

Fairness and job satisfaction of Japanese multinationals in Asia

Yoshitaka Yamazaki
International University of Japan

Jeewhan Yoon
The George Washington University

July 2012

IUJ Research Institute
International University of Japan

These working papers are preliminary research documents published by the IUJ research institute. To facilitate prompt distribution, they have not been formally reviewed and edited. They are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment and may be revised. The views and interpretations expressed in these papers are those of the author(s). It is expected that the working papers will be published in some other form.

Title

Fairness and job satisfaction of Japanese multinationals in Asia

Authors

Yamazaki, Yoshitaka ^(a) & Yoon, Jeewhan ^(b)

^(a)Graduate School of International Management, International University of Japan
777 Kokusai, Minami Uonuma, Niigata, 949-7277, Japan (tel: 025-779-1106; fax:
025-779-1187e-mail; yyama@iuj.ac.jp).

^(b)School of Business, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street, NW, Washington,
DC 20052, USA (tel: 347-583-9531; e-mail: start@gwu.edu).

Abstract

We explored how fairness perceptions of HR practices affect job satisfaction among Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries, controlling age, gender, job tenure, previous work experiences, and management positions. Our fairness study focus described the effect of procedural justice and that of the transparency, which we have added as a new justice construct that is an organizational level of informational justice. We applied a performance evaluation system as an HR practice implemented over the MNC subsidiaries. Our research participants comprised of 903 Asian managers who worked for a leading Japanese multinational strategically expanding retail business markets in Asian locations: Japan, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand. Our key results revealed that both procedural and transparent fairness perceptions of the HR practice significantly influenced job satisfaction of Asian managers as a whole group. Each regional group also mostly exhibited a strong connection between their fairness perceptions of both procedures and transparency, and their job satisfaction. Finally, we discussed the implication of this study.

Key words

Procedural justice, transparency, job satisfaction, HR practices, Asian managers, Japanese MNCs

Introduction

Human resource management (HRM) has been deeply and importantly involved with fairness perceptions of the employees who react to HR practices (Bowen, Gilliland, & Folger, 1999; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Holbrook, 2002; Konovsky, 2000; Skarliski, 2003). Among HR practices in relation to organizational justice—the role of fairness in workplaces (Greenberg, 1995), a process of evaluating employee performance is one of the most influential practices not only for the organizational life of employees who judge on whether they are treated as being fair with the evaluation process, but also for critical decisions to other HR activities and policies (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Fairness perceptions in terms of employee performance evaluations become a key issue for the effectiveness of organizations (Bretz, Milkovich, & Read, 1992).

Several studies documented the magnitude of relationships between organizational justice and employee performance evaluations. With regard to an organizational level, fairness perceptions of performance evaluations have been defined as a primary measure to determine how this practice is useful and effective for organizations (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994; Erdogan, 2002; Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). As to an individual level, the fairness perceptions make important outcomes of individual attitudes or behaviors, including organizational commitment (Erdogan, 2002; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Sweeny & McFarlin, 1993), trust (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994), performance (Lind & Tyler, 1988), and job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll, 1995). As such, there is little doubt that organizational justice concerns employee performance evaluation processes (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

Cross-cultural and cross-national contexts

A growing body of organizational fairness research has been making great contribution to the progress and establishment in the HRM literature. The main research context of the studies has been made mostly in the U.S. Therefore, there are relatively few understandings of how employees of different countries make fairness judgments in organizations (Skarlicki, 2001); moreover, there are much fewer understandings as to how various countries employees judge performance evaluation processes through fairness perceptions. To explain about this situation, Greenberg (2001) argued that researchers have tended to pay little attention to cultural differences when studying organizational justice. Skarlicki (2001) also illustrated that the prevailing assumption our current understanding of organizational justice is universal; thus, we may overlook cultural differences among organizational employees of various countries. Cross-cultural management research suggests that a way of perceiving, interpreting, and understanding environments hinges on country cultures (Alder & Gundersen, 2008), so that culture shapes individuals' perceptions relevant to justice and injustice (Heine, 2010). Although concern of justice or fairness may be universal across cultures, a way of expressing to respond to the justice concern varies from one culture to another (Greenberg, 2001; Pillai, Williams, & Tan, 2001). Accordingly, research on fairness perceptions of different countries and cultures is significant in that such research can contribute to a greater understanding of not only organizational justice principles (Morris & Leung, 2000; Skarliski, 2001) but also the culture itself (Greenberg, 2001).

Multinational HRM contexts

The magnitude of MNC fairness research will be also justified from a perspective of strategic global HRM. In the competitive globalization, it is widely known how MNCs manage their employees is a key determinant of their success or failure (Bartlet & Ghoshal,

1989; Doz & Prahalad, 1986; Heldund, 1986). For their effectiveness, MNCs often desire to implement common HR practices in order to align the attitudes and behavior of their workforces across their overseas business locations (Onyemah, Rouzies, & Panagopopoulos, 2010). Common HR practices also serve to smoothly mobilize their global workforces within the MNC. However, MNCs may face a difficulty in adopting the common HR practices due to strong local pressures (Morris, Snell, & Wright, 2006; Onyemah et al., 2010) which include different values and perceptions of their employees who culturally interpret and evaluate the HR practices. Furthermore, employees make judgments toward HR practices from the users' view that is mostly driven by desire for fair treatment (Bowen, Gilliland, & Folger, 1999). Common HR practices matter for employees that affect the success or failure of MNCs' worldwide operations. This global HRM perspective allows us to explore to what extent common HR practices work well to manage employee attitudes and behaviors through a lens of fairness perceptions.

Study purposes

In this study, our central HR practices of fairness research describe the organizational processes to evaluate employee performances and promotion, which in turn employees can generally judge in terms of how they are treated through their fairness perceptions (Bowen, et al., 1999). More specifically regarding organizational justice dimensionalities to be analyzed, the present study focused procedural justice and transparency. Procedural justice as a key justice construct has been continually examined for over the past three decades with the initial study of procedural justice by Thibaut and Walker (1975) and plainly entails organizational evaluation processes (see Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). In contrast, transparency has not been paid much attention to in the organizational justice

literature. However, we believe that transparency will be possibly included into important justice constructs by which employees make fairness judgment. Assuming that your organization does not provide evaluation information clearly and openly, you may feel unfair and unhappy. In a more worsened case, if you are in the only department that is unable to access the information, you will feel definitely unfair. Transparency refers to a virtue (Murphy, Laczniak, & Wood, 2007) and relates to business ethics or morality (see Planski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011), an aspect of which involving social relations is justice (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

We have selected job satisfaction to be examined as an appropriate outcome of fairness perceptions of performance evaluation system. Hartmann (2000) discussed that job satisfaction itself is a more proper outcome than performance when studying performance evaluation. Because satisfaction in performance evaluation processes is thought to be a very important aspect of reaction to the process (Giles & Mosshoder, 1990; Jawahar, 2007), many studies have been done with employees' job satisfaction (Keeping & Levy, 2000). Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) argue that procedural justice leads to system referenced outcomes, while distributive justice leads to person referenced outcomes. System referenced outcomes are thought to contain a board aspect of organizational outcomes that individuals receive through procedures. This notion is matched with job satisfaction to be investigated because it is characterized as a more general, holistic, and multifaceted reaction than is outcome satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001). In addition, performance evaluation system with compensation results in a reflection of the degree of individuals' success or failure in performing their jobs (Lau, Wong, & Eggleton, 2008). Lind and Tyler (1988) discussed that fairness perceptions of procedures lead to satisfaction as one of important

outcomes. Several studies showed a strong relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998).

