



## **ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIOR: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP IN THE MALAYSIAN CULTURAL CONTEXT**

Arif Hassan and Kamariah Mohd Noor

*Department of Business Administration, Kulliyah of Economics and  
Management Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia, P.O. Box  
10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur.*

---

### ABSTRACT

The study examines the role of organizational justice (OJ) in promoting extra role behavior (ERB). OJ is a multi dimensional construct and involves fairness of reward/resource allocation decisions, procedural aspects of these decisions, fairness in interpersonal treatment, and fairness in information and explanation given to employees concerning decisions relevant to them. ERB involves discretionary behavior such as helping other employees and developing ideas, speaking up on issues and voicing concerns relevant to the work group. Recent conceptualizations distinguish ERB from organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which includes dimensions such as compliance and conscientiousness. The paper is based on a study that uses Van Dyne, Cummings and Parks' (1995) measure of ERB. This instrument measures two dimensions of ERB, namely, helping (defined as affiliative and promotive behavior) and voice (defined as challenging and promotive behavior). Using data from lower and middle level managers from a mix of organizations, the study validated the four and two dimensional construct of OJ and ERB respectively. Cross cultural studies on social values have identified Malaysia as high on power distance and collectivism. Based on arguments from literature on normative influence of social values on human behavior, the study expected no relationship of OJ with ERB in Malaysia. Results supported the hypotheses.

JEL Classification: D230, L200

Keywords: Malaysia, Organizational justice, Extra- role behavior

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational justice research over the last four decades has highlighted the importance of perceptions of justice for work behaviour and motivation in Western societies (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt *et al.*, 2001). However, the extent to which these findings can be generalized to non-western work contexts is still under-explored. There is growing evidence now that employees from different socio-cultural backgrounds with different expectations and value systems may also differ in the way they perceive and react to their organizational environments. Recent research has demonstrated that employees in Taiwan (Farh, Earley and Lin, 1997), Hong Kong (Lam, Schaubroeck and Aryee, 2002), the People's Republic of China (PRC) (Begley *et al.*, 2002; Brockner *et al.* 2001; Tyler, Lind and Huo, 2000), Britain (Fischer and Smith, 2006), former Eastern Germany (Fischer and Smith, 2006) and the USA (Tyler, Lind and Huo, 2000) are influenced differently by justice perceptions, depending on their value orientation. However, the nature and direction of the effect is debatable (Smith, Bond and Kagitcibasi, 2005). A good number of studies have been conducted in the past to examine the organizational justice and organizational citizenship relationships in Malaysia. (e.g., Abdullah and Mohd Nasrudin, 2008; Lo, Ramayah, and Hui, 2006). However, most of them have examined a one, two, or three dimensional construct of organizational justice and in-role form of citizenship behaviour, not extra-role behaviour as conceptualized by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). As such the present study is designed to examine the four dimensional model of organizational justice as advanced by Greenberg (1993) and its relationship with employees' extra role behaviour in a non-western cultural setting. It is expected that the findings would add value to the existing body of knowledge on organizational justice and work behaviour relationships in unique cultural contexts, in this case, Malaysia.

## 2. CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

The term organizational justice describes the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace. Specifically, organizational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those determinations influence other work related variables (Moorman, 1991). There is a general consensus that organizational justice consists of at least two components,

namely distributive and procedural justice. The former is concerned with perception of fairness in distribution of reward, whereas the latter is concerned with the fairness of the process of allocation decisions (Adams, 1965). A number of procedural justice criteria have been outlined, such as opportunities for control of the process and the outcomes, ability to voice one's view points, (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998) consistency, lack of bias, availability of appeal mechanisms, accuracy, use of accurate information and following ethical and moral norms (Leventhal, 1980).

This clear two-factor model of organizational justice was challenged by the introduction of the concept of interactional justice (Bies and Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is focused on the treatment of individuals by decision-makers and whether they show respect, sensitivity and explain decisions thoroughly. A debate started about whether interactional justice is independent and separate from the two existing forms of organizational justice (Bies and Moag, 1986) or whether it forms part of a larger procedural justice construct that includes both structural and social aspects (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Lind, Tyler, and Huo, 1997). There is literature to suggest that interactional justice may be conceptually and empirically distinct. After a conceptual analysis of the existing literature, Greenberg (1993) suggested that there may be four different components of organizational justice ordered along two independent dimensions. The first dimension is the classical differentiation of justice focusing either on procedures or outcomes. The second dimension refers to the focal determinant (either structural or interpersonal). Greenberg (1993) argued that traditionally procedural and distributive justice dealt with structural aspects. The focus is on the environmental context within which the interaction occurs, e.g., the procedures used to determine an outcome and the perceived fairness of the final outcome. Interpersonal and informational justice deal with the treatment of individuals, and therefore the emphasis is on social determinants. These two dimensions can be integrated, leading to four distinct parts of justice: procedural (procedures, structural), distributive (distributions, structural), informational (procedures, social) and interpersonal justice (distributions, social). This framework provided an important role in highlighting the conceptual distinction between social and structural aspects of organizational justice.

