PERCIEVED GENDER DISCRIMINATION AS A MODERATOR IN THE RELATION BETWEEN INTERACTION JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Asong Joseph, Chua Bee Seok & Jasmine Adela Mutang[1]

Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah

e-mail: song.aj24@gmail.com[1]; chuabs@ums.edu.my[2]; jasmine@ums.edu.my[3]

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the effect of interaction justice toward organizational citizenship behavior and perceived gander discrimination as a moderator in the relation between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as are pro-social or extra-role behaviors performed outside the scope of a job description or typical job-specific tasks. There are many factors that can influence organizational citizenship behavior of an employee. Organizational citizenship behavior can increase the effectiveness and performance in organization. At the same time, fairness interaction between managers and employees can also increase the effectiveness and performance in organization. Interactions justice within the organization plays a role in shaping the behavior of employees in the organization citizenship and colleagues. Unfair treatment creates a different perception among employees. Perception of the fairness of interaction has an important role to improve organizational citizenship behavior. A total of 453 employees in Kota Kinabalu were involved as respondents in study. Studies using survey questionnaires: Organizational Justice Survey (OJS); Perceived Discrimination; Organizational Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire (OCBs). The analysis found a positive significant effect of interaction justice toward organizational citizenship behavior and gender discrimination was not a moderate the relationship between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Theoretical and practical implications of the results are discussed.

Keywords: interaction justice, gender discrimination and organizational citizenship behaviors.

INTRODUCTION

Organization consists of a group of people working together to achieve a goal. The main component of the organization is manager and employees interact with one other. Interaction is a field that connects two or more persons in a same time. Within the organization, interaction is also used as a channel for communication between workers either employee or manager.

Interaction within the organization is required to build a good teamwork with the nature of cooperation and mutual help among one another. According to De Vito (1995), individuals who have the ability to communicate with others will be more open and not judged any disagreement as an opportunity to bring down, but instead look for opportunities to understand the circumstances to improve the interaction. The statement is further supported by the finding Joseph and Chen (2004) stated that individuals who have good communication able to create a quality teamwork. Therefore by interpersonal communication is one of the factors that influence the effectiveness learning of teamwork and develop a conducive work environment.

Kim (2009) found that employees who perceived that they were treated fairly by their company tended to develop and maintain communal relationships with the company. Organizational justice, which refers to people's perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from organizations, is important as a basic requirement for the effective functioning of organizations.

Good and fair interaction between manager and employee will enhance the effectiveness and performance of the organization. According to Moorman (2001) organizational justice is defined as employees' perception that they are treated fairly by employers and organizations in their careers. Justice within the organization played an important role in influencing beliefs, feelings, attitudes and behavior of employees. Organizations justice can lead to the high commitment beyond the terms of reference of an employee (Yaghobi, Javadi & Agha-Rahimi, 2010). Colquitt (2001) suggested that there are four constructs (scale) in justice organizations, distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and justice information. Bies and Moag (1986) introduced the concept of interaction justice which included two constructs of justice (interpersonal justice and informational justice). According to Bies and Moas interaction justice is the most recent advance in the justice literature by focusing attention on the importance of the quality of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented.

Interaction Justice. Bies and Moag (1986) referred to interpersonal and informational of justice as "interactional justice." More recently, interactional justice has come to be seen as consisting of two specific types of interpersonal treatment. First of all, labeled interpersonal justice reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. Next, labeled informational justice, focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion.

Interactional justice implies respect and honesty in the conduct of social interactions with people (Blakely et al., 2005). in addition, the quality of behavior among persons that is feeling by someone is interactional justice (Moshref-Javadi et al., 2006). Interactional justice is a way that transfers organizational justice by supervisors to subordinates. This type of justice related to aspects of the communication process (such as politeness, honesty and respect) between the transmitter and receiver of justice (Bahari-Far and Javaheri-Kamel, 2010).

Interaction justice can be defined as the interactions or treatment or treatment directed toward members of an organization by their supervisor (DeConinck & Johnson, 2009). It's also referring to the quality of the interpersonal treatment that employees receive as procedures are implemented and rewards and outcomes are distributed (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Perceived Discrimination. Perceived discrimination is defined as a person's perception that he/she is mistreated due his/her group membership (Ensher et al., 2001). It's has been found (by Holocomb-McCoy & Addison-Bradley, 2005; Levin, Van Laar, & Foote, 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003) as a negative relationship with one's attitudes and behaviors. Harris et al. (2004) also found that perceived discrimination is likely to affect other important industry and organizational psychology variables of interest, such as turnover, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior. Perceived discrimination is determined by how well a particular event or incident reflects widely held beliefs, expectation and norms about (the violation of) social responsibility. An

important variable in understanding perceptions of discrimination may be subgroup identity. Remarkably, that people who more strongly identify with a particular subgroup which has historically experienced discrimination will be more likely to perceive discrimination in a selection or promotion context than those who do not identify with the group (King. 2003).

