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The purpose of this study is to criticize and develop the construct of equity theory within the framework of perceived justice. Specifically, this study aims to investigate construct of perceived justice in political marketing perspective. Sample of the research is the voters of political parties in Indonesia. Data were collected through interviews and a survey using a structured questionnaire with a purposive sampling method to 150 respondents. The study use exploratory factor analyses and Cronbach Alpha method to test the construct validity. The research also use measurement model of structural equation model (SEM) which is the same as confirmatory factor analysis procedure. Qualitative method also used in this research to investigate the new construct of perceived justice in political marketing. Result of the study found that procedural justice has weak construct validity and the definition of the construct is not clear. Findings the new concept of justice in a political marketing perspective discussed in this article.
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Introduction

Peng and Hackly (2009) found that the limitations of the analogy of consumer-voters ranged in a different context in each case reflecting the marketing and the different responses at the micro level. They suggested that their research opens several reasons to suspect that at the micro level analysis of consumer involvement with political marketing, particularly ethnography and other qualitative approaches, revealing layers of complexity that may not normally get in a commercial context of brand marketing. Furthermore, a future research should describe the difference in depth in the nature of the involvement of consumers with the political marketing and commercial marketing.

In some cases, voters and consumers are considered different in attitude formation and...
decision making (Lock and Harris, 1996). First, for every election, all voters make their choice on the same day. In the context of consumer behavior, almost no purchasing decision with these characteristics. Second, although some might argue that there is a long-term individual costs in the general election, the fact is there is no price directly or indirectly attached at the time of voting. This is a difference between voting in elections to the purchase of a product. Third, although the actual voting has no price attached to it, but nonetheless voters have to go from home to polling stations. Fourth, the party winning elections meant winning all voters despite the fact that not all voters to vote on election-winning party. This differs from the concept of market share in the science of marketing. Fifth, political party or candidate is an intangible product and complex. Voters cannot identify whether a candidate or a political party. As a consequence, most voters have to assess the overall concept that is packaged or delivered messages during the campaign either publicly or through the media. In general, the error choices in the past, according to the opinion of voters, no significant impact on the possibility of moving to the choice of other political parties. In the case of complex product purchase or service options, consumers are usually able to change their minds, despite the cost, if they believe that they have made a mistake. They can complain to providers or switch brands. Very different from the election, voters must wait until the next election. Sixth, it is difficult for political parties to influence the direction of the party by introducing new brands in the form of a new party. Finally, in the current market situation, party leaders tend to dominate, although he does not represent the party as a brand that represents the product.

Differences identified above raises at least two consequences. The first is political marketing as a discipline must develop in specific framework adapted from the core of marketing literature. Second, if developing their own models, then this should provide predictive and prescriptive power to inform and influence on the actions to be carried out both by voters and political parties. The main criteria of the private sector can be measured from the efficiency and profitability, while in the public sector; performance is measured by service quality, especially from the side of justice and democratic control (Walsh, 1994). Justice can be analogue with the value or values, which is the ratio between the benefits of the sacrifice. Increasing the value can be done by adding benefits or vice versa, reducing the sacrifice in the form of a price to be paid or other sacrifice of time, energy and opportunity. Democratic control is shown from the opportunity to make a claim. In liberal framework, there are three types of claims are very important; direct claim individually, collective claims, and claims from other parties.

Brennan and Henneberg (2008) investigated the feasibility and usefulness of adapting the concept of customer value from commercial marketing to be used in the political marketing field. They found that the application of customer value approach in a political context, it was concluded that the concept of an analog values voters can be translated and are the foundation for a promising approach for the development of political marketing strategy. Terms of organizations seeking to build consumer confidence is to build internal trust (Huff and Kelly, 2005). Internal trust is a good and fair relationship between the organization and its employees. This was confirmed by the study of Hooley et al. (2005) who analyzed the relationship between employee satisfactions with the organization of the company’s marketing performance.