Subsequently Colquitt (2001) developed and validated a measure differentiating these four components. This scale has been successfully used in longitudinal studies in the US (Judge and Colquitt, 2004). The

usefulness of this four factor conceptualization is evidenced in studies relating them to various organizational outcomes (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt *et al.*, 2001).

There is, however, a relative absence of work on the distinctiveness of these four dimensions of organizational justice perceptions across cultures, largely because previous research has primarily focused on distributive justice (Leung and Bond, 1984; see Fischer and Smith, 2003 for a review). Although there is some evidence that distributive, procedural and a broader interactional justice dimension are distinguished by individuals outside the US, including samples from Taiwan (Farh, Earley and Lin, 1997), Hong Kong (Fields, Pang and Chiu, 2000) and the Netherlands (van den Bos, Lind, Vermunt and Wilke, 1997), other research suggests that individuals in different parts of the world may not differentiate between the various dimensions of organizational justice (Bolino and Turnley, 2007; Fischer, 2002). However, in a recent study Fischer *et al.* (2008) examined the universality of the four factor model of organizational justice perception in thirteen countries. Data were collected from Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Turkey, UK and US. Using a combination of confirmatory factor analysis and multi group covariance analyses, Colquitt's (2001) four dimensional measure of justice yielded the best fit compared to the three, two and one dimensional models across the sample.

### 3. CONCEPT OF EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIOR

Organ (1988, 1990) pioneered the concept of extra-role behavior (ERB) – organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCBs are defined as “those organizationally beneficial behaviors and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations nor elicited by contractual guarantees or recompense” (Organ, 1990, p. 46). Of late, doubt has been raised on the value of such OCBs. For example, Chiaburu and Baker (2006) contended: “... behaviors such as helping colleagues with workloads, attending functions that are not required, and obeying informal organizational norms might be construed as supporting the status-quo and perpetuating organizational procedures and routines that are less-than-perfect for enhanced performance.” Such compliance and uncritical support may be at odds with business imperatives that require employees to “getting off the treadmill” (Prahalad and Hammel, 1996,

p.1). It is therefore important to encourage ERBs that are challenging-promotive rather than affiliative-promotive (Van Dyne *et al.*, 1995).

Van Dyne *et al.* (1995) clarified many previous conceptual ambiguities and suggested that ERBs can be distinguished based on whether the behavior is proactive and challenging or cooperative and non-challenging. Compliance and conscientiousness is a core dimension of organizational citizenship behavior and has been one of the most popular extra-role concepts. Compliance refers to behavior directed to the organization, such as attendance and obedience to rules that go beyond minimum required levels. Van Dyne *et al.* (1995) pointed out that these behaviors are more passive and are often part of one's in-role job expectations. Therefore, compliance is conceptually closely related to formal in-role behavior. The two concepts that focus on more proactive aspects of ERB are personal initiative (Ferse *et al.*, 1997) and voice (Van Dyne and Lepine, 1998). These types of behavior include encouraging and promoting change through constructively challenging the status quo and overcoming barriers and setbacks. These behaviors might damage the relationships with superiors, with initiative even implying "a certain rebellious element towards supervisors" (Frese *et al.*, 1997, p. 141)

Van Dyne *et al.* (1995) in their seminal review of ERB developed a new typology contrasting promotive *versus* prohibitive behavior and affiliative *versus* challenging behavior. 'Promotive behaviors are proactive; they promote, encourage, or cause things to happen. Prohibitive behaviors are protective and preventative; they include interceding to protect those with less power as well as speaking out to stop inappropriate or unethical behavior. Affiliative behavior is interpersonal and cooperative. It strengthens relationships and is other-oriented. Challenging behavior emphasizes ideas and issues. It is change-oriented and can damage relationships (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998, p. 108). Van Dyne and LePine (1998) subsequently developed an instrument measuring helping (affiliative and promotive) and voice (challenging and promotive) behaviors. Using a two-stage longitudinal design involving both self, peer and supervisor ratings, they demonstrated the empirical validity of this instrument. Since the authors did not provide any empirical validity for affiliative prohibitive (i.e. steward ship) and challenging prohibitive (i.e. whistle blowing) only two dimensions of ERB, namely, affiliative promotive (i.e. helping) and challenging promotive (i.e. voice) were examined in this study.

Van Dyne and LePine (1998) defined 'helping' as promotive behavior that emphasizes small acts of consideration. It is affiliative because it builds and preserves relationships and emphasizes interpersonal harmony. 'Voice' was defined as promotive behavior that emphasizes expression of constructive challenge intended to improve rather than merely to criticize. Voice is making innovative suggestions for change and recommending modifications of standard procedures even when others disagree.