In overall, our study pursues to examine the effect of both procedural and transparency fairness perceptions of performance evaluation system as an HR practice on job satisfaction. Peculiarly, we aim to explore this fairness examination in cross-national work settings of MNCs.

Organizational Justice

Procedural justice with other critical justice constructs

The literature of organizational justice fundamentally describes three justice principles: distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Distributive justice relates to the perceived fairness of the outcomes that employees receive (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). A central topic of early research of perceived fairness was the distributive justice (Jawanhar, 2007), establishing that individuals care about outcomes such as a pay (Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1988). Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the procedures by which the decision of outcomes is made (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Greenberg, 1986a; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Research of procedural justice originated in the study of Thibaut and Walker (1975) with regard to a legal setting. Leventhal (1980) argued the importance of the procedural justice that is applicable for most organizations to make allocation decisions. This notion, together with the first empirical procedural justice study using a work setting by Folger and Greenberg (1985), stimulated justice research from legal to organizational contexts. Further, Leventhal (1980) proposed six fair process criteria of procedural justice that comprise of consistency, accuracy, representation, bias free, ability to correct, and ethical standard. Lind and Tyler (1988) demonstrated how these six criteria are

critical in perceived fairness of procedural situations. Distributive and procedural justices were firmly established to constitute organizational justice principles as two distinctive components (Greenberg, 1990). Several empirical studies supported these two factors (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Sweeny & McFarlin, 1993).

The principle of procedural justice can be theoretically accounted for by the following two models: the self-interest model and the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Blader & Tyler, 2005). The main focus of self-interest model represents the effect of subjective fairness perceptions, while that of group-value model describes a relational aspect between objective and subjective fairness perceptions in groups (Konovsky, 2000). The self-interest model, which is based on control theory applied by Thibaut and Walker (1975), posits that individuals want to control over procedures for motivational reasons to maximize their favorable outcomes through this control. Their fairness perceptions will be enhanced in terms of the procedures that produce outcomes. In contrast, the group-value model assumes that individuals want to become valuable members of their groups that influence the creation of individuals' identity, beliefs and behavior consistent with the group norm (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Individuals' fairness perceptions will be increased in their groups where they wish to support the procedures matched with the important values of the group and its members. Although these two models provide the different assumptions, the models explain that perceived procedural fairness can enhance several organizational outcomes, including commitment, trust, job satisfaction, performance, etc. Lind and Tyler (1988) argued that these models do not compete but complement each other to account for most findings involved with procedural justice.

With regard to a context of HR practices, Folger, Konovsky, and Cropanzano (1992)

have conceptualized a procedural justice model for performance evaluations. Their model relies on a due process with three fundamental components: 'adequate notice,' 'a fair hearing,' and 'judgment based on evidence.' Adequate notice focuses on giving employees proper information of performance evaluation. The proper information includes performance objectives and standards for evaluation that needs to be developed and established in advance of appraisal sessions. These objectives and standards are necessarily, clearly communicated and understood by all parties involved. The second component is a fair hearing, basically involving making two-way communications (Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008), in which evidence like individuals' voice is presented for evaluation decisions. Finally, the third component is judgment based on evidence. It entails bias free procedures and consistent implementation of standard as important elements for procedural fairness proposed by Leventhal (1980). Greenberg (1986b) discussed that appraisal results are accepted if they accord with documented evidence of performance evaluation. This perspective strengthens a relationship between the function of judgment based on evidence and employee procedural fairness perception. Several empirical studies have supported the procedural justice model for performance evaluations that consist of the three components, by examining the role of adequate notice (Williams & Levy, 2000; Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008), that of a fair hearing (Dulebohn & Ferris, 1999; Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008), and that of judgment based on evidence in part (Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008).

More recently, interactional justice was introduced as a different type of organizational justice, contrasting with distributive and procedural justices (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is defined as the perceived fairness of interpersonal treatment that employees receive (Bies & Moag, 1986; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Some researchers have

identified interaction justice as a third type of organizational justice, while others have treated it as a subcomponent of procedural justice (see Colquitt, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Furthermore, Greenberg (1993) suggested that interactional justice has two subsets. One component is characterized as an interpersonal aspect such as respect, politeness, and sensitivity, whereas the other describes an informational such as explanations and social accounts (Greenberg, 1993; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). By using confirmatory factor analysis, Colquitt (2001) has confirmed four distinctive dimensions of organizational justice: distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justices.

Transparency as a justice constituent

Transparency has been studied in several disciplinary areas such as politics (Balkin, 1999), marketing (Eggert & Helm, 2003), organizational governance (Hebb, 2006; Millar, Eldomiaty, Choi, & Hilton, 2005), and etc. A key idea of transparency used in these areas can be viewed into a similar conceptualization (Palanski, et al., 2010). To wit, transparency is a virtue accompanied with openness, clarity (Murphy, et al., 2007), availability, or disclosure of information (Palanski, et al., 2010).

This notion suggests that transparency may be associated with organizational justice as but it has not been defined yet in the literature of organizational justice. As discussed earlier, informational justice in the literature is regarded as a subset of the interaction justice (Greenberg, 1993), which refers to the perceived fairness of interpersonal treatment that employees receive (Bies & Moag, 1986; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The main focus of informational justice involves explaining to individuals with the quality of justification and truthfulness (Colquitt, 2001) that enhances the perceived adequacy of explanation (Shapiro, Buttner, & Barry, 1994). With the research findings on the dimensionality of organizational

justice by Colquitt (2001), Palanski et al. (2010) argues that transparency may be defined as the organizational level of the informational justice that involves explaining about organizational procedures by means of candid, timely, thorough, reasonable, or considerate communications toward employees' specific needs. Informational justice and transparency seem to possess some conceptual similarities about characteristics; however, informational justice is an individual level of organizational justice, while transparent justice is an organizational level of organizational justice. Consistent with the transparent justice definition described in other disciplines, in this study we define transparency as the organizational level of informational justice that represents clarity, openness, availability, or disclosure of information about organizational procedures in the firm.

Defined transparency of procedural information can be viewed as a positive organizational treatment to employees who wish to maximize their favorable results. Without the transparent information, they probably have a difficulty in expecting what behavioral performance produces outcomes that they are interested in. As a consequence, the employees may experience negative emotions toward their organization where they are working. Like a procedural justice, transparent justice is considered to influence more general satisfaction than outcome satisfaction. Although the meta-analysis of overall organizational justice by Colquitt et al. (2001) does not include transparent justice, their study showed the effect of informational justice was moderately related to job satisfaction. Accordingly, it would be reasonable to infer that transparency will influence job satisfaction.

Procedural and Interactional Justices across Countries and Cultures

According to the comprehensive review of cross-cultural justice research by Morris and Leung (2000), procedural and interactional justice research in different countries and

cultures is constrained. However, Morris and Leung (2000) suggest that similar patterns of procedural and interactional justice perceptions may be seen even in a number of an abstract level of cross-national studies (Morris & Leung, 2000). As discussed earlier, the self-interest model based on control theory tells us that individuals desire to control over procedures to enhance their favorable outcomes through this control (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Some cross-national studies about procedural justice showed this similar principle in research contexts of not only in the U.S. but also in other countries (Morris & Leung, 2000). Such studies represent a procedural model for conflict resolution Honk Kong (Leung, 1987), and a procedural preference comparison between Japan and Spain (Leung, Au, Fernandez-Dole, & Iwawaki, 1992). Further, other cross-national studies also showed an interpersonal facet of interactional justice (Morris & Leung, 2000) including research on voice effects in US and Honk Kong (Leung & Li, 1990) and that on procedural justice judgments of US, Germany, Honk Kong, and Japan (Lind, Tyler, & Huo, 1997). With regard to a relationship between culture and procedural justice, Brokner, Chen, Mannix, Leng, and Skarliski (2000) found that cultural differences between interdependent-self (i.e., collectivism) and independent-self (i.e., individualism) moderate the interactive relationship between procedural justice and outcome favorability, using samples of U.S., Canadian, Chinese, and Taiwanese students. Their study suggests that if individuals define the nature of their social exchanges by using procedural justice information, those who believe that social exchanges are important will tend to show the interactive connection between procedural justice and outcome favorability.