In the context of political marketing, the voters should be entitled to have something of their voices. In the perspective of consumers, they receive products or services from the price that was paid. Furthermore, this concept is known as the perceived of fairness. The problem is how to measure the construct of justice. The main purpose of this study is to measure the perceived justice construct, especially in political marketing perspective. Specifically, this study will investigate the perceived justice and how their dimensions. The first part, this paper will discuss the literature referring to political marketing and the theory of justice. The second part proposes a model that is tested and explained the methodology adopted. Final section discusses findings and implications.
Literature Review

The Concept of Political Marketing

Application of political marketing somewhat neglected both in marketing and political literature studies. In fact, the election is very important within the framework of democracy in almost all country. Political scientists focus on this issues rather than political campaigns. The campaign is a political machine that is always used by all parties that will win the election. However, political marketing scientists more tend to focus on the institutional relationship process of legislative, public policy, and scientific explanation of the phenomenon in politics than the election campaign strategy and management.

To understand political marketing, a term known characteristics of the political structure (Butler and Collins, 1994) which can be categorized into four groups of products, organizations, markets, and process characteristics. Political product consists of three parts, namely the nature of the bidding multi component (person, party, and ideology), the level of fidelity (loyalty), and the fact that it could change (mutability). While the political organization is the people who intend to win a position in public office through the electoral process. In this case, they tend to maintain the tradition of amateurism, the negative view of marketing and dependence on volunteers. The third of political structure is the political market. Political market is those with the resources and willingness to make the exchange. They are the voters. Characteristic market policy can be grouped into three namely the process of indoctrination in the ideology that require fees, affirmation strong social, and voters counter (counter-consumer). The fourth of political structure is a characteristic that can be described as a process of open market operations in a specific context. The main issues is the shift from substance to style in the selection, advertising and communications standards that apply, the phenomena of political polls, the news media attention and technical operational voting, which allows buying votes.

Political marketing industry expands, not only in developed countries but also in developing countries. Political marketing industry has created new markets, especially in the field of technology and information (Bowler et al. 1996). Political parties and politicians are intangible products and complex. Identification can be done based on information available and this creates a very broad information needs associated with political marketing to communicate with party members, the media and voters (Lock and Harris, 1996). Political parties and politicians have repeatedly shown a capacity to produce information. On the other hand, the information generated is also distorted and mislead them. The advertisement tends to dishonest and to fool into a culture that tolerated. This kind of behavior continues to repeat and become something considered comfortable. Thus, the crucial issue in assessing the political marketing industry in advertisement is the level of honesty or dishonesty.

During its development, political marketing is more focused on marketing communications. Thrassou et al. (2009) identified a number of important factors from the success of marketing communications for small political parties in developing countries. There are increasing political relationship between business and marketing, environmental contexts that stimulate and maintain the symbiotic relationship between the party and the electorate, and the importance of perception management. Based on these findings, Thrassou et al. (2009) developed a framework of marketing communications for small parties in the developed countries. The framework presented is not just a process but also in a context and the transformation rests upon a shift from reactive to proactive marketing communication applications.

From the application of customer value approach in a political context, it can be concluded that the concept of an analog of the value of the voter can be described and the basis for a promising approach for the development of political marketing strategy. In conclusion, there is face validity in the argument that the concept of customer value can be useful for the field of political marketing (Brennan and Henneberg, 2008). Political market can already be identified and fixed (i.e. voters). Therefore, marketing has an important role. Political market characterized...
not only reveals the special characteristics of the market but also highly intangible services. Build trust and service products will be more appropriate in a political campaign (Baines and Egan, 2001).

Wring (1996) states that the process is very important strategic changes in the organization of political party campaign. As companies plan commercial, party campaign organization can be seen its development through three stages, namely productions, sales and marketing orientations. It is similar with the election. It has been called propaganda that media and marketing approach to politics for the election. Political campaigns are faced with marketing problems and opportunities. It is associated with a professional marketing activity in political campaigns. Butler and Collins (1994) developed a model of political marketing by basing on the structural characteristics and processes. Structural characteristics include the nature of the product, organizational and market characteristics. The process is dealing with procedures and systems governing the marketing activities and their implications.