Studies conducted on Organizational Citizenship/Extra Role Behavior in Malaysia (For example, Abdullah and Mohd Nasrudin, 2008; Lo, Ramayah and Hui 2006) have generally measured cooperative and non- challenging (compliance and conscientiousness) dimensions of OCB which, as stated earlier, are conceptually closely related to in-role rather than extra-role behavior. The present study, however, examined proactive and challenging aspects of ERB. It is, therefore, expected to provide new understanding on the role of organizational justice in promoting extra role behavior especially in Malaysian context.

Moorman (1991), while examining the relationship between organizational justice and employees' behavioral outcomes, argued for measuring non- traditional types of behavior such as ERB. According to him traditional outcomes like job performance depends upon several factors beyond the control of the person. On the contrary, extra-role behavior (ERB) are on-the-job behaviors that are not usually captured by traditional job descriptions and thus, are more likely to be under personal control (Organ, 1977; 1997).

Organizational justice is likely to show a strong relationship to self-reported ERB (conceptualized as proactive and challenging). A meta-analysis of predominantly Western studies by Colquitt *et al.*, (2001) showed that ERB directed towards individuals (e.g. helping) was most strongly related to interpersonal justice, followed by informational and procedural justice and then distributive justice. ERB directed towards the organization (e.g. voice) was most strongly related to broadly-defined procedural justice, closely followed by distributive justice and then informational justice. This suggests that all four justice components are related to ERB, but the extent is likely to differ across different cultural contexts. Depending on the particular cultural context and dominant values, individuals may pay more or less attention to organizational justice.

A good number of studies have been conducted on the antecedents and consequences of traditionally defined OCB (conceptualized as cooperative and non-challenging). For example, Turnipseed (1996) examined the relationship between organizational citizenship and the

environment in which that citizenship behaviour is manifested. He also examined whether good citizenship is a personal characteristic that is demonstrated irrespective of the environment. The sample of the study were officers in the US army. The findings supported the OCB and work environment relationship. He reported that work environment promoting involvement and task orientation significantly contributed to OCB. The study also found a significant correlation between citizenship behaviour and individual productivity. Gautam *et al.*, (2005) examined the factor structure of OCB and identified two usable ones in Nepalese organizations. These were: altruism and compliance, replicating traditional Western models of OCBs. Further they investigated the relationship of these two factors with three dimensions of organizational commitment, namely, affective, normative, and continuance. The results indicated a positive relationship of both factors of OCBs with affective as well as normative commitment. However, continuance commitment was negatively related to compliance and showed no relationship with altruism.

Some studies have also examined the antecedents and consequences of OCBs as well as some methodological issues in the Malaysian context. For example, Othman *et al.*, (2005) hypothesized that psychological contract violation during the process of organizational downsizing influenced employees' justice perception which moderated citizenship behaviour. They reported partial support for the model. Abdullah and Mohd Nasrudin (2008) examined the relationship between Organizational Justice (OJ, Distributive and Procedural Justice) and OCB in the Malaysian hospitality industry. They reported significant relationship between OJ and OCB. Lo, Ramayah and Hui (2006) investigated the role of quality of the leader-member relationship (LMX) in promoting OCB among executives and managers in Malaysian manufacturing organizations. They found significant contribution of LMX on employees' citizenship behaviour. Khalid and Ali (2005) compared the self rating scores with supervisor's ratings of employees' citizenship behaviour and found the two to be positively correlated, though the mean score of self rating was higher than supervisor's rating.

### 3.2 CONCEPT OF CULTURE AND VALUES AND JUSTICE EFFECTS

The effect of organizational justice perception on work behaviour such as ERB may vary on the basis of values among cultural groups. Depending upon the cultural context and the dominant values, the concern for justice may vary and should uniquely influence employees' work behaviour. The study assumed that culture refers to shared meaning



and value systems (Hofstede, 2001) and may be treated as contextual variables (Poortinga and van de Vijver, 1987) having normative influence on individuals within cultures. Two cultural facets which have been extensively researched, namely, power distance and individualism - collectivism (see Hofstede, 1991; 2001 for details), are directly relevant to this study. Power distance is conceptualized as the degree to which people accept unequal distribution of power in a society. Individualism is the extent to which people value personal freedom, self sufficiency, control over their lives, and appreciation of the unique qualities that distinguish them from others. Collectivism is defined as the extent to which people value duty to groups to which they belong and, to group harmony (McShane and Von Glinow, 2008).

Schwartz (1992) conceptualized value clusters into ten motivational types having two opposing dimensions. One of them ranges from self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism to preference for security, conformity, and tradition. The former is labelled as 'openness to change' and the latter as 'conservation.' This dimension summarizes a conflict between emphasis on one's own independent thoughts, actions, and interests as well as positive attitude towards change at the end, whereas the opposite end reflects a submission of oneself, preservation of traditional practices, valuing and protecting the stability of one's life, and attempts to preserve the status quo. Schwartz's conceptualization is similar to Hofstede's concept of power distance where openness to change reflects lower power distance and conservation indicates higher power distance. Studies have shown the validity of this dimension as a predictor of cultural differences in organizational attitude and behaviour such as co-operation, competition, and conflict management styles (Kozan and Ergin, 1999; Morris *et al.*, 1998; Schwartz, 1996).

