

a807438

Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention in Malaysia: Organizational Justice as a Determinant

By:

C.H. Ponnu
and
C.C. Chuah

(Paper presented at the **14th International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA) Conference** held on 23-24 Jun 2010 in Istanbul, Turkey)

RISALAH

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A515087744

Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention in Malaysia: Organizational Justice as a Determinant

C. H. Ponnu and C.C. Chuah, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, cyrilh@um.edu.my

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the importance of employees' justice perception toward their commitment with an organization and their intention to leave the organization. Numerous studies have been carried out in western countries to investigate the effects of perceived equity among employees. However, there are no such studies done in the Malaysian context. Therefore, this study attempts to fill the gap by investigating the relationship between organizational justice, organizational commitment and turnover intention of Malaysian employees. Using a sample of 172, collected from employees across organizations in the country, both procedural and distributive justice perceptions were significant contributors in explaining organizational commitment and turnover intention. Perceptions of organizational justice (procedural justice and distributive) were positively related to organizational commitment but negatively related to employees' turnover intention. Additional analyses revealed that perception of procedural justice was more important to organizational commitment than perceptions of distributive justice. However, perception of distributive justice was more important to turnover intention than perceptions of procedural justice. These findings have important implications for managers in formulating appropriate strategies, policies and procedures to improve employees' commitment to their organizations and to reduce their turnover intentions.

Keywords: organizational justice, organizational commitment, turnover intention, Malaysia

1. Introduction

Staff retention is one of the greatest human resource challenges faced by organizations today. High employee turnover adversely affects organizations. The costs of high staff turnover is substantial as it involve not only the direct financial costs of replacing staff but also other repercussions such as the potential loss of key skills, knowledge and experience, disruption to operations and the negative effect on workforce morale. In addition, high turnover represents a considerable burden

both on human resource and line managers as they are constantly recruiting and training new staff.

When seeking to resolve the problems associated with high turnover, companies must first investigate the underlying causes. Why do some staff leave and some stay? The reasons are complex and inter-related and to a certain extent are dependant upon individual needs and preferences. The very reasons why some staff stay can be the cause of others leaving. It is therefore important to understand staff and address their needs where feasible and practical.

Existing literature suggests that employees' organizational commitment and intention to leave are two important predictors of employee turnover (Griffeth & Hom, 1995; Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000). In particular, intention to leave has been considered as a proximal antecedent since it captures employees' perceptions and evaluations of job alternatives (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979).

Organizational commitment has significant effect on employees' behavior and is highly correlated with employees' turnover intention. Employees start to consider and search for other opportunities actively once they have the intention to leave the organization. If they find better opportunities, they may quit their current work position. Even if opportunities are unavailable or unattractive, they still may emotionally or mentally withdraw from the organization, leading to increased absenteeism and lowered enthusiasm and effort on the job (Russ & McNeilly, 1995; Jovan Cjhia-Jung Hsu, 2002).

In short, to retain staff, employers should aim to have employees who are emotionally committed to the organization and have no intention to leave the organization. Strategies need to be put in place both in short and long terms. Strategies should in general be applied equally and fairly. In relation to this, it is essential to determine the contributors of employees' commitment with an organization and their intention to leave the organization.

Previous studies reported that the level of perceived fairness play an important role in employees' commitment with an organization and their

intention to leave the organization. According to Adams (1965), the degree of fair treatment relative to others that employees received has been postulated to influence their motivation and performance. This possibly includes of their organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization. The perception of equitable or inequitable treatment may be related to the comparison made within or outside the organization. The outcomes factors may be salary, salary raises, fringe benefits, promotion, incentives and recognition. If the allocation decisions (distributive justice) and the process of allocation decisions (procedural justice) are perceived as fair it should lead to increased employee commitment and reduced tendency to leave the organization (Arif Hassan, 2002)

As mentioned earlier, numerous studies have been carried out in western countries to investigate the effects of perceived equity among employees. These studies have shown that employee perceptions about organizational justice may predict an employee's intention to stay, job satisfaction, evaluation of supervisor and organizational commitment (Cropanzano and Randall, 1993; Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1993; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997)

Locally, there are limited studies that have examined how employees' justice perceptions are related to their commitment with organization and their intention to leave the organization. Therefore, this study attempts to fill a gap by investigating the relationship between organizational justice, organizational commitment and turnover intention of employees in the Malaysia organizations.

1.2 Research Question

The general purpose and objective of the study led to the development of the following specific research questions:

- a) Is the perceived organizational justice (procedural justice and distributive justice) significantly related to organizational commitment?
- b) Is the perceived organizational justice (procedural justice and distributive justice) significantly related to employees' turnover intention?

1.3 Scope of the Study

By referring to the research questions mentioned above, the scope of this study focus on three main constructs: organizational justice, organizational

commitment and turnover intention of employees in the Malaysia.

The study seeks to clarify the links between organizational justice and organizational commitment as well as the links between organizational justice and employees' turnover intention. Besides, the study also examines the impact of perceived organizational justice by employees on their organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Organizational justice describes the perception of individual or groups towards fairness treatment received from the organizations and their responses to such perception (James 1993). In this study, organizational justice refers to two components, procedural justice and distributive justice. It is based upon previous studies of organizational justice, which have identified two major types of employees' justice perception:

- a) Distributive Justice – The fairness of the allocation of rewards by an organization;
- b) Procedural justice – The fairness of the procedure used by an organization in allocating rewards and the voice afforded employees in the allocation process (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Dail Fields, Mary Pang, and Catherine Chiu, 2000).

Organizational commitment is one of the dependent constructs in this study. This study refers to Roberts, Coulson and Chonko's (1999) suggestion; the definition of organizational commitment may be restricted to include employees' attachment to the organization as a result of compliance caused by reward and punishment; affiliation with the referent organization, and internalization of the organization's goals and values as one's own.

We used affective measure of organizational commitment in this study since previous researchers like Hackett, Bycio and Hausdorf (1994) and others found affective commitment is most affected by the nature of one's work experiences (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Affective commitment can be described as an employee's emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in an organization (Allen and Meyer, 1991).

Employees' turnover intention is another dependent construct besides organizational commitment in this study. Intentions can be conceptualized as statements regarding the specific behaviors of interest. As such, turnover intention can be described as a conscious and deliberate willfulness

to leave the organization (Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978)

Lastly, "employees" in the study refers to Malaysian employees who work in organizations located in our nation across different industrial type since the research questions need to be investigated specifically in the Malaysian context.

2. Literature Review

This section provides a chorological review of the organizational justice literature, which has contributed to current conceptualization and theoretical framework. There is also an overview of implications of employees' fairness or organizational justice perception towards their organizational commitment and turnover intention.

2.1 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to the study of fairness within organizational settings and originates from work in social psychology aimed at understanding fairness issues in social interactions (Greenberg, 1990). The fairness with which employees are treated by their respective organizational is a commonly explored topic. This concept has been the target of a great deal of research, and it has important implications for organizations and their employees (Greenberg, 1990b).