**Perceived Justice Construct**

In theory, perceived justice was known as equity theory. Equity theory was first proposed by Stacy Adams in the early study in 1963, which related to conditions of injustice against employees. At the beginning of this article, Adams (1963) mentioned several input and output of the exchange process carried out by company employees. For example, employees provide the level of education as an input, and then he will get a salary as an output. Injustice is that if the input-output ratio varies from one individual to other individual input-output ratio. The reaction of employees who are treated unfairly there are two possibilities. They will be anger, when the output obtained is too low (under-reward) or will be feel guilty, if the output obtained is too high (over-reward). This research discusses injustice of the building blocks of this theory, more-gift, under-appreciation and justice. Equity theory contributes in determining benefits for employees and also determines the types of benefits linked to the performance. Carrel and Dittrich (1976) showed that experimental research in equity theory has a weakness, who engineered a laboratory situation and weaknesses in generalization. Carrel and Dittrich (1976) suggest that the concept of justice is considered more appropriate than equity. Justice is a term which more appropriate for measuring the perception of fairness by comparing value of the overall relationship of balance or fairness of input-output ratio. Theorists divide two approaches to conceptualize the concept of fairness; focus on content (distributive justice) and focus on processes (procedural justice).

Distributive justice focuses on the result or how to obtain the justice. Terms of fairness in this approach is to take a period of justice. Equity theory defined as input-output ratio between the individual and the comparison individuals. Research on distributive justice approach stated that low employee performance if they are low salary. Otherwise, the employee’s performance will be high if they are highly salary (Greenberg, 1990). However, critics of this theory, the early studies of experimental design is confusing or unfair treatment to be applied in real conditions are questionable, such as self-esteem is too challenging or threatening the jobs of respondents. Development of a distributive justice approach is the emergence of the model presented in the assessment of justice (Greenberg, 1990). This model focuses on how individuals attempt to apply and accept the norms of justice. For example, social harmony in the organization is realized with a fair allocation of benefits, while maximizing the performance improvement is done by adjusting the system was a fair result. The implications of distributive justice such as delayed response to consumer complaints. Procedural justice more focused on improvement process to achieve the final result from the outcome for consumers (Hoffman and Kelley, 2000). Nevertheless, the evaluation of the process could be bad or poor.

Understanding the differences in distributive justice and procedural justice is important to note, that both differences not only from the theory of heuristic but very real of course from the perspective of the phenomenology of workers. Procedural justice relate to how individual deals with justice, whereas distributive justice is the
satisfaction of individual justice. Procedural justice is also related to the evaluation system, while distributive justice organizations associated with acceptable results. Tyler (1994) suggests there are differences in the patterns of psychological distributive justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice is based on a motive in the assessment of resources, while procedural justice is based on the relational motive in his or her assessment. This research uses public service settings. This study examines whether people feel fairly treated by the two institutions. Interesting results of this study is the public is more receptive to third-party decisions when they are affected by procedural justice. This is a relational model of justice proposed by Lind and Tyler (1988). This model is connected between the concern for justice with a concern for the social bond that exists between individuals with groups, institutions or governments. The basic assumption of this model is that individuals have always felt a bond with the group and was very concerned about the signs and symbols of communication to obtain information about their position in the group. Distributive justice in the process of improving services focused on specific results from efforts to improve service. The efforts to improve the service are more than the cost due to service errors (Gilliand, 1993).

Interactional justice is defined as the presence of interpersonal behaviors and improvements in the enforcement process proceeds. Thus, interactional justice refers to how the service improvement process is implemented and how the end-result (outcome) was presented. Interactional justice as a polite employee behavior, provide empathy to the consumer and corporate willingness to explain to consumers why the error occurred services (Blodgett et al., 1997).

Previous work in the application of equity theory is a theory of consumer behavior can be done, especially its application in problems of consumer dissatisfaction in the product (Laufer, 2002). Oliver and Swan (1989) argue that justice is the antecedent of customer satisfaction. A customer who obtain an unfair services would show a sense of dissatisfaction or other emotions such as anger and complaints that may trigger the consumer to remedy this unfair situation.