Those who value conservation are likely to accept decisions made by their superiors, without questioning or scrutinizing them in terms of perceived justice. Their social relations are more likely to be role constrained and they are less likely to focus on the quality of their relationship with superiors, because they already accept their position in the workplace. This acceptance is motivated by their belief in social order, obedience to authorities, and acceptance of their position within the social order. They do not need relational information in the form of justice to determine their social standing (Fischer and Smith, 2006). On the other hand, those who value openness to change over conservation are more likely to focus on justice as they are less concerned with preserving social order or traditional role obligations. Rather than



emphasizing loyalty, obedience, and role obligation, they would focus more on the quality of treatment (Tyler *et al.*, 2000). Concern for justice consequently becomes more salient in this case. Using Schwartz's value profile, Fontaine and Richardson (2005) examined the differences among three racial groups in Malaysia, namely, Malay, Chinese, and Indian. They reported more similarities than differences among them. Overall the mean scores for the three groups suggested that they preferred respect for tradition and cultural embeddedness.

According to Lind *et al.*, (1997) in hierarchical or high power distance societies, people are embedded in groups with strong power differentials. These individuals are used to unequal distribution of power and may be less likely to focus on justice issues. There is evidence to suggest that those who held more egalitarian values were more strongly influenced by justice concerns, whereas those who believed that power should be distributed unequally were not influenced in their job attitudes by lack of justice (such as voice and participation in decision making, Brockner *et al.*, 2001). Farh *et al.*, (1997) found that traditional values served as moderators of the organizational justice-extra-role behaviour relationship. Strong moderator effects were found in particular for distributive and interpersonal justice dimensions.

Similarly, studies suggest that work relationships in collectivistic settings are often seen in terms of family. Employees are more concerned with maintaining harmonious relationships within their immediate work groups (Erdogan and Liden, 2005). Collectivists are also more likely to maintain relationships even when these relationships are not personally advantageous any more (Triandis, 1995). Obligation and loyalty are important. Therefore, in collectivistic settings, it is likely that employees are less concerned with organizational justice and are less likely to monitor the extent to which they are fairly treated or to what extent they have received the rewards. Collectivists will engage in helping behaviour or make suggestions that will benefit the organization, relatively independent of organizational justice. In contrast, employees in individualistic settings are more concerned with rational calculation of costs and benefits in their work relations (Triandis, 1995).

#### 4. HYPOTHESIS

Studies conducted on Malaysian social values generally identify it with high power distance, and collectivism (Asma, 1996; Hofstede, 2001; Carl, Gupta and Javidan, 2003; Fontaine and Richardson, 2005). Based

on the arguments advanced by Lind *et al.*, (1997) about individual's behavior in a power distance society and Triandis' (1995) description of collectivistic culture where obligations and loyalty takes priority over justice issues, as well as Schwartz's (1996) interpretation of conservation values and behaviour, the study expected *no significant relationship between organizational justice components and ERB in a high power distance and collectivistic society such as Malaysia.*

## 5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 5.1. SAMPLE AND METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Subjects of the study were students enrolled in the MBA executive program at a public university in Malaysia. English is the medium of instruction in this university and all the students had good command of this language. Therefore, the questionnaires were administered in English. In all, a sample of 81 employees (Female = 42; Male = 39) belonging to 14 organizations from a variety of industries (agriculture, manufacturing, electricity and gas, transportation/storage, communication, finance, community service, entertainment, education, health, consulting and research services, and information technology) participated in the study. They represented both managerial (n = 41) and non-managerial positions (n = 40). The mean age was 33.16 and had a fair mix of races belonging to the Malaysian population. (Malay = 71.6%; Chinese = 21%; Indian = 7.4%). On an average they were working with the present organization for a period of 3.3 years.

Surveys were always completed outside work hours. It was stressed that completion and submission of the questionnaire was entirely voluntary and that answers were treated anonymously. The data collection method did not allow an exact calculation of response rates.

### 5.2 MEASUREMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

The organizational justice measure developed by Colquitt (2001) was used in the study. This scale measures procedural, distributive, informational and interpersonal aspects of organizational justice. It has been developed and validated in the US (Colquitt, 2001). The 7- point scale (1 = not at all; 7 = to a great extent) consisted of 20 items - seven measuring procedural justice, four measuring interactional justice, five informational justice, and four measuring distributive justice.