Morris and Leung (2000) illustrate that there is also a similarity among different countries with regard to positive attitudes or behaviors as the consequences of procedural and interactional justice. For example, the joint venture study in China by Leung, Smith, Wang,

and Sun (1996) showed that perceived procedural justice affected job satisfaction. In Lithuanian work settings, Pearce, Bigley, and Branyiczki (1998) found that procedural justice was related to organizational commitment and trust. Leung and his colleagues also reported a similar influence of procedural and interactional justice in Hong Kong and China (Leung & Li, 1990; Leung, Chiu, & Au, 1993). However, the cross-national study by Pillari, et al. (2001) revealed inconsistent consequences about the effect of procedural justice, using business settings' or executive MBAs' samples from U.S., German, India, and China (Hong Kong). Their results showed that the effect of procedural justice on organizational commitment, trust, and job satisfaction in a context of U.S. participants, while organizational commitment and trust among German employees; trust for Indians; and organizational commitment for Chinese Honk Kong executive MBA students. Those cross-national comparative studies suggest that although each study has its different research purposes and contexts, procedural justice effect might differ across countries.

In contrast to the aforementioned cross-national comparisons between countries, Kim and Mauborgne (1991, 1993) focused on an entire international group of MNC executives of how to perceive fairness and its attitudinal and behavioral effects. They reported commitment, trust, and outcome satisfaction as the effect of procedural justice perceived by top executives of multinational subsidiaries abroad (Kim & Mauborgne, 1991). Their follow-up study illustrates that procedural justice perception of the top executives group that consists of North America (U.S. and Canada), Europe, and Asia (Japan and South Korea) is associated with their behavioral compliance with strategic decision (Kim & Mauborgne, 1993). Although it is necessarily important to compare and define national and cultural differences in organizational justice from a view point of cross-cultural research, it is also significant to

understand organizational justice perceptions and their effect of an entire group of people who have similar features and positions in the global firm. In this study, we explore the following three research questions.

Research Question 1: To what extent do procedural and transparent fairness perceptions toward a common HR practice of performance evaluation system affect job satisfaction in a whole group of Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries?

Research Question 2: To what extent do procedural and transparent fairness perceptions toward a common HR practice of performance evaluation system affect job satisfaction according to the different countries of Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries?

Research Question 3: Is there any difference in degrees of procedural and transparent fairness perceptions according to the different countries of Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries?

In addition to these research questions, we considered

Methods

Research Context and Site

Asian-Pacific regions have been becoming more important for global business and economy in the 21st century. Our study focused on Asia because very little comparative organizational justice research has previously been done in Asia, excepting China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan. For those reasons, we asked a Japanese MNC to participate in a series of several studies that included the present organizational justice research. This Japanese MNC is one of the largest and successful retail business firms, headquartered near Tokyo and has been strongly deploying in Asia's emerging countries and regions according to

its global expansion strategy. Its line of business is operating shopping centers, supermarkets, home centers, convenience stores, drugstores, financial services, and gas stations. It has more than 4000 stores in Asia where it applies the same code of conduct and common HR practices of performance based evaluation and promotion systems that this study has concerned.

Consequently, this Japanese MNC provides a good source for data collecting from managers for our organizational justice analysis that includes comparative studies among Japan, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand.

Sample and procedures

Our sample consisted of 903 managers of the aforementioned Japanese MNC. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the participating Asian managers of the 5 locations. The Japanese managers were the oldest; the Hong Kong and Thai managers, the next oldest; and the Chinese and Malaysian managers, the youngest. A majority of the Japanese managers were male, while the other Asian managers were relatively balanced about gender. Japanese managers had the longest work experience at this Japanese MNC, followed by Hong Kong and Thai managers, whereas Chinese and Malaysian managers had the shortest amount. This pattern is similar to the age demographic. This is because the Japanese MNC expanded its business in China and Malaysia more recently than it did in the other countries and region. It seems to have hired young people in China and Malaysia. Japanese managers had the least prior working experience in other companies; Malaysian and Thai managers had the next; and Chinese and Hong Kong managers had worked the most for organizations other than this Japanese MNC. With regard to the Japanese managers, it seems that Japanese tend to stay at a larger size of organization due to their job security, once they are hired. Finally, the distribution of management positions varied slightly among the five Asian manager groups.

Survey packets were directly sent to the stores of the Japanese MNC in Japan and sent to the headquarters of the MNC subsidiary in China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand. Potential participants received the packet through the internal delivery service. A total of 1,440 packets were distributed, and 1,111 were returned. However, 208 questionnaires were eliminated due to incomplete or incorrect ones. As a result, 903 questionnaires usable for this study remained at the return rate of 63.5% against the completed versions. As shown in Table 1, the usable questionnaires of Japanese managers were 229 out of 480 survey packets distributed at the return rate of 47.8%; those of Chinese managers were 300 out of 370 at 81.1%; those of Honk Kong managers were 107 out of 150 at 71.3%; those of Malaysia managers were 161 out of 300 at 53.7%; and finally, those of Thai managers were 106 out of 140 at 75.7%.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Measures

Procedural and transparent justices of HR practices

We developed two justice questionnaires to examine procedural and transparent fairness perceptions to fit to our research context of where Asian managers work for their subsidiaries of Japanese MNC. With regard to procedural justice of performance evaluation system, we particularly focused on ‘bias free’ that includes the six process criteria of procedural justice proposed by Leventhal (1980). According to Hofstede (1997) and Triandis (1995), many Asian countries are collectivism or grouped-basic countries. Thus, it is thought to have a tendency to naturally make a group by comparing similarities and differences in

terms of individual demographic characteristics. Besides, as we discussed earlier, a foundation of the principle of procedural justice describe the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Blader & Tyler, 2005), postulating that individuals desire become important group members who affect identity, beliefs and behaviors harmonized with the group norm (Lind & Tyler, 1988). It seems that this group-value model is appropriate to apply for Asians to affect their fairness perception of procedural processes and that Asian people may be sensitive to the demographic characteristics of the group that they belong or do not belong, especially with regard to procedural justice processes. We applied this notion and considered ethnicity, religion, and gender as a potential source of making groups in their workplaces which in turn these diversification sources may become a root of bias against procedural justice of employee performance evaluation system.

The Japanese MNC participated in this study uses a performance-based evaluation system to all of its subsidiaries in Asia and its employees recognize their evaluation process using the word of ‘personnel evaluation’ as their performance assessment. To avoid confusing our participants, we adopted the same term, ‘personnel evaluation’ in three question items of our questionnaires. Three procedural justice questions consist of: ‘I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on ethnic group in my company,’ ‘I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on gender in my company,’ and ‘I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on religions in my company.’ All three items were designed with a 5-point Likert scale, 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree to analyze the degree of procedural justice of Asian managers. The more scores will become the more biases and the less perceived fair against the performance evaluation system as an HR practice.