Aurier and Martin (2007) contributed to conceptualize justice by add the concept of credibility and benevolence. Credibility reflects consumer perception relative to the ability of operators to deal with events, which enables customers to predict the behavior of firms. Benevolence, on the other hand, is defined as the belief in the honesty and integrity of the provider (Aurier and Martin, 2007). In experimental research, the component of justice is felt to show the impact on the entire structure of the relational. Distributive justice has a positive effect on quality, value and trust (credibility and benevolence). Procedural justice was interaction effect of quality and value. Interactional justice has a strong impact on the quality of interaction and trust-benevolence, which underlines how prompt, courteous service to customers is important. Components of macro-justice have influence on the yield and quality of interaction, also on trust-benevolence. Trust-benevolence is a crucial component in evaluating the quality of the relationship because of its impact on show loyalty behavior as shown in the literature (Coulter and Coulter, 2003). Trust has an important role in the development of relationships (Morgan and Hunt, 1994).

In marketing science, the value is the price to get the product. This value is included in the price of the monetary price and non-monetary price that includes the expenditure of time, energy and thought. When voters go to polling stations, they had to pay the price by sacrifice of time, energy and mind. They will receive something or a product which were paid. The question is what they get from the price? In this case, justice is considered a product that they will receive. Previous research found that there are positive impact of equity components on trust (Aurier and Martin, 2007). This finding also supports Gremler et al. (2001) who found the antecedent of trust is a treatment which is defined as customer perceptions of employees who have a concern for the customer’s welfare. Gouldner (1960) stated that trust is interpersonal interaction. In the interaction, individuals tend to help people who have helped them. A general norm of reciprocity may exist in a service relationship in which an employee is showing concern for the customer because they feel indebted to them for their
Meanwhile, Hupertz et al. (1978) found a relationship between manipulation of the level of patronage frequency, as an input, and the service received or the price level, as a result. Oliver and Swan (1989) distinguish between traditional equity theory with contemporary theories to gain a fair relationship between consumers and service providers. Laufer (2002) provide interesting additional application of the equity associated with the theory of consumer behavior, the factors of cultural differences. Consumers with different cultural backgrounds have different ways in the face of injustice by the service.

In general, consumers are trying to achieve fairness in dealing with service providers. However, consumers are apparently different behavior when interacting with their social environment. In the social environment interact with consumers as individuals will adjust to the social environment. If the social environment can accept injustices committed service providers, consumers as individuals will also receive this. Hoffman and Kelley (2000) examined the relationship of perception of justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) on service improvement. Service improvement would be considered reasonable by the consumer (Sheppard et al, 1992). Perceptions of justice indicate that the results of the process of service improvement strategies, interpersonal behavior in the repair process, and consumers receive a result are very important in the process of service improvement (Sheppard et al., 1992).

A critique of the public service stating that service providers are not responsive and inefficient because it is not liable to users of these services. Public service is more dominated by those who produce services. Public service users should be treated fairly between the right and obligation (Walsh, 1994). This also applies to voters of political parties. Table 1 shows a perceived justice construct that adopted by Kau and Loh (2006). In this study, a researcher adjusts a questionnaire in political party setting.

### Methodology

Data were collected through survey using a questionnaire and in-depth interview. Purposive sampling method was used. Respondents in this research are the voter of political parties in Indonesia. A total of 150 responses were collected. In order to confirm the validity construct, we use confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The survey instrument in this article developed from by Kau and Loh (2006). The reliability or internal consistency in this research uses Cronbach Alpha, suggested by Nunnally (1978). Qualitative method also used in this research to investigate the new construct of perceived justice in political marketing.

The data were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis by SPSS and Confirmatory factor analysis by AMOS Basic. The profiles of respondents would first present in this section, followed by result of the statistical analysis.

| Table 1. The Perceived Justice Construct. |
|------------------------------------------|
| **Perceived Justice Construct**          |
| **Interactional justice**                |
| 1. polite                                |
| 2. treat well                            |
| 3. listen to the aspirations              |
| 4. seemed concerning with the problem    |
| 5. seemed understanding about issues      |
| **Procedural justice**                   |
| 1. provide an opportunity to convey aspirations |
| 2. provide convenience to convey aspirations |
| 3. trying to explain the events that caused the problem |
| 4. quickly respond to complaints and problems |
| 5. provide facilities to submit complaints and problems |
| 6. easy to find out to whom should convey aspirations |
| 7. provide an opportunity to tell the problem |
| 8. easy to make the complaints process    |
| 9. listen to all problems                 |
| 10. promising to resolve the problem      |
| 11. submission of aspiration does not require a long time |
| 12. try to solve problems                 |
| 13. try to explain about the problem is happening |
| **Distributive justice**                 |
| 1. give the required                      |
| 2. get what is needed                     |
| 3. aspirations in line with expectations  |
| 4. provide a sense of justice             |