To examine the empirical validity, the scale was factor analyzed using principal axis method with varimax rotation, limiting factor extraction to Eigen value not to be less than 1.00. The method yielded four usable factors and validated the a-priori scale dimensions. Together they explained 61.13 percent of the variance. Factor loadings, descriptive statistics, and reliability values are displayed in Table 1.

Factor 1 consisted of five items, of which four belonged to the original interactional justice scale dimension and one to the informational justice. Factor 2 consisted of four items which belonged to the distributive justice dimension of the scale. Four items designed to measure informational justice were loaded on Factor 3 while Factor 4 consisted of three items from the procedural justice dimension of the scale. Thus Factor 1 was labeled as interactional justice, Factor 2 as distributive justice, Factor 3 as informational justice and Factor 4 as procedural justice. Alpha values demonstrated good reliability of the scale dimensions. Mean values of the four organizational justice facets were on the lower side of the scale. Interactional justice obtained the highest endorsement of 3.99 on a 7- point scale (See Table 1).

### 5.3 MEASUREMENT OF EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIOR.

The study used the helping and voice scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). The scale consisted of 12 items, seven measuring helping and five measuring voice behavior. Responses were obtained on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

Factor analysis using the same procedure as followed earlier with organizational justice scale, yielded two usable factors providing empirical validity to the a-priori scale dimensions. Factor 1 consisted of 6 items from the original 'helping' dimension and Factor 2 included all five items of the original 'voice' dimension of the scale. Thus, the two extracted factors were labeled as 'helping' and 'voice' respectively. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 2. Alpha values demonstrated good reliability of the scale dimensions. Mean scores of the two dependent measures, namely, helping and voice were moderate. Helping behavior showed higher endorsement (Mean = 4.6) compared to voice (Mean = 4.44).

TABLE 1  
Factor Structure of Organizational Justice Scale

Items	Factor loadings			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Has s/he treated you in a polite manner?	<b>.76</b>	.04	.21	-.06
Has s/he treated you with dignity?	<b>.81</b>	.20	.27	-.04
Has s/he treated you with respect?	<b>.78</b>	.14	.29	-.06
Has s/he refrained from improper remarks or comments?	<b>.76</b>	.10	.00	.14
Has s/he been candid in communications with you?	<b>.75</b>	.18	.14	.24
Does your outcome reflect the effort you have put into your work?	.18	<b>.77</b>	.20	.05
Is your outcome appropriate for the work you have completed?	.08	<b>.81</b>	.29	.07
Does your outcome reflect what you have contributed to the organization?	.03	<b>.66</b>	.27	.28
Is your outcome justified, given your performance?	.07	<b>.60</b>	.28	.23
Has s/he explained the procedures leading to a decision thoroughly?	.17	.14	<b>.59</b>	.05
Were his/her explanations regarding the procedures leading to a decision reasonable?	.19	.21	<b>.70</b>	.21
Has s/he communicated details in a timely manner?	.21	.23	<b>.63</b>	.27
He s/he seemed to tailor his/her communications to individual needs?	.18	.20	<b>.70</b>	.20
Have you been able to express your views and feelings during these procedures?	.01	.24	.19	<b>.79</b>
Have you had influence over the outcomes arrived at by those procedures?	.09	.19	-.05	<b>.65</b>
Have you been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures?	.06	-.03	.25	<b>.63</b>
% Variance	18.69	16.49	14.51	11.43
Mean	3.99	3.52	3.66	3.16
SD	1.06	.82	1.04	.79
Alpha	.82	.92	.89	.90

TABLE 2  
Factor structure of ERB Scale

Items	Factor loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
I help orient new employees in this group	<b>.66</b>	.22
I attend functions that help this work group	<b>.76</b>	.31
I help others in this group with their work for the benefit of this work group	<b>.76</b>	.23
I get involved to benefit this work group	<b>.81</b>	.31
I help others in this group learn about the work	<b>.78</b>	.30
I help others in this group with their work responsibilities	<b>.51</b>	.29
I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group	.29	<b>.62</b>
I speak up and encourage others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group	.23	<b>.73</b>
I communicate my opinions about work issues to others in my group even if my opinion is different and others in the group disagree with me	.27	<b>.81</b>
I keep well informed about the issues where my opinion might be useful to my work group	.23	<b>.84</b>
I speak up in my group with ideas for projects or changes in procedures	.34	<b>.87</b>
	34.76	33.37
% Variance		
Mean	4.60	4.44
SD	.74	.78
Alpha	.91	.92

## 6. RESULTS

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix of the study variables. The correlation coefficient suggested that all four dimensions of organizational justice were significantly correlated. Also, helping and voice dimensions of the ERB scale were significantly correlated. Significant correlations were also obtained between 'helping' and all dimensions of organizational justice, except procedural justice. Voice as ERB did not correlate with interactional justice but yielded significant correlations with the other three justice variables.