With regard to transparent justice, we created two question items that entail ‘clarity’

as one of basic features of transparency (Murphy, et al., 2007) as follows: 'I feel the personnel evaluation criteria are clear in my company,' and 'I feel the personnel evaluation process is transparent in my company.' Like the procedural justice questionnaires, the transparent ones also accompanied with the 5-point Likert scale: the greater numbers, the more perceived transparent fairness toward the performance evaluation commonly used in the Japanese MNC.

In order to verify the validity and reliability of the procedural and transparent justice measures discussed above, we conducted the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We used the complete data set from our Asian participants ($N = 903$) for both analyses of a total of five items: three items for procedures and two items for transparency. The results of EFA showed that two factors were dominant whose eigen values were greater than one, accounting for 74.9% of the total variance. Factor loading of three items of procedural justice measure ranged from 0.86 to 0.85, while that of two items of transparency showed 0.88 and 0.87. Cross loading was very low among five items from 0.02 to -0.14. Then, we conducted CAF on the same sample of 903 participants to confirm that the two factors identified from EFA were actually valid. Results of the CAF indicated that the fit indices except the score of χ^2 fell within acceptable range ($\chi^2 = 25.08$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 4$; GFI = 0.989; CFI = 0.983; TLI = 0.958; RMSEA = 0.076), suggesting the data fit model well with structural validity. In addition, the correlation test showed that a strong positive relationship of indicators within the measure of procedural justice ($r = 0.59$ to 0.61 , $p < 0.01$), that of transparent justice ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.01$), lending support for convergent validity. Finally, the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the procedural and transparent justices were 0.81 and 0.71 respectively, suggesting an acceptable reliability of each measure. Table 2 describes the results of EFA and CAF of the two justice measures.

Insert Table 2 about here

Job Satisfaction

We used a revised shorter version of the job satisfaction scale designed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) to measure the job satisfaction of Asian managers. The original measure is composed of 18 items and was devised to examine overall job satisfaction in organizations. It was also developed to show sensitivity to variations in attitude and is applicable to various kinds of jobs. As we sought to consider the overall workload of survey questions, we developed six items on a Likert-type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, including 'I feel fairly satisfied with my present job,' 'I am often bored with my current job' (reverse item), 'My current assignment is pretty uninteresting' (reverse item), 'I am satisfied with my present assignment for the time being,' 'I am disappointed that I took this current assignment' (reverse item), and 'Most days, I am enthusiastic about my present job.' The instrument was used in several studies about job satisfaction (Brayfield, Wells and Strate 1957; Ewen 1967) including expatriate management studies (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2007; Yamazaki, 2010) and cross-national organizational justice research (Pillari, et al., 2001). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was 0.82.

Demographic characteristics as control variables

The Asian managers participated in this study were asked to write about gender, age, periods of working experiences in the Japanese MNC (job tenure), previous working experiences before starting to work for this firm, and a hierarchical management position such as senior (store or vice store managers), middle (line managers), and junior (assistant line managers). All of the five demographics are shown in Table 1. To control for the possibility

that socio-demographic characteristics in the fairness variables and the job satisfaction variable might produce a spurious relationship between those variables, we entered the five demographic variables as covariates in this study. Several organizational justice studies that involve satisfaction applied age, gender, and/or tenure as control or even independent variables (see, McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Janssen, 2001; Arnold & Spell, 2006). It is also reported that a significant relationship between both procedural and interaction justices and management ranks of senior, middle and supervisor (Leung et al., 1996). Additionally, a cross-national management study showed that tenure and past working experiences were the predictor of job satisfaction (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2010). For these control variables, age (years), job tenure (months), gender (female = 0; male = 1), previous work experiences (0 = no experience; 1 = experience), and a hierarchical management positions (1 = senior; 2 = middle; 3 = junior).

Translations procedures

Survey questionnaires used in this study were translated across four languages: English, Japanese, Chinese, and Thai, according to the translation procedures for cross-cultural study proposed by Brislin, Lonner, and Thorndike (1973). All questionnaires were originally written in English, which was applicable to the examination of Malaysian managers. The original English version was translated into Japanese, Chinese, and Thai versions, which were back translated into English. The meanings of the original English and translated Japanese, Chinese, or Thai versions were compared, as were the meanings of the original and back-translated versions.

Results

Table 3 shows the correlation matrix and descriptive statistics for all variables used in

this study. Results of correlation analysis illustrated that procedural and transparent justices were significantly related to job satisfaction ($p < 0.01$ for both justice variables), indicating that the greater fairness perceptions of performance evaluation systems relate to the more satisfied with jobs. Two demographic variables were also significantly associated with job satisfaction: past work experiences and management positions. It is suggested that Asian managers who had worked for organizations are more satisfied with their jobs than those with no work experiences ($p < 0.01$). This result might be ascribed to comparatively better contextual working environment of this Japanese MNC than those of previous ones for its many managers who had worked in the past. Management positions were negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($p < 0.05$). It is meant that higher management positions might provide a greater opportunity to motivate to work than lower positions. These explanations, however, are not beyond speculation, so close examination on these results would be necessary. Results showed that gender was negatively and marginally significant on job satisfaction, indicating that female managers are relatively more satisfied with male managers. Interestingly, gender was also significantly, positively associated with tenure; that is, female managers have shorter working experiences in this MNC than male managers, suggesting the reflection from its HR strategy to hire more female workers recently than in the past in an Asian context excepting Japan.

Insert Table 3 about here

The first research question concerns a whole group of Asian managers. How do their procedural and transparent justices to commonly used performance evaluation system

influence job satisfaction in their MNC subsidiaries? In order to assess the effect of the justice variables, we applied a hierarchical regress analysis, loading job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and generated two models: the first model represented only five socio-demographic items as control variables, while the second one added the predictors of the justice variables into the first model as a main effect to be expected. As shown in Table 4, the second model for all Asian managers indicated that the main effects of two justice variables were significant on job satisfaction, demonstrating the incremental adjusted R^2 (F change = 62.46, $p < 0.01$) in comparison with the first model that consists of the five control variables. Although the first model received statistical significance ($F = 5.52$, $p < 0.01$) with the effects of past work experience ($p < 0.01$), management positions ($p < 0.05$), and gender ($p < 0.10$), it is quite evident that the second model including the two justice variables is much stronger and influential to job satisfaction. Accordingly, it is reasonable to conclude that the more Asian managers perceive fairness to common performance evaluation system about procedures and transparency, the greater they will be satisfied with their jobs in MNC subsidiaries.

The second research question concerns the individual five locations in Asia: Japan, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand, by asking the similar question that describes the effect of procedural and transparent justices on job satisfaction. Like the results of the entire group of all Asian managers, results also exhibited job satisfaction received from the significant effect of the both justices to the performance evaluations of each of the five different areas managers, excepting procedural justice variables of Hong Kong but that marginally affected job satisfaction ($p < 0.10$). In addition, all of Model 2s in terms of five locations were strengthened by the inclusion of the two main predictors of procedural and transparent justices at the range of adjusted R^2 changes from 0.09 (Malaysia) to 0.17 (China)

along with F changes from 7.03 (Thailand, $p < 0.01$) to 30.75 (China, $p < 0.01$). Model 1s that are constituted of the only socio-demographic control items varied with five different locations in terms of the influences of the controls on job satisfaction. In overall, the results of the individual five locations in Asia confirmed that procedural and transparent justices toward common performance evaluation system strongly affect the job satisfaction of most Asian managers. Table 4 summarized results of all of the regression analyses relevant to the two research questions.