| Table 2. Characteristic Respondents       |
|-------------------------------------------|
| Characteristic                           |
| Number | %    |
| Gender                                      |
| Male   90  |   60 |
| Female 60  |   40 |
| Age group                                   |
| < 20 35  | 23.33 |
| 21 – 23 90  | 60.00 |
| > 24 25  | 16.67 |
| Selected political parties                  |
| Partai Demokrat 41  | 27.33 |
| Partai Demokarasi Indonesia Perjuangan 32  | 21.33 |
| Partai Golongan Karya 24  | 16.00 |
| Partai Keadilan Sejahtera 21  | 14.00 |
| Partai Amanat Nasional 14  | 9.33 |
| Partai Persatuan Pembangunan 10  | 6.67 |
| Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa 8  | 5.33 |
Profiles of Respondents

There were 60% female and 40% male. Distribution of respondents by age is known those 23.33% less than 20 years but over 17 years (prerequisite the voter), 60% were 21 to 23 years old, and 16.67% were aged 24 or older. Meanwhile, the distribution of political parties has selected respondents spread of 27.33% chose the Partai Demokrat, 21.33% were Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan, 16% chose the Partai Golkar, 14% chose Partai Keadilan Sejahtera, 9.33% were Partai Amanat Nasional, and were chose Partai Persatuan Pembangunan and Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa respectively 6.67% and 5.33%.

The study analyzes the construct validity of perceived justice with exploratory factor analyses (EFA). Table 3 shows the result of EFA. Table 3 shows the perceived justice construct that represent seven dimensions. It uses EFA (Exploratory Factor Analysis). Ideally, EFA will shows only three dimensions which represent three latent variables, there are interactional justice, procedural justice, and distributive justice. In Table 3, interactional justice and distributive justice have 4 items respectively that represent the variable. But, procedural justice is not well defined. The operational definition is not match with the concept, so that it defines other construct.
In order to find the internal reliability we test perceived by using Cronbach Alpha. Table 4 shows the result of reliability of perceived justice. Nunnally (1978) states that a scale will have internal consistency or reliability if reach Cronbach Alpha above 0.6. The dimension of interactional justice and distributive justice has internal consistency since it achieve Cronbach Alpha above 0.6. Procedural justice has a serious problem in internal consistency with lack of Cronbach Alpha. Only Dimension 3 that have a good internal consistency with Cronbach Alpha 0.6781.

Table 4 shows that there are five dimensions of procedural justice construct. Referring to several items in the questionnaire, researcher categorizes into five dimensions in procedural justice. There are benevolence, process, facility, personality, and system. Referring to reliability of the construct with Cronbach Alpha, only dimension of process (procedural justice) has good reliability and other dimension is not reliable.

The next analysis is to find the good construct validity of perceived justice. Then, it use confirmatory factor analysis to find the best result. Regarding from estimate and critical ratio value, all of items have a significant loading. By using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with Structural Equation Model, researcher was analyzed the construct validity. The goodness of fit of the measurement model adopts the criteria proposed by Byrne (2001) and Bagozzi and Yi (1989). Table 5 shows the best result of CFA.

By qualitative research, several respondents were gave some statements in in-depth interview. Researcher ask respondent about justice in political party’s perspective. The main question in in-depth interview is how their received the justice from political party.

Interactional justice is defined as the existence of interpersonal behavior in the enforcement process and outcome improvements are accepted. Thus, interactional justice refers to how the service improvement process is implemented and how the end result (outcome) is presented. Interactional justice as a polite employee behavior, provide empathy to the consumer and corporate willingness to explain to consumers why the mistake occurred services (Blodgett et al., 1997). In in-depth interview, some respondents state that:

“I met party officials and politicians. They seemed polite and treated me well” (respondents A and some respondents).