Gender (coded as male = 1, female = 2) was negatively correlated with both ERB factors suggesting females were less interested in extra roles. Also tenure yielded negative relationship with interactional justice

TABLE 3  
Factor structure of ERB Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1									
2	<b>.38</b>								
3	<b>.68</b>	<b>.63</b>							
4	<b>.19</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.41</b>						
5	<b>.26</b>	<b>.29</b>	<b>.28</b>	.02					
6	.12	<b>.33</b>	<b>.32</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.68</b>				
7	-.12	.07	-.16	-.07	<b>.23</b>	.16			
8	-.10	-.04	-.15	-.13	<b>-.27</b>	<b>-.25</b>	.03		
9	<b>-.18</b>	.14	-.08	-.12	<b>.19</b>	.17	<b>.85</b>	<b>-.24</b>	
10	<b>.19</b>	-.13	.07	-.14	-.17	<b>-.26</b>	<b>-.54</b>	<b>-.47</b>	<b>-.47</b>

Notes: 1 IntJ, 2. DstJ, 3. InfJ, 4. Proj, 5. Help, 6.Voice, 7. Age, 8. Gender, 9. Tenure, 10.Postn.

indicating that seniority and perception of interactional justice were inversely correlated. However, age of employees was positively correlated with help dimension of ERB. Correlation was also positive and significant between job position and interactional justice, suggesting that non-managerial staff gave higher endorsement to this aspect of organizational justice compared to managers.

In order to examine the contribution of organizational justice variables on ERB, the data was subjected to multiple regression analysis. Table 4 displays the result.

Since most of the intercorrelations among independent variables were significant, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) option of the SPSS

was used to detect multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is when there is high correlation among the independent variables. This can distort the standard error of estimation; therefore, it can lead to incorrect conclusions as to which independent variable is statistically significant (Lind, Marchal and Wathen, 2003). Oslon (n.d) states that a VIF of 4 or more is considered to be indicative of severe collinearity because it indicates that about 75% of the variance in the independent variable is shared. VIF for the four organizational justice variables used as predictors of ERB were under acceptable level ( $< 4$ ), thus minimizing the problem of multicollinearity.

TABLE 4  
Regression predicting HELPING and VOICE as extra role behavior

Predictors	HELPING			VOICE		
	St. $\beta$	$t$	Sig	St. $\beta$	$t$	Sig
DistJ	0.25	1.66	0.10	0.16	1.06	0.29
ProJ	0.23	1.84	0.07	0.01	0.06	0.94
IntrJ	0.09	0.61	0.54	-0.12	-0.78	0.43
InfoJ	0.18	0.19	0.34	0.28	1.58	0.11
Age	0.35	1.60	0.11	0.10	0.44	0.65
Gender	-0.23	-0.21	0.03	-0.20	-1.81	0.07
Tenure	-0.24	-1.10	0.27	-0.06	-0.27	0.78
Position	-0.08	-0.68	0.49	-0.18	-1.39	0.16
	Adj. $R^2 = 0.17$ ; $F = 3.12$			Adj. $R^2 = 0.15$ , $F = 2.82$		

The regression result indicated no significant contribution of any organizational justice factors on the two dependent measures, namely, helping and voice, except gender. In case of 'helping,' all the independent variables entered in the equation together explained 17 percent of the variance. Similarly in case of 'voice,' where all independent variables entered in the equation explained 15 percent of the variance. Thus the regression result demonstrated overall significance of the model, though the contributions of independent variables were not so, except for gender on helping behavior. The negative contribution of gender on ERB (Help) may be interpreted that female employees in Malaysia are less inclined to this form of extra roles.



## 7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study provided a number of significant results. First, it provided empirical support to the four dimensional measure of organizational justice developed by Colquitt (2001) and the two dimensional measure of ERB developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). Secondly, the study distinguished itself from previous studies on organizational citizenship behavior in the Malaysian context by employing a measure that captured proactive and challenging aspects of extra-role behavior rather than cooperative and non-challenging facets of OCBs. Thirdly, the result appeared to be in the hypothesized direction, as none of the organizational justice components made any significant impact on either 'helping' or 'voice' dimensions of extra role behavior.

The findings, therefore, supported the arguments that in a high power distance and collectivistic society, individuals are used to unequal distribution of power and may be less likely to focus on justice issues (Lind et al., 1997; Brockner *et al.*, 2001). On the contrary, in egalitarian societies people are more influenced by justice concerns.

Likewise, collectivists are also more likely to maintain relationships even when these relationships are not personally advantageous any more (Triandis, 1995). Obligation and loyalty are more important. Therefore, in collectivistic settings, it is likely that employees are less concerned with organizational justice and are less likely to monitor the extent to which they are fairly treated or to what extent they have received the rewards. Collectivists will engage in helping behavior or make suggestions that will benefit the organization, relatively independent of organizational justice. The result validated this argument. Also it is in line with Schwartz's conceptualization of values and arguments made by others (Kozan and Ergin, 1999; Morris *et al.*, 1998; Schwartz, 1996) that people having preference for conservation value are likely to accept decisions made by their superiors, without questioning or scrutinizing them in terms of perceived justice. Therefore, any form of justice or injustice is not likely to influence their work behavior.