Early studies on organizational justice were more focused on distributive justice. Distributive justice is actually grounded in Adams' (1965) equity theory. According to equity theory, people look at others in a social setting, calculate his /her perceived input-outcome ratio and then compares this ratio with that of the comparison others. Equity exists if the individual perceives that his/her ratio of inputs to outcomes received is similar to that of the referent. On the other hand, inequity is present when there is an unequal input-outcome ratio between the individual and the referent other, which will lead to a feeling of unfairness experienced by both parties and an attempt to correct this discrepancy is made. Both parties would rectify the unjust situation by either reacting psychologically or behaviorally. He/she may make behavioral changes that increase or decrease his/her input or cause a change in received outcomes (e.g. altering job performance; Raymond Loi, Ngo Hang-yue and Sharon Foley, 2006). Besides, he/she may also react psychologically to change the perceived input/output ratio of self and/or referent (e.g. altering perception of outcomes; Greenberg, 1990). Distributive justice was found to be related to such work outcomes as pay satisfaction, job

satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust in organizations (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

The studies on organizational justice was then shifted from the focus of distributive justice, the justice of decision outcomes (Adams, 1965; Colquitt, 2001), to procedural justice, the justice of the processes that led up to the decision outcomes (Greenberg, 1990b; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) when scholars noted that distributive justice could not address individual's fair procedure pursuit (Greenberg, 1990). Procedural justice was introduced by Thibaut and Walker, (1975) who studied the fairness of processes in legal proceedings. Researchers observed legal proceedings and suggested that mediation and arbitration procedures have both a process stage and a decision stage. Thibaut and Walker, (1975) characterized third-party procedure in terms of the amount of process control and decision control each procedure afforded disputants. Mediation, for instance, was viewed as a procedure that afforded disputants high control over the process (as disputants typically had considerable opportunity to express their views in the procedure) and high control over the decision (as disputants were free to reject any decision reached by a mediator). An adjudication procedure, by comparison, offers disputants similar levels of process control but low decision control, as in this procedure the third party (a judge) issues a ruling that is binding on the parties.

Thibaut and Walker's, (1975) work suggested that as long as disputants were able to retain control in the process stage, they were willing to give up control in the decision stage. In that way, disputants perceived fairness in the procedure when they perceived that they had control over presentation of their arguments and adequate time to present their cases. Thus, disputant process control was seen as central to creating high levels of procedural justice.

Procedural justice was later generalized into other, non-legal organizational settings (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza Leventhalza, & Fry, 1980). Leventhal and colleagues (1980) suggested that procedures could be perceived as fair if they met the following six criteria:

- a) Accurate - truthful and correct information need to be gathered and used in the decision making process.
- b) Consistent both temporally and interpersonally - the procedure should guarantee similar treatment across all people and times.

- c) Ethical - the procedure conforms to the prevailing standards of ethics and morality.
- d) Correctable - the procedure has a means of correcting flawed decisions in place.
- e) Free from bias - third party must not have a vested interest in a particular outcome or make decisions based on his or her own personal beliefs.
- f) Representations - the procedure must ensure that all affected parties have an opportunity to state their concerns and opinions.

- f) Distributing tasks - the perceived fairness of the supervisor when allocating work assignments
- g) Latitude - the perceived fairness with regard to employee job latitude.

Folger and Konovsky (1989) supported the above six criteria for perceived procedural justice, they conducted a survey to examine the impact of distributive and procedural justices on the reactions of 217 first-line manufacturing plant employees to decisions about pay raises. Respondents were asked to answer questions on the survey which measured distributive and procedural justices, organizational commitment, pay satisfaction, trust in supervisors, negative affectivity and percent of salary increase. The survey results indicated that perceptions about the procedures used in determining pay raises make a unique contribution to organizational commitment and trust in supervisor. In other words, pay raise evaluative procedures which are applied consistently across people and time, free from bias or favoritism, utilize accurate information, have a system in place for correcting errors, follow organizational standards, and account for the opinions of both the organization as well as individual employees are suggested to result in increased organizational commitment and trust in supervisor (Folger and Konovsky, 1989).

Beside the above, Dubinsky and Levy (1989) have summarized the literature of organizational fairness and identified seven accepted dimensions of organizational equity:

- a) Pay rules - the degree to which one is paid fairly, relative to coworkers, and the degree to which pay raises and promotions are fairly administered.
- b) Pay level - the degree that pay is fair relative to that of others outside the organization.
- c) Pay administration - the perceived fairness of supervisors in executing rules for raises and promotions
- d) Rule administration - the perceived fairness of the administration of workplace behavior rules.
- e) Work pace- the perceived fairness of the supervisor in maintaining a reasonable pace of work activity

In relation to the above study, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) considered pay rules, distributing tasks and pay levels as forms of distributive justice in which the perceived fairness of the outcomes received are judged. Pay administration, rule administration, work pace and latitude can be considered as forms of procedural justice in which the perceived fairness of the methods used to determine outcomes are judged.

Besides this, there is a two-factor model of organizational justice in explaining the impact of justice on effective organizational functioning. Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) has specified a structural equation model in which distributive justice was related to personal-referenced outcomes, such as pay satisfaction, whereas procedural justice was related to organizational referenced outcomes, such as organizational commitment. This two-factor model of organizational justice provided a better fit than models where the two types of justice overlapped in their effects.

The two-factor model of organizational justice was then clouded with introduction of interactional justice. Interactional justice focuses on the quality of the interpersonal treatment that people receive in the process of procedure implementation (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice exists when decision makers treat people with respect and sensitivity and explain the rationale for decisions thoroughly. Although interactional justices have been considered as a third type of justice by some researchers (e.g. Aquino, 1995; Barling & Phillips, 1993; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tata & Bowes-Sperry, 1996), there were also researchers who considered it as a subset of procedural justice (e. g. Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Tyler & Bies, 1990). Besides, there were also researchers who used separate measures of procedural justice and interactional justice but have combined them because of high intercorrelations (e.g. Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; Skarlicki & Latham, 1997). Thus, there is a debate over whether interactional justice is a separate component of fairness or whether it is a portion of procedural justice.

Greenberg (1990a) further distinguished interactional justice into two separate forms of justice labeled it as interpersonal justice and informational justice. The researcher brought a new perspective to the above debate by suggesting a

four-factor structure for organizational justice (Greenberg 1990b). He suggested that the sensitivity, politeness and respect aspects of interactional justice might be more appropriately viewed as interpersonal facets of distributive justice since it alters reactions to decision outcomes. On the other hand, the explanations aspect of interactional justice might be more appropriately viewed as informational facets of procedural justice since explanations generally provide the information needed for evaluating structural aspects of procedures. Obviously, interpersonal and informational justice focus more on the statements and behaviors of the decision makers rather than on the systemic or structural characteristics of procedures or outcomes themselves. Colquitt (2001) supported this four-factor model of justice (distributive-procedural-interpersonal informational) in two separate studies.

It is worth to note that this four-factor view of justice seems inconsistent with some past research, which seems unable to even distinguish between procedural and distributive justice. Many researchers find extremely high correlations between the two procedural and distributive justices, suggesting that some individuals may view justice from a one-factor perspective. For example, Welbourne, Balkin and Gomez-Mejia (1997) reported an uncorrected correlation of 0.74 between these two constructs while Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) reported an uncorrected correlation of 0.72.

Further, Cropanzano and Ambrose (2001) in their discussion on the procedural-distributive distinction argued that procedural and distributive justices are as constructs, more similar than most researchers believe. This is because procedural evaluations are based in large part on outcomes attained, and because the same event can be seen as process in one context and an outcome in another. For instance, reorganizing a performance evaluation system so it provides employees more process control can be considered as a fair outcome, even though process control is a procedural construct. Cropanzano and Ambrose's (2001) view is acknowledge that individuals may not always perceive a distinction between procedural and distributive justice.

Based on the above organizational justice literature review, we can conclude that there are four models of organizational justice, that is, the one factor, two-factor, three-factor and four-factor models but it is still unclear which model best portrays organizational justice. In this study, organizational justice will only focus on distributive and procedural justice since past researchers have demonstrated that these two constructs actually consist of interpersonal and informational justice.