Procedural justice associated with how a person dealing with justice, whereas distributive justice is the individual’s satisfaction of justice. Procedural justice is also related to the evaluation system, while distributive justice organizations associated with the outcomes received. Procedural justice in relation to the improvement of service process is more focused on service improvement process to achieve the end result of outcomes for consumers (Hoffman and Kelley, 2000). In this perspective, although the final outcome of service improvements in accordance with service improvement strategies, evaluation of process improvements that could be bad because the process is bad. In qualitative research, it found that procedural justice was

### Table 5. Factor Loading of Dimension of Perceived Justice

| Items | Construct       | Estimate | S.E  | C.R  |
|-------|----------------|----------|------|------|
| Interac1 | Interactional justice | 0.856    | 0.111 | 7.685 |
| Interac2 | Interactional justice | 1.168    | 0.152 | 7.685 |
| Interac3 | Interactional justice | 1.359    | 0.168 | 8.078 |
| Interac4 | Interactional justice | 1.610    | 0.189 | 8.512 |
| Proced3 | Procedural justice | 1.101    | 0.193 | 5.718 |
| Proced4 | Procedural justice | 0.908    | 0.159 | 5.718 |
| Proced8 | Procedural justice | 0.661    | 0.148 | 4.456 |
| Proced9 | Procedural justice | 0.515    | 0.156 | 5.016 |
| Distrib1 | Distributive justice | 0.994    | 0.062 | 15.908 |
| Distrib2 | Distributive justice | 1.006    | 0.063 | 15.908 |
| Distrib3 | Distributive justice | 0.862    | 0.057 | 15.125 |
| Distrib4 | Distributive justice | 0.841    | 0.073 | 11.500 |

Chi square 38,778; Probability 0.000; GFI 0.886, AGFI 0.429, CFI 0.894, RMSEA 0.351 and CMIN/DF 19.389

Chi square 4,033; Probability 0.133; GFI 0.987, AGFI 0.933; CFI 0.981; RMSEA 0.083 and CMIN/DF 2.106.

Chi square 8,345; Probability 0.015; GFI 0.975; AGFI 0.874; CFI 0.986; RMSEA 0.146 and CMIN/DF 4.173.

Source: CFA analysis with SEM
not delivered from political party. This is two statements from respondent B and C.

“About a year ago I met members of parliament. I tried to give a few things related to growing problem in society, especially about the lack of infrastructure......but, until now there is no follow-up on my aspirations” (Respondents B).

“Some roads in my village now badly damaged. I tried to find out somebody who I must express my complaint. Finally I come to one of party officials. He says that I have to complaint directly to politician... I feel that is so difficult to make a complaint ...” (Respondents C).

Distributive justice focus on the end result is how justice obtained. Distributive justice is based on the motifs in the assessment of resources. In political party setting, there is a gap between what is expected and the fact. Respondent say that:

“Once upon a time I met members of parliament at an event. I tried to convey some of the aspirations, but it’s been almost two years since I tell it, there is no follow-up. Some development activity was carried out in other places which I think is not supposed to be done” (Respondents D).

“At the time I tell my problem, but they seem not so concerned with my problem. They look casual and not-so pay attention” (Respondents E and some respondents).

“I feel never got what I expected. My proposal never approved” (Respondents F).

Lind and Tyler (1988) research concern for justice with a concern for the social ties that exist between individuals with groups, institutions or governments. The basic assumption of this model is the individual always felt a bond with the group and very concerned about signs and symbols of communication to obtain information about their position in the group. Distributive justice in the service improvement process focused on specific outcomes of service improvement efforts. The end result of the efforts to improve service that the company exceeds the cost (sacrifice) due to service errors (Gilliand, 1993).

Result and Discussion

Distributive justice is relative to the customer’s evaluation of the outcome. Three main rules have been discussed in the literature: needs (everyone receives according to their own requirements), equality (everyone receives the same allocation and treatment) and equity refers to a ratio of rewards vs contributions such as time, money, energy, etc. (Deutsch, 1975).

