicki, & D. D. Steiner (Eds.), Research in social issues in management: Justice, morality, and social responsibility. Information Age Publishing.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(1), 160–169.

Dutton, J. E. (2003). Energize your workplace: How to create and sustain high-quality connections at work. Jossey-Bass.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500–507.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. American Psychologist, 56(3), 218–226.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25(2), 161–178.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9–22.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management (pp. 79–103). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755–768.

Kelly, J. R., &Barsade, S. G. (2001). Moods and emotions in small groups and work teams. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86(1), 99–130.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research (pp. 27–55). Plenum Press.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. Human Relations, 1(1), 5–41.

Lind, E. A. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), Advances in organizational justice (pp. 56–88). Stanford University Press.

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

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout. In G. Fink (Ed.), Stress: Concepts, cognition, emotion, and behavior (pp. 351–357). Academic Press.

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 43(4), 738–748.

Ndjaboue, R., Brisson, C., &Vézina, M. (2012). Organisational justice and mental health: A systematic review of prospective studies. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 69(10), 694–700.

Pillai, R., Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (1999). Leadership and organizational justice: Similarities and differences across cultures. Journal of International Business Studies, 30(4), 763–779.

Quinn, R. W., & Dutton, J. E. (2005). Coordination as energy-in-conversation: A process theory of organizing. Academy of Management Review, 30(1), 36–57.

Rupp, D. E., &Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89(1), 925–946.

Schermuly, C. C., Creon, L., Gerlach, P., Graßmann, C., & Koch, J. (2022). Leadership styles and psychological capital in LMX — A multilevel analysis. ZeitschriftfürArbeits- und Organisationspsychologie, 66(1), 1–14.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., &Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(3), 219–227.

Shaw, J. D., Wild, E., & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). To justify or excuse? A meta-analytic review of the effects of explanations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(3), 444–458.

Shkoler, O., &Tziner, A. (2017). The mediating and moderating role of burnout and personal resources in the relationship between organizational justice and work misbehavior. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 33(2), 137–144.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(3), 434–443.

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(3), 617–633.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. Academy of Management Journal, 43(2), 178–190.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1996). The ambidextrous organization: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. California Management Review, 38(4), 8–30.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. Wiley.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. Journal of Management, 34(1), 89–126.

Weiss, H. M., &Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. Research in Organizational Behavior, 18, 1–74.

Wright, T. A., &Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(3), 486–493.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. Academy of Management Review, 26(2), 179–201.