The perception of fairness is important in predicting the occurrence of organizational citizenship behavior. Williams, Pitre and Zainuba (2002) found that perception of interactional justice influenced an employee's intention to perform citizenship behaviors. The employees who believed that they personally were treated fairly by their supervisor were more likely to exhibit citizenship behaviors. It also means that employees who felt supported by their supervisor were more willing to perform citizenship activities.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are work-related activities performed by employees such behaviors increase organizational effectiveness but are beyond the scope of job description and formal, contractual sanctions or incentives. Organ et al. (2006) defined the organizational citizenship behaviors as an individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization.

Moorman and Blakely (1995) suggested the four dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. These dimensions are interpersonal helping. individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism. Interpersonal helping focuses on helping co-workers whenever such help is needed. Individual initiative describes communication to others in the work place help to improve individual and group performance. Personal industry relates to specific tasks that are not part of the job description or task performance above and beyond normal role expectations. Loyalty boosterism focuses on promoting the organization's image to others.

The purpose in the present study aimed to determine the interaction justice and gender discrimination on the intention of employees to perform OCB.

Objective:
1. To study the influence of interaction justice toward organizational citizenship behaviors.
2. To study the role perceived gender discrimination as moderation effect in the relationship of interaction justice and organizational citizenship behaviors.

METHODS

Participants. The participants of this study were chosen by using the purposive random sampling method. A total of 453 employees participated in this study. The participants consisted of 206 males and 247 females (M = 1.55, SD = 0.5). The participants were selected from multiple races background which is 65.6% Sabah natives, 19.4% Melayu, 6.4% Chinese, 2.9% Sarawak natives and 10.8% from others races (M = 2.67, SD 0.99). The totals of 73.5% participants are from government and 26.5% from private sector (M = 1.26, SD 0.44).

Location. This study was conducted in private and government organizations in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah. The Organizations involved *Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Lembaga Pembangunan Perumahan dan Bandar, Dewan Bandaraya Kota Kinabalu, Jabatan Perangkaan Neferi Sabah,* Sabah Land Development Board, Sabah Electricity Sdn Bhd and New Tech Furniture Sdn Bhd.

Measures. Interaction justice was measured using the 9-item scale validated in Colquitt (2001). Respondents used a 5-point Likert scale that range from 1 = *never* to 5 = *always*. Interaction justice was divided into two construct which is interpersonal justice and informational justice. The first 4 items is an interpersonal justice where asked about reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. The second set of 5 items is an informational justice where assessed participant on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain fashion. The reliability (Coefficient alpha values) of interpersonal justice was 0.920 and 0.930 for informational justice.

Perceived gender discrimination were adapted from a scale used by Sanchez and Brock (1996) to measure perceived race discrimination. The word "ethnicity" was replaced were replaced with "gender" on all items to reflect age discrimination. An example item is: "I have been denied a promotion because of my gender". The Cronbach's Alpha for the scale's reliability in this study was 0.962.

Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured by using Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Questionnaire (OCBs) developed by Moorman and Blakely (1995). This questionnaire consisted of 19 items. Employee response were obtained on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. It measures four dimensions of OCB which is interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyalty boosterism. The reliability (Coefficient alpha values) of this instrument was 0.931.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1
Hierarchical Regression of Influence Interaction Justice toward Organizational Citizenship Behavior

variables	Constant	R2	F	F sig	β	t	t sig
Interpersonal justice					.103	1.527	.127
Informational justice	3.024	.097	3.024	.000	.226	3.343	.001

The multiple regression analysis showed that both predictors which are interpersonal justice and informational justice influence significantly toward organizational citizenship behavior. Where, the value of interpersonal justice β = 0.103, p <0.01 and informational justice recorded the β = 0.226, p <0.01 with a contribution of 9.7 percent of the variance (r = .312) changes in the variance of organizational

citizenship behavior [F (2,250) = 24 185, p <0.01]. The result found the interaction justice will influence organization citizenship behavior. In other words, employees who experienced interpersonal and informational justice in the organization will improve their citizenship behavior.