Building on social exchange theory, Adams (1963) suggested that individuals establish a judgment in two phases to estimate the equity of an exchange. They first evaluate their own equity ratio of subjective rewards and contributions and compare it to those obtained by other individuals placed in a similar situation. Inequity exists that whenever one perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of other’s outcomes to other’s inputs are unequal. Then, distributive justice conforms to the criterion of proportionality. Deutsch (1985) demonstrates that the equity rule is the most preferred in the economic relationship. Perceived inequity creates a tension that individuals would like to reduce using different strategies, such as seeking tangible elements (refund, exchange), psychological elements (apologies from the service provider) or simply expressing their emotions (anger, joy) and behaving accordingly.

Apart from the fairness of the outcome, people also pay attention to the fairness of procedures. Taking its origins in the study of social justice (Rawls, 1971), procedural justice theory refers to the processes implemented to produce the outcome; essentially rules, policies and procedures chosen by the partner (service provider). Fair procedures must be consistent, unbiased, well-informed, impartial and ethical. In the area of conflict resolution procedures, Thibaut and Walker (1978) show that when people have control of decision rules, they more easily accept the outcome, even if it is to their disadvantage. Providers’ responsiveness and flexibility are essential and tied to consumer satisfaction (Bitner et al., 1990; Parasuraman et al., 1985).

Tax et al. (1998) define interactional justice as dealing with interpersonal behavior in the
enactment of procedures and the delivery of outcomes. This component of justice deals with the human aspects of an interaction and refers to characteristics such as honesty, courtesy, respect, politeness and candor. Service delivery studies have demonstrated its relevance and importance: personnel in contact with customers should be polite, responsive and provide useful information not only during the transaction but also after as well, such as during a complaint or the giving of simple feed-back. These three components of justice have been studied in organizational research, human resource management and in the service recovery marketing literature (Blodgett et al., 1997; Chebat and Slusarczyk, 2005; Tax et al., 1998). Thus, with its qualitative approach, the main objective of this study is to identify the nature of justice or injustice components experienced by individuals in their vote experiences.

This research shows the importance of construct validity in the consumer behavior research, especially on political party’s perspective. Schwab (1978) shows that research on construct validity in consumer behavior will give major contributions to the development of consumer behavior theory. However, little concern about this effort, which result low correlation among consumer behavior constructs.

Abe et al. (1996) states that in an investigation of construct validity will also give the answer of reliability, validity and generalize of a construct. In this research we analyze the construct validity and reliability of perceived justice. The result shows that procedural justice scale does not have proper construct validity. It will have a serious effect in using the scale to measure the antecedents and consequences of perceived justice on political marketing research.

Conclusion

Measuring the value of fairness in political marketing is similar to actual measurements of justice on the behavior of consumption goods or services. Theories of organizational justice have identified three main antecedents of the justice/injustice perception: distributive justice which focuses on the outcome of the exchange, procedural justice which focuses on the way this outcome is reached, and interactional justice which focuses on interpersonal interactions involved during the service delivery process. As non-profit organizations, political parties have a slightly different concept of justice. This is due to the exchange process occurs because the range is limited and done in a long time. Assessing fairness requires much longer time than when the voters to vote an election.

The research was found that the concept of interactional justice and distributive justice can be accepted by the voters. But, the voters feel the facts are slightly different, especially in terms of attention to the problems faced by the public. From a personal side, it was good, especially from the aspect of politeness and attention. The important founded of the research is procedural justice has weak construct validity. There are separate into five dimensions by EFA analysis. It conclude that there are five variable represent new concept in perceived justice refer to benevolence, process, facilities, personality, and systems. The construct of process is represents of procedural justice.

To develop measurement perceived justice concept in political marketing, a researcher should pay attention more on construct validity before moving further into test of substantive research. The concept of interactional justice and distributive justice has good construct validity, but procedural justice has weak construct validity. The implication is a researcher should have anticipation in order to prevent the weakness of construct validity of procedural justice variable.

Swan and Martin (1994) proposed three steps to overcome the problem. It called Theory-Setting-Testable Hypotheses (TST Hypotheses). The steps are theoretical statement and prediction, determine setting and preposition and determine testable hypotheses. A new concept of perceived justice in political marketing needs a grounded research to develop the new concept referring to benevolence, facilities, personality, and systems. Grounded research should be able to produce certain dimensions and test it in several researches. A new concept that found in this research is still premature. Future research should develop a specific concept and it must have good construct validity.
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