2.2 Organizational Commitment

There is still a lack of consensus in the literature on the conceptualization of organizational commitment. According to Brett et al (1995), there is no consensus on the dimensions of commitment and how they affect behavior. However, there are two underlying themes in approaching organizational commitment theory. First, commitment can be considered as having either an attitudinal or a behavioural dimension. Second, there is the question of whether the construct consists of a single dimension, as in a commitment to an organization, or if there exist multiple dimensions, commitment for an individual – such as commitment to one's job or career as well as commitment to the organization (Bashaw and Grant 1994; Morrow 1983; Roberts, Coulson and Chonko, 1999)

In relation to the above, we can say that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct with various conceptualizations. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974), defined commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" They also indicated that commitment has three components: an employee's belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, his/her willingness to work toward accomplishing the organization's goals, his/her strong desire to continue as an organizational member.

Wiener and Vardi (1980) defined organizational commitment in terms of normative approaches as being the sum of internalized normative pressures, pressuring an individual to act in a way corresponding to on organization's interests.

Cohen (1993) considered commitment to be primarily an affective attachment having three dimensions: identification, affiliation and moral involvement. The dimensions of identification and affiliation correspond to Porter et al (1974) first and third components respectively, while moral involvement implies "internalization of the roles of the commitment objects demonstrated in feelings of care and concern for these committed objects (organizations)" (p.79)

In addition to these attitudinal aspects, commitment has another dimension with regards to the employee's intentions to stay/leave (Meyer and Allen 1991; Meyer et al 1993; Iverson and Roy 1994) indicated three correlate but different dimensions of organizational commitment namely, affective, continuance and normative commitment. These dimensions were found to be correlated but

clearly differentiated among each other. Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment:

- a) Affective commitment - an employee's emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in an organization.
- b) Continuance commitment - commitment based on costs that an employee is associated with leaving the organizations and
- c) Normative commitment - the employee's feeling of obligation to stay with the organization.

This means employees stay because they want to, and/ or they need to, and /or they feel they should, respectively. In other words, commitment reflects in the forms of employee's intention to stay or leave the organization, through it may be moderated with factors like opportunities available outside and normative pressure to stay on the job (Arif Hassan ,2002)

Other researchers like Salancik (1977), Rhodes and Streers (1981) urged that behavioural commitment leads to attitudinal commitment. This is indirectly contrasted to the previously noted attitudinal model which implies that attitudes lead to behavioral commitment. It is possible that there is some degree of circularity in that either forms of commitment leads to other forms (Roberts, Coulson and Chonko, 1999).

In relation to the problems with the conceptualization, many scholars urged that the construct of organizational commitment requires further research. These later reconceptualizations of organizational commitment suggested that the definition of organizational commitment may be restricted to include employees' attachment to the organization as a result of compliance caused by reward and punishment, affiliation with the referent organization, and internalization of the organization's goals and values as one's own (Roberts, Coulson and Chonko, 1999)

2.3 Justice Perceptions and Organizational Commitment

Researchers have shown that the fairness perceptions among employees influence a variety of important organizational outcomes (Cohen, Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001) Lind et al. (1993) argued that justice judgments affect attitudes, behaviour and decisions across a wide variety of social contexts and they also play an important role in how employees respond to organizational outcomes and organizational procedures and

process. Similarly, Hartman et al. (1999) also argued that the concept of organizational justice is central to understanding a wide range of human attitudes and behaviors in organizations. The underlying premise is that the justice perceptions of employees affect their job attitudes and organizational outcomes.

Equity in the form of procedural justice and distributive justice was found to predict organizational commitment (McFarlin and Sweeney 1992). Further, an interaction between the two form of equity and organizational commitment existed such that the effects of varying levels of perceived distributive justice on organizational commitment were greater in conditions of low perceived procedural justice than they were in high perceived procedural justice conditions. Similarly Rhodes and Steers (1981), Dubinsky and Levy (1989), and Quarles (1994) found direct equity to organizational commitment linkages.

Rhodes and Streers (1981) found that pay equity was the most important contributor to the prediction of organizational commitment for a group of cooperative employees, but was not a significant predictor of commitment for a group of conventional employees.

Lind and Tyler (1988) suggested that procedural justice is more highly related to institutional evaluations that require a long-term perspective, like organizational commitment. While Folger and Konovsky (1989) state that appraisal system most shift their focus from distributive justice (outcomes) to procedural justice which establishes grounds for trust and commitment.

Dubinsky and Levy (1989) found that pay level, pay rules and distributing tasks (forms of distributive justice) were positively associated with organizational commitment while pay administration, rule administration, work pace and latitude (forms of procedural justice) were positively associated with job satisfaction.

Quarles' (1994) path analyses data from internal audit supervisors and staff level auditors found that satisfaction with promotion opportunities (a form of distributive justice) and satisfaction with evaluation criteria used (a form of procedural justice) were directly corrected with organizational commitment for the respective groups.

In their two-factor model, Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) suggested that procedural justice is a better predictor of organizational commitment when compared with distributive justice. Their explanation was that fair procedure let employees feel they will "get a fair shake" from the company

and its representative should they perform well in future, even if current rewards were unfair (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993, p37). This is supported by Cohen-Charash & Spector, (2001) as well as Colquitt et al (2001), who also found that procedural justice have a significant positive relationship with organizational commitment.

Although procedural justice is a better predictor of organizational commitment, previous research has revealed that distributive justice also has a significant effect on organizational commitment (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Randall & Mueller, 1995). Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) concluded that outcome (distributive) fairness is a better predictor than procedural fairness when predicting organizational commitment. They explain the relative importance of outcome and procedural fairness by using the "Levels of Justice" model. The model was proposed by Sheppard, Lewicki and Mointon (1992). Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) argue that the most salient factor for employees is generally the outcome of an organizational. Assessment of the procedural fairness of the decision will likely follow if the outcome (decision) is seen as unfair. This is because employees will hardly see or gain information about the propriety of the procedures used in making managerial decisions, but usually infer them from the outcomes.

2.4 Turnover Intention

Previous research has demonstrated that intention to leave is one of the strongest predictors and an immediate precursor of employee turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000; Porter & Steers, 1973). Besides, empirical findings with regards to the turnover process generally indicated that the effect of attitudes on turnover behaviour is mediated by turnover intention (Mowday et al, 1984; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984; Hom & Griffeth, 1991; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Mobley et al. (1979) conceptualized intentions as statements regarding the specific behaviours of interest. Employees' intentions to leave are consistently related to turnover behaviour and explain more variance in turnover than other affective or emotional responses such as job satisfaction.

It noted that many of the studies on turnover have centered on the development of conceptual models of the turnover process and empirical validation of the models. Although these models have diverse origins, several have hypothesized job satisfaction and organizational commitment to be antecedents of turnover. In a review by Jaros, Jermier, Koehler & Sincich, (1993), it was reported that most of the

turnover research has looked at the role of effect on subsequent behavior; job satisfaction and organizational commitment that have been the most frequently investigated links of turnover.

Turnover and related variables such as turnover intention, intention to leave, and intention to search for alternative jobs have been the stimulating factor of organizational commitment research (Meyer et al, 1989). The underlying assumption of the commitment-turnover linkage is that the more committed an employee is, the less likely he or she will leave the organization (Porter et al, 1974; Angel & Perry, 1981).

In relation to the above, it is logical to say that employees are less likely to have the intention to leave their organization when they are emotionally attached to the organization. The statement can be supported by considerable research which has suggested organizational commitment as a main factor of intention to leave and many studies have reported a significant negative relationship between the two (Griffeth et al., 2000; Lum et al., 1998; Wong et al., 1995).