Insert Table 4 about here

The research question concerns a relationship between countries/locations and two justice variables and asks whether there is a similarity or difference with regard to degrees of procedural and transparent fairness perceptions according to different countries of Asian managers. Results of ANOVA illustrated, as shown in Table 5, that the both justice variables differed among the five locations (procedural justice: $F = 26.05$, $p < 0.01$; transparent justice: $F = 22.10$, $p < 0.01$). The Bonferroni test was used to identify which area group of managers is different from each other among the five locations in Asia. With regard to procedural justice, Japanese and Chinese managers were the lowest scores sub-group, showing the highest justice perception; Malaysian and Thai managers were the highest scores subgroup, indicating the lowest justice perceptions; and Hong Kong managers were in the middle among the five Asian managers' groups. Results of Bonferroni test of transparent justice illustrated that Japanese and Chinese managers were significantly different from Hong Kong and Malaysian managers, but not different from Thai managers, who were distinct from Malaysian managers.

Furthermore, Hong Kong managers differed from Malaysian managers but not from Thai managers. In sum of transparency among the five locations, Japanese and Chinese managers perceived its fairness the least toward common performance evaluation system; Malaysian managers perceived it the most; Hong Kong managers perceived it in the middle; and Thai managers perceived it with a similar level of not only Japanese and Chinese managers but also Hong Kong managers. According to the results described in this section, it is suggested that fairness perceptions to common performance evaluation system differ among Asian managers according to their countries. Table 5 described the results of ANOVA and the Bonferroni test about relationship between the two justice variables and the five Asian locations.

Insert Table 5 about here

Based on the results of the correlation analysis in this study, it is noticeable that justice perceptions were significantly related with management positions and past work experiences, especially procedural justice. This empirical evidence would provide us further two exploratory questions.

Exploratory question 4: How do management positions affect fairness perceptions to common performance evaluation system among Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries?

Exploratory question 5: How do past work experiences affect fairness perceptions to common performance evaluation system among Asian managers of MNC subsidiaries?

We used ANOVA to examine the exploratory question 4, loading three management

positions of senior (store/vice store managers), middle (line managers), and junior (assistant managers) as the predictor of fairness perceptions of procedures and transparency. As shown in Table 6, results of ANOVA revealed a significant difference in procedural justice among three management positions as an entire group of Asian managers ($F = 3.52, p < 0.05$) but no difference in transparency ($F = 1.25, p > 0.10$). Bonferroni test as a post-hoc examination explained about a significant difference between senior management and junior management (m.d. = -0.65; $p < 0.05$), indicating that senior managers perceived more fairness about performance evaluation system than junior managers. When we examined the relationship between three management positions and fairness perceptions in each five-location, results of ANOVA indicated that procedural justices significantly differed among three management positions in Japan ($F = 5.37, p < 0.01$) and marginally varied with the position in Hong Kong ($F = 2.38, p < 0.10$). Results of Bonferroni test showed that senior and middle Japanese managers perceived more fairness than junior managers (m.d. of senior vs. junior = -1.39, $p < 0.05$; that of middle vs. junior = -0.98, $p < 0.05$), but they revealed no statistical difference among positions of three Hong Kong managers. Results of ANOVA also showed that transparency was a significant difference among three management positions of Japanese managers ($F = 4.64, p < 0.05$). Subsequent Bonferroni test revealed that senior managers perceived more fairness of transparency against performance evaluation system in Japan. With the exception of Japan and Hong Kong, there was no significant difference in procedural or transparent justices of the other three countries. Table 6 summarizes the results of the justice variables and the management positions.

Insert Table 6 about here

The sixth exploratory question asks the influence of past work experience on justice perceptions. As showed in Table 7, results of t-test showed a significantly lower level of procedural justice of past work experiences than that of no past work experience in an entire group of all Asian managers ($t = 2.82, p < 0.01$), but there was no difference in transparency between past and no past work experiences ($t = 0.17, p > 0.10$). It suggests, in general, that Asian managers with past work experience perceive less procedural fairness to common performance evaluation system than those who had not had work experience, but all Asian managers had similar transparent fairness perceptions regardless of their past work experience. Close examination about each five-location in Asia provided slightly different results. With regard to procedural justice, results of t-test indicated that past work experience made difference among Chinese managers ($t = 2.30, p < 0.05$), suggesting that the managers with the past work experience perceived less fairness than those with no past work experience. Further, Japanese managers who had worked for other organizations marginally felt more unfair than those with no past work experience ($t = 1.86, p < 0.10$). According to these results about specific country analysis, the past experience of Chinese managers affects the degree of procedural justice perceptions toward common performance evaluation system and that of Japanese managers is relatively influential factor on procedural justice perceptions. Past work experience, however, do not affect transparent fairness perceptions to the performance evaluation system. Table 7 describes results of the t-test about past work experience related to two justice perceptions.

Insert Table 7 about here

Discussions

Summary of results

Our study provided four important findings. First, this study largely supported the effect of both procedural and transparent justices on job satisfaction in Asian multinational contexts of Japan, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand. Second, fairness perceptions of procedural and transparent justices varied with Asian countries and locations. Third, although our study showed that management positions generally affect procedural fairness perceptions as an entire group of Asian managers, this finding was specifically applied to Japanese managers and partly applied to Hong Kong managers. Additionally, transparency justice perceptions depended on management positions only in Japanese management contexts. Fourth, we found that past work experience influenced procedural justice perceptions in an entire group of Asian managers, but our close analysis revealed that this effect emerged in a context of Chinese managers and partly in that of Japanese managers.

Theoretical implications

On account of few organizational justice studies across cultures (Skarlicki, 2001; Greenberg, 2001) and relatively small numbers of various countries' procedural justice studies (Morris & Leung, 2000), this study has made a theoretical contribution to development for the literature of organizational justice through cross-national examination. Our study largely confirmed that procedural and transparent justice perceptions significantly influence job satisfaction in Asia as well as in the five countries and locations on individual analyses. The results of our study about the effect of procedural justice on job satisfaction were consistent with the previous research conducted in the U.S. (e.g., McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Pillai, et

al., 2001) but relatively inconsistent with the results in Hong Kong using the sample of executive MBA students (Pillari, et al, 2001). Our results of Hong Kong managers showed marginally significance on its effect on job satisfaction ($p < 0.10$), so that the association between procedural justice and job satisfaction might not be as strong among Hong Kong managers as the other managers. Therefore, a promising study will be needed about how procedural justice of Hong Kong managers affects job satisfaction.

Our study importantly proposed a new justice construct, which is ‘transparency,’ as an organizational level of information justice. Four justice dimensionalities such as distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and information have been presented in the organizational justice literature (Colquitt, 2001); so, we believe that transparency can be characterized as another distinctive justice. Interpersonal and informational justices are conceptualized into interaction justice (Greenberg, 1993; Floger & Cropanzano, 1998) as an individual facet rather than an organizational one that involves transparency described in this study. Although our study also showed the effect of transparent justice to job satisfaction in Asia, it needs to be more investigated with respect to other important organizational outcomes as a predictor. In a study of expectancy theory, it is reported that transparency of the performance-reward link affected motivations (Kominis & Emmanuel, 2007). We hope that this study will stimulate the interests of organizational justice researchers to analyze several features of transparency that serves as an organizational level of an interactional aspect between the individual and the organization.