The results differed from Western literature (e.g. Colquitt *et al.*, 2001) which indicated significant contributions of the four forms of organizational justice on the two dimensions of extra role behavior. The finding also goes against those who reported significant relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior in Malaysia (for example, Abdullah and Mohd Nasrudin, 2008).

## 8. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

There are several limitations to the study. First of all, the study did not employ any measure for cultural values and was based on the findings of other studies on culture and values across nations. Secondly, the results are based on a small sample, thus limiting the generalizations of the findings. Also causal explanation cannot be made from the cross sectional design of the study. Most importantly, the measure of distributive justice in the study was based on the equity principle. There may be other bases of distribution, such as equality and need, which may be culturally more significant in the Malaysian context. Further studies are suggested to examine these issues. Nonetheless, the study provides valuable empirical validity to the four and two dimensional constructs of organizational justice and extra role behavior respectively. It also identifies the unique influence of culture on organizational behavior in Malaysia.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M.H. and Mohd Nasrudin, A. "Investigating the Influence of Organizational Justice on Hotel Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior Intentions and Turnover Intentions." *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality Tourism*, 7 (2008): 1-23.
- Adams, J.S. "Inequity in Social Exchange." In Berkowitz, L. (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Asma, A. *Going Glocal: Cultural Dimension in Malaysian Management*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management, 1996.
- Begley, T.M., C. Lee, Y. Fang and J. Li. "Power Distance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Justice and Employee Outcomes in a Sample of Chinese Employees." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 17, (2002): 692-711.
- Bies, R.J. and J.S. Moag. "Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness." In R.J. Lewicki, B.H. Sheppard and B.H. Bazerman (eds.). *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, vol. 9. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1986.

- Bolino, M.C. and W.H. Turnley. "Old Faces, New Places: Equity Theory in Cross Cultural Contexts." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (2007).
- Brockner, J., G. Ackerman, J. Greenberg, M.J. Gelfand, A.M. Francesco, Z.X. Chen, K. Leung, G. Bierbrauer, C. Gomez, B.L. Kirkman and D. Shapiro. "Cultural and Procedural Justice: The Influence of Power Distance on Reactions to Voice." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37 (2001): 300-315.
- Carl, G., V. Gupta and M. Javidan. "Power Distance." In R.J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (eds). *GLOBE, Cultures, Leadership, and Organizations: GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. CA: Sage, 2003.
- Chiaburu, D.S. and V.L. Baker. "Extra-role Behaviors Challenging the Status-quo: Validity and antecedents of taking charge behaviors." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21, no. 7 (2006): 620-637.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. and P.E. Spector. "The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86 (2001):278-321.
- Colquitt, J.A. "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of Measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, no. 3, (2001): 386-400.
- Colquitt, J.A., D.E. Conlon, D.E., M.J. Wesson, C.O. L.H. Porter and K.Y. Ng. "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (2001): 425-445.
- Cropanzano, R. and J. Greenberg. "Progress in Organizational Justice: Tunneling Through the Maze." In C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12. Chichester, UK: Wiley (1997): 317-372.
- Erdogan, B., and R.C. Liden. "Collectivism as a Moderator of Responses to Organizational Justice: Implications for Leader-Member Exchange and Ingratiation." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27 (2005): 1-17.
- Farh, J. L., C.B. Zhong and D.W. Organ. "Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China." *Organization Science*, 15 (2004): 241-253.
- Farh, J. L., P.C. Earley and S. Lin. "A Cultural Analysis of Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Chinese Society." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42 (1997): 421-444.

- Fischer, R. *Organizational Justice and Culture in Europe*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex, UK, 2002.
- Fischer, R. and P.B. Smith. "Who Cares About Justice? The Moderating Effect of Values on the Link between Organizational Justice and Work Behaviour." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 55 no. 4 (2006): 541-562.
- Fischer, R. et al. "Are Perceptions of Organizational Justice Universal? An Exploration of Measurement Invariance across Thirteen Cultures." (Manuscript submitted for publication), 2008.
- Folger, R. and R. Cropanzano. *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Fountaine, R. and S. Richardson. "Cultural Values in Malaysia: Chinese, Malays, and Indian Compared," *Cross Cultural Management* 12, no. 4 (2005): 63-77.
- Frese, M., W. Kring, A. Soose and J. Zempel. "Personal Initiative at Work: Differences Between East and West Germany." *Academy of Management Journal* 39, (1996):37-63.
- Gautam, T., R.V. Dick, U. Wagner, N. Upadhyay and A.J. Davis. "Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment in Nepal." *Asian Journal of Psychology*, 8 (2005): 302-314.
- Greenberg, J. "The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and Informational Classes of Organizational Justice." In Cropanzano, R. (ed). *Justice in the Workplace Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, 79-103, 1993.
- Hofstede, G. *Culture and Organizations: Software of the Minds*. NY: McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)* CA: Sage, 2001.
- House, R. J., P.J Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (eds.) *GLOBE, Cultures, Leadership, and Organizations: GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 2003.
- Khalid, S.A. and H.C. Ali. "Self and Superior Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Are There Differences in the Source of Ratings?" *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 4, (2005): 147-153.