2.5 Justice Perceptions and Employees' Turnover Intention

There are rather limited studies on the linkage between justice perceptions and intention to leave and existing literature showed mixed results. Some studies suggested that employees choose to quit their job in order to end the inequity if they perceived low distributive justice (Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998; Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984). Others reported that procedural justice was negatively related to turnover beyond any specific outcomes since procedural justice reflected organizational norms of decision making (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Dailey & Kirk, 1992).

James A. Roberts, Kevin R. Coulson and Lawrence (1999) did a study on the role that perceptions of equity and justice play in sales force commitment to the organization and intent to turnover. They suggested that facets of both internal and external equity were significant factors in explaining organizational commitment and intent to turnover. In this study, they also found that distributive justice was more important to organizational commitment and intent to turnover than procedural justice.

Fields, D. P Pang M., & Chiu C (2000) study on distributive and procedural justice as predictors of employee outcomes in Hong Kong suggested that distributive justice had a significant effect on Hong Kong employees' intent to stay. It is logical to

predict that when employees perceive that they are treated unfairly in terms of outcomes or procedures, they tend to leave their current organization to seek a fairer alternative.

In Malaysia, Arif Hassan (2002) conducted a study to investigate how perception of equity and justice played an important role in employees' commitment to the organization and intention to leave. The sample of study consisted of 181 middle and lower level managers from the banking and finance, production and manufacturing and service sectors. The results hypothesized that both internal and external equity perceptions are positively related to commitment and negatively related to intent to leave. Among all the facets, equity promotion appeared to be the most significant predictor. Both distributive and procedural justice factors made significant contributions to employees' organizational commitment and intention to leave. However, there is no conclusion on whether distributive justice or procedural justice made more significant contributions to the employees' organizational commitment and intention to leave.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

Based on the above literature review, Figure 1 presents a proposed model of organizational justice, organizational commitment and turnover intention for this study. It helps to illustrate the relationship between the constructs of the study, i.e. organizational justice, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. In other words, it can be used to describe the scope of the study as overall. Hypotheses of the study which to be discussed in next chapter are also to be derived from here.

3. Research Methodology

Based on the literature review above, the following hypotheses were developed to test the relationship between the constructs of organizational justice and organizational commitment as well as the relationship between the constructs of organizational justice and employees' turnover intention:

- H1: Perceptions of procedural justice is positively related to organizational commitment.
- H2: Perceptions of distributive justice is positively related to organizational commitment.
- H3: Perceptions of procedural justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention.

- H4: Perceptions of distributive justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention

From the hypotheses, the independent constructs and dependent constructs used in the study were as follows:

Independent Constructs: Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice
Dependent Constructs: Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

3.1 Data Collection

Research Measures

3.3.1 Procedural Justice

McFarlin and Sweeney's (1997) 13-item measurement of procedural justice was adopted to measure employees' perceptions of procedural justice towards their respective organizations. Respondents were requested to evaluate the fairness of procedures throughout the organization including procedures used to evaluate their performance, communicate performance feedback, solving work-relating problems and promotion procedures on a five-point Likert scale.

3.3.2 Distributive Justice

The independent construct was measured using an 11-item, five-point Likert scale developed by McFarlin and Sweeney (1997). The measures dealt with employees' perceived fairness of the distribution of various rewards, including raises, promotions, performance ratings, and general reward distribution.

3.3.3 Organizational Commitment

The dependent construct, organizational commitment was measured using a 4-item, five-point Likert scale developed by Hunt, Chonko, and Wood (1985). The measures were used to measure employees' commitment to his/her organization and it actually captures the attitudinal aspect of loyalty to the firm and psychological bonds to the organization (Hunt et al 1989, Roberts et al, 1999).

3.3.4 Turnover Intention

The study used Blueborn's (1982) 3-item turnover scale as the survey instrument to assess another dependent variable – turnover intention. The respondents were required to indicate their likelihood of leaving the organization in the near of distant future. The responses were also measured

on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "Strongly Disagreed" to 5 = "Strongly Agreed" as mentioned earlier.

3.3.5 Profiles of Respondents

Finally, the study also collected data on nine demographic variables on gender, marital status, age, education level, job tenure, years with current organization, annual income, job level and industrial type. The control variables were assessed with single-item scales. These variables have been found in previous research to correlate with commitment or turnover intention.

3.2 Sample Design and Procedure

The data of this study was collected from 200 employees from various organizations across industries; most of the organizations were located in the Klang Valley, which represents most of the different industries in Malaysia. The organizations represented a wide spectrum of industries, ranging from banking and finance, education, energy/utilities, transportation, manufacturing, health care, construction, professional services, trading, to tourism and communications. The job level of respondents varied from senior management, middle management to supervisory/executive

The data for this research was based on convenience sampling which a type of non-probability sampling.

Each respondent was invited to complete a set of self-administrated questionnaire for this study. Specifically, the respondents were selected based on the researchers' personal contacts with employees in various organizations across industries in the Klang Valley. The questionnaires were distributed through the researchers' friends, relatives, colleagues and students.

The questionnaires together with covering letters explaining the broad purposes of the study were distributed by e-mail as well as hardcopies. The study managed to obtain 200 completed questionnaires, out of which, only 172 were usable.

3.3 Data Analysis Techniques

The data collected was analysed, after appropriate coding processes, using the SPSS software. Besides coding, all the negatively worded statement responses were reversed scored to be comparable to the positively worded items before any statistical analyses was done.

The selection of techniques to analyze the result of this study was based on the research objectives of

the study. Descriptive analyses, factor analysis, Pearson correlation, and regression were used to test the hypotheses. The primary data analysis techniques employed to test the study's hypotheses was a series of regression which used organizational commitment and turnover intention as dependent variables and the procedural justice as well as distributive justice as independent variables. Regression analysis was used to assess the relative impact of procedural justice and distributive justice on the dependent variables of organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Descriptive statistics namely the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores for the dependent and independent variables were also done. The demographic profiles of respondents in relation to the variables were also analysed.

4. Research Findings

The study obtained 200 respondents from various industrial backgrounds, of which 172 were usable responses. This provides a rather high response rate of 86%. The respondents represented a wide spectrum of employees working across different industries. The demographic profile is summarized in Table 1.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics, including the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores are presented in Table 2. The results show that both procedural justice and distributive justice have rather similar mean scores.

4.2 Validity Test

Principle-component factor analysis was conducted to verify the two components of organizational justice, procedural justice and distributive justice. Two separate analysis were conducted, one for each component. For instance, in the first analysis, all 13 items of Procedural Justice were entered and the factor loading of each item was examined. The factor matrix was also rotated to distribute the significant variables evenly and the type of rotation used was Varimax. Results of the factor analysis are shown in Table 3 and Table 4.

The factor analysis results shown in Table 3 indicates that there were 2 factors in the procedural justice construct that have Eigen-values of more than 1.00; i.e. Factor 1 has the highest Eigen-value of 6.691 and Factor 2 with Eigen-value of 1.541. This means that there were two significant factors, which suggest that there was a dimension to the procedural justice.

Table 4 shows that all items of procedural justice have a factor loading of 0.5 and above. These significant items for the procedural justice were factored into 2 components and evenly distributed after Varimax rotation. It can be further summarized to component 1 consisting of items P02, P05, P07, P08, P09, P10, P11, P12 and P13. Component 2 consists of items P01, P03, P04 and P06. Component 2 actually consisted of all recoded items of procedural justice except for item P04. Item P04 was an item which has significant factor loading for both components 1 and 2, the values were rather close, i.e. 0.542 and 0.605 respectively.