These findings also supported by Farrell (2005) who reported organization justice had a significant influence toward organizational citizenship behavior. When the trust is formed among the workers, the workers will increase their OCB in organizations. Justice in the organization and conduct of a manager are able to influence the beliefs, feelings, behaviors and attitudes of employees in the organization (Colquitt, Wesson, Porter, Conlon and Yee Ng, 2001). It is also supported by Yaghobi, Javadi and Agha-Rahimi (2010) by stating that justice can cause high and committed employees perform any work beyond their duty. Colquitt et al., (2010) with the results of the analysis found significant positive regression between organizational justice and OCB. This explains the workers who suffer justice organizations tend to do their job well and helps other colleagues with regard to the task. However, the small variance contribution of interaction justice towards OCB indicating that the interaction justice is not the major predictor of OCB. Sjahruddin et al. (2013) found that interaction justice (justice organization) has insignificant effect directly toward increased OCB.

Table 2
Hierarchical Regression Using Gender Discrimination as a Moderator in the Relationship between Interaction Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Dependent variable	Variables	Std Beta Step 1	Std Beta Step 2	Std Beta Step 3	constant
Organizational citizenship behavior					
	Independent variable: Interaction justice:				
	Interpersonal justice	.218	.179	.244	
	Informational justice	.167	.174	.108	
	Moderator:				
	Gender discrimination		-.156	-.158	
	Interaction term:				
	Gendis X interjustice			-.127	
	Gendis X infor justice			.131	
R^2		.133	.156	.160	
Adjusted R^2		.129	.150	.150	
R^2 Change		.133	.023	.004	
F Change		32.687	11.647	1.016	
Sig. F Change		.000	.001	.363	
Durbin-Watson					1.799

The moderating effect of gender discrimination to the relationship between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The result of the moderated regression analysis of gender discrimination as a moderator on the relationship between each of the interaction justice (i.e. interpersonal justice and

informational justice) and organizational citizenship behavior are shown in table 2. In total, 16 % of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior was explained when all variables were entered. Regression analysis for the first step asserted that the interaction justice was accounted 13.3 % of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior. Interaction justice had a significant positive beta weight in organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the increased of interaction justice in organization were more likely to increase organizational citizenship behavior among employees.

The gender discrimination were entered in the second step, which explaining an additional 12.9 % of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior among employees in organization. Gender discrimination showed a negative beta weight in organizational citizenship behavior and thus, the gender discriminate is the employee, the less likely the employee organizational citizenship behavior.

The moderating effect of gender discrimination in the relationship between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior were entered in the third step. The result showed a non-significant interaction between interaction justice and gender discrimination. The interaction model explained only additional 2.3 % of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior. As a result finding showed that gender discrimination was not a moderate in the relationship between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

The study explains that the perceived gender discrimination did not moderate the relationship between interaction justice and OCB. However, interaction justice has a directly effect to OCB. Sjahruddin et al. (2013) found a positive and significant effect of high organizational justice (interaction justice) that directly tends to increase OCB in positive direction. Tacneaux (2012) found gender discrimination was extensively cause demotivation among employees in an organization, especially when one gender dominates over the other. Study also found that gender discrimination negatively influenced to organizational citizenship behavior. This clarifies that a high of gender discrimination within the organization will decrease the employee citizenship behavior. On the other hand, low gender discrimination within the organization will increase the organizational citizenship behavior.

We were surprised to find that the relationship between interaction justice and OCB was not moderate by perceived gender discrimination, suggesting that interaction justice is enough to affect OCB. Employees seem to form OCB by directly considering the interaction justice in their organization. This may also be influenced by the findings of this study that showing the interaction is not the main predictor of organizational citizenship behavior with only 13.3% variance contribution. This assumption supported by Wan Shahrazad et al., (2013); Sjahruddin et al., (2013); Oren et al., (2013); Indhira (2013) and Batool (2012) which found that organizational justice is one of the predictors toward organizational citizenship behavior. Organ (1997) has produced a variety of other studies testing forecasters organizational citizenship behavior, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of justice, personality and leadership.

In this study a structured model have been developed and tasted that the perceived gender discrimination moderates the interaction justice in organizational citizenship behavior. Some important findings of the study are: Firstly, interaction justice is positively and significantly influenced to organizational citizenship behavior the employees in Kota Kinabalu. Secondly, perceived gender discrimination is negatively and significantly influenced to organizational citizenship behavior the

employees in Kota Kinabalu. Thirdly, perceived gender discrimination was not moderate the relation between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior. So, it can conclude that interaction justice has insignificant effect toward increased organizational citizenship behavior since the gender discrimination does not play a role as moderator in the relation between interaction justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

REFERENCES

Bahari-Far, A., Javaheri-Kamel, M. (2010). The survey of outcomes of organization ethical values. *Journal of Tosse Ensani Police*, 7(28): 95-118.

Batool, s. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: diagnosis of prognostic strength of performance monitoring and organizational justice. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(12): 284-296.