Our studies revealed cross-national variations of justice perceptions among five locations. With regard to procedural justice, Malaysian and Thai managers perceived less fairness than the other three groups. As our study focused on the lack of bias from procedural

justice about gender, ethnicity, and religion each of which leads to making a group naturally in organizations, working contexts that both Malaysian and Thai managers face may comprise of plural ethnic groups: Malaysia has three ethnic groups, while Thailand has two groups. Their ethnic contextual situations might affect the degree of procedural fairness perceptions more negatively than the other managers' groups such as Japan, China, and Hong Kong. As to transparency that is clear explanation and information available to employees, Japanese and Chinese managers perceived lower degrees of transparent justice than Hong Kong and Malaysia managers whose main language is English in their subsidiaries. Asian countries seem to be embedded to a high context culture (Hall, 1976), but the types of main corporate languages might somehow influence the degree of transparency perceptions. That is, a working context used in English may be direct, straight, or logical than a Japanese or Chinese working context using their mother tongues. However, our explanations about the ethnic group as well as the main language remain speculative so that a further study will be important to find out its reasons.

Practical implications

Konovsky (2002) discussed that the implications of procedural fairness are quite obvious in the area of HRM. Our findings will importantly offer several practical implications for HR managers especially who are responsible to manage host country nationals (HCNs) through HR practices and policies over their MNC subsidiaries. The management of HCNs is strategically important for MNCs to become strong competitors in the race for global talent (Beamish & Inkpen, 1998), because HCNs have been becoming increasingly effective (DeNisi, Toh, & Connelly, 2006) in performing at managerial positions (Briscoe, Schuler, & Claus, 2009). To enhance job satisfaction of HCNs, HR managers of the headquarters should

be sensitive to bias free HR practices or policies in terms of performance evaluation processes when making and implementing them commonly. Such global policies and practices without bias of gender, ethnicity, and religion as socio-demographic elements may need to be clearly and openly communicated with the HCNs through host HR management actions of MNC subsidiaries. These HR practices and policies are important to increase the satisfaction of HCNs, leading to their intention to stay (Wand, 2010).

To increase fairness perceptions of HCNs in an MNC subsidiary, effort levels of local HR managers depend on which country or location they belong to and at which management position employees are placed. In terms of countries and locations in Asia, HR managers in Malaysia and Thailand may have to make a great effort on elimination of socio-demographics from HR practices and policies, especially from performance evaluation system or perhaps promotion evaluation processes that involve evaluating employees because they perceive unfair most among Asian managers. HR managers of Japan, China, and probably Thailand should exert to enhance the transparency of those evaluation systems within their MNC subsidiaries in that their management employees felt transparent to them least. Further, HR managers of Japan may need to pay much attention to procedural and transparent fairness perceptions of junior managers and should increase these fairness perceptions. HR managers in China more care about particularly management employees who had worked for other organizations due to their lower procedural fairness perceptions to personnel evaluation systems.

Limitations

Some limitations exist in our study. First, we focused on bias-free of gender, religion, and ethnicity to develop the scale of procedural justice because we believe that this trait is

particularly crucial to evaluate fairness perceptions in Asia. Although this scale was valid and reliable based on our analysis using EFA and CFA, we did not include other components proposed by Leventhal (1980). Because this scale was inclined to the bias-free element, it might overlook some other features of procedural fairness perceptions. Second, our study sample was drawn from Asian managers of a Japanese retail business firm that allowed us to use their data. In order to generalize findings obtained from this study, future research should move beyond Japan, China, Hong Kong, and Thailand to contain other Asian countries as well as other countries beyond Asia. This view also can be applied for other industries beyond retail service industries.

References

- Adams, S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 267–299. New York: Academic Press.
- Adler, N.J., & Gundersen, A. (2008). *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, 5th ed. Mason, OH: Thomson, South-Western.
- Arnold, T., & Spell, C.S. (2006). The relationship between justice and benefits satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20, 599–620.
- Balkin, J.M. (1999). How mass media simulate political transparency. *Cultural Values*, 3, 393–413.
- Bartlett, C.A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing across borders: the transnational solution*. Boston, MA: Hutchinson Business Books.
- Beamish, P. W., Inkpen, A. C. (1998). Japanese firms and the decline of the Japanese expatriate. *Journal of World Business* 33, 35–50.
- Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice: communication criteria of fairness. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11, 133–174.
- Blader, S.L., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justices. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 107–126.
- Bowen, D.E., Gilliland, S.T., & Folger, R. (1999). HRM and service fairness: how being fair with employees spills over to customers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27, 7–23.
- Brayfield, A.H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An Index of Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 5, 307–311.
- Brayfield, A.H., Wells, R.V., & Strate, M.W., (1957). Interrelationships among Measures of

Job Satisfaction and General Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41, 4, 201–205.

Bretz, R.D., Milovich, G.T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18, 321–352.

Briscoe, D. R., Schuler, R. S., & Claus, L. (2009). *International Human Resource Management* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Brislin, R., Lonner, W., & Thorndike, R. (1973). *Cross-cultural Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Brockner, J., Chen, Y., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K., & Skarliski, D.P. (2000). Culture and procedural fairness: When the effects of what you do depend on how you do it. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 138–159.

Cardy, R.L., & Dobbins, G.H. (1994). *Performance appraisal: alternative perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

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

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

DeNisi, A. S., Toh, S. M., & Connelly, B. (2006). Building effective expatriate-host country national relationships: the effects of human resources practices, international strategy and mode of entry. In M. J. Morley, N. Neraty & D. G. Collings (Eds.), *International Human Resource Management and International Assignments*. (pp. 114–134).

Hampshire, UK:Palgrave MacMillan.

- Dulebohn, J.H., & Ferris, G.R. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of performance evaluations' fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 288–303.
- Doz, Y., & Prahalad, C.K. (1986). Controlled variety: a challenge for human resource management in the MNC. *Human Resource Management*, 25, 55–71.
- Eggert, A., & Helm, S. (2003). Exploring the impact of relational transparency on business relationship: A cross-sectional study among purchasing managers in Germany. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 32, 101–108.
- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 555 –578.
- Erdogan, B., Kraimer, M.L., & Liden, R.C. (2001). Procedural justice as two-dimensional construct: an examination in the performance appraisal context. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 37, 205–222.
- Ewen, R.B. (1967). Weighting Components of Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51, 1, 68–73.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretative analysis of personnel system. In Ferris, G.R., & Rowland, K.M. (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management (Vol. 3)*, pp.141 –183, Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115–130.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for

performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14, 129–177.

Giles, W.F., & Mossholder, K.W. (1990). Employee reactions to contextual and session components of performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 371–377.

(III)

Greenberg, J. (1986a). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 340–342.

Greenberg, J. (1986b). Organizational performance appraisal procedures: What makes them fair? In Bazerman, M.H., Lewicki, R.J., Sgeooardm B.H., (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, pp.25–41, Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity and workplace status: a field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 606–613.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399–432.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In Cropanzano, (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, (pp.79–103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Greenberg, J. (1995). *The quest for justice on the job: Essays and experiments*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greenberg, J. (2001). Studying organizational justice cross-culturally: fundamental challenges. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 365–375.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hartmann, G.H. (2000). The appropriateness of RAPM: toward the further development of theory. *Accounting, Organization, and Society*, 25, 415–482.