Table 3 also indicates that there were 3 factors in the distributive justice construct that have Eigen-values of more than 1.00; i.e. Factor 1 has the highest Eigen-value of 4.321, Factor 2 and 3 with Eigen-value of 1.865 and 1.261 respectively. This means that there were three significant factors, which suggest that there was a dimension to the distributive justice.

As illustrated in Table 4, all items of distributive justice except for items D18 and D20 have factor loading of 0.5 and above. These significant items for distributive justice were factored into 3 components and evenly distributed after Varimax rotation. We can further summarize that component 1 consisted of items D14, D19, D21, D22, D23 and D24. Component 2 consisted of items D15, D16, and D17 while component 3 only consisted of item D20 with factor loading of 0.479. Similar to procedural justice, the component 2 of distributive justice actually consisted of all recoded items. We do not suggest to drop items D18 and D20 although its' factor loading is lower than 0.5 as factor loading for both items are rather closed to 0.5.

4.3 Reliability Test

The Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess the reliability of all constructs, procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational commitment and turnover intention. The final output of the reliability test is shown in Table 5.

As illustrated in Table 5, the Cronbach's Alpha for all the constructs were higher than significance level of 0.5. Therefore, we can conclude that all the constructs used for this study are highly reliable. We did not consider further to drop any of the items from all four constructs since the original Cronbach's Alpha obtained for every construct is rather high i.e. procedural justice recorded 0.9166, distributive justice recorded 0.812, organizational recorded 0.9187 and turnover intention recorded 0.9536.

4.4 Hypothesis Testing

The relationship between organizational justice, organizational commitment and turnover intention were investigated. There were two components of organizational justice involved in the study: procedural justice and distributive justice. Pearson correlation and simple regression were both used for testing the following hypothesis:

- H1: Perceptions of procedural justice is positively related to organizational commitment.
- H2: Perceptions of distributive justice is positively related to organizational commitment.
- H3: Perceptions of procedural justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention.
- H4: Perceptions of distributive justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention

As concluded in factor analysis and reliability analyses, all the items of the dependents and independent constructs were adopted for testing the hypotheses.

Correlation analysis was first used for testing hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4 since it is a statistical measure of a covariation or association between variables. It indicates the relationship of one variable to the other variable in two forms:

- Magnitude of the linear relationship (*the higher the correlation value, the more important the relationship is*); and
- Direction of relationship (*whether it is a positive or inverse relationship*).

It must be noted that correlation is not causation. Correlation simply indicates the relationship between variables, and does not make any inference to causal relationship between variables.

There were several tasks involved here; the first task was to combine or to total all the procedural justice items (P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09, P10, P11, P12 and P13) into a new variable called Procedural Justice. The combination will give us overall perceptions of procedural justice among the respondents.

The second task was to combine or to total the distributive justice items (D14, D15, D16, D17, D18, D19, D20, D21, D22, D23, D24) into a new variable called Distributive Justice. The combination will give us the overall perceptions of distributive justice among the respondents.

Similarly, we have also combined the items of organizational commitment (C25, C26, C27 and C28) as well as turnover intention (T29, T30, T31) into new variables called Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention respectively. These were also for the purposes of getting overall organizational commitment and turnover intention of respondents.

Subsequent task was to perform correlation analysis on Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. The results are shown in Table 6.

- a) Procedural Justice and Organizational Commitment
- b) Distributive Justice and Organizational Commitment
- c) Procedural Justice and Turnover Intention
- d) Distributive Justice and Turnover Intention
- e) Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice
- f) Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

From the correlations matrix table above, there were six (6) significant correlations:

- a) Procedural Justice and Organizational Commitment
- b) Distributive Justice and Organizational Commitment
- c) Procedural Justice and Turnover Intention
- d) Distributive Justice and Turnover Intention
- e) Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice
- f) Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

The correlation between procedural justice and organizational commitment was highly significant at 0.579 and it was a positive correlation. Therefore, the result supported Hypothesis 1 (H1) which predicted perceptions of procedural justice were positively related to organizational commitment. In other words, we can say that employees who have high perception of procedural justice towards their organization tend to have high organizational commitment or verse versa.

The correlation between distributive justice and organizational commitment was also highly significant at the level of 0.541 and it is a positive correlation. This means that Hypothesis 2 (H2) that predicted perceptions of distributive justice is positively related to organizational commitment was accepted. This means that employees who have high perception of distributive justice towards

their organization tend to have high organizational commitment or verse versa.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) that predicted perceptions of procedural justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention, was supported by the results of correlation analysis. The correlation between procedural justice and turnover intention is highly significant at 0.612 and it is a negative correlation. This means that intention of employees to leave their respective organization decreases proportionally to their perceptions of procedural justice.

Hypothesis 4 (H4) predicted that perceptions of distributive justice is negatively related to employees' turnover intention. This hypothesis was also accepted since the correlation between distributive justice and turnover intention is highly significant at the level of 0.641 and it is a negative correlation. The result shows that as the employees' perceptions of distributive justice increases; their intention to leave the organizational is also lower.

The correlations of (e) and (f) mentioned earlier were not further analyzed since both were not covered in this study. However, simple regressions were conducted to further examine all the hypotheses, H1, H2, H3 and H4. The results were summarized as follows:

H1: Perceptions of procedural justice is positively related to organizational commitment.

Simple regression was conducted to investigate how well employees' perception of distributive justice predicts their organizational commitment. As illustrated in Table 7, the results were statistically significant $F = 85.753$, $p < 0.001$. The identified equation to explain this relationship or linear model is,

$$y = -0.064 + 0.257x \text{ where,}$$

y = Organizational Commitment and
 x = Procedural Justice

The adjusted R^2 in Table 7 is 0.331. This indicates that 33% of the variance in organizational commitment can be explained by the employees' perception of procedural justice whereas 77% of the variance is unexplained.

H2: Perceptions of distributive justice is positively related to organizational commitment.

Simple regression was conducted to investigate how well employees' perception of distributive justice predicts their organizational commitment. As illustrated in Table 8, the results were

statistically significant $F = 70.210$, $p < 0.001$. The identified equation to explain this relationship or linear model is,

$$y = -0.0645 + 0.357x \text{ where,}$$

y = Organizational Commitment and
 x = Distributive Justice

The adjusted R^2 in Table 8 is 0.288. This indicates that 29% of the variance in organizational commitment can be explained by the employees' perception of procedural justice whereas the remaining 71% of the variance is unexplained.

H3: Perceptions of procedural justice is negatively related to turnover intention.

Simple regression was conducted to investigate how well employees' perception of procedural justice predicts their intention to leave the organization. As illustrated in Table 9, the results were statistically significant $F = 101.928$, $p < 0.001$. The identified equation to explain this relationship or linear model is, $y = 18.711 - 0.237x$ where,

$$y = \text{Turnover Intention and}$$

$$x = \text{Procedural Justice}$$

The adjusted R^2 in Table 9 was 0.371. This indicates that 37% of the variance in turnover intention can be explained by the employees' perception of procedural justice whereas 73% of the variance is unexplained.

H4: Perceptions of distributive justice is negatively related to turnover intention

Simple regression was conducted to investigate how well employees' perception of distributive justice predicts their intention to leave the organization. As illustrated in Table 10, the results were statistically significant $F = 118.631$, $p < 0.001$. The identified equation to explain this relationship or linear model is, $y = 20.487 - 0.337x$ where,

$$y = \text{Turnover Intention and}$$

$$x = \text{Distributive Justice}$$

The adjusted R^2 in Table 10 was 0.408. This indicates that 41% of the variance in turnover intention can be explained by the employees' perception of distributive justice while the remaining 59 of the variance is unexplained.