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

Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C., & Moorman. R. H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal o f Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 259-273.

Chang, C.-C. Tsai, M.-C., & Tsai, M.-S. (2011). Influences of the Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Commitments on the Effects of Organizational Learning in Taiwan, *International Conference on E-business, Management and Economics IPEDR 3*, 37-41.

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

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

De Vito, J. (1995). *The Interpersonal Communication Book*. Fourth Edition, New York : Harper and Row Edition.

DeConinck, J. B., & Johnson, J. T. (2009). The effect of perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and organization justice on turnover among salespeople. *Journal of Personal selling and sale management*, 29(4): 333-330.

Dubin, D. F. (2011). The Effects Of Perceived Discrimination, Equal Opportunity Climate, And Team Cohesion On Team Effectiveness In A Military Sample. *Unpublished thesis PhD*. University of Houston.

Ensher. E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 53.

Evans, R. R. (2006). Organization citizenship behavior antecedents: an examination of perceived corporate citizenship, work roles and identity. *Unpublished thesis PhD*. The University of Mississippi.

Farrell, S. K. (2005). Coworker Perceptions of Distributive Justice In Response To Rewarded Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Role Of Attributions. *Unpublished thesis PhD. Northern Illinois University.*

Foley, S., Hang-Yue, N. & Wong, A. (2005). Perceptions of discrimination and justice: are the gender differences in outcomes? *Group & Organization Management.* 30(4), 421-450.

Harris. M. M., Lievens. F. & Hoye. V. (2004). "I think they discriminated against me": using prototype theory and organizational justice theory for understanding perceived discrimination in selection and promotion situation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment.* 12(1) 54-65.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., & Addison-Bradley, C. (2005). African American counselor educators'job satisfaction and perceptions of departmental racial climate. *Counselor Education & Supervision.* 45, 2-15.

Indhira Pratiwi (2013). Analisis pengaruh budaya organisasi dan keadilan organisasi terhadap *Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (OCB) dengan komitmen organisasional sebagai variable Intervening. Unpublished thesis Master. Universitas Diponegoro.

Joseph. C. C. & Chen, J. (2004). *Testing a New Approach for Learning Teamwork Knowledge and Skills in Technical Education. Journal of Industrial Technology,* 20(2): 1-10.

Kim, H. (2009). "Integrating Organizational Justice into the Relationship Management Theory". dlm. http://www.allacademic.com. Retrieved from 3 Mac 2014.

King, K. R. (2003). Do you see what I see? Effects of group consciousness on African American women's attributions to prejudice. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 27, 17-30.

Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Foote, W. (2006). Ethnic segregation and perceived discrimination in college: Mutual influences and effects on social and academic life. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 36(6), 1471-1501.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 76:845-855.

Moorman, R. H. & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 16:127–142.

Moshref-Javadi, M. H., Dalvi, M. R., Abdolbaghi, A. (2006). Organizational justice in the shadow of Alavi justice. *Journal of Modiriyate Farda,* 4(15-16): 1-10.

Oren, L., Tziner, A., Nahshon, Y. & Sharoni, G. (2013). Relations between OCBs. organizational justice, work motivation and self-efficacy. *Journal of Economy.* 15(34): 505-516.

Organ. D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good Soldier Syndrome.* Lexington. MA: Lexington Books.

Organ. D.W., 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance,* 10(2): 85-97.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. P. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences.* London: Sage Publications.

Rezaiean A. Givi ME. Givi HE., & Nasrabadi MB. (2010)," The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The

Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment, Satisfaction and Trust", *Research Journal of Business Management* 4(2), 112-120

Sjahruddin, H., Armanu. Sudiro, A. & Normijati (2013). Personality Effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): Trust in Manager and Organizational Commitment Mediator of Organizational Justice in Makassar City Hospitals (Indonesia) *European Journal of Business and Management,* 5(9), 95-105.

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 84(5), 1079-1092.

Wan Shahrazad Wan Sulaiman, Muhamad Ariff Ibrahim dan M. Sukanthi a/p Mariappa. (2013). Peranan tingkah laku kewargaan organisasi sebagai mediator dalam hubungan antara komitmen organisasi dan prestasi tugas. *Journal of psychology & human development.* 1:29-35.

Williams, S., Pitre, R. & Zaiuba, M. (2002). Justice and organization citizenship behavior intentions: fair rewards versus fair treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology.* 142(1), 33-44.

Yaghobi, M., Javadi, M., Agha-Rahimi, Z. 2010. The relationship between knowledge management and syudents demographic characteristics in Isfahan Medical University. *Iranian Journal of Education in Medical Science.* Number of development and education.