- Hedlund, G. (1986). The hypermodern MNC: a heterarchy? *Human Resource Management*, 25, 9–35.
- Hebb, T. (2006). The economic inefficiency of secrecy: pension funds investors' corporate transparency concerns. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 385–405.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holbrook Jr., R.L. (2002). Contact points and flash points: Conceptualizing the use of justice mechanisms in the performance appraisal interview. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 101–123.
- Jawahar, I.M. (2007). The influence of perceptions of fairness on performance appraisal reactions. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28, 735–754.
- Janssen, O. (2001). Fairness perceptions as a moderator in the curvilinear relationships between job demands, and job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1039–1050.
- Keeping, L.M., & Levy, P.E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 708–723. (ILL)
- Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (1991). Implementing global strategies: The role of procedural justice. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 125–143
- Kim, W.C., & Mauborgne, R.A. (1993). Procedural justice, attitudes, and subsidiary top management compliance with multinationals' corporate strategic decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 502–526.
- Kominis, G., & Emmanuel, C.R. (2007). The expectancy–valence theory revisited: developing an extended model of managerial motivation. *Management Accounting*

Research 18, 49–75

- Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding procedural justices and its impact on business organization. *Journal of Management*, 26, 489–511.
- Konovsky, M., & Pugh, S. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656–669.
- Lau, C.M., Wong, K.M., & Eggleton, R.C. (2008). Fairness of performance evaluation procedures and job satisfaction: the role of outcome-based and non-outcome-based effects. *Accounting and Business Research*, 38, 121–135.
- Leung, K. (1987). Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution: A cross-national study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 898–908.
- Leung, K., Au, Y.F., Fernandez-Dols, J.M., & Iwawaki, S. (1992). Preferences for methods of conflict processing in two collective cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, 27, 195–209.
- Leung, K., Chiu, W.H., & Au, Y.F. (1993). Sympathy and support for industrial actions: A justice analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 781–787.
- Leung, K., & Li, W. (1990). Psychological mechanisms of process control effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 613–620.
- Leung, K., Smith, P., Wang, Z., & Sun, H. (1996). Job satisfaction in joint venture hotels in China: An organizational justice analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27, 947–962.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In Gergen, K.K., Greenberg, M.S., & Willis, R.J. (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in theory and*

- Research, pp. 27–55. New York: Plenum.
- Lind, E.A., & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum.
- Lind, E.A., Tyler, T.R., & Huo, Y.J. (1997). Procedural context and culture: Variation in the antecedents of procedural justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 767–780. (ILL)
- McFarlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626–637.
- Millar, C.C., Eldomiaty, T.I., Choi, C.J., & Hilton, B. (2005). Corporate governance and institutional transparency in emerging markets. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, 163–174.
- Morris, M.W., & Leung, K. (2000). Justice for all? Progress in research on cultural variation in the psychology of distributive and procedural justice. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49, 100–132.
- Morris, S.S., Snell, S.A., & Wright, P.M., (2006). A resource-based view of international human resources: toward a framework of integrative and creative capabilities. In G.K. Stahl & I. Bjorkman (eds.), *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*, pp.433–448, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Mossholder, K.W., Bennett, N, & Martin, C.L. (1998). A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 131–141.
- Murphy, K.R., & Cleveland, J.N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal: Social,*

Organizational and Goal-based perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Murphy, P.E., Laczniak, G.R., & Wood, G. (2007). An ethical basis for relationship marketing: a virtue ethics perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41, 37–57.
- Narcisse, S., & Harcourt, M. (2008). Employee fairness perceptions of performance appraisal: a Saint Lucian case study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 1152–1169.
- Onyemah, V., Rouzies, D., & Panagopoulos, N.G. (2010). How HRM control affects boundary-spanning employees' behavioural strategies and satisfaction: the moderating impact of cultural performance orientation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 1951–1975.
- Palanski, M.E., Kahai, S.S., & Yammarino, F.J. (2011). Team virtue and performance: an examination of transparency, behavioral integrity, and trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99, 201–216.
- Pearce, J.L., Bigley, G.A., & Branyiczki, I. (1998). Procedural justice as modernism: Placing industrial/organisational psychology in context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47, 371–369.
- Pillai, R., Williams, E.S., Tan, J.J. (2001). Are the scales tipped in favor of procedural of distributive justice? An investigation of the U.S., India, Germany, and Hong Kong (China). *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 312–333.
- Shapiro, D.L., Buttne, E.H., & Barry, B. (1994). Explanations: What factors enhance their perceived adequacy? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58, 346–368.
- Skarlicki, D.P. (2001). Cross-cultural perspectives of organizational justice. *International*

Journal of Conflict Management, 12, 292–294.

Skarliski, D.P. (2003). HRM special issue: fairness and human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 1–5.

Sweeney, P.D., & McFarlin, D.B. (1993). Workers' evaluation of the "ends" and "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23–40.

Taylor, S.M., Tracy, K.B., Renard, M.K., Harrison, J.K., & Carroll, S.J. (1995). Due process in performance appraisal: a quasi-experiment in procedural justice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 495–523.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wang, Y. (2010). Intention to stay in Chinese foreign-invested comparisons: previous experiences, initial expectations and current satisfactions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 1996–2012.

Williams, J.R., & Levy, P.E. (2000). Investing some neglected criteria: the influence of organizational level and perceived system knowledge on appraisal reactions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14, 501–513.

Yamazaki, Y. (2010). Expatriate adaption: a study of fits between skills and demands among Japanese expatriates in USA. *Management International Review*, 50, 81–108.

Yamazaki, Y., & Kayes, D.C. (2007). Expatriate learning: exploring how Japanese managers adapt in the United States. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 1373–1395.

Yamazaki, Y., & Kayes, D.C. (2010). Learning and Work satisfaction in Asia: A comparative study of Japanese, Chinese, and Malaysian managers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 2271–2289.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of Japanese, Chinese, Hong Kong, Malaysian, and Thai managers.

	ALL managers		Japanese		Chinese		Hong Kong		Malaysian		Thai	
	(N = 903)		(N = 229)		(N = 300)		(N = 107)		(N = 161)		(N = 106)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age												
mean	36.1		42.5		31.8		39.4		31.9		37.8	
s.d.	8.1		8.7		5.4		7.6		4.9		6.7	
Gender												
Male	479	53.0%	174	76.0%	146	48.7%	46	43.0%	70	43.5%	43	40.6%
Female	424	47.0%	55	24.0%	154	51.3%	61	57.0%	91	56.5%	63	59.4%
Work experience at this MNC (tenure)												
mean (months)	131.1		220.4		83.9		146.0		84.4		127.7	
s.d.	93.0		107.4		42.7		62.3		63.5		81.4	
Past work experience at other organizations												
Yes	520	57.6%	61	26.6%	225	74.8%	95	88.8%	77	47.8%	62	58.5%
No	383	42.4%	168	73.4%	75	25.2%	12	11.2%	84	52.2%	44	41.5%
Management positions												
Store manager/vice-manager	117	12.3%	21	9.2%	56	18.7%	10	9.3%	17	10.6%	13	12.3%
Line manager	174	19.3%	44	19.2%	39	12.3%	24	22.4%	55	34.2%	12	11.3%
Assistant line manager	612	67.8%	164	71.6%	205	68.3%	73	68.2%	89	55.2%	81	76.4%

Table 2. Results of EFA and CFA for procedural and transparent justice scales.