5. Discussion

5.1 Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

The results show that there is a significant, strong and positive relationship between the organizational justice (procedural justice and distributive justice) and organizational commitment. Therefore, when employees' perceptions of procedural and distributive justice were high, their organizational commitment was also high. Employees will be more committed to their present employer if they perceived higher fairness in the organization.

The results also show that procedural justice plays a more important role than distributive justice in influencing employees' organizational commitment. This is because procedural justice accounted for 33% of the variance while distributive justice accounted for only 29% of the variance in organizational commitment. This result is in line with the findings of previous research by McFarlin and Sweeney (1993), they also found that procedural justice is a better predictor of organizational commitment when compared with distributive justice. When people perceive procedures to be fair, resentment will be minimal, even when distributive justice is low. The fairness of a firm's procedures has an important impact on organizational commitment because procedures define the organization's capacity to treat employees fairly (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992).

These findings suggest that employees' commitment with an organization could be significantly increased by enhancing organizational fairness, particularly procedural justice. Managers should aware that the fairness of procedures used in allocating rewards and the voice afforded employees in the allocation process are more important than the fairness of the allocation of rewards in improving level of employees' commitment in the organization. To increase employees' organizational commitment, managers should first improve the procedural justice and hence increase overall levels of perceive justice by involving employees in the procedures for making decisions and allocating rewards.

5.2 Organizational Justice and Turnover Intention

The results show that both procedural justice and distributive justice affected employees' intention to leave. There was a significant, strong and negative relationship between the organizational justice (procedural justice and distributive justice) and turnover intention. This means that, when the perceived procedural and distributive justices were high, employees' intention to leave the organization were low. Employees will have lower intention of leaving his/her present employer

if they perceived higher fairness in the organization.

Procedural justice accounted for 37% of the variance while distributive justice accounted for 41% of the variance in organizational commitment. This means that distributive justice plays a more important role in explaining employees' turnover intention in comparison to procedural justice. This finding was not in line with the findings of Folger and Konovsky (1989) as well as McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), they reported that procedural justice is a better predictor of turnover intention as compare to distributive justice. Nevertheless, the research result was in line with the finding reported by Robert et al (1999), they reported that distributive justice was more important to intent to turnover of sales forces than procedural justice.

In this study, it appears that the respondents were more concerned with fair pay than they are about the methods used to obtain outcomes in deciding whether to leave or stay with their present employer. This is not surprising given the fact that most of the people work to earn for living; their motivation factor to work is on the outcomes of rewards. As compared to procedural fairness, employees will give emphasis more on the fairness of distributive justice in the organization for their consideration to stay with the organization.

Another possible explanation for this finding of distributive justice is a better predictor for turnover intention as compare to procedural justice is, more than half of the respondents (57%) are currently holding the positions at the level of supervisory/executive. In Malaysia, employees at this job level may not have sufficient insight into the decision making process used to allocate rewards, they have less opportunities to observe procedural justice in action. What they are more exposed to is the distributive justice or in simple words the outcomes of allocated reward. This leaves them to use outcomes as a way of judging organization justice and further in deciding whether to leave the organization as proposed by Shappard et.al (1992).

It is worth to note from the findings that both procedural justice and distributive justice were positively related to organizational commitment but procedural justice plays a more significant role in this relationship and both procedural justice and distributive justice were negatively related to turnover intention but distributive justice plays a more significant role in this relationship. Previous researches like Folger and Konovsky (1989) and McFarlin Sweeney (1992) reported that as compared to distributive justice, procedural justice is a significant predictor of organizational

commitment and turnover intention. On the other hand, there were also previous researchers like Roberts et.al (1999) who reported that distributive justice is a better predictor in determining organizational commitment and turnover intention of salespersons. Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) concluded that outcome (distributive) fairness is a better predictor than procedural fairness when predicting organizational commitment. These show that the findings of the present research were supported by previous research.

6. Conclusion

This study provides managers with valuable insights on determinants of Malaysia employees' commitment and retention and hence assisting in formulating appropriate policies and procedures for the management and operation of organizations. Findings suggest that McFarlin and Sweeney's (1997) measure of procedural justice and distributive justice, Hunt, Chonko, and Wood's (1985) measure of organizational commitment as well as Bluedorn's (1982) turnover intention can be used in organizational settings with greater confidence in their reliabilities and validities. Besides, the strong and significant relationships found between the two components of organization justice, procedural justice and distributive justice with organizational commitment and turnover intention have important organizational implications.

The study addressed the important workforce management issues of perceptions of organizational justice and the role they play in the level of organizational commitment and turnover intention. Specific managerial recommendations based upon the results of this study can be listed as follows:

- a) As perceptions of organizational justice increase, so will employees' organizational commitment.
- b) As perceptions of organizational justice increase, employees' intention to leave the organization will decline.
- c) Perceptions of procedural justice are more important than perceived distributive justice when explaining employees' organizational commitment.
- d) Perceptions of distributive justice are more important than perceived procedural justice when explaining employees' intention to leave the organization.

However, the result presented herein should be read with caution because certain theoretical and empirical limitations exist. Several limitations of the study are inherent in the methodology of this study and worth noting here. This study employed

a convenience, non-probability sampling, which result in a selection bias and thus influenced the research results. The small sample size of 172, and the geographical concentration of the respondents also restricts the generalization of the findings to reflect the overall population.

In order to cover the whole population of Malaysia, perhaps the data should be gathered from a larger sample from different age groups, job level and industries. Besides that, to get a better representation of the analysis, employees located in various parts of the country should be surveyed.

Future research should be carried out to support the current research finding that perceptions of distributive justice are more important than perceived procedural justice when explaining turnover intention, controlling for demographic factors such as age, job level and annual income. This may help explain part of the unexplained variance in organizational commitment and turnover intention.

References

- [1] Adams J (1965), "Inequity in Social Exchange", In: L. Berkowiz (ed) *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, Vol. New York: Academic Press.
- [2] Alexander, Sheldon and Ruderman, M (1987), "The Role of Procedural and Distributive Justice in Organizational Behavior", *Social Justice Research*, Vol 1, Iss. 2, p. 177-198
- [3] Allen N.J and Meyer JP (1991), "A Three-component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1 p. 61-89.
- [4] A McDowall and C Fletcher (2004), "Employee Development: An Organizational Justice Perspective", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 33, Iss. 1, p. 8-29.
- [5] Ann Marie Ryan, Bradford S Bell and Darin Wiechmann (2006), "Consequences of Organizational Justice Expectations in a Selection System", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 91, No. 2, p. 455-466.
- [6] Arif Hassan (2002), "Organizational As A Determinant Of Organizational Commitment And Intention To Leave", *Asian Academy of Management*, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 55-66.
- [7] Baliga, B Ram (1993), "Organizational Justice", *HR Focus*, Vol. 70, Iss. 5, p. 20.
- [8] Blau, PM (1964), "Exchange and Power in Social Life", New York: Wiley.
- [9] Bluedom, AC (1982), "A Unified Model of Turnover from Organizations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 35, p. 135-153.
- [10] Colquitt J.A (2001), "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation Measure", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 3, p. 386-400.
- [11] Chockalingam, V. and Deniz, S. (2002), "Examining The Construct Of Organizational Justice: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation Of Relations With Work Attitudes And Behaviors", *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 38, Iss. 3, p. 193.
- [12] Dail Fields, Mary Pang and Catherine Chiu (2000) "Distributive and Procedural Justice As Predictors of Employee Outcomes in Hong Kong", *Journal of Organizational Behavior* Vol 21, Iss. 5, p 547.
- [13] DeConinck, James B, Bachmann, Duane P. (1994), "Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions of Marketing Managers", *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol 10, Iss 3, p 87-95.
- [14] Dubinsky AJ and Levy M (1989), "Influence of Organizational Fairness on Work Outcomes of Retail Salesperson", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 65, Iss. 2, p. 221-252.
- [15] Elizabeth Eve Umphress, Giuseppe (Joe) Labianca, Daniel J Brass, Edward (Eli) Kass, Lotte Scholten. (2003), "The Role of Instrumental and Expressive Social Ties in Employees' Perceptions of Organizational Justice Organization Science", Vol.14, Iss. 6, p. 738-753.
- [16] Folger, R. (1994), "Organizational Justice: The Search for Fairness in the Workplace, *Academy of Management*", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 19, Iss. 1, p. 152.
- [17] Gerald L. Blakely, Martha C. Andrews and Robert H. Moorman (2005), "The Moderating Effects of Equity Sensitivity on the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20, Iss. 2, p. 259.
- [18] Greenberg, Jerald (1987), "A Taxonomy Of Organizational Justice Theories, *Academy of Management*", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12, Iss. 1, p. 9.