- Kozan, M.K. and C. Ergin. "The Influence of Intra-cultural value Differences on Conflict Management Practices." *International Journal of Conflict Management* 10 (1999): 249-267.
- Lam, S.S.K., J. Schaubroeck and S. Aryee, "Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross-National Study." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23 (2002): 1-18.
- Leung, K. and M.H. Bond. "The Impact of Cultural Collectivism on Reward Allocation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (1984): 793-804.
- Leventhal, G.S. "What Should be Done With Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships." In K.J.Gergen, M.S. Greenberg, and R.H. Willis (eds), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*, 27-54. New York: Plenum, 1998.
- Lind, D.A., G. Marchal, and S.A. Warthen. "*Basic Statistics for Business Economics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) NY: McGraw-Hills. 2003.
- Lind, E.A., T.R Tyler and Y.J. Huo. "Procedural Context and Culture: Variations in the Antecedents of Procedural Justice Judgments." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73, (1997): 767-780.
- Lo, M.C., T. Ramayah and J.K.S Hui. "An investigation of Leader Member Exchange Effects on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Malaysia." *Journal of Business and Management*, 12 (2006): 5-23.
- McShane, S.L. and M.A.Von Glinow. *Organizational Behavior*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2008.
- Moorman, R.H. "Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76, (1991): 845-855.
- Morris, M.W., K.Y. Williams, K. Leung, R. Larrick, M.T. Mendoza, D. Bhatnagar, J. Li, M. Kondo, J.L. Luo and J.C. Hu. "Conflict Management Styles: Accounting for Cross-national Differences." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29 (1998): 729-747.
- Organ, D.W. "A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of Satisfaction Causes Performance Hypothesis." *Academy of Management Review*, 2 (1977): 46-53.
- Organ, D.W. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington MA: Lexington Books. 1988.

- Organ, D.W. "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors." In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Straw (eds). *Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 12*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. 42-72.
- Organ, D.W. "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean –Up Time." *Human Performance* 10, (1997): 85-97.
- Oslon, B.L. (n.d). "Regression Analysis: Issues of Multicollinearity Too Often Overlooked." Retrieved Jan 10, 2007 from <http://iaca.net/resources/articles/multicollinearity-article.pdf>.
- Othman, R., A. Rashida, H. Noor Azuan and M. Rosmah. "Psychological Contract Violation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Gaja Mada International Journal of Business* 7, (2005): 325-349.
- Poortinga, Y.H. and F.J. R. van de Vijver. "Exploring Cross – Cultural Differences: Bias Analysis and Beyond." *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* 18, (1987): 259-282.
- Prahalad, C.K. and G. Hamel. *Competing for the Future*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Smith, P. B. and M.H. Bond. *Social Psychology Across Cultures*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall. 1998.
- Smith, P. B., M.H. Bond and C. Kagitcibasi. "Understanding Social Psychology Across Cultures: Living and Working in a Changing World." London: Sage, 2005.
- Schwartz, S.H. "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries." In M.P. Zanna (ed). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 25, pp 1- 65. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1992.
- Schwartz, S.H. "Value Priorities and Behavior: Applying a Theory of Integrated Value Systems. In C. Seligman, J.M. Olson and M.P. Zanna (eds). *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*," , pp. 1-24, NJ: Erlbaum, 1996.
- Triandis, H. *Individualism-Collectivism*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1995.
- Turnipseed, D. "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Examination of the Influence of the Workplace." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 17, (1996): 42-47.
- Tyler, T. R., E.A. Lind and Y.J. Huo. "Cultural Values and Authority Relations: The Psychology of Conflict Resolution across Cultures." *Psychology, Public Policy and Law* 6, (2000): 1138-1163.

- Van Dyne, L. and J.A. LePine. "Helping and Voice Extra-Role Behaviors: Evidence of Construct and Predictive Validity." *Academy of Management Journal*, 41 (1998): 108-119.
- Van Dyne, L., L.L. Cummings and J.M. Parks. "Extra-Role Behaviors: In Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity. In L. L. Cummings & B. Staw (eds). *Research in Organizational Behavior* , vol. 19. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, (1995): 214-285.
- Van den Bos, K., E.A. Lind, R. Vermount and H.A.M Wilke. "How do I Judge My Outcome When I Do Not Know the Outcome of Others? The Psychology of Fair Process Effect." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72, (1997): 1034-1046.