Factors and each items	EFA	CFA
Procedural justice		
1. I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on ethnic group in my company.	0.86	0.79
2. I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on gender in my company,	0.85	0.77
3. I feel the personnel evaluation system is manipulated based on religions in my company.	0.85	0.75
Transparent justice		
1. I feel the personnel evaluation criteria are clear in my company,	0.88	0.65
2. I feel the personnel evaluation process is transparent in my company.	0.87	0.84

Note. $N = 903$; The CFA indices were $\chi^2 = 25.08$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 4$; GFI = 0.989; CFI = 0.983; TLI = 0.958; RMSEA = 0.076.

Table 3. The correlation matrix and descriptive statistics for all key variables.

Variables	mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	36.11	8.07							
2. Gender	0.53	0.50	0.14 **						
3. Tenure (months)	131.10	93.00	0.77 **	0.09 **					
4. Past work experience	0.58	0.49	0.05	-0.05	-0.22 **				
5. Management positions	2.55	0.71	-0.17 **	-0.01	-0.11 **	0.05			
6. Procedural justice	6.21	2.49	-0.02	-0.06 †	-0.04	0.10 **	0.09 **		
7. Transparent justice	5.59	1.75	0.04	-0.04	-0.02	0.01	-0.04	-0.1 **	
8. Job satisfaction	21.61	3.87	0.01	-0.06 †	-0.05	0.14 **	-0.07 *	-0.23 **	0.28 **

Note. Gender code (female = 0; male = 1); Past work experience code (yes = 1; no = 0); Management positions (senior = 1; middle = 2; junior = 3). The greater number of procedural justice, the less fairness perception; the greater number of transparent justice, the more fairness perception. $N = 903$; ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, † $p < 0.10$

Table 4. Results of regression analysis about the effect of procedural and transparent justices on job satisfaction controlling socio-demographics

	All Asians		Japanese		Chinese		Hong Kong		Malaysia		Thai	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Control variables												
Age	0.79	0.24	0.27	0.03	-0.01	-0.64	3.43**	2.78**	2.01*	2.14*	0.35	0.44
Gender	-1.66 [†]	-1.75 [†]	1.06	0.71	-0.42	0.28	-1.51	-1.29	-0.06	0.52	-0.71	-1.16
Tenure	-0.99	-0.55	1.10	1.07	-0.01	0.48	-1.05	-0.70	-1.94 [†]	-1.81	0.29	0.76
Past work experience	3.54**	4.51**	0.11	0.11	1.84	2.92**	-0.37	-0.32	1.22	1.63	0.62	0.73
Management position	-2.17*	-1.54	-1.13	0.04	-0.50	-0.46	1.08	0.89	-0.84	-0.80	0.28	0.71
Predictors												
Procedural justice		-7.01**		-3.38**		-5.70**		-1.86 [†]		-2.75**		-2.25**
Transparent justice		7.97**		4.62**		3.74**		3.38**		2.24*		2.46**
F values	5.52**	22.33**	2.52*	7.37**	0.93	9.58**	3.10*	4.77**	2.24 [†]	4.10**	0.37	2.30*
Adjusted R²	0.02	0.14	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.19	0.9	0.20	0.04	1.12	-0.03	0.08
R² change		0.12		0.14		0.17		0.12		0.09		0.12
F change		62.46**		18.51**		30.75**		7.87**		8.23**		7.03**

Note. $N = 903$; ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, [†] $p < 0.1$.

Table 5. Results of ANOVA and Bonferroni tests about fairness perceptions of Asian managers

	<i>N</i>	Procedural justice		Transparent justice	
		mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.
Japanese	229	5.59	2.40	5.29	1.58
Chinese	300	5.56	2.18	5.17	1.77
Hong Kong	107	6.46	1.82	6.02	1.49
Malaysia	161	7.60	2.85	6.57	1.64
Thai	106	7.41	2.50	5.52	1.81
<i>F</i> values		26.05**		22.10**	
Bonferroni		m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.
Japanese	vs. Chinese	0.03	0.21	0.12	0.15
Japanese	vs. Hong Kong	-0.86*	0.28	-0.73*	0.20
Japanese	vs. Malaysia	-1.77*	0.24	-1.28*	0.17
Japanese	vs. Thai	-1.81*	0.28	-0.23	0.20
Chinese	vs. Hong Kong	-0.90*	0.27	-0.85*	0.19
Chinese	vs. Malaysia	-1.80*	0.23	-1.39*	0.16
Chinese	vs. Thai	-1.84*	0.27	-0.35	0.19
Honk Kong	vs. Malaysia	-0.90*	0.30	-0.55	0.21
Honk Kong	vs. Thai	-0.95*	0.32	0.50	0.23
Malaysia	vs. Thai	-0.05	0.30	1.05*	0.21

Note. ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 6. Results of ANOVA and Bonferroni tests about fairness perceptions according to management positions

	All Asian managers				Japanese				Chinese				Hong Kong				Malaysia				Thai			
	Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent	
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.
Senior managers	5.68	2.24	5.64	1.74	4.50	1.72	6.10	1.26	5.55	1.99	5.16	1.72	6.10	1.97	5.80	1.40	6.23	3.08	6.59	1.77	7.00	2.24	5.62	2.18
Middle managers	6.21	2.49	5.59	1.75	4.93	2.08	5.57	1.42	5.1	2.04	5.1	1.79	5.83	1.55	5.67	1.66	7.69	2.53	6.45	1.72	7.33	2.81	5.67	1.23
Junior managers	6.34	2.52	5.53	1.76	5.91	2.49	5.11	1.62	5.65	2.25	5.19	1.78	6.71	1.85	6.16	1.43	7.36	2.96	6.63	1.57	7.48	2.51	5.48	1.83
F values	3.52*		1.25		5.37**		4.64*		1.05		0.04		2.38 [†]		1.14		1.58		0.19		0.21		0.08	
Bonferroni tests	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.	m.d.	s.e.
Senior vs. Middle	-0.45	0.30	-0.12	0.21	-0.41	0.63	0.53	0.41	0.45	0.45	0.06	0.37	0.27	0.68	0.13	0.56	-1.40	0.79	0.13	0.46	-0.33	1.01	-0.05	0.73
Senior vs. Junior	-0.65*	0.25	0.11	0.18	-1.39*	0.55	0.99*	0.36	-0.10	0.33	-0.03	0.27	-0.61	0.61	-0.36	0.50	-1.07	0.75	-0.04	0.44	-0.48	0.75	0.13	0.54
Middle vs. Junior	-0.21	0.21	0.23	0.15	-0.98*	0.40	0.46	0.26	-0.55	0.38	-0.09	0.31	-0.88	0.42	-0.50	0.35	0.33	0.49	-0.18	0.28	-0.15	0.78	0.19	0.56

Note. Senior managers = store/vice store managers; middle managers = middle managers; junior managers = assistant managers.

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$; [†] $p < 0.10$.

Table 7. Results of t-test about fairness perceptions according past work experiences or not.

	All Asain managers				Japanese				Chinese				Hong Kong				Malaysia				Thai			
	Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent		Procedural		Transparent	
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.
Past work experience	6.41	2.43	5.6	1.73	6.10	2.37	5.43	1.52	5.73	2.24	5.17	1.79	6.44	1.79	6.03	1.44	7.74	2.76	6.52	1.45	7.53	2.57	5.53	1.85
No past work experience	5.94	2.56	5.58	1.77	5.42	2.39	5.24	1.60	5.07	1.91	5.19	1.70	6.58	2.15	5.92	1.88	7.01	2.89	6.61	1.80	7.23	2.41	5.50	1.76
t values	2.82**		0.17		1.86 [†]		0.80		2.30*		-0.08		-0.25		0.25		1.63		-0.34		0.62		0.09	

Note. ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$; [†] $p < 0.10$.