- [19] Hian Chye Koh and Alfred HY Boo (2004) "Organization Ethics and Employee Satisfaction and Commitment", *Management Decision*, Vol. 42, Iss. 5, p. 677-693.
- [20] Hunt, Shelby D., Lawrence B. Chonko and Van R. Wood (1985), "Organizational Commitment and Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49p. 112-126.
- [21] Levingstone L.P., Roberts J.A., and Chonko L.W. (1995). "Perception of Internal and External Equity as Predictors of Outside Sales People Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, Vol. 15, Iss. 2, p. 33-46.
- [22] Lynn Harland (1999), "Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management, Personnel Psychology", Vol. 52, Iss. 1, p. 215-218.
- [23] Halpern, Jennifer J. (1994), "Organizational Justice, Industrial & Labor Relations Review", Vol. 47, Iss. 4, p. 721.
- [24] Jaclyn M Nowakowski and Donald E Conlon (2005), "Organizational Justice: Looking Back, Looking Forward", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 16, Iss. 1, p. 4-29.
- [25] James L.P (2000), "Reflections on Determinants of Voluntary Turnover", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 22, No 7, p. 600-624.
- [26] Janice M Paterson, Andrea Green and Jane Cary (2002), "The Measurement Of Organizational Justice In Organizational Change Programmes: A Reliability, Validity And Context-Sensitivity Assessment", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 75, Part 4 p. 393-408.
- [27] John Simmons (2003), "Balancing Performance, Accountability And Equity In Stakeholder Relationships: Towards More Socially Responsible HR Practice", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol. 10, Iss. 3, p. 129.
- [28] Jovan Chia-Jung Hsu (2002), "Does Organizational Commitment Affect Turnover In China's Internet Industry?", Ph.D. dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Florida.
- [29] Karl Aquino, Margaret U Lewis and Murray Bradfield (1999), "Justice Constructs, Negative Affectivity, And Employee Deviance: A Proposed Model And Empirical Test", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, Iss. 7, p. 1073-1091.
- [30] Kottraba, Carin (2003), "The Relationship between Organizational Justice, Employee Absenteeism, And Role Stress", Ph.D. dissertation, Alliant International University, San Diego, California.
- [31] McFarlin D.B. and Sweeney P.D (1992), Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes, *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 35, Iss. 3, p. 626-637.
- [32] McFarlin D.B. and Sweeney P.D (1997), "Process and Outcome: Gender Differences in the Assessment of Justice", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 18 Iss. 7, p. 83.
- [33] Marjorie Chan (2000), "Organizational Justice Theories And Landmark Cases", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Special Issue: Experiment in Developing Scholars, Vol. 8, Iss. 1, p. 68-88.
- [34] Mark N K Saunders, Adrian Thornhill and Philip Lewis (2002), "Understanding Employees' Reactions To The Management Of Change: An Exploration Through An Organisational Justice Framework", *Irish Journal of Management*, Vol. 23, Iss. 1, p. 85-108.
- [35] Mark L Lengnick-Hall (2002), "Advances in Organizational Justice", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 55, Iss. 3, p. 781.
- [36] Michel Tremblay, Bruno Sire and David B Balkin (2000), "The Role Of Organizational Justice In Pay And Employee Benefit Satisfaction, And Its Effects On Work Attitudes", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 25, Iss. 3, p. 269-290.
- [37] Pernick, Robert (1994), "Organizational Justice: The Search For Fairness In The Workplace", *The Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 8, Iss. 1, p. 87.
- [38] Porter L. W. and Streers R.M (1981), "Conventional vs Worker Owned Organizations, Human Relations", Vol. 43, Iss. 12, p. 1013-1035.
- [39] Raymond Loi, Ngo Hang-yue and Sharon Foley (2006), "Linking Employees' Justice Perceptions To Organizational Commitment And Intention To Leave: The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support", *Journal Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 79, p. 101-120.
- [40] Roberts J.A, Coulson K.R. and Chonko L.B (1999), "Salespersons Perceptions of Equity and Justice and Their Impact on Organizational

Commitment and Intention to Turnover”, Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, Val. 7, Iss 1, p. 1-16.

[41] Robert Folger and Mary A Konovsky (1989), “Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reaction To Pay Raise Decisions”, Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 32, Oss 1, P115.

[42] Robert Folger and Russell Cropanzano (1998), “Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management”, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publication Inc.

[43] Sarminah Samad (2006), “Procedural and Distributive Justice: Differential Effects on Employees’ Work Outcomes”, The Business Review, Cambridge, Vol 5, No 2.

[44] Sandra J Hartman, Augusta C Yrle and William P Galle Jr. (1999), “Procedural And Distributive Justice: Examining Equity In A UniversitySetting”, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 20, Iss. 4, Part 2 p. 337-351.

[45] Sharon Foley, Ngo Hang-yue and Angela Wong (2005), “Perceptions Of Discrimination And Justice: Are There Gender Differences in Outcomes?”, Group & Organization Management, Vol. 30, Iss. 4, p. 421-450.

[46] Shu-Cheng Chi, Hsin-Hsin Lo (2003), “Taiwanese Employees’ Justice Perceptions Of Co-Workers’ Punitive Events”, The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 143, Iss. 1, p. 27-42.

[47] Simon S K Lam, John Schaubroeck and Samuel Aryee (2002), “Relationship Between Organizational Justice And Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross-National Study”, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 23, Iss. 1, p. 1-18.

[48] Tang, Thomas Li-Ping, Sarsfield-Baldwin, and Linda J. S.A.M (1996), “Distributive and Procedural Justice As Related To Satisfaction And Commitment”, Advanced Management Journal, Vol. 61, Iss. 3, p. 25.

Figure 1
Proposed Theoretical Model




Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Responding Respondents

Gender			Years with Current Organization		
	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Male	88	51.2	2 years and below	51	29.7
Female	84	48.8	3-5 years	65	37.8
			6-10 years	48	27.9
			11-15 years	2	1.2
			16 years and above	6	3.5
Marital Status			Annual Income		
	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Married	78	45.3	RM25,000 and below	51	29.7
Single	94	54.7	RM25,001 - RM50,000	85	49.4
			RM50,001 - RM100,000	29	16.9
			RM100,001 - RM150,000	6	3.5
			RM150,001 and above	1	.6
Age			Job Level		
	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
29 years and below	64	37.2	Senior Management	3	1.7
30-39 years	89	51.7	Middle Management	29	16.9
40-49 years	18	10.5	Supervisory / Executive	98	57.0
50 years and above	1	.6	Others	42	24.4
Education Level			Industrial Type		
	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Secondary Education	1	.6	Banking and Finance	26	15.1
Diploma	14	8.1	Education	36	20.9
Bachelor Degree	127	73.8	Energy/Utilities	6	3.5
Postgraduate	30	17.4	Transportation	5	2.9
			Manufacturing	11	6.4
			Health Care	7	4.1
			Construction	29	16.9
			Professional Services	11	6.4
			Trading	12	7.0
			Tourism	8	4.7
			Communication	9	5.2
			Others	12	7.0
Job Tenure					
	Frequency	Percent			
5 years and below	75	43.6			
6-10 years	69	40.1			
11-15 years	10	5.8			
16-20 years	15	8.7			
21 years and above	3	1.7			

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Items	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Procedural Justice	P01 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	3.0116	1.30222
	P02	1.00	5.00	3.3837	1.16145
	P03 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.7907	1.18090
	P04	1.00	5.00	3.0581	1.09603
	P05	1.00	5.00	3.3663	1.16961
	P06 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	3.0872	1.12310
	P07	1.00	5.00	3.2093	.99843
	P08	1.00	5.00	3.1802	1.07446
	P09	1.00	5.00	2.9419	1.16333
	P10	1.00	5.00	3.1047	.99741
	P11	1.00	5.00	3.2733	.96171
	P12	1.00	5.00	3.0291	1.13131
	P13	1.00	5.00	3.1919	1.13598
Distributive Justice	D14	1.00	5.00	3.0116	1.28867
	D15 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	3.0349	1.28825
	D16 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.9826	1.14184
	D17 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	3.1686	1.14481
	D18	1.00	5.00	3.1977	1.09031
	D19 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	3.2442	1.10751
	D20	1.00	5.00	3.0407	1.18152
	D21	1.00	5.00	3.0756	1.00297
	D22	1.00	5.00	3.0814	1.25856
	D23	1.00	5.00	3.2209	1.13839
	D24	1.00	5.00	2.8430	1.19639
Organizational Commitment	C25 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.5349	1.19646
	C26 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.5523	1.25779
	C27 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.5581	1.29871
	C28 (Recoded)	1.00	5.00	2.7267	1.32929
Turnover Intention	T29	1.00	5.00	3.1337	1.38058
	T30	1.00	5.00	2.8663	1.36781
	T31	1.00	5.00	3.0640	1.41895

Table 3
Total Variance Explained

Variable	Factor	Initial Eigenvalues		
		Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Procedural Justice	1	6.691	51.471	51.471
	2	1.541	11.851	63.323
	3	.907	6.977	70.300
	4	.658	5.064	75.364
	5	.561	4.313	79.677
	6	.467	3.590	83.267
	7	.460	3.539	86.807
	8	.394	3.028	89.835
	9	.373	2.866	92.701
	10	.319	2.457	95.158
	11	.258	1.987	97.144
	12	.226	1.738	98.883
	13	.145	1.117	100.000
Distributive Justice	1	4.321	39.280	39.280
	2	1.865	16.954	56.234
	3	1.261	11.466	67.700
	4	.760	6.909	74.609
	5	.594	5.398	80.007
	6	.491	4.463	84.470
	7	.472	4.291	88.761
	8	.424	3.852	92.613
	9	.319	2.900	95.512
	10	.281	2.556	98.068
	11	.213	1.932	100.000

Extraction Method: Generalized Least Squares.

Table 4
Component Matrix Value Before and After Rotation

a. Procedural Justice

Procedural Justice	Component Matrix (Before Rotation)		Component Matrix (After Rotation)	
	1	2	1	2
P01	.711	-.513	.202	.853
P02	.745	.022	.577	.471
P03	.649	-.507	.158	.808
P04	.806	-.101	.542	.605
P05	.715	.071	.587	.415
P06	.621	-.325	.256	.652
P07	.693	-.007	.519	.459
P08	.664	.210	.639	.276
P09	.368	.563	.647	-.184
P10	.804	.271	.785	.322
P11	.616	.211	.604	.244
P12	.829	.250	.790	.354
P13	.763	.163	.683	.377

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis and the significant value is >1.00

b. Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice	Component Matrix (Before Rotation)			Component Matrix (After Rotation)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
D14	.705	.024	-.095	.557	.133	.422
D15	.479	.512	-.220	.220	.569	.409
D16	.211	.699	-.135	-.003	.715	.201
D17	.148	.586	.396	.217	.624	-.292
D18	.425	-.534	.039	.476	-.454	.185
D19	.445	-.071	.325	.551	.022	-.069
D20	.304	-.040	-.378	.088	-.012	.479
D21	.776	.064	.329	.815	.209	.083
D22	.816	.032	-.051	.673	.162	.437
D23	.855	-.160	.113	.817	-.011	.317
D24	.850	-.045	-.241	.624	.080	.621

Note: Significant Factor Loading is > 0.5

	0.257	0.028	0.579	9.260	0.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

Table 5
Reliability Coefficients

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Procedural Justice	0.9166	13
Distributive Justice	0.8121	11
Organizational Commitment	0.9187	4
Turnover Intention	0.9536	3

* Acceptable significance Cronbach's Alpha is more than 0.5

Table 6
Correlations

		Procedural Justice	Distributive Justice	Organizational Commitment	Turnover Intention
Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.848(**)	.579(**)	-.612(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	172	172	172	172
Distributive Justice	Pearson Correlation	.848(**)	1	.541(**)	-.641(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	172	172	172	172
Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.579(**)	.541(**)	1	-.715(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	172	172	172	172
Turnover Intention	Pearson Correlation	-.612(**)	-.641(**)	-.715(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	172	172	172	172

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7
Regression Analysis – Hypothesis 1

a. Model Summary

Model	Adjusted R Square	ANOVA	
		F	Sig.
Regression	0.331	85.753	0.000 ^a

Significance $\alpha < 0.05$

a: Predictors: (Constant), Procedural Justice

b: Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

Variable /Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
	B	Std Error			
(Constant)	-0.064	1.162		-0.055	0.956

Procedural Justice	0.257	0.028	0.579	9.260	0.000
--------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

Table 8
Regression Analysis – Hypothesis 2

a. Model Summary

Model	Adjusted R Square	ANOVA	
		F	Sig.
Regression	0.288	70.210	0.000 ^a

Significance $\alpha < 0.05$

a: Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice

b: Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

b. Coefficients

Variable /Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
	B	Std Error			
(Constant)	-0.645	1.347		-0.479	0.632
Distributive Justice	0.325	0.039	0.541	8.379	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

Table 9
Regression Analysis Hypothesis 3

a. Model Summary

Model	Adjusted R Square	ANOVA	
		F	Sig.
Regression	0.371	101.928	0.000 ^a

Significance $\alpha < 0.05$

a: Predictors: (Constant), Procedural Justice

b: Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

b. Coefficients

Variable /Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
	B	Std Error			
(Constant)	18.711	0.986		18.986	0.000
Procedural Justice	-0.237	0.024	-0.612	-10.096	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Table 10
Regression Analysis – Hypothesis 4

a. Model Summary

Model	Adjusted R Square	ANOVA	
		F	Sig.
Regression	0.408	118.631	0.000 ^a

Significance $\alpha < 0.05$
a: Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice
b: Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

b. Coefficients

Variable /Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
	B	Std Error			
(Constant)	20.487	1.075		19.066	0.000
Distributive Justice	-0.337	0.031	-0.641	-10.892	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention