THE INFLUENCES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR AMONG GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MALAYSIA

BY

CHEW HOOI YEAN CHONG PHEY LING HEE YUAN YUAN TAN SU ZEN TANG HUEI THING

A research project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (HONS)

UNIVERSITI TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS

AUGUST 2016

Copyright @ 2016

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this paper may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, without the prior consent of the authors.

DECLARATION

We hereby declare that:

- (1) This undergraduate research project is the end result of our own work and that due acknowledgement has been given in the references to ALL sources of information be they printed, electronic, or personal.
- (2) No portion of this research project has been submitted in support of any application for any other degree or qualification of this or any other university, or other institutes of learning.
- (3) Equal contribution has been made by each group member in completing the research project.
- (4) The word count of this research report is 28,996.

Name of Student:	Student ID:	Signature:
1. Chew Hooi Yean	13ABB07904	
2. Chong Phey Ling	13ABB07876	
3. Hee Yuan Yuan	12ABB03819	
4. Tan Su Zen	13ABB08128	
5. Tang Huei Thing	13ABB07893	

Date: 15 August 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to express sincere thanks to Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) for giving us the opportunity to participate in the final year project that exposed us to various benefits including learning, communication, teamwork and self-development. With the guidance and contribution from numerous parties, we have successfully completed our final year project.

Firstly, special thanks to our FYP supervisor, Mr. Lim Yoong Hing, who provided guidance and information to us for two semesters. We appreciate his contribution to guide us for our research project. Without his guidance, we are unable to complete our research project in a proper and smooth manner.

Secondly, we would like to the express appreciation to Mr. Alex Choong Yuen Onn. Although we are not under his FYP group, he still provides us useful and constructive suggestion that able to help us through the difficulties and problems.

Thirdly, our sincerest appreciation is extended to all the respondents who were willing to spend their valuable time and efforts to complete the questionnaire. Without their collaboration and contributions in filling our questionnaire, it would have been impossible to collect so many questionnaires in such a short period. Therefore, we truly appreciate the efforts of the respondents who were being so kind to provide us such quality and precise data to run our test.

Lastly, we are so pleased to have each other to be team members in doing this project. It would have been unable to complete the project on time without each other's cooperative and tolerance. Furthermore, the support from family and friends are also important to give us the determination and commitment in doing this research.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Page

Copyright Page	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of Contents	v - xii
List of Tables	xiii - xv
List of Figures	xvi-xvii
List of Appendices	xviii-xix
List of Abbreviations	xx - xxi
Preface	xxii
Abstract	xxiii

Page

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Background	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Research Objectives	9
	1.3.1 General Objective	9
	1.3.2 Specific Objectives	9
1.4	Research Questions	10
1.5	Hypothesis of the Study	11
1.6	Significance of the Study	12
1.7	Chapter Layout	14
1.8	Conclusion	16
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.0	Introduction	17
2.1	Literature Review	17
	2.1.1 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	17
	2.1.2 Psychological Empowerment	21
	2.1.2.1 Meaning	23
	2.1.2.2 Competence	24

	2.1.2.3 Self-determination	25
	2.1.2.4 Impact	26
	2.1.3 Organizational Justice	26
	2.1.3.1 Procedural Justice	28
	2.1.3.2 Distributive Justice	29
	2.1.3.3 Interactional Justice	30
2.2	Review of Theoretical Framework	32
	2.2.1 Model 1	32
	2.2.2 Model 2	34
2.3	Proposed Theoretical / Conceptual Framework	36
2.4	Hypothesis Development	37
	2.4.1 Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	38
	2.4.1.1 Meaning and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	39
	2.4.1.2 Competence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	40
	2.4.1.3 Self-determination and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	41
	2.4.1.4 Impact and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	42

	2.4.2 Organizational Justice and Organizational	
	Citizenship Behaviour	43
	2.4.2.1 Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	44
	2.4.2.2 Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	46
	2.4.2.3 Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	47
2.5	List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypothesis	48
CHAPTER 3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	51
3.0	Introduction	51
3.1	Research Design	51
3.2	Data Collection Methods	53
	3.2.1 Primary Data	53
	3.2.2 Secondary Data	54
3.3	Sampling Design	54
	3.3.1 Target Population	55
	3.3.2 Sampling Location and Sampling Frame	56
	3.3.3 Sampling Elements	59

	3.3.4 Sampling Size	59
	3.3.5 Sampling Technique	60
3.4	Research Instrument	62
	3.4.1 Pilot Test	64
	3.4.2 Result of Full Study	65
3.5	Construct Measurement	66
3.6	Data Processing	70
3.7	Data Analysis	71
	3.7.1 Descriptive Analysis	71
	3.7.2 Scale Measurement	72
	3.7.2.1 Reliability Test	72
	3.7.3 Inferential Analysis	74
	3.7.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient	75
	3.7.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis	76
3.8	Conclusion	77
CHAPTER 4	RESEARCH RESULTS	78
4.0	Introduction	78
4.1	Descriptive Analysis	78
	4.1.1 Respondent Demographic Profile	78

	4.1.2 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs	90
	4.1.2.1 Psychological Empowerment: Meaning	90
	4.1.2.2 Psychological Empowerment: Competence	92
	4.1.2.3 Psychological Empowerment: Self-determination.	93
	4.1.2.4 Psychological Empowerment: Impact	95
	4.1.2.5 Organizational Justice: Procedural Justice	97
	4.1.2.6 Organizational Justice: Distributive Justice	100
	4.1.2.7 Organizational Justice: Interactional Justice	102
	4.1.2.8 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	105
4.2	Scale Measurement	110
	4.2.1 Internal Reliability Test	110
4.3	Inferential Analysis	112
	4.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient	112
	4.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis	120
	4.3.2.1 Psychological Empowerment dimensions and	
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	120
	4.3.2.2 Organizational Justice dimensions and	
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	124
	4.3.2.3 Psychological Empowerment dimensions,	
	Organizational Justice dimensions and	
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	128

4.4	Conclusion	132
CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	133
5.0	Introduction	133
5.1	Summary of Statistical Analysis	133
	5.1.1 Descriptive Analysis	133
	5.1.2 Scale Measurement	135
	5.1.3 Inferential Analysis	135
	5.1.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient	135
	5.1.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis	136
5.2	Discussions of Major Findings	139
	5.2.1 Meaning and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	140
	5.2.2 Competence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	141
	5.2.3 Self-determination and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	142
	5.2.4 Impact and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	143
	5.2.5 Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	144
	5.2.6 Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	145
	5.2.7 Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	146
5.3	Implication of the Study	153

5.4	Limitation of the Study	155
	5.4.1 Single Language Version	155
	5.4.2 Short Time Frame	156
	5.4.3 Difficulties of Distributing Questionnaire in Government	
	Primary School	156
5.5	Recommendations for Future Research	157
5.6	Conclusion	158
References		159
Appendices		

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and	
	Hypothesis	48
Table 3.1	Statistic for Primary Education in Malaysia as at December	
	2015	55
Table 3.2	Gred Purata Sekolah (GPS) Ranking for UPSR in 2012, 2013	
	and 2014	58
Table 3.3	Sample Size for a Given Population Size	59
Table 3.4	Calculation of Number of School and Respondent in Each	
	District	62
Table 3.5	Schedule of Pilot Study	64
Table 3.6	Schedule of Full Study	65
Table 3.7	The Origin of Construct in the Research	69
Table 3.8	Cronbach's Alpha Range	72
Table 3.9	Reliability Test Result for Pilot Study	73
Table 3.10	Rules of Thumbs of Pearson Correlation Coefficient	76
Table 4.1	Respondents' Gender	78
Table 4.2	Respondents' Age	79
Table 4.3	Race	81
Table 4.4	Marital Status	82
Table 4.5	Educational Level	83

Table 4.6	Services Years in the School	84
Table 4.7	Services Years in Educational Industry	86
Table 4.8	Working Hours Per Week	87
Table 4.9	Number of Subjects Teach in School	89
Table 4.10	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Meaning	90
Table 4.11	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Competence	92
Table 4.12	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs:	
	Self-determination	93
Table 4.13	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Impact	95
Table 4.14	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Procedural	
	Justice	97
Table 4.15	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Distributive	
	Justice	100
Table 4.16	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Interactional	
	Justice	102
Table 4.17	Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs:	
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	105
Table 4.18	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis	110
Table 4.19	Correlations (N=428)	112
Table 4.20	Strength	113
Table 4.21	Analysis of Variance	120
Table 4.22	Model Summary	121
Table 4.23	Parameter Estimates	122

Table 4.24	Analysis of Variance	124
Table 4.25	Model Summary	125
Table 4.26	Parameter Estimates	126
Table 4.27	Analysis of Variance	128
Table 4.28	Model Summary	129
Table 4.29	Parameter Estimates	130
Table 5.1	Summary of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Result	139
Table 5.2	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result	147
Table 5.3	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result	148
Table 5.4	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result	150

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1.1	Comparison of Malaysia's basic and tertiary education	
	budget with other countries	4
Figure 2.1	Conceptual Framework	32
Figure 2.2	Conceptual Framework	34
Figure 2.3	Proposed Theoretical Framework	36
Figure 3.1	Cluster School of Excellence	56
Figure 3.2	Example of Nominal Scale	67
Figure 3.3	Example of Ordinal Scale	67
Figure 3.4	Example of Interval Scale	68
Figure 4.1	Respondents' Gender	79
Figure 4.2	Respondents' Age	80
Figure 4.3	Race	81
Figure 4.4	Marital Status	82
Figure 4.5	Educational Level	83
Figure 4.6	Services Years in the School	85
Figure 4.7	Services Years in Educational Industry	86
Figure 4.8	Working Hours Per Week	88

Eigung 10	Number of Subjects Teach in School	00
FIgure 4.9		09

LIST OF APPENDIXES

		Page
Appendix 3.1	Questionnaire	178
Appendix 3.2	Reliability Test Result – Meaning (Pilot Test)	187
Appendix 3.3	Reliability Test Result – Competence (Pilot Test)	187
Appendix 3.4	$Reliability \ Test \ Result - Self-determination \ (Pilot \ Test)$	188
Appendix 3.5	Reliability Test Result – Impact (Pilot Test)	188
Appendix 3.6	Reliability Test Result - Procedural Justice (Pilot	
Appendix 5.0	Test)	189
Appendix 3.7	Reliability Test Result – Distributive Justice (Pilot Test)	189
Appendix 3.8	Reliability Test Result – Informational Justice (Pilot	
Appendix 5.8	Test)	190
Appendix 3.9	Reliability Test Result – Interpersonal Justice (Pilot	
Appendix 5.9	Test)	190
Appendix 3.10	Reliability Test Result – Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Pilot Test)	191
Appendix 4.1	Reliability Test Result – Meaning (Full Study)	192
Appendix 4.2	Reliability Test Result – Competence (Full Study)	192
	Reliability Test Result - Self-determination (Full	
Appendix 4.3	Study)	193
Appendix 4.4	Reliability Test Result – Impact (Full Study)	193
Amondia 45	Reliability Test Result - Procedural Justice (Full	
Appendix 4.5	Study)	194
A	Reliability Test Result - Distributive Justice (Full	
Appendix 4.6	Study)	194
A	Reliability Test Result - Informational Justice (Full	
Appendix 4.7	Study)	195

Appendix 4.8	Reliability Test Result – Interpersonal Justice (Full	
	Study)	195
Appendix 4.9	Reliability Test Result – Organizational Citizenship	
	Behaviour (Full Study)	196
Appendix 5.1	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Meaning and	
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	197
Appendix 5.2	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Competence	
Appendix 5.2	and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	197
Amendia 5.2	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Self-	
Appendix 5.3	determination and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	198
A 1' 7 4	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Impact and	
Appendix 5.4	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	198
A 11 5 5	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Procedural	
Appendix 5.5	Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	199
	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Distributive	
Appendix 5.6	Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	199
	Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Interactional	
Appendix 5.7	Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	200
	Linear Regression Results for Psychological	
Appendix 5.8	Empowerment Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship	
	Behaviour	201
	Linear Regression Results for Organizational Justice	
Appendix 5.9	Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	201
	Linear Regression Results for Psychological	
Appendix 5.10	Empowerment Dimensions, Organizational Justice	_
	Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	202

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
COI	Classroom Observation Instrument
DJ	Distributive Justice
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPS	Gred Purata Sekolah
IJ	Interactional Justice
IMJ	Informational Justice
IPJ	Interpersonal Justice
JPN	Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education
OCB	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
OCBI	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for Individual
OCBO	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PEC	Psychological Empowerment - Competence
PEI	Psychological Empowerment - Impact
PEM	Psychological Empowerment - Meaning
PER	Performance Evaluation Report
PES	Psychological Empowerment – Self-determination
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment

РЈ	Procedural Justice
PMR	Penilaian Menengah Rendah
RO	Research Objectives
RQ	Research Questions
SAS	Statistical Analysis System
SPM	Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia
STPM	Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
UPSR	Ujian Pencapaian Sekolah Rendah
UTAR	Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman
WP	Wilayah Persekutuan

PREFACE

It is compulsory to carry out a research project in order to achieve our study – Bachelor Degree of Business Administration (Hons). The topic of the research project is "The Influences of Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Government Primary School Teachers in Malaysia". This study is conducted because the purpose is to find out how student academic performance is affected by the outcome of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour.

Nowadays, it is important for students to get desired academic result not only in national level, however, the ability of students to compete with students of other countries become crucial. Therefore, the standard of educational level in particular country can be perceived by student international academic result, government spending on education, student-teacher ratio and more. As the research found that Malaysia is lagging behind of the educational standard in Asia context, therefore, this research will provide a more comprehensive and general information that are essential for policy makers and school authorities to come out with various strategies to increase the educational level in Malaysia.

In this research study, we outline the two important variables that affect the organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. The variables are psychological empowerment and organizational justice. The dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination, impact while organizational justice consist of procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. These two variables play an important role in determining teachers' willingness to perform organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

The willingness of teachers to perform organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia tends to be crucial in providing information for Ministry of Education. The purpose of this study is to find out the willingness of teachers to perform organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia, whether their outcome is affected by psychological empowerment dimensions and organizational justice dimensions. Psychological empowerment dimensions include meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. Organizational Justice includes procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. Pearson Correlation Coefficient has been adopted to examine the relationship between these two independent variables. Multiple regression analysis was used to identify the influential factors affecting organizational citizenship behaviour. Questionnaires have been distributed to 400 government primary school teachers in Malaysia. From the result, all of the variables are significantly and positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviour. Competence and procedural justice have stronger influence than interactional justice in this research.

Meaning, self-determination, impact and distributive justice were found not strong significant indicators of organizational citizenship behaviour. The result is similar with previous findings supported by other researchers. Future researchers are recommended to add other variables to investigate what some other variables important to encourage teachers' willingness to exert organizational citizenship behaviour.

Keywords: Psychological Empowerment, Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Primary School Teachers, Educational Industry

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter begins the study of educational background in Malaysia. Organizational citizenship behaviour is important in education sector which it can improve student achievement. The study purpose is to find out the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in education sector. This chapter covers discussions on research background, statement of problem, research objectives and questions, hypotheses, significance of the study, chapter layout and conclusion.

1.1 Research Background

In Malaysia, the education systems are divided into five categories, which are preschool education, primary education, secondary education, post-secondary education and tertiary education. Besides, education structure can be separated into two levels which are pre-tertiary and tertiary education levels. At pre-tertiary level, there are six categories of school including: government and private kindergartens, government schools, government aided primary schools, private funded schools, independent Chinese secondary schools and international schools. At tertiary level, higher education institutions can be divided into government funded and private higher educational institutions including: government funded public universities, polytechnics, colleges, community colleges and private universities, universities colleges, private colleges and foreign universities branch ("A Glance at The Malaysian Education System", 2015).

Public primary school can be divided into national schools and national type schools. National primary schools are using Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction while national type primary schools are using Chinese or Tamil. Chinese and Tamil national type primary schools are categorized as government aided primary schools as they received partially financial aid from the Malaysia Government (Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Malaysia, 2015).

There are two government authorities supervised in Malaysia's education which are Ministry of Education (MOE) and Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE). From pre-school to post-secondary education sector was governed under the jurisdiction of the MOE while the higher education sector was placed under the jurisdiction of the MOHE. In 2013, MOE and MOHE were combined into one entity namely Ministry of Education Malaysia ("A Glance at The Malaysian Education System", 2015). The purpose of this combination is to constitute more rationale role in making decision and increase harmonisation across different education levels.

The main education legislation in Malaysia is Education Act 1966. It legislates all pre-tertiary education level from pre-school education, primary school education, secondary school education, post-secondary education, teacher education, special education, religious teaching and private education to technical education except international schools. Excepting national type schools, Bahasa Melayu is used as an instruction medium to all schools which under national education system. Furthermore, all schools are necessary to use a national curriculum in order to prepare students in common public examinations ("The Public Schooling System - for Primary, Secondary and Post-secondary Levels", n.d.). The recent education policies are concluded in The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 which aims to transform Malaysia into knowledge based economy and increase competency in the globalised economy. Therefore, the Blueprint emphasize on improving teacher quality, infrastructure of schools in rural areas and enhancing more structured

education system to students (Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Malaysia, 2015).

The formal education in Malaysia starts with pre-school education from the ages of 4+ or 5+, followed by 6 years primary school education which is compulsory and the entry age is 6+. Consequently, students proceed to 5 years lower and upper secondary school education. Students may pursue Form 6 programme in 2 years of post-secondary education which serves as an entrance to bachelor's degree programme. At the end of each level of education, students are assessed through public examinations which are The Primary School Assessment Test (UPSR), Lower Secondary Assessment (PMR), the Malaysia Certificate of Examination (SPM) and The Malaysia Higher School Certificate Examination (STPM).

The Malaysia government contributed strong commitment to education when the education spending is the 22 per cent of total federal budget and 4 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). It shows the positive result of student enrolment in primary education has increased. In addition, the goal of government on primary education is to ensure all children including those in difficult circumstances and belonging to minority ethnic group able to assess and complete compulsory and free education of good quality (Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Malaysia, 2015).

1.2 Problem Statement

The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report (2012) stated that the gap between Malaysia and other Asia countries on international assessment are widening. Unlike Singapore, Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong achieve above international assessment performance, Malaysian student performance is far behind on international requirement and standard. In the global assessment on Reading, Mathematics and Science, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) resulted that Malaysia was ranked 55th out of 74 and 52nd out of 65 of all participating countries during the year of 2009 and 2012 respectively (Chen, 2013).

In the global assessment on Mathematics and Science, Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) reported that the score of TIMSS significantly dropped between 1999 and 2007. In 2007, 20 per cent of students in Malaysia failed to meet the minimum requirement in Mathematics and Science (The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report, 2012). Both results show that the declining educational quality has resulted in students' weak performance throughout primary and secondary schools.

Figure 1.1: Comparison of Malaysia's Basic and Tertiary Education Budget with Other Countries (2008)



Source: Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report, 2012

In the early 1980s, government spending on primary and secondary education ranked the highest in East Asia. As shown the Figure 1.1 above, compared to ASEAN countries, Malaysia allocated more education expenditure than South Korea and Japan as the percentage of total government expenditure in 2008. The amount spending on education at 3.8 per cent or 16 per cent of total government spending was higher than Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2011. Furthermore, the government drew a total education budget of RM 37 billion and continued to contribute the largest proportion of its budget in 2012 (The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report, 2012).

Malaysia is able to reduce the overall student-teacher ratio and become one of the lowest student-teacher ratios in the world. Currently, it maintains at 13:1 that is lower than OECD average at 16:1 and high education performing countries such as South Korea which having 20:1 student-teacher ratio. In other words, primary schools size is able to maintain less than 35 students that teachers are work within targeted threshold (The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report, 2012). Although the student-teacher ratio is favourable than other ASEAN countries and Malaysia's government expanded the great amount of spending on education that result significant increase in student enrolment in primary education, however, the unfavourable result from PISA and TIMSS shows that the overall education performance is not consistent with the government efforts.

Several studies showed it is rationale for linking organizational citizenship behaviour to student academic performance. It is because when teachers are willing to help students and colleagues, contribute extra effort and spontaneously carry out innovate teaching strategies that result such teachers are personally devoted to the success of students and responsible for student learning. Hence, student achievement will significantly improve when teachers are willing to go beyond job duties with students such as contributing more time and staying after school to help students (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005; Optlanka, 2009). In contrast, when teachers only perform within their formal job duties and not willing to exert extra efforts to students will affect students' academic performance. Therefore, poor academic performance has become one of the significant factors that may due to the lack of organizational citizenship behaviour among Malaysia primary school teachers.

According to The Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report (2012) stated that several practices make a significance difference between good performance and under-performance schools in Malaysia. Firstly, good performance school teachers tend to extend the available amount of time on weaker performance students for teaching and learning. Secondly, experienced teachers in good performance are willing to show extra support to new teachers such as providing on-going coaching and feedback on their teaching performance. As a result, under-performing schools are not able to perform well because teachers extra efforts spend on students are hardly seen. In Johor, for instances, the performance of national examination Ujian Pencapaian Sekolah Rendah (UPSR) was ranked one of the bottom five states in 2007. However, it able to implement the practices that make significance improvement of student performance and currently is in the top three states of all states regarding of student performance.

There are several studies showed the importance of teachers exert organizational citizenship behaviours in schools. According to Somech and Ron (2007) suggested that organizational citizenship behaviour is essential in school settings when school effectiveness, success and goal achievements are mostly depend on teachers' perform organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore, it is crucial for schools to develop open and healthy climate that teachers can be expected to perform citizenship behaviour benefit to students, parents and colleagues (Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

However, the issue arose when primary school teachers lack participation in decision making due to the highly centralization of education system in Malaysia. Ministry of Education has the highest power and authority in making decision over State Education Departments, District Education Departments and school that result a hierarchy of authority levels. Therefore, there is no underlying policy yield from higher authorities empowering teacher in decision making (Vengrasalam, 2000). Teachers only involved in low level of decision making due to the perceived limited duties and responsibilities of teaching in a classroom. Low level of decision making includes classroom management, support and delivery to students (Saad, 2012). As a result, teachers are not willing to perform extra role behaviour because researcher found that psychological empowerment such as decision making is a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour (Bogler & Somech, 2004). Moreover, the issue of organizational justice occurred when primary school teachers perceived unfair practice in school. As a professional educator, teachers must be evaluated as professionals in an organization because the evaluation process carries out for continuing professional development and educational practice improvement (DarlingHammond, 1990; Glatthorn & Fontana, 2000). Malakolunthu and Vasudevan (2012) conducted the study of primary school teacher evaluation practices in Malaysia found out school-based teacher evaluation system did not evaluate teachers fairly by school administrators. Teachers perceived unfairness on formative evaluation in determining teacher quality and effectiveness of instructional practices because the instruments including Classroom Observation Instrument (COI) and Performance Evaluation Report (PER) were not comprehensive to cover all aspects of the teaching profession. Besides, there is an inconsistency among primary schools' evaluation when different school administrators measuring the criteria is different.

Furthermore, teachers also receive unfair evaluation process when school administrators evaluate teachers through observations. They indirectly observed and evaluated teachers outside the classroom while they wandering around schools. Such informal evaluation also considered in teachers' year end summative evaluation that will affect teachers' remuneration adjustment, reward, promotion and upgrading (Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012). According to Buluc (2015) concluded that the feeling of justice is important for teaching profession because they are more willing to carry out organizational citizenship behaviour in a fair working environment.

Realizing the importance of organizational citizenship behaviour in school context, the problems occur in student achievement and performance provide the reason in this study to further explore what extent primary school teachers are willing to perform extra role beyond the formal role requirements. Since the issue of organizational citizenship behaviour becomes significant in this research therefore understanding the effect of two independent variables, namely psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour will be carried out to improve organizational citizenship behaviour amongst primary school teachers.

In school setting, there are only few researchers studied organizational citizenship behaviour (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Oplatka, 2006; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). The four cognitions of psychological empowerment developed by Spreitzer (1995) are mostly used by researcher to identify the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour hence we adopt the same dimensions in our study. Furthermore, only several researches have proven the relation between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational sector (Bogler & Somech, 2004) and the relation between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour has limited studies in developing countries including Malaysia (Liu, Chen & Lin, 2004). Therefore, the research gap provides us for conducting a comprehensive research of the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objective will be addressed in this section. The research objectives will be carried out from the problem statement with specific, concrete and achievable goals.

1.3.1 General Objective

The purpose is to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among Malaysia government primary school teachers.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- 1. To determine the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 1.1 To determine the relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 1.2 To determine the relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 1.3 To determine the relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 1.4 To determine the relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

- 2. To determine the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 2.1 To determine the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 2.2 To determine the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 2.3 To determine the relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

1.4 Research Questions

General and specific research questions that relate to organizational citizenship behaviour:

- 1. What is the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 1.1 What is the relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 1.2 What is the relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 1.3 What is the relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 1.4 What is the relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour?

- 2. What is the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 2.1 What is the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 2.2 What is the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 2.3 What is the relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?
- 3. What is the relationship between psychological empowerment, organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?

1.5 Hypothesis of the Study

Based on our research, the list of hypothesis are shown as below:

H₁: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{1a} : There is a significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H_{1b}: There is a significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{1c} : There is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{1d} : There is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₂: All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{2a} : There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{2b} : There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 H_{2c} : There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₃: All the psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

1.6 Significance of the Study

At student level, the research of teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour brings impact on improving students' overall academic performance. According to Khalid, Jusoff, Othman, Ismail and Rahman (2010) mentioned that teachers need to show organizational citizenship behaviour by exerting more effort on the lower achievement students such as putting more personal attention, helping them to understand difficult subject matter and willing to give them extra classes on their own time. Certainly, performing organizational citizenship behaviour also works on high achievement student due to motivate and encourage them to get higher than current performance. Therefore, exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour is the way for teachers to facilitate the learning process of students and improve students' academic performance directly (Khalid et al., 2010). At teacher level, the study of organizational citizenship behaviour can bring positive consequences toward teacher individual himself or herself. In addition, study organizational citizenship behaviour can also positively effect on teacher's self-fulfilment (Somech & Oplatka, 2014). For example, teachers may feel self-fulfilled when they conduct extra educational programs for students (Oplatka, 2006). Besides, teachers who performed organizational citizenship behaviour tend to have low employees turnover, and absenteeism (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009). They have low possibility to leave their job rather than teachers who do not perform organizational citizenship behaviour and just focus on in role responsibilities.

At school level, the study of organizational citizenship behaviour will positively affect the school effectiveness (Alanoglu & Demirtas, 2016). School administrators are responsible for creating a climate that teachers can be expected to perform citizenship behaviour towards their colleagues as well as serving students. It exhibited that school targets achievement and academic success are depending on organizational citizenship behaviour showed by teachers. Hence, importance of organizational citizenship behaviour should keep highlighted and school cultures showing sort of behaviour must be supported in order to obtain high performance output. Besides, teachers who have high organizational citizenship behaviour are more willing to help others teachers which turn out increase school performance. Another impact of our research to school is to enhance school public image (Krastev & Stanoeva, 2013). Students are considered as clients of school organizations hence organizational citizenship behaviour will tend to affect the teachers service quality towards students. Teachers' contributions toward students and school have created awareness by parents and students. When teachers in the school go beyond formal role, parents will appreciate which bring up the name of school and enhance the school public image.
At government level, the impact of our research to the government is to enhance the overall performance in the education system. As our research problem stated, result from TIMSS showed declining educational quality due to students' weak academic performance in primary schools. Besides that, Malaysia government also contributes great amount on education spending but the unfavourable result from PISA and TIMSS shows that the quality of education is not consistent with the amount of government's spending on education. The academic achievement of students will improve if teachers willing to perform beyond the formal role requirement. Therefore, the education standard will increase and bring benefit to the overall education system. It is because good teachers may raise student achievement then closing the achievement gaps with other countries student. Meanwhile, if students' achievement improves, ranking on PISA also will be heightened therefore Malaysian students are able to compete with other countries students. Thus, the overall education system will be enhanced by the teacher's quality and student achievement, the image of our country also will be increased.

1.7 Chapter Layout

This research contains of total 5 chapters that conducted to study the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia, as shown below:

Chapter 1 Introduction

In Chapter 1, background introduction and statement of problem will be contained in this research. Research objectives, research questions and hypothesis will also identify in order to understand more about the effect of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

In Chapter 2, literature review provides insights to the research topic by reviewing related journal previously done by other researchers. To construct the proposed framework in this research, this chapter includes the review of related theoretical framework through the source from online article and journal, theses and books which is important to this research study in order to hypothesize the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

Chapter 3 Research Methodology

In Chapter 3, the method of research is outlined. Research design, data collection method, sampling design for target population, sampling size, sampling location, sampling technique are identified. Measurement of scale and data analysis will be further identified in research instrument.

Chapter 4 Research Results

In Chapter 4, research result is identified and outlined to analyse the previous formed research question and hypothesis. Descriptive analysis use to analyse the demographic background of target respondents, scale measurement use to analyse the reliability results and inferential analysis use to conclude the result from pearson correlation and linear regression analysis.

Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion

In Chapter 5, the summary of statistical analysis will be provided. Based on the result in previous chapter, the major findings will discuss and prove the research

hypothesis and research objectives. The implication, limitation and recommendation of this research will become important to future researchers.

1.8 Conclusion

In summary, we have examined Malaysia educational background and student performance in Asia region. Performance of Malaysia students are far behind on international requirement and standard compared to other Asia countries. These research background and problem statement provide a primary and better understanding before proceed to next chapter. In chapter 2, a more specific literature review will be carried out and form a research framework by reviewing all relevant secondary data which are journal articles that done by previous researchers.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

3 main sections in this chapter will be outlined. For the first part of literature review is to illustrate the definition terms and dimensions including organizational citizenship behaviour, psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions. For the following part is to evaluate the relationship between those dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviour. This chapter also shows independent variables and dependent variable in the form of conceptual framework to further investigate the research objectives. Lastly, hypothesis is formulated after establishing the relationship between the independent variables and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour can be traced back to earlier research. In Barnard's study (1938), there are three elements found to constitute an effective and efficient organization which consists of willingness to cooperate, common purpose and communication. These elements are interrelated with each other when an effective communication mode will result individual willingness to contribute themselves in order to achieve common goal of the organization. The term willingness to cooperate makes a foundation in the definition of organizational citizenship behaviour when it refers to an individual is willing to go beyond formal job requirements and contribute efforts to the organization.

In Katz and Kahn's study (1966) mentioned that individuals need to involve themselves into innovative and spontaneous behaviour that beyond the formal job requirements in the service of organizational goals in order to achieve high level of organizational effectiveness. As a result, such behaviour is considered as supra-role behaviour or extra-role behaviour that often link to the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour.

The term of organizational citizenship behaviour was introduced by Smith, Organ and Near (1983) after Barnard's and Katz's study. The study proposed at least two distinct dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour that are best represented different fashion which including altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism is defined as behaviour of helping individual who seek for help, having specific problems, or need some assistance. The study showed that altruistic people are usually influenced by mood which brings impact to job satisfaction. Leadership supportiveness showed indirectly impact on altruism which mediated by job satisfaction. Generalized compliance is defined as behaviour of impersonal conscientiousness towards organization. Individuals tend to follow the organization's rule and regulation and doing things that are proper and right. Individuals who are punctual to work, not to skip work, and follow the company rule are considered as having such dimension. Leadership supportiveness has directly influenced on generalized compliance.

In Organ's study (1988), organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as "included behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (p.4). Thus, he further clarified the construct of organizational citizenship behaviour by offering five different types of discretionary behaviour which are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue to further define organizational citizenship behaviour and explained how each dimension helps to maximize the organization's efficiency.

Altruism refers to the voluntary behaviour that directed toward specific individuals such as helping other colleagues complete organizationally related task (Organ, 1988). For example, voluntarily helping others with work related problems (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000).Conscientiousness is derived from generalized compliance, which refers to an individual accept any organization's rules, regulations and procedures internally even when no one is observing (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Sportsmanship refers to behaviour that maximizing total time spent on the endeavours of the construction in the organization and try to avoid complain of others (Organ, 1988). Courtesy refers to effective communication that helps to prevent problems and maximize use of time. Lastly, civic virtue refers to employee involvement in serving the interest of the organization (Organ, 1988). For example, individual is willing to involve actively in its organization function including attend meetings (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

From five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour proposed by Organ (1988), William and Anderson (1991) utilized these dimensions and distinguished into two broad categories of organizational citizenship behaviour which is organizational citizenship behaviour for organization (OCBO) and organizational citizenship behaviour for individual (OCBI). OCBO refers to the behaviour that only benefit to the organization and it represents altruism while OCBI refers to the behaviour that benefits to certain individuals and indirectly contribute to the organization.

According to Organ (1997), he redefined organizational citizenship behaviour again because the problem exists and organization's behaviour changed due to current environment improvement. He found three out of two soft spots that needed to make some correction on the previous definition which he constructed in 1988, including discretionary, organization effectiveness and non-contractual reward.

Firstly, the problem occurred when in defining organizational citizenship behaviour as extra role and beyond job description. Role can be defined as the expectation of role sender and such expectation can be viewed as expecting within formal job requirement (Katz & Khan, 1966). Besides, formal job requirement are changing due to the individual's workplace comply with necessary job training and whatever need to be done by the individual is considered as part of the job (Organ, 1997). Secondly, Organ has reached agreement towards organizational effectiveness will benefit to organizational citizenship behaviour eventually. Lastly, organizational citizenship behaviour is not entitled to any formal reward system including salary increment or promotion because few rewards are hardly guaranteed to formal reward system even when individual performs within job requirements. In fact, to the extent to determine reward is based on the appraisals of performance. Therefore, organizational citizenship behaviour is redefined as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place." (p. 95).

Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) are first authors to examine and introduce organizational citizenship behaviour concept in education context. They used Smith and colleague's 16-items scale measurement and

after that restructure to 15 items for measuring organizational citizenship behaviour in school. Based on two different samples of schools studies, they found out there was only one dimension in education context which means combine generalized compliance dimension and altruism dimension into one and become bipolar construct (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005). Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran argued that organizational citizenship behaviour can be defined differently in service organization such as schools. The first reason of one dimension organizational citizenship behaviour construct is organizational citizenship behaviour will be different depends on the different organization type. Second, there is a different between organization from private sector and schools sector. Students are the prime beneficiary of the organization as schools are considered as service organization. Schools are operated by teachers who are commonly committed to help student with the goal of improving student achievement.

2.1.2 Psychological Empowerment

There are various researchers define psychological empowerment at different meaning. (Spreitzer, Kizilos & Nason, 1997). Conger and Kanungo (1988) further explained this definition by using Bandura's self-efficacy notion. According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), psychological empowerment is a process to increase employee's self-efficacy feelings within an organization. In motivational terms, empowerment means the enhancement of individual's belief in self-efficacy and weaken one's belief in personal powerlessness. According to expectancy theory, individuals' self-efficacy is strengthened when they are empowered. Rather than increasing individuals' hopes for achieving desired level of performance, empowering tend to enable individuals' convictions in their own effectiveness.

When comes to Thomas and Velthhouse (1990), they argued that psychological empowerment cannot be described by only single concept. Therefore, Thomas and Velthhouse (1990) broadened the definition by focusing on intrinsic task motivation. Psychological empowerment defined as 'four cognitions of intrinsic motivation that reflect orientation of an individual to work role' (p.669). In theoretical work, they use cognitive model to further explain intrinsic task motivation which is using task assessments and interpretive processes to provide the basis of psychological empowerment. Task assessments identified four cognitions which are sense of meaningfulness, competence, choice and impact. When these four cognitions combined, it indicates how an individual wishes to make own work role.

Spreitzer (1995) took initial step of developing psychological empowerment in work context and began the construct validation process. The study constructed the multi-dimension of psychological empowerment which is slightly different with Thomas and Velthhouse (1990). There is some advancement made by Spreitzer (1995) on the previous psychological empowerment construct model. The dimensions of "meaningfulness" and "choice" are renamed by Spreitzer (1995) to become "meaning" and "self-determination". Moreover, these four dimensions namely meaning, competence, self-determination and impact can reflect an individual feels able towards his or her work role. These four dimensions are interrelated and it will limit the empowerment if any one of these dimensions is missing. Hence, empowered feelings will be maximized when all dimensions are required together.

For understanding psychological empowerment, these four dimensions contribute a nearly complete and sufficient set of cognitions. In addition, Spreitzer et al. (1997) concluded these four dimensions will lead to different outcomes. The outcome of psychological empowerment includes managerial effectiveness and innovative behaviours (Spreitzer, 1995). When empowered individuals feel as competent and able to make significant impact on their jobs and environment in meaningful ways, such managerial effectiveness can fulfil and exceed extra role expectations. Besides, empowered individuals are likely to be innovative and creative in their jobs when they believe they are autonomous and have an impact.

In education context, teachers have higher level of interpersonal trust in their principals if they found out their works are meaningful and have significant influence in their work environments (Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2005). According to Dee, Henkin and Duemer (2003), psychological empowerment in educational context defined as 'empowered teachers with increased task motivation, enhanced feelings of meaning, and strong organizational commitment are the foundation of a dynamic school technology.' (p.273). In addition, psychological empowerment is an important predictor of innovative behaviours of lecturers in Malaysian private higher education institutions (Ghani, Raja & Jusoff , 2009). Most of the studies in educational context ascertained the relevance of psychological empowerment scale and the universality of four dimensions developed by Spreitzer (1995) across different educational settings (Lee & Nie, 2013).

2.1.2.1 Meaning

Meaning cognition is defined as purpose to the work goal (Spreitzer, 1995). However, meaning is defined as an individual judgement towards job's value, belief and behaviour (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The belief of every employee is important and must have in their values of work, work role as well as behaviours

towards their work. Moreover, chances must be given to employees in order they can guide by their own opinions and standards to assess organization's goal accomplishment. According to Nord, Brief, Atieh and Doherty (1990), the meaning of work will be enhanced and employees are become more motivated as well as more willing commit to their organization in case the company able to assign each employee's work task that is compatible with the ability of employee for completing the task. The best ideal situations will occurr if the individual knows that the jobs they are doing are significant to the organization.

2.1.2.2 Competence

According to Spreitzer (1995), competence defined as an individual's belief in own capability and skills while performing their works. In addition, competence is also defined as the ability of an individual employee to accomplish the tasks activities with their own skills (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). These two definitions illustrate that employees will not feel empowered when they are lack of confidence in their skills and capability. In other words, the self-confidence of employees will enable them to complete the task activities or job scope by having their skills. Moreover, employees will become more commit at continuing their works when they feel competent to perform the task activities as competence is an intrinsic work motivator (Bandura, 1977). According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy defined as confidence level of an individual's in own ability in controlling behaviour, motivation, and social environment. Hence, employees are willing to put more efforts in their works and deal with the work related problems if they have high self-efficacy whereas employees will tend to not care and solve the problems if they have low selfefficacy. In short, employees will able to perform the task activities with their skills if they feel they are competence on the job. The sense of competence will motivate them to work hard on the organization's activities.

2.1.2.3 Self-determination

Self-determination defined as an autonomy or freedom in initiating and continuing of work behaviours and processes (Spector, 1986). According to Greenberger, Porter, Miceli and Strasser (1991), selfdetermination defined as sense of a person towards the control of a work. Self-determination is a sense of autonomy in the way of doing work by an individual (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1995). In short, it is an individual's perception that has confident in the ability and right to control and participate in decision making based on he or she own thinking. According to Quinn and Spreitzer (1997), they support that a person who owned self-determination will consist the power to implement their tasks activities by their own way. Employees will have power or autonomy to participate in decision making about their works when they have felt a sense of empowerment from their superior. Employees will not feel a sense of empowerment if they just follow whatever instructions from their superior. The reason behind this is employees feel that there is only a little freedom and power given to them by the superior. Hence, principal should give teachers the freedom to complete the assigned task in order to improve work effectiveness.

2.1.2.4 Impact

Impact is defined as an individual employee believes that he or she can influence or bring impact on the system in which he or she is embedded (Spreitzer, 1995). According to Ashforth (1989), impact is defined as an individual can influence job related tasks such as administrative and operating outcome at work. In addition, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) stated that a sense of impact reflects how employees feel that they can make a change or influence in the organizational outcome. In short, employees who have a sense of impact will believe that they are able to bring impact or influence their organization. Employees will believe that they can perform better and influence their organization significantly if the impact exists. Therefore, belief of employees that they can bring impact or affect the organization outcome which can foster by managers. Opportunities for giving suggestions and opinions should be given to employees by managers in order let them involve in their operational changes in working environment. Consequently, it will enhance their work satisfaction and effectiveness and bring positive impact on their work outcomes. Hence, a sense of impact will directly influence the outcomes of organization due to employees feel that they able to perform better.

2.1.3 Organizational Justice

There are large numbers of research carried out to understand the concept of organizational justice. Justice in the research of organizational justice is to study employee's perception on the actions of organization leaders through judgment (Greenberg, 1990; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice are the three widely accepted dimensions of organizational justice that identified by various scholars in their research. Among these three dimensions, distributive justice is the earliest identified dimension and continued by procedural and interactional justices.

Organizational justice is a concept that comes from Equity Theory from Adam (1965). Employee will allocate values for both job input and output. A ratio is computed from these values and compares with the employee who has similar job scope (Adam, 1965). Therefore by building on Adam's equity theory, Greenberg (1996) was defined organizational justice as a concept that emphasizes on perceptions of employees whether being treated fairly in organization and how the employee's satisfaction and commitment affected by these perceptions. According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), those distribution rules on rewards, punishments, opportunities and promotions are concern in organizational justice.

Hoy and Tarter (2004) are first authors who study the concept of organizational justice in school context which explained organizational justice in schools in terms of its relationship with trust. In education context, organizational justice defined as perceptions of teacher on the fairness which related to interactions with school leaders. Hence, school leaders or principals should understand the sense of fairness from teacher perceptions because they are the one who responsible to create climates of justice. There are examples of justice in schools such as school leaders celebrate the successes of individual and group, allow teachers involve and participate in decision-making processes, take responsibility for mistakes and correct the person who was made the mistakes and apply practices and rules systematically (Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

According to Burns and Dipaola (2013), level of teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour may strengthen by organizational justice and significantly improve student performance as these two variables have significant relationship. If teachers perceived the actions of principal unfair, it may decrease the level of organizational citizenship behaviour. Hence, school principals are responsible to develop or foster a culture of justice in schools. In our study, there are also three main dimensions in organizational justice which are procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice.

2.1.3.1 Procedural Justice

During the 1970s, procedural justice was begun studied by various researchers in organizations. Thibaut and Walker (1975) are the first researchers who examine procedural justice in the perceptions of justice in dispute resolution. Thibaut and Walker (1975) defined procedural justice as individual concern with the processes and decision making in the allocation of resources. According to Greenberg (1990), procedural justice defined as an individual perceived procedures fairness that decides those important decisions which in both rewards and punishments. According to Thibaut and Walker (1975), people are more concern on procedural justice compared to distributive justice. Therefore, the fair and without biases decision making procedures are much more concerned by people.

The concept of procedural justice basically refers to an employee's perceptions about the processes and methods in decision making that relevant to them. Those researches about procedural justice mentioned the more effective and important factor in justice perceptions is process compared to outcome (Folger & Cropanzano,

1998). People will perceive the decision is fair when they have authority control the process and influence decision making. Moreover, when people perceived those processes on decision control was fair, they more willing to accept unfavorable outcomes (Greenberg, 1990). Employees expect fair decision making procedures and not only look for favorable outcomes. Therefore, a good decision making process should develop in every organization by using all valid information in order to make decisions accurately. Besides, organization should allow employees to give suggestions in order to improve decision making process system.

2.1.3.2 Distributive Justice

The first wave of organizational justice research was happened in Adam's equality theory, which is focuses on distributive justice by Blau (1968). This theory stated employees make a comparison between their own rewards in the organization and other employees in order to gain a justice perception about themselves. Distributive justice basically refers to perceptions of equity related to resource distribution. During the 1970s, distributive justice research showed that distributive judgments on fairness are important determinants on allocation and conflict resolution satisfaction (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

According to Greenberg (1990), distributive justice is a perception perceived by an employee about equality and fairness in which resources is distributed and allocated within an organization. It relates to equity perceived by the worker regarding his input and output in the organization. Thus when workers perceived there is fairness in the distribution of resources or rewards they would feel satisfied. Employees perceive distributive justice in the way of relative distribution of salaries, budgetary fund and merit pay.

On the other hand, distributive justice also concerns with punishments rather than just focus on rewards. Discipline actions will be taken by employer on what employee have done in an organization (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). In short, distributive justice is related with equity exchange theory as the employees will look at their performance and what they receive from employers.

2.1.3.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is another dimension that describe the term of organizational justice. According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), interactional justice defined as the quality of the interpersonal treatment received from others both before and after decisions. There are two sub dimensions that divided from interactional justice which are interpersonal justice and informational justice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993). Interpersonal justice refers to social interaction that take place between individuals and others in organization. Those social interaction included people explaining how the decision and outcomes being made and distribute outcomes to subordinates politely. On the other hand, informational justice refers to social determinants of procedural justice and how the decision makers provide fairness information that is accurate regarding distributed decisions. People are more likely to perceive they are being treated fairly if they informed about procedures. (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993).

In addition, Bies (1987) who tended to distinguish interactional justice from procedural justice and emphasize it as a different dimension of organizational justice. There are some researchers

tests the differences between interactional justice and procedural justice and result shown that interactional justice can be differentiated from procedural justice because these two dimensions have different correlates. Interactional justice is defined as an individual perception on the experienced treatment from others (Bies & Moag, 1986). Bies (1987) found that social interactions can help people to reduce anger feelings toward perceived unfair decision makers. Hence, organizational members will achieve justice when they perceive their leaders have justified their decisions adequately.

2.2 Review of Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Model 1

Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework of Najafi, Noruzy, Azar, Nazari-Shirkouhi & Dalvand (2011)



<u>Adapted from:</u> Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Azar, H. K., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. R. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(13), 5241.

The model above shows the relation of psychological empowerment, organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The mediators are job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between psychological empowerment, organizational justice, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment is examined by its mediating role. There are total sample of 378 educational experts whom working in universities participate in this study. The measurement of psychological empowerment is adopted from Spreitzer (1995) while organizational justice is adopted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The measurement of organizational citizenship behaviour is adopted from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990).

From the result of this study, psychological empowerment and organizational justice has positive and indirect influences on organizational citizenship behaviour which is mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Both psychological empowerment and organizational justice increase job satisfaction and organizational commitment that result the improvement of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Spreitzer et al. (1997) reported that when employees feel certain level of psychological empowerment towards their jobs, they get motivated and are possibly to experience positive accompanying outcomes. Besides, Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) argued that employees are more committed to their job when they perceived justice in their organization. Therefore, such committed employees will tend to perform beyond the call of duty (Fatt, Khin, & Heng, 2010).

The result also concluded that organizational justice and psychological empowerment in the universities favour job satisfaction and organizational commitment that employees tend to show extra role behaviour.

2.2.2 Model 2

Figure 2.2 Conceptual framework of Mohammad, Habib, & Alias (2010)



<u>Adapted from:</u> Mohammad, J., Habib, F. Q. B., & Alias, M. A. B. (2010). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in higher education institution.*Global Business and Management Research*, 2(1), 13.

The model above shows the relation between three dimension organizational justice which is distributive, procedural and interactional justice and two dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour includes OCBI and OCBO in higher education.

The purpose of this study is to find out the impact of three dimension of organizational justice upon two dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour, as well as the overall relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia higher education institution. 120 non-academic staffs are the total sample in National University of Malaysia participates in this study. The measurement of OCBI and OCBO is adopted from Lee and Allen (2002).

Distributive justice is adopted from Price and Mueller's (1986) measurement while procedural and interactional justice is measured by using Niehoff and Moorman (1993).

The result shows that procedural and interactional justice is significant and positively relate to OCBI and OCBO, especially procedural justice has the strongest relationship. The result is explained that employees feel they have a sense of fairness in their organization when the organization makes consistent decisions and procedures among employees, and the organization adopts those procedures are accurate, ethical and appropriate. Besides, education workers tend to practice OCBI and OCBO within organization when they perceive procedural and interactional justice increase.

However, the relationship between distributive justice and OCBI and OCBO is not supported in this study. This study interpreted this result as the long term evaluation such as citizenship behaviour is more significant related to procedural justice and distributive may more relate to short term evaluation such as satisfaction within an outcome. The end of this study concluded that organizational justice positively related to organizational citizenship in overall.

2.3 Proposed Theoretical / Conceptual Framework

Figure 2.3: Proposed Theoretical Framework



Source: Developed for the research

From the previous part of review theoretical model, the proposed framework is formed as depicted in Figure 2.3. It is formed by two independent variables, which are psychological empowerment and organizational justice to investigate the impact on organizational citizenship behaviour.

The research purpose is to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. The proposed framework shown above stated there are four dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. The four dimensions are chosen based on the universality developed by Spreitzer (1995) across different educational settings.

Organizational justice consists of procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. Based on previous study, it is more appropriate to use one dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour in this research because organizational citizenship behaviour aims to serve and benefit both organization and individuals in educational context. Therefore, we choose to adopt the one dimensional perspective which is developed by Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001).

This research aims to find out how organizational citizenship behaviour of government primary school teachers in Malaysia is affected by psychological empowerment and organizational justice variables. Since the study among these relationship in Malaysia is limited, therefore this research may suggest how psychological empowerment and organizational justice becoming significant factor of organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia government primary school. Further study and investigation are required to prove this relationship.

2.4 Hypothesis Development

In theoretical framework, we have identified the important variables which relate to our research. Hence, we obtain the relevant information from the relationship which is proved, theorized and tested by previous studies.

2.4.1 Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1

In the study of Chiang and Hsieh (2012) proved the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour in tourism and hospitality industries. The result suggested that the feeling of psychological empowerment increases among employees will significantly motivate to demonstrate more organizational citizenship behaviour that allows employees to improve service effectiveness and job performance as a return. This result also supported by Gholami, Soltanahmadi, Pashavi and Nekouei (2013) in examining psychological empowerment with both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour in Iran public sector.

Most of the study proved the significant relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational setting (Bagheri, Matin & Amighi, 2011; Bogler & Somech, 2004; Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014; Cheasakul & Varma, 2015; Yangaiya & Abubakar, n.d.). Increase in psychological empowerment can induce to improve job satisfaction and influence organizational commitment. Once the employees satisfied in their job and committed to the organization, they will tend to behave in an extra role manner, which lead to high level of organizational citizenship behaviour (Najafi, Noruzy, Azar, Nazari-Shirkouhi, & Dalvand, 2011).

The study conducted by Aksel, Serinkan, Kizilogl and Aksoy (2013) in Turkey education sector mentioned the importance of relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour. The result shows that the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour is positive. When there is an amplified workplace environment provided to teachers, they will feel more freedom and confident to themselves, followed by the level of organizational citizenship behaviour of them will increase.

H₀: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are not significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.1.1 Meaning and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1a

In service organization, the study of effect of psychological empowerment on organizational citizenship behaviour conducted by Lin (2013) in life insurance industry shows there is a positive relationship between meaning and conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy in organizational citizenship behaviour. The result implied that when employees in service industry find the job meaningful and thus demonstrate their capability on completing the tasks. Employees will work more meaningfully and appear extra-role behaviour when organizational citizenship behaviour acts as a social exchange between organization and employees (Lin, 2013).

In educational settings, the study of Bogler and Somech (2004), Cheasakul and Varma (2015) mentioned when teachers find their jobs meaningful they tend to seek continuous improvement, revised work process and carry out innovative behaviour to solve work problems. Therefore, when teachers feel meaningfulness in their work, their perception of psychological empowerment increase and which is more likely for them to exert high levels of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.1.2 Competence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1b

In hospitality industry, Raub (2008) proved that empowered employees are more willing to involve themselves in spontaneous activities relate to organizational citizenship behaviour when they have the confident in their own competence. In life insurance industry, Lin (2013) studied the relationship between competence and conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and courtesy in organizational citizenship behaviour is positive. The result indicated that employees are more likely to perform extra role behaviour when their job is meaningful hence show ability on completing the duties.

In the study of Yangaiya and Abubakar (n.d.) resulted the positive relationship between competence and organizational citizenship

behaviour of secondary school teachers in Nigeria. The result indicated that teachers are empowered when they have the competence to do work effectively. Kasekende, Munene, Otengei & Ntayi (2016) studied the relationship of teacher's competence and organizational citizenship behaviour in Ugandan primary schools pointed out that the role of competence is related to organizational citizenship behaviour through empowerment. It is important to increase level of competence because empowerment will link the bond between teachers and schools that result the exhibition of voluntary behaviours of employees as a return.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.1.3 Self-determination and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1c

Lin (2013) found that self-determination has significantly positive impact on courtesy and altruism which is under organizational citizenship behaviour in life insurance industry. When employees are given opportunity of the authority in making decision they tend to see themselves have the power of influencing work and therefore willing to perform citizenship behaviour. In the study of Bogler and Somech (2004) stressed that when teachers are involved in making decision regarding the decision related from classroom to school will willing to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour towards students, colleagues and school. Runhaar, Konermann and Sanders (2013) studied teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour mentioned that increasing autonomy has an impact on teachers psychological states when teachers given the responsibility to prioritize professional development activities hence increasing autonomy to fulfill their tasks.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.1.4 Impact and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1d

In the study of Raub (2008) demonstrated the positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour in hospitality industry. Empowered employees have a sense of impact on organizational result that as a return will more likely to engage in voluntary and discretionary activities and feel that they can take initiative to succeed in the tasks given. Based on the study of Lishchinsky and Tsemach (2014), there is a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour among teachers which in education industry and the result also consistent with Bogler and Somech (2004). In their studies, they found that impact is positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour. As teachers perceive they have influence on what happens at school, it will be motivated them to care more deeply about what they do in their workplace.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.2 Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 2

According to the study conducted by Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) in education sector examined the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour showed that organizational justice has the positive relationship to organizational citizenship behaviour. Besides that, research constantly showed that individual behaved different in workplace based on the perception of organizational justice (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011). For example, employees perform organizational citizenship behaviour and prove higher level of commitment to their organization in exchange for fair treatment. Moreover,

Williams, Pitre and Zainuba (2002) indicated that they are more likely to exert organizational citizenship behaviour increased when employees perception of fair treatment by supervisor become more positive.

In additional, in the study of Fatimah, Amiraa and Halim (2011) also shown that organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour has a positive relationship. Unfair treatment or injustice leads to less cooperation with co-workers and decrees quality of cooperation (Greenberg, 1987). Furthermore, workers who put organizational justice as an important aspect of their work will react negatively if they perceived their organization does not practice justice in the organization. Thus, in education context, teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour can be influenced by their relationship with school authorities, degree of support and organizational justice.

H₀: All the organizational justice dimensions are not significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.2.1 Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 2a

The study of influence of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour which is conducted by Iqbal, Aziz and

Tasawar (2012) in Pakistan education industry showed that procedural justice has positive relation with organizational citizenship behaviour. Teacher feels satisfied when a fair and justice procedure is adopted in an organization. Therefore, it able to lead them to perform behaviour which beyond job description, remuneration, and formal reward system which results in occurrence of organizational citizenship behaviour in the organization.

Jafari and Bidarian (2012) mentioned that there is a significant positive relationship between the procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in education industry. The result implied that the higher teacher perceived procedural justice, the more willing they perform innovative behaviour in institution. They tend to show more organizational citizenship behaviour in organization when they satisfied with their income. Again, Ince and Giil (2011) stated that teachers willing to exert more effort in their performance when they perceived the managerial and organization procedures such as wages distribution and decision making fairly (Ince & Giil, 2011; Colquitt & Chertkoff, 2002).

H₀: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.2.2 Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 2b

The study of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour which is conducted by Jafari and Bidarian (2012) in education industry showed the significant positive relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. This is because the result has implied that the higher teachers get incentives and awards, the more they show extra role behaviour.

Furthermore, in education industry, Ince and Giil (2011) mentioned that distribution of the organization has formed the positive distributive justice perception of the employees which regard to the organizational resources. However, it able to increase the organizational citizenship behaviour among employees who feel that organizational supportive when the reward and punishment system are fair enough to them. As contrast, they tend to perform absenteeism, low performance, low loyalty and citizenship behaviour when there is an occurring unfair practice in the organization.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.4.2.3 Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 2c

The study of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour which is conducted by Jafari and Bidarian (2012) in education industry showed the significant positive relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The result has implied that the more interaction between superior and inferiors there are, they better consider citizenship behaviour requirements (Jafari & Bidarian, 2012).

Moreover, Coyle-Shapiro, Kessler & Purcell (2004) stated that interactional justice has positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour. When the organization is able to manage the relationship well with the employee, then they likely tend to perform organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore, the managers must be interacting well with their employees. Again, Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) studied that interactional justice has significant impact on teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour which directs linked towards to their coworkers, supervisor and the organization.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.5 List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypothesis

Table 2.1 shows the list of research objectives, research questions and hypothesis that provide a clear picture in this study. A strong and clear research objectives and questions address the formulation of hypothesis.

Table 2.1 List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Obejectives (RO) and Research	Hypothesis
Questions (RQ)	
RO1: To determine the relationship between	H ₁ : All the psychological empowerment
psychological empowerment and	dimensions are significant explained the
organizational citizenship behaviour.	variances of organizational citizenship
	behaviour.
RQ1: What is the relationship between	
psychological empowerment and	
organizational citizenship behaviour?	
RO1.1: To determine the relationship	H _{1a} : There is a significant relationship
between meaning and organizational	between meaning and organizational
citizenship behaviour.	citizenship behaviour.
RQ1.1: What is the relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
RO1.2: To determine the relationship	H _{1b} : There is a significant relationship
between competence and organizational	between competence and organizational
citizenship behaviour.	citizenship behaviour.
RQ1.2: What is the relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour?	

Table 2.1 List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypothesis

RO1.3:Todeterminetherelationshipbetweenself-determinationandorganizationalcitizenshipbehaviour.	H_{1c} : There is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ1.3: What is the relationship between self- determination and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
	H_{1d} : There is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ1.4: What is the relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
RO2: To determine the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.	H ₂ : All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ2: What is the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
RO2.1: To determine the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.	H _{2a} : There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ2.1: What is the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
RO2.2: To determine the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.	H_{2b} : There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ2.2: What is the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour?	
Table 2.1 List of Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypothesis

RO2.3: To determine the relationship	H_{2c} : There is a significant relationship
between interactional justice and	between interactional justice and
organizational citizenship behaviour.	organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ2.3: What is the relationship between	
interactional justice and organizational	
citizenship behaviour?	
RO3: To determine the relationship between	H ₃ : All the psychological empowerment and
psychological empowerment, organizational	organizational justice dimensions are
justice and organizational citizenship	significant explained the variances of
behaviour.	organizational citizenship behaviour.
RQ3: What is the relationship between	
psychological empowerment, organizational	
justice and organizational citizenship	
behaviour?	

Source: Developed for the research

-

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The primary objective of this chapter is to use research methodology to carry out several factors that affect the primary teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour in educational industries. Research methodology is the process of collecting the data and information for the research purpose and it is considered as a crucial part of this study. Therefore, we describe the way of research is formulated in terms of designing a research, the methods of collecting data, sampling design, construct measurement, measurement scale, and methods of data analysis which related to the proposed framework.

3.1 Research Design

According to Zikmund, Babin, Carr and Griffin (2013), business research can be separated into basic business research and applied business research. Basic business research is the research conducted without satisfy the need and address the decision for specific organization. It attempts to expand the limits of general knowledge and is not solving a particular pragmatic problem. Applied business research is the research conducted to address a tailor business decision for specific organization. In this research, applied business research is adopted because we tend to conduct specific research which to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. In addition, applied business research may help the researchers determine the specific cause and effect relationship from any single variable in the research study.

In the study of Zikmund et al. (2013), qualitative business research is the research that allows the researcher to provide explanation of phenomena by not depending on numerical measurement in order to address business objectives. Qualitative research focuses on discovering true inner meanings and new insights. Approach for qualitative research is more on observation and interpretation, it also often used in exploratory research design. Besides that, quantitative business research is the business research that addresses research objectives through empirical assessments that involve numerical measurement and analysis. Approach for this type of research is more on measure and test and most often used in descriptive and causal research design.

Quantitative research method is found in this research instead of qualitative to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour. It is because numerical measurement involved in our research which we used statistics to generalise a finding by giving out the questionnaire to our target respondents. In addition, quantitative paradigm measurement is more reliable, valid, and generalizable in its clear prediction of cause-and-effect compare to qualitative research method.

Furthermore, research design can be classified into three types. Exploratory research is used to clarify unknown conditions or find ideas that may be benefit to organizations. Descriptive research uses to analyse the characteristics of objects, people, groups, organizations, or environment. In addition, causal research allows causal inferences to be made, seeks to identify cause-and-effect relationship for a study (Zikmund et al., 2013).

In this research, causal research is used to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour. It is because causal design attempts to explain the cause-and-effect relationship between variables. We tend to determine the cause-and-effect relationship which does a change in organizational citizenship behaviour cause a change in psychological empowerment and organizational justice. Therefore, we may understand which variables are the causes and which variables are the effects and also we get to decide the nature of the relationship between the causal variables and the effect to be predicted.

3.2 Data Collection Method

According to Zikmund et al. (2013), it stated that data collection method is the main part of research design and there are few ways that used to collect the primary and secondary data. The main methods include face to face interviews, telephone interviews, observation and questionnaire which is distributed through personally or electronically to respondents.

3.2.1 Primary Data

Primary data is the first hand information collected and gathered by the researchers specifically for the objective of conducting a research (Sekaran & Bouige, 2012). Primary source data consist of observation, interview and administered questionnaire. It is fast, efficient and accurate to primary data in conducting a research. However, it also brings some difficulties when collecting data such as consuming more time to collect and ethical

consideration. In this research, we use self-administered and fixed alternative questionnaire to fulfil our primary data collection.

3.2.2 Secondary Data

According to Zikmund et al. (2013), secondary data is the data that have been collected and gathered by the researcher for some other purpose. Moreover, there are several sources to obtain secondary data such as journals, publications of economic indicators, books and periodicals and so on.

In this research, secondary data is used in this research because it is less costly and more convenient to access stored data easily. The needed secondary data is obtained from Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman online library resource, including E-database such as JSTOR, ProQuest, SAGE Premier, ScienceDirect, and Emerald. However, some problems may occur such as the data accuracy and the obtained data is out-dated.

3.3 Sampling Design

In this research, the sampling design included target population, sampling location and sampling frame, sampling elements, sampling technique and sampling size.

3.3.1 Target Population

The initial step of sampling design is to define target population. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2012), target population is the entire group of people which researchers are interested to investigate in their research. This research is about the influence of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. Therefore, target population for this research is government teachers who teaching in primary school in Malaysia which are 231,243 peoples (Table 3.1).

State	Number of teachers	Number of students enrolment	
Johor	26,645	325,196	
Kedah	17,004	190,768	
Kelantan	16,029	174,801	
Melaka	7,222	77,795	
Negeri Sembilan	9,504	102,231	
Pahang	14,150	144,060	
Perak	21,410	205,136	
Perlis	2,268	21,582	
Pulau Pinang	10,513	132,470	
Sabah	24,923	267,707	
Sarawak	24,800	243,309	
Selangor	34,217	510,398	
Terengganu	11,554	122,567	
WP Kuala Lumpur	9,408	128,503	
WP Labuan	733	8,309	
WP Putrajaya	863	12,096	
Total	231,243	2,666,928	

Table 3.1: Statistic for Primary Education in Malaysia as at December 2015

Source: Perangkaan Pendidikan Malaysia, 2015

3.3.2 Sampling Location and Sampling Frame

Sampling location in this research is based on Johor. Due to time constraint and limited costs, it is difficult to set sampling location in every state of Malaysia government primary schools. Therefore, we only focus on one state to represent whole Malaysia government school teachers because it requires larger sample size sets in every state of Malaysia. Furthermore, the number of government primary school teachers in Johor is large enough to represent entire target population in Malaysia because the number of teachers in this state is ranked second highest which is 26,645 teachers.

Figure 3.1: Cluster School of Excellence



Source: Sekolah Kluster Kecemerlangan, 2016

On the other hand, the excellence performance of primary school students in Johor is another reason for choosing Johor as sampling location in this research. Cluster School of Excellence is a reward or label given by Ministry of Education when that school attained excellent result in student achievement and school management. By giving this label, it will foster excellence in schools within the Malaysian education system. Figure 3.1 indicates that Johor is the highest number of Cluster School of Excellence among Malaysia primary school.

In addition, previous performance of national examination Ujian Pencapaian Sekolah Rendah (UPSR) in Johor was ranked one of the bottom five states in 2007. However, based on the result of Gred Purata Sekolah (GPS) on UPSR in year 2012 (Table 3.2), Johor is ranked at the 6th places with 2.19 index number which is lower than 2.30 national index value. GPS is used to evaluate student achievement and lower GPS indicates higher student achievement. Johor is ranked at 4th places and 5th places in year 2013 and 2014 with an index number of 2.14 and 2.17 respectively. Both years GPS index value are above national average which is 2.27 in 2013 and 2.29 in 2014.

As previously mentioned, Malaysia primary school education is highly centralized and controlled by Ministry of Education (MOE). In each state, State Education Department was established to represent MOE in conducting all issues relate to the management and administration of primary school. Besides, State Education Department also responsible for coordinating the management and administration of the district education offices. In other words, the system policy of education in every state is consistent. Therefore, it is possible for our research to focus only in Johor to represent entire Malaysia population. There are restrictions on getting personal information due to protection on private and confidential matters and this subsequently create difficulty to get full list of teacher's personal data in Johor. Therefore, it is not possible to get sampling frame in this research. However, it is possible to get full list of school details including school name, address, contact information and total number of schools in each district from official portal of Johor Education Department and official website of Ministry of Education.

	2012		2013		2014	
State	Ranking	GPS	Ranking	GPS	Ranking	GPS
Johor	6	2.19	4	2.14	5	2.17
Kedah	12	2.33	11	2.27	11	2.29
Kelantan	4	2.18	6	2.16	4	2.16
Melaka	3	2.17	3	2.13	3	2.15
Negeri Sembilan	2	2.14	2	2.12	6	2.17
Pahang	7	2.19	8	2.18	10	2.23
Perak	11	2.31	12	2.29	12	2.31
Perlis	13	2.35	13	2.37	13	2.41
Pulau Pinang	8	2.19	5	2.15	7	2.17
Sabah	16	2.83	16	2.76	16	2.71
Sarawak	15	2.57	15	2.52	14	2.52
Selangor	10	2.22	9	2.18	9	2.22
Terengganu	9	2.21	10	2.2	2	2.14
WP Kuala Lumpur	5	2.18	7	2.16	8	2.21
WP Labuan	14	2.47	14	2.49	15	2.58
WP Putrajaya	1	1.74	1	1.73	1	1.7
Purata Kebangsaan	-	2.3	-	2.27	-	2.29

Table 3.2: Gred Purata Sekolah (GPS) Ranking for UPSR in 2012, 2013 and 2014

Source: Analisis 2014 SPM dan UPSR Perak, 2015

3.3.3 Sampling Elements

The sampling element in this research is the government formal teachers who are teaching in Johor primary school. Therefore, two criteria to be included in sampling elements which are (1) teachers who are having contract with government or Ministry of Education and (2) not a practicing teacher in primary school. Other than that, school principals are not included in the sampling elements. The reason behind this is our questionnaire was distributed to teachers in order to get their perception of psychological empowerment and organizational justice that received from school leaders which can affect their organizational citizenship behaviour level.

3.3.4 Sampling Size

Population	Sample
20000	377
30000	379
40000	380
50000	381

Table 3.3: Sample Size for a Given Population Size

Source: Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educ psychol meas*.

As previously mentioned, the total amount of formal teachers worked in the government primary school in Johor is 26,645 peoples. According to Table 3.3, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) simplified the size decision by providing a sample size table showed that 400 respondents are required in this research. Hence, we need to distribute 400 questionnaires over 26,645 target population. However, Barlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2001) stated that there is possible to deal with nonresponse bias within a quantitative research design. To avoid some of the respondents decline to respond the survey, total 400 sets will be distributed.

3.3.5 Sampling Technique

Sampling technique can be separated into probability sampling and nonprobability sampling. Probability sampling is individual in the population has the same probability or chance to be selected, whereas non-probability does not provide equal chances to all individuals being selected. Probability sampling is used in this research. According to Sekaran and Bouige (2012), stratified sampling method is used to differentiate needed information for various strata of the population, hence can be divided into proportionate and disproportionate stratified sampling technique. In a proportional stratified sample, the size of each stratum in the sampling units is proportionate to the size of population of that stratum. In contrast, disproportional stratified sampling is the sample size of every stratum is allocated based on analytical conditions in order to ensure that each stratum in the sample size has adequate number (Zikmund et al., 2013). None of the non-probability is used in this research.

Stratified sampling technique and simple random sampling technique are used in this research. Firstly, we randomly select 20 primary schools in Johor to represent the population. Consequently, since the full list of school details can be obtained, we adopt proportionate stratified sampling technique to select the number of schools from each district to the proportion of population size of the stratum. Considered the percentage of school in each district presented in Table 3.4, a proportional sample would have the same percentage as in the population.

The sample size is 400 of primary school teachers, therefore there are 20 primary school teachers will be selected based on disproportionate stratified sampling method in each selected primary school. Since primary school in Malaysia separated into morning session and afternoon session, therefore by referring to disproportionate sampling technique, sample size of teachers in each selected primary school will be distributed equally that is 10 respondents for morning session and another 10 respondents for afternoon session. The reason of using disproportionate stratified sampling is to ensure that an adequate number of sampling units in every stratum. Teachers whom are selected are based on simple random sampling technique because it allows every teacher in the selected primary school has equal chance to be selected.

District	Number of School	(Total number of school in each district / Total number of school in Johor) x 100%	Number of School Selected	Number of respondents
Johor Bahru	96	96/830 x 100%=12%	20 x 12%=2	2 x 20=40
Pasir Gudang	71	71/830 x 100% =9%	20 x 9%=2	2 x 20=40
Pontian	81	81/830 x 100%=10%	20 x 10%=2	2 x 20=40
Segamat	82	82/830 x 100%=10%	20 x 10%=2	2 x 20=40
Kulai	53	53/830 x 100%=6%	20 x 6%=1	1 x 20=20
Kota Tinggi	73	73/830 x 100%=9%	20 x 9%=2	2 x 20=40
Mersing	29	29/830 x 100%=3%	20 x 3%=1	1 x 20=20
Batu Pahat	88	88/830 x 100%=11%	20 x 11%=2	2 x 20=40
Kluang	88	88/830 x 100%=11%	20 x 11%=2	2 x 20=40
Muar	169	169/830 x 100%=20%	20 x 20%=4	4 x 20=80
Total	830		20	400

Table 3.4 Calculation of Number of School and Respondent in Each District

Source: Developed for the research

3.4 Research Instrument

Questionnaire is used in our study for collecting primary data from respondents. There must have a well-designed questionnaire in order for us to receive relevant result from respondents. A good questionnaire will directly help to achieve research objectives and provide accurate information on the same time. Fixed-alternative questionnaire or closed-ended question is considered as our data collection method where multi-choice answer will be given for respondents to choose the one closest to their own opinion. The reason we use this method is to save respondents time to answer and easy for us to key data when computing the result.

There are three sections included in our survey questionnaire. Section A is about respondent's demographic information. In this section, question of gender, age, race, marital status, educational level, service years in the schools, service years in the educational industry, working hours per week and the number of subjects teach in school will be asked.

Section B divided into two parts, which are questions about psychological empowerment and organizational justice. Psychological empowerment consists of 12 questions and Organizational Justice consists of 20 questions. This part of questionnaire is designed by using Five Point Likert scale rating. It is used to measure respondents' level of agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Section C is the last part of questionnaire used to measure the level of respondents' organizational citizenship behaviour. There are 15 questions in Section C. It is also using Five Point Likert scale rating, which ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

3.4.1 Pilot study

In our study, we had distributed 400 sets of questionnaire to our target respondents which are government primary school teachers in Johor. Initially, we distributed 30 sets of questionnaire to the teachers of SJK(C) Chien Chi were selected for pilot test purpose.

Table 3.5 Schedule of Pilot Study

Date	Activity
18 th May 2016	Distribute questionnaire at SJK(C) Chien Chi
19 th May 2016	Collect back the questionnaire
21 th May 2016	Run pilot test in Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software

Source: Developed for the research

As the table above, on 18th May 2016, we distributed 30 sets of questionnaire to the teachers who teach in SJK(C) Chien Chi. Moreover, we have given more times for them to complete the questionnaire and not collect back the questionnaire directly on the same day. Thus, we were collect back the questionnaire on the next day which on 19th May 2016. After collected, we managed the data in detail and prepare to run the pilot test. Then, we run the pilot test when all the date is well prepared on 21th May 2016.

3.4.2 Full Study

Date	Activity
2 th June 2016	Distribute questionnaire
30 th June 2016	Collect questionnaire
15 th July 2016	Analyze data and proposed research result

Table 3.6 Schedule of Full Study

Source: Developed for the research

The schedule of full study is showed above Table 3.6. After the pilot test has been conducted, full study is targeted at government primary school teachers in Johor as to represent the entire target population in Malaysia. Total 400 sets of questionnaires have been distributed.

On 2^{th} June 2016, we distributed 400 sets of questionnaire to the government primary school teachers in ten distinct areas in Johor. We distributed 40 set of questionnaire to seven districts out of ten districts which are Johor Bahru, Pasir Gudang, Pontian, Segamat, Kota Tinggi, Batu Pahat and Kluang. Besides that, there are 20 sets questionnaire we distributed to Kulai and Mersing. Moreover, there are another 80 sets of questionnaire had been allocated in Muar which the district that we have distributed the most number of questionnaire. We get the permission from the headmaster and headmistress of government primary school before entering schools and distributed questionnaires to teachers. With the help from headmaster and headmistress, all the questionnaires have been fully collected back on 30^{th} June 2016.

There are 400 sets of questionnaire have been collected from all the ten distinct area in Johor. On 15th July 2016, all the data are keyed in into the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) system software which used to generate the reliability test, Pearson correlation coefficient and also the Multiple Regression analysis results. Thus, the result of the research study is proposed after all the 400 sets of questionnaire keyed in into the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

3.5 Construct Measurement

According to Zikmund et al. (2013), measurement is conveying number in reliable and valid way in order to describe some objects of a phenomenon. The number measured carry out the information of the objects. The rule must be used when assigning number to an observation in order to provide accurate description. Scale measurement consists of ordinal scale, nominal scale, interval scale and ratio scale. It is a tool for researcher to determine the mathematical comparison between one another on the variables.

Nominal scale identifies and classifies objects or individual into variety groups. Nominal scale is a qualitative scale which provides basic and general information (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012). The value need not be represented in numerical form because no quantities are being represented. Figure 3.2 show that gender is one of the examples that use nominal scale in our study's questionnaire. Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Figure 3.2: Nominal Scale Example

1. Gender?	
Male	Female

Source: Developed for the research

Ordinal scale is used by researchers to differentiate variables in rank orders for distinguish categories into some preference (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012). Ordinal scale provides more information than nominal scale. However, it does not show the value of the magnitude of the differences between the ranks. Academic level in our study's questionnaire is using ordinal scale.

Figure 3.3: Ordinal Scale Example



Source: Developed for the research

Interval scale is a mathematic operation used by researchers on the respondents' data. It captures information about differences in quantities of a concept. It not only categorizes people in certain groups, but also measure size or degree of the preference differences among individuals (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012). Figure 3.4 shows the example of our study's questionnaire that uses interval scale for measurement.

Figure 3.4: Interval Scale Example

Meaning

No		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The work I do is very important to me	1	2	3	4	5

Source: Developed for the research

Ratio scale has all properties of interval scales and additional characteristics to symbolize absolute quantities. It overcomes the fault of interval scale that has arbitrary origin point. It has unique zero origin which is contrast to an arbitrary, which is meaningful measurement point (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012).

In our study's questionnaire is divided into two sections. Section A is respondent's demographic profile. Demographic profile includes of respondents details in of gender, age, race, marital status, educational level, service years in the schools, service years in the educational industry, working hours per week and the number of subjects teach in school. Nominal scale and ordinal scale are used in Section A's questionnaire.

Section B of questionnaire also separated into two parts, part A, part B and part C. Part A is questions for Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, part B is questions about Psychological Empowerment while part C is questions for Organizational Justice. Both part A, B and C is designed using interval scale. Under interval scale, there is a technique namely Likert scale that used to identify how strongly respondents agree or disagree with the statements. Respondents will be given fivepoint scale, as following:

1- Strongly Disagree 2- Disagree 3- Neutral 4- Agree 5- Strongly Agree

Construct	Adopted from	No. of items	
Psychological Empowerment			
• Meaning		3	
• Impact	Spreitzer (1995)	3	
• Self-determination		3	
• Competence		3	
Organizational Justice			
Procedural Justice	Thibaut & Walker (1975)	7	
	Leventhal (1980)		
• Distributive Justice	Leventhal (1976)	4	
• Interpersonal Justice	Bies & Moag (1986)	4	
Informational Justice	Bies & Moag (1986)	5	
	Shapiro, Buttner & Barry		
	(1994)		
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Dipaola and Tschannen-	15	
	Moran (2001)		

Table 3.7: The Origin of Construct in the Research

Source: Developed for the research

Our research's questionnaires are adopted from other researchers' research questions. Above Table 3.7 is about the source of where the questionnaire is adopted and how many items are used in our research.

3.6 Data Processing

After the result of questionnaire collect back from respondents, data analysis is considered as important part to ensure the quality of accuracy of data. Therefore, there are several steps which used to analysis the collected data.

The first step of data processing is data checking. It is where the raw material should be checked carefully and properly when entered into computer for data analysis purpose and before any detailed analysis is continuing conducted. For example, we must make sure that the questionnaire that we had distributed has collected back all and checked the question whether it has filled up by respondents.

Then, the second step is data editing. It is the process of checking data for omissions, consistency and legibility. Indeed, we must identify the errors that made by respondents when filled up the questionnaire such as those too many questions that did not fill up by respondents will be considered invalid. So, we need to remove it out.

The following step is data coding which is assigning the number to the participants' response before entered it into database. After editing and coding the participants' response, then it will continue done by Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software to analyse data.

3.7 Data Analysis

3.7.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis provides a way for researcher to summarize responses obtained from large numbers of target respondents in a simple statistics. Therefore, we use descriptive analysis to summarize responses obtained from demographic profiles by using pie chart and frequency bar chart.

In section A in our questionnaire, there are nine questions related to respondents' demographic information. Pie chart is used for the data obtained from gender, age group, race, marital status, average working hour and teaching subject because it is easily to be understood when displaying relative proportions of data.

Apart from that, data obtained from educational level, the years of service contributed to the school and the years of service contributed in educational industry are using frequency bar chart to present because these questions have more options and the visual form of frequency bar chart help readers easily to recognize trends of data.

3.7.2 Scale Measurement

3.7.2.1 Reliability Test

According to Sekaran and Bougie (2012), reliability refers to the stability and consistency of instruments measure of the research. It indicates to what range the questionnaire is free from bias.

Cronbach's Alpha is the most familiar method that is used to measure the reliability test (Sekaran, 2003). Hence, a reliability test based on a Cronbach's Alpha statistic will be applied to test the consistency and reliability of both dependent and independent variables.

Table below shown the range of the Cronbach's Alpha:

Table 3.8: Cronbach's Alpha Range

Level of Reliability	Coefficient Alpha ranges, α
Poor Reliability	Less than 0.60
Fair Reliability	0.60 to 0.70
Good Reliability	0.70 to 0.80
Very Good Reliability	0.80 to 0.95

Source: Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2012). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (6th ed.). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

According to Table 3.8, when coefficient alpha value below 0.60, it is poor reliability. It is considered as fair reliability when coefficient value is from 0.60 to 0.70 whereas 0.70 to 0.80 is good reliability. Lastly, the reliability is considered very good when the coefficient alpha value is range from 0.80 to 0.95.

As mentioned earlier, a pilot study of 30 government sector primary school teachers have been done to evaluate the reliability of all constructs which adopted from prior researchers. The results of the reliability test are summarized in the table below:

Constructs	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Alpha Coefficient	Strength of
		Value	Range	Association
Meaning	4	0.881	> 0.8	Very Good
Competence	4	0.718	> 0.7	Good
Self-determination	4	0.693	> 0.6	Fair
Impact	4	0.856	> 0.8	Very Good
Procedural Justice	7	0.920	> 0.9	Very Good
Distributive Justice	4	0.934	> 0.9	Very Good
Interpersonal Justice	4	0.879	> 0.8	Very Good
Informational Justice	5	0.902	> 0.9	Very Good
Organizational	15	0.782	> 0.7	Good
Citizenship Behaviour				

Table 3.9: Reliability Test Result for Pilot Study

Source: Developed for the research

According to the Table 3.9, the dependent variable which is organizational citizenship behaviour is under good reliability as its Cronbach's alpha value is between 0.70 and 0.80. While for the independent variables, all dimensions from organizational justice yield a very good reliability as their Cronbach's alpha values are between 0.80 and 0.95. On the other hand, for psychological empowerment, the dimension of self-determination has the lowest reliability as compared to the other dimensions. However, it still has a fair reliability as its Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.693. Besides, competent dimension is under good reliability as its Cronbach's alpha values are 0.718 whereas both dimensions of meaning and impact are under very good reliability as their Cronbach's alpha values are between 0.80 and 0.95. As each variable's reliability result is above 0.6, it shows that this questionnaire is suitable to be used in full study.

3.7.3 Inferential Analysis

Likert scale is an interval scale that used to investigate the relationship among the variables. Hence, Five Point Likert scale is designed in our questionnaire to identify how strongly respondents agree or disagree with the statements. The variables in our study are considered as metric, which allow us to measure the items differences in sizes. Pearson Correlation Analysis and Linear Regression Analysis are used to investigate the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

3.7.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

H₁: There is a significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 $H_{1:}$ There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

According to Sekaran and Bouige (2012), Pearson Correlation Coefficient is used to show the direction, strength and significance of the relationship among all the variables at interval or ratio scale level. The correlation range between -0.1 and +0.1. The variables are perfectly positive correlated when the correlation coefficient is +0.1. In contrast, the variables are perfectly negative correlated when the correlation coefficient is -0.1. Furthermore, if the coefficient value is less than 0.5 which means there is a weak correlation. However, there is a strong correlation if the coefficient value is more than 0.8. Below Table 3.10 shows the rules of thumb of Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

Range of Coefficient	Strength of Association	
± 0.91 to ± 1.00	Very Strong	
± 0.71 to ± 0.90	High	
± 0.41 to ± 0.70	Moderate	
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Small but definite relationship	
± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Slight, almost negligible	

Table 3.10: Rules of Thumbs of Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Source: Hair, J., Money, A., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007). *Research Methods for Business*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

3.7.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis is used to explain the variance in the dependent variable with few independent variables (Sekaran & Bouige, 2012). It provides a way of examining the character of the relationship among independent variables and dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis equation is as followed:

$$Y_i = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + \ldots + b_n X_n + e_i$$

The multiple regression coefficient which also known as R^2 , is used to indicate the combination of independent variables X explain the percentage of variation in dependent variable Y (Zikmund et al., 2013). The contribution of variation of each dependent variable can be ranked. In our study, multiple regression analysis is used to examine as below: H₁: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₂: All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₃: All the psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

The equation for our study will be:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = b₀ + b₁*Psychological Empowerment + b₂*Organizational Justice + e

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter outlines the methods of designing research, collection of data, sampling design, research instruments, contrust measurements, and the data processing and on how the data collected for data analysis purpose. Furthermore, the finding of questionnaire's result will be disclosing in the following chapter of our research.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

This section outlines the analysis of the results that are relevant to the research questions and hypothesis form in previous chapter. Therefore, it includes descriptive analysis of respondents' demographic profile and central tendencies constructs presented by graph and calculation. Scale measurements provide full reliability test result of the questionnaire. Inferential analysis is discussed to show the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

4.1.1 Respondent Demographic Profile

			Cumulative
	Frequency	Percent	Percent
Male	115	26.87	26.87
Female	313	73.13	100
Total	428		

Table 4.1 Respondents' Gender

Figure 4.1: Respondents' Gender



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1 show that 115 respondents out of 428 respondents are male, which is 26.87%. While for the female respondents consist of 313 respondents, which is 73.13%. Most of the respondents are female in this research.

Table 4.2 Respondents' Age

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-29	177	41.36	41.36
30-39	121	28.27	69.63
40-49	80	18.69	88.32
50-59	46	10.75	99.07
60 & above	4	0.93	100.00
Total	428		

Figure 4.2 Respondents' Age



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.2 and Figure 4.2 show that most of the respondents' age range in this research is between 20-29 years old, which is 177 respondents (41.36%). The age between 60 years old and above has lowest respondent in this research, which are 4 respondents (0.93%). The age between 30-39 years old consist of 121 respondents (28.27%). The age between 40-49 years old consist of 80 respondents (18.69%). The age between 50-59 years old consist of 46 respondents (10.75%).

Table 4.3	Race
-----------	------

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Chinese	323	75.47	75.47
Malay	72	16.82	92.29
Indian	31	7.24	99.53
Others	2	0.47	100.00
Total	428		

Source: Developed for the research



Figure 4.3 Race

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.3 and Figure 4.3 show that the majority of the respondents are Chinese, which consists of 323 respondents and equivalent to 75.47%. The others (races) are considered as the smallest number among the respondents, which consist of 2 respondents and is equivalent to 0.47%.

There are 16.82% (72 respondents) of Malay respondents and 7.24% (31 respondents) of Indian respondents in this research.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Single	223	52.10	52.10
Married	204	47.66	99.77
Divorced	1	0.23	100.00
Widowhood	0	0.00	100.00
Total	428		

Table 4.4 Marital Status

Source: Developed for the research



Figure 4.4 Marital Status

Table 4.4 and Figure 4.4 show that 223 out of 428 respondents (52.10%) are still single and the remaining 204 respondents (47.66%) among the respondents are married. There are 1 respondent is divorced and none of the respondents are widowhood in this research.

Table 4.5 Educational Level

			Cumulative
	Frequency	Percent (%)	Percent
STPM	26	6.07	6.07
College Diploma	97	22.66	28.74
Bachelor's Degree	274	64.02	92.76
Master's Degree	22	5.14	97.90
Doctorate Degree	2	0.47	98.36
Others	7	1.64	100.00
Total	428		

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.5 Educational Level



Table 4.5 and Figure 4.5 show that the highest number of educational level in this research is Bachelor's Degree while the smallest number belongs to Doctorate Degree, which consists of 64.02% (274 respondents) and 0.47% (2 respondents) among the total respondents respectively. The second highest number of educational level is College Diploma, which is 22.66% (97 respondents). STPM holders consist of 6.07% (26 respondents), Master Degree holders consist of 5.14% (22 respondents) and others consist of 1.64% (7 respondents).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
below 5 years	200	46.73	46.73
5 - 10 years	70	16.36	63.08
11 - 15 years	65	15.19	78.27
16 - 20 years	48	11.21	89.49
21 - 25 years	26	6.07	95.56
26 - 30 years	16	3.74	99.30
31 years & above	3	0.70	100.00
Total	428		

Table 4.6 Services Years in the School

Figure 4.6 Services Years in the School



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.6 and Figure 4.6 show that 46.73% (200 respondents) of service years in the school are not more than five years. The range of service year in the school between 5-10 years and 11-15 years, comprise of 16.36% (70 respondents) and 15.19% (65 respondents) respectively. Furthermore, 11.21% which is 48 respondents provided their services in the school which not more than 20 years but also exceeds 16 years in the school. 6.07% which is 26 respondents and 3.74% which is 16 respondents are having between 21 to 25 years and 26-30 service years in the school respectively. Lastly, 31 years and above is the lowest range of service year in the school which contribute to 0.70% (3 respondents).
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
below 5 years	160	37.38	37.38
5 - 10 years	87	20.33	57.71
11 - 15 years	59	13.79	71.50
16 - 20 years	49	11.45	82.94
21 - 25 years	34	7.94	90.89
26 - 30 years	30	7.01	97.90
31 years & above	9	2.10	100.00
Total	428		

Table 4.7 Services Years in Educational Industry

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.7 Services Years in Educational Industry



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.7 and Figure 4.7 show the respondents' services years in educational industry. Majority of the respondents' service year in education industry are less than 5 years, which consists of 160 respondents (37.38%) while the minority of the respondents' service year in education industry is equal and more than 31 years, which is 9 respondents (2.10%). There are 87 of the respondents (20.33%) are ranged between 5-10 service year and 59 of the respondents (13.79%) are between 11-15 service years in education industry. 49 of the respondents (11.45%) under the range of 16-20 service years, 34 of the respondents (7.01%) under the range of 26-30 service years in educational industry.

Table 4.8 Working Hours Per Week

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
30 hours	57	13.32	13.32
35 hours	106	24.77	38.08
40 hours	161	37.62	75.70
50 hours and above	104	24.30	100.00
Total	428		

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.8 Working Hours Per Week



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.8 and Figure 4.8 show the respondents' working hours per week. Throughout this research, it reflects that majority number of the respondents is 161 respondents (37.62%), who work for 40 hours while there have 57 respondents (13.32%), who work for 30 hours. It also consists of 106 respondents (24.77%) and 104 respondents (24.30%) are working for 35 hours and more than 50 hours respectively.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	45	10.51	10.51
2	109	25.47	35.98
3	107	25.00	60.98
others	167	39.02	100.00
Total	428		

Table 4.9 Number of Subjects Teach in School

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.9 Number of Subjects Teach in School



Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.9 and figure 4.9 show that majority of the respondents teach more than 3 subjects, which comprises of 39.02% among the respondents. While 109 respondents (25.47%) teach 2 subjects which contribute to second

highest. 107 respondents (25%) and 45 respondents (10.51%) teach 3 and 1 subjects respectively.

4.1.2 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs

4.1.2.1 Psychological Empowerment: Meaning

Table 4.10: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Meaning

Meaning		Pe	Mean	Ranking			
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
The work I do is very	1.17	0.93	8.41	67.06	22.43	4.08	2
important to me.							
My job activities are	1.17	1.40	12.15	60.98	24.30	4.06	3
personally meaningful to							
me.							
The work I do is	0.70	1.40	11.21	61.21	25.38	4.09	1
meaningful to me.							

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.10 is the central tendencies measurement of constructs about psychological empowerment of meaning. Meaning is measured by Five Point Likert scale. The highest ranked statement is that "The work I do is meaningful to me." while the mean score is 4.09. There are 61.21% of respondents choose agree, 25.38% choose strongly agree, 11.21% choose neutral, and 1.40% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.70%.

The second ranked statement is that "The work I do is very important to me." while the mean score contributes to 4.08. There are 67.06% of respondents choose agree, 22.43% choose strongly agree, 8.41% choose neutral, and 1.17% choose strongly disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose disagree which is 0.93%.

The last ranked statement is that "My job activities are personally meaningful to me." while the mean score is 4.06. There are 60.98% of respondents choose agree, 24.30% choose strongly agree, 12.15% choose neutral, and 1.40% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.17%.

4.1.2.2 Psychological Empowerment: Competence

Competence		Percentage (%)					Ranking
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
I am confident about my	0.93	0.70	15.65	61.44	21.28	4.01	1
ability to do my job.							
I am self-assured about	0.23	1.17	14.49	66.59	17.52	4.00	2
my capabilities to							
perform my work							
activities.							
I have mastered the skills	0.23	3.50	17.76	61.21	17.30	3.92	3
necessary for my job.							

Table 4.11: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Competence

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.11 is the constructs about psychological empowerment of competence. Competence is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The first ranked statement is that "I am confident about my ability to do my job." while the mean score 4.01. There are 61.44% of respondents choose agree, 21.28% choose strongly agree, 15.65% choose neutral, and 0.93% choose strongly disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose disagree which is 0.70%.

The second ranked statement is that "I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities." while the mean score is 4.00. There are 66.59% of respondents choose agree, 17.52% choose strongly agree, 14.49% choose neutral, and 1.17% choose

disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The third ranked statement is that "I have mastered the skills necessary for my job." while the mean score is 3.92. There are 61.21% of respondents choose agree, 17.76% choose neutral, 17.30% choose strongly agree, and 3.50% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

4.1.2.3 Psychological Empowerment: Self-determination

Self-determination		Pe	ercentage (%	b)		Mean	Ranking
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
I have significant	0.23	2.10	25.70	58.88	13.09	3.82	1
autonomy in determining							
how I do my job.							
I can decide on my own	0.70	6.78	22.42	55.37	14.73	3.77	2
how to go about doing							
my work.							
I have considerable	0.70	5.84	25.47	55.61	12.38	3.73	3
opportunity for							
independence and							
freedom in how I do my							
job.							

Table 4.12: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Self-determination

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.12 is the constructs about psychological empowerment which is self-determination. Self-determination is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job." while the mean score is 3.82. There are 58.88% of respondents choose agree, 25.70% choose neutral, 13.09% choose strongly agree, and 2.10% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The second ranked statement is that "I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work." while the mean score is 3.77. There are 55.37% of respondents choose agree, 22.42% choose neutral, 14.73% choose strongly agree, and 6.78% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.70%.

The last ranked statement is that "I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job." while the mean score is 3.73. There are 55.61% of respondents choose agree, 25.47% choose neutral, 12.38% choose strongly agree, and 5.84% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.70%.

4.1.2.4 Psychological Empowerment: Impact

Impact		Percentage (%)					
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
My impact on what	0.23	6.78	38.79	44.86	9.34	3.56	1
happens in my							
department is large.							
I have a great deal of	0.47	8.64	40.42	41.59	8.88	3.50	3
control over what							
happens in my							
department.							
I have significant	0.23	7.48	39.95	42.99	9.35	3.54	2
influence over what							
happens in my							
department.							

Table 4.13: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Impact

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.13 is the constructs about psychological empowerment which is impact. Impact is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "My impact on what happens in my department is large." while the mean score is 3.56. There are 44.86% of respondents choose agree, 38.79% choose neutral, 9.34% choose strongly agree, and 6.78% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%. The second ranked statement is that "I have significant influence over what happens in my department." while the mean score is 3.54. There are 42.99% of respondents choose agree, 39.95% choose neutral, 9.35% choose strongly agree, and 7.48% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The last ranked statement is that "I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department." while the mean score is 3.50. There are 41.59% of respondents choose agree, 40.42% choose neutral, 8.88% choose strongly agree, and 8.64% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

4.1.2.5 Organizational Justice: Procedural Justice

Table 4.14: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Procedural Justice
--

Procedural Justice		Pe	ercentage (%	ó)		Mean	Ranking
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
I am able to express my	1.17	3.50	28.04	57.94	9.35	3.71	4
views and feelings							
during those procedures.							
I am able to influence	1.17	7.71	33.18	49.30	8.64	3.57	7
over the (outcome)							
arrived at by those							
procedures.							
I believe those	0.47	3.04	30.61	58.41	7.47	3.69	5
procedures are applied							
consistently.							
I believe those	1.17	2.34	32.24	52.57	11.68	3.71	3
procedures are free of							
bias.							
I believe those	0.47	3.27	29.44	53.97	12.85	3.76	2
procedures are based on							
accurate information.							
I am able to appeal the	0.47	4.44	31.07	55.84	8.18	3.67	6
(outcome) arrived at by							
those procedures.							
I believe those	0.94	3.74	25.23	56.78	13.31	3.78	1
procedures are upheld							
ethical and moral							
standards.							

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.14 is the constructs about organizational justice which is procedural justice. Procedural justice is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "I believe those procedures are upheld ethical and moral standard" while the mean score is 3.78. There are 56.78% of respondents choose agree, 25.23% choose neutral, 13.31% choose strongly agree, and 3.74% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.94%.

The second ranked statement is "I believe those procedures are based on accurate information" while the mean score is 3.76. There are 53.97% of respondents choose agree, 29.44% choose neutral, 12.85% choose strongly agree, and 3.27% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

From the seven statements, "I believe those procedures are free of bias" is the third ranked statement which the mean score is 3.71. For this statement most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 52.57%. Next follow by neutral 32.24%, strongly disagree 11.68% and disagree 2.34%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.17%.

The statement "I am able to express my views and feelings during those procedures" is the fourth ranked statement which the mean score is 3.71. The highest percentage for this statement is agree which occupy 57.94%. Then follow by neutral 28.04%, strongly

disagree 9.35% and disagree 3.5%. The lowest is strongly disagree 1.17%.

The following statement is "I believe those procedures are applied consistently" which is the fifth ranked statement with the mean of 3.69. There are 58.41% of respondents choose agree, follow by neutral which is 30.61%, strongly agree 7.47%, and disagree 3.04%. The lowest is strongly disagree 0.47%.

The sixth statement is "I am able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures" which the mean score is 3.67. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 55.84%, follow by neutral which is 31.07%, strongly agree 8.18% and disagree 4.44%. The lowest is strongly disagree 0.47%.

The last ranked statement is "I am able to influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures" which the mean score is 3.57. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 49.30%, follow by neutral which is 33.18%, 8.64% strongly agree and 7.71% disagree. The lowest is strongly disagree which is 1.17%.

4.1.2.6 Organizational Justice: Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice	Percentage (%)						Ranking
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
My outcome is reflected	0.47	2.34	21.96	61.68	13.55	3.86	1
the effort I have been put							
into my work.							
My outcome is	0.47	2.34	21.49	63.08	12.62	3.85	2
appropriate for the work							
I have completed.							
My outcome is reflected	0.47	2.34	29.44	55.84	11.91	3.76	4
what I have contributed							
to the organization.							
My outcome is justified	0.93	3.04	26.17	55.84	14.02	3.79	3
by given my							
performance.							

Table 4.15: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Distributive Justice

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.15 is the constructs about organizational justice which is distributive justice. Distributive justice is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "My outcome is reflected the effort I have been put into my work" while the mean score is 3.86. There are 61.68% of respondents choose agree, 21.96% choose neutral, 13.55% choose strongly agree, and 2.34% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

The second ranked statement is "My outcome is appropriate for the work I have completed" while the mean score is 3.85. There are 63.08% of respondents choose agree, 21.49% choose neutral, 12.62% choose strongly agree, and 2.34% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

"My outcome is justified by given my performance" is the third ranked out of the four statements which the mean score is 3.79. For this statement most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 55.84%. Next follow by neutral 26.17%, strongly disagree 14.02% and disagree 3.04%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.93%.

The last ranked statement is "My outcome is reflected what I have contributed to the organization" which the mean score is 3.76. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 55.84%, follow by neutral which is 29.44%, strongly agree 11.91 % and 2.34% disagree. The lowest is strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

4.1.2.7 Organizational Justice: Interactional Justice

Interactional Justice		Pe	ercentage (%	ý)		Mean	Ranking
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
The principal has treated	0.47	1.87	14.95	61.45	21.26	4.01	1
me in a polite manner.							
The principal has treated	0.23	2.80	23.60	53.51	19.86	3.90	3
me with dignity.							
The principal has treated	0.47	1.87	16.59	60.05	21.02	3.99	2
me with respect.							
The principal has	1.40	7.71	32.00	47.20	11.69	3.60	9
refrained from improper							
remarks or comments.							
The principal has been	0.70	2.57	27.80	56.07	12.86	3.78	7
candid in his/her							
communications with							
me.							
The principal has been	0.93	1.87	25.23	57.48	14.49	3.81	5
explained the procedures							
thoroughly.							
The principle's	1.40	1.87	22.20	57.94	16.59	3.86	4
explanations regarding							
the procedures were							
reasonable.							
The principal has	1.17	2.57	27.80	53.27	15.19	3.79	6
communicated details in							
a timely manner.							
The principal has seemed	1.17	3.27	27.57	55.37	12.62	3.75	8
to tailor his/her							
communications to							
individuals' specific							
needs.							

Table 4.16: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Interactional Justice

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.16 is the constructs about organizational justice which is interactional justice. Interactional justice is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "The principal has treated me in a polite manner" while the mean score is 4.01. There are 61.45% of respondents choose agree, 21.26% choose strongly agree, 14.95% choose neutral, and 1.87% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

The second ranked statement is "The principal has treated me with respect" while the mean score is 3.99. There are 60.05% of respondents choose agree, 21.02% choose strongly agree, 16.59% choose neutral, and 1.87% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.47%.

From the nine statements, "The principal has treated me with dignity" is the third ranked statement which the mean score is 3.900. For this statement most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 53.51%. Next follow by neutral 23.60%, strongly disagree 19.86% and disagree 2.80%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The statement "The principle's explanations regarding the procedures were reasonable" is the fourth ranked statement which the mean score is 3.86. The highest percentage for this statement is agree which occupy 57.94%. Then follow by neutral 22.20%, strongly disagree 16.59% and disagree 1.87%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.40%.

The following statement is "The principal has been explained the procedures thoroughly" which is the fifth ranked statement with the mean of 3.83. There are 57.48% of respondents choose agree, follow by neutral which is 25.23%, strongly agree 14.49%, and disagree 1.87%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.93%.

The sixth statement is "The principal has communicated details in a timely manner" which the mean score is 3.79. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 53.27%, follow by neutral which is 27.80%, strongly agree 15.19% and disagree 2.57%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.17%.

Next statement is "The principal has been candid in his/her communications with me" which the mean is 3.78. The highest scale that choose by the respondents is agree which is 56.07%, then follow by 27.80% neutral, 12.86% strongly agree and 2.57% disagree. The lowest scale is strongly disagree which occupy 0.70%.

The eighth statement is "The principal has seemed to tailor his/her communications to individuals' specific needs" which the mean score 3.75. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 55.37%, follow by neutral which is 27.57%, strongly agree 12.62% and disagree 3.27%. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.17%.

The last ranked statement is "The principal has refrained from improper remarks or comments" which the mean score is 3.60. Most of the respondents choose agree which occupy 47.20%, follow by neutral which is 32.00%, 11.69% strongly agree and 7.71% disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.40%.

4.1.2.8 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organizational		Pe	rcentage (%	(o)		Mean	Ranking
Citizenship Behaviour							
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
I help students on my	0.00	1.87	15.19	66.12	16.82	3.98	4
own time.							
I waste a lot of class	23.13	48.13	18.22	8.18	2.34	2.18	15
time.							
I schedule personal	1.87	11.21	31.54	44.86	10.51	3.51	12
appointments at times							
other than during the							
school day.							
I am rarely absent.	2.34	4.67	10.05	46.50	36.45	4.10	2
I voluntarily help new	0.00	1.17	13.79	64.95	20.09	4.04	3
teachers.							
I volunteer to serve on	0.23	1.87	25.93	57.71	14.25	3.84	7
new committees.							
I volunteer to sponsor	0.00	5.61	36.21	47.43	10.75	3.63	11
extracurricular activities.							
I arrive to work and	0.00	0.70	11.68	53.74	33.88	4.21	1
meetings on time.							
I take the initiatives to	0.00	1.40	28.97	57.01	12.62	3.81	8
introduce myself to							
substitutes and assist							
them.							

Table 4.17: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organizational	Percentage (%)				Mean	Ranking	
Citizenship Behaviour							
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly		
	disagree				agree		
I begin class promptly	0.00	1.17	19.86	60.28	18.69	3.96	5
and use class time							
efficiently.							
I leave immediately after	21.03	45.79	18.46	12.62	2.10	2.29	14
school is over.							
I give colleagues	0.23	1.40	22.43	60.75	15.19	3.89	6
advanced notice of							
changes in schedule or							
routine.							
I give an excessive	9.34	22.43	36.68	29.91	1.64	2.92	13
amount of busy work.							
Teacher committees in	0.23	2.34	26.87	60.05	10.51	3.78	9
this school work							
productively.							
I make innovative	0.70	3.27	35.05	52.34	8.64	3.65	10
suggestions to improve							
the overall quality of our							
school.							

Table 4.17: Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.17 is the constructs about organizational citizenship behaviour. Organizational citizenship behaviour is measured by Five Point Likert scale.

The highest ranked statement is that "I arrive to work and meetings on time." while the mean score is 4.21. There are 53.74% of respondents choose agree, 33.88% choose strongly agree, 11.68% choose neutral, and 0.70% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The second ranked statement is that "I am rarely absent." while the mean score is 4.10. There are 46.50% of respondents choose agree, 4.10% choose strongly agree, 10.05% choose neutral, and 2.34% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 2.34%.

The third ranked statement is that "I voluntarily help new teachers." while the mean score is 4.04. There are 64.95% of respondents choose agree, 20.09% choose strongly agree, 13.79% choose neutral, and 1.17% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The fourth ranked statement is that "I help students on my own time." while the mean score is 3.98. There are 66.12% of respondents choose agree, 16.82% choose strongly agree, 15.19% choose neutral, and 1.87% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The fifth ranked statement is that "I begin class promptly and use class time efficiently." while the mean score is 3.96. There are 60.28% of respondents choose agree, 18.69% choose strongly agree, 19.86% choose neutral, and 1.17% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The sixth ranked statement is that "I give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine." while the mean score is 3.89. There are 60.75% of respondents choose agree, 15.19% choose strongly agree, 22.43% choose neutral, and 1.40% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The seventh ranked statement is that "I volunteer to serve on new committees." while the mean score is 3.84. There are 57.71% of respondents choose agree, 14.25% strongly agree, 25.93% neutral, and 1.87% disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The eighth ranked statement is that "I take the initiatives to introduce myself to substitutes and assist them." while the mean score is 3.81. There are 57.01% of respondents choose agree, 12.62% choose strongly agree, 28.97% choose neutral, and 1.40% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The ninth ranked statement is that "Teacher committees in this school work productively." while the mean score is 3.78. There are 60.05% of respondents choose agree, 10.51% choose strongly agree, 26.87% choose neutral, and 2.34% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.23%.

The tenth ranked statement is that "I make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school." while the mean score is 3.65. There are 52.34% of respondents choose agree, 8.64%

choose strongly agree, 35.05% choose neutral, and 3.27% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 0.70%.

The eleventh ranked statement is that "I volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities." while the mean score is 3.63. There are 47.43% of respondents choose agree, 10.75% choose strongly agree, 36.21% choose neutral, and 5.61% choose disagree. None of the respondents choosing strongly disagree in this research which contributes to 0.00%.

The twelfth ranked statement is that "I schedule personal appointments at times other than during the school day." while the mean score is 3.51. There are 44.86% of respondents choose agree, 10.51% choose strongly agree, 31.54% choose neutral, and 11.21% choose disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly disagree which is 1.87%.

The thirtieth ranked statement is that "I give an excessive amount of busy work." while the mean score is 2.92. There are 29.91% of respondents choose agree, 36.68% choose neutral, 22.43% disagree, and 9.34% strongly disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly agree which is 1.64%.

The fourteenth ranked statement is that "I leave immediately after school is over." while the mean score is 2.29. There are 12.62% of respondents choose agree, 18.46% choose neutral, 45.79% choose disagree, and 21.03% choose strongly disagree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly agree which is 2.10%.

The last ranked statement is that "I waste a lot of class time." while the mean score is 2.18. There are 48.13% of respondents choose disagree, 23.13% choose strongly disagree, 18.22% choose neutral, and 8.18% choose agree. There are smallest number of respondents choose strongly agree which is 2.34%.

4.2 Scale Measurement

4.2.1 Internal Reliability Test

Торіс	Coefficient Alpha Value	No. of item	
Psychological Empowerment :	0.864	3	
Meaning			
Psychological Empowerment :	0.774	3	
Competence			
Psychological Empowerment :	0.762	3	
Self-determination			
Psychological Empowerment :	0.863	3	
Impact			
Organizational Justice :	0.892	7	
Procedural Justice			
Organizational Justice :	0.872	4	
Distributive Justice			
Organizational Justice :	0.860	4	
Interpersonal Justice			
Organizational Justice :	0.898	5	
Informational Justice			
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	0.803	15	

Table 4.18: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis

Source: Developed for the research

Based on Sekaran and Bougie (2012), we determine that most of variables of our research have very good reliability. For psychological empowerment, meaning has a coefficient alpha value of 0.864, competence has a coefficient alpha value of 0.774, self-determination has coefficient alpha value of 0.762, and impact has coefficient alpha value of 0.863.

Besides, for organizational justice, procedural justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.892, distributive justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.872, interpersonal justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.860, and informational justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.898. Lastly, organizational citizenship behaviour also showed a good reliability, which the coefficient alpha value is 0.803.

As conclusion, the internal reliability test shows that all dimensions in the questionnaire is reliable and consistent as they have coefficient alpha value between 0.70 to 0.90.

4.3 Inferential Analysis

4.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Table 4.19: Correlations (N=428)

		Organizational Citizenship
		Behaviour
	Pearson correlation	0.327
Meaning	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.388
Competence	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.341
Self-determination	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.354
Impact	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.485
Procedural Justice	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.446
Distributive Justice	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428
	Pearson correlation	0.469
Interactional Justice	Sig.(2-tailed)	<.0001
	Ν	428

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.20: Strength

Coefficient range	Strength
± 0.91 to ± 1.00	Very Strong
± 0.71 to ± 0.90	High
± 0.41 to ± 0.70	Moderate
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Small but definite relationship
± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Slight, almost negligible

Source: Hair, J., Money, A., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007). *Research Methods* for Business. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient is used to test H_0 and H_1 among the independent variables with the dependent variable in this research. It indicates the direction, strength and significance among two variables by using the "Rules of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Alpha". The standard of the alpha level usually set the value at 0.01 and 0.05. Hence, null hypotheses need to be rejected when the p-value is less than or equal to the alpha value ($p \le 0.01$ and $p \le 0.05$). In others word, alternate hypotheses is accepted when null hypotheses are rejected and this shows that there is significant relationship between the variables.

Hypotheses 1 a

H₀: There is no significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour.

According to Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour due to the positive value of correlation coefficient. The meaning variable has a +0.327 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when meaning is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.327 is fall under coefficient range from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 . Therefore, the relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite relationship.

The relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 1 b

H₀: There is no significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour.

From the Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour because of the positive value of correlation coefficient. The competence variable has a +0.388 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when competence is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high. The value of this correlation coefficient +0.388 is fall under coefficient range from \pm 0.21 to \pm 0.40. Therefore, the relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite relationship.

The relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 1 c

H₀: There is no significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour.

From the Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between selfdetermination and organizational citizenship behaviour due to the positive value of correlation coefficient. The self-determination variable has a +0.341 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when self-determination is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.341 is fall under coefficient range from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 . Therefore, the relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite relationship.

The relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 1 d

H₀: There is no significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour.

According to Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour due to the positive value of correlation coefficient. The impact variable has a +0.354 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when impact is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.354 is fall under coefficient range from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 . Therefore, the relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite relationship.

The relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H_1 is accepted while H_0 is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 2 a

H₀: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

From the result shown on Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour because of the positive value for correlation coefficient. The procedural justice variable has a +0.485 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when procedural justice is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.485 is fall under coefficient range from \pm 0.41 to \pm 0.70. Therefore, the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is moderate.

The relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 2 b

 $H_{0:}$ There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

 $H_{1:}$ There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

From the result shown on Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour because of the positive value for correlation coefficient. The distributive justice variable has a +0.446 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when distributive justice is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.446 is fall under coefficient range from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 . Therefore, the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is moderate.

The relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Hypotheses 2 c

H₀: There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

From the result shown on Table 4.19, there is a positive relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour because of the positive value for correlation coefficient. The interactional justice variable has a +0.469 correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour variable. Thus, when interactional justice is high, organizational citizenship behaviour is high.

The value of this correlation coefficient +0.469 is fall under coefficient range from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 . Therefore, the relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is moderate.

The relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is significant. It is because the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.01. Therefore, H₁ is accepted while H₀ is rejected which shows that there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

4.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

4.3.2.1 Multiple Regression Analysis between Psychological Empowerment dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Source	DF	Sum of	Mean	F Value	Pr > F
		squares	Square		
Model	4	14.627	3.657	28.71	<.0001
Error	423	53.875	0.127		
Corrected	427	68.501			
Total					

Table 4.21 Analysis of Variance

Source: Developed for the research

- a. Predictors: Meaning, Competence, Self-determination, Impact
- b. Dependent variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 1

H₀: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are not significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Based on Table 4.21, p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05. The F-statistic is significant with value of 28.71. The model for this study is a good descriptor of the relation between the dependent and predictor variables. Therefore, the dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination and impact are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour.

Table 4.22 Model Summary

Root MSE	Dependent	Coefficient	R-Square	Adjusted R-
	Mean	Variance		Square
0.357	3.801	9.390	0.214	0.206

Source: Developed for the research

The R square indicates the extent or percentage the independent variables can explain the variations in the dependent variable. Based on Table 4.22, the dimensions of psychological empowerment can explain 21.40% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour. However, it still leaves 78.60% unexplained in this research. It shows that there are other additional variables that are important in explaining organizational citizenship behaviour that have not been considered in this research.
Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard	t-Value	$\mathbf{Pr} > \mathbf{t} $
			Error		
Intercept	1	2.310	0.144	16.07	<.0001
PEMAVG	1	0.083	0.033	2.52	0.012
PECAVG	1	0.161	0.038	4.18	<.0001
PESAVG	1	0.032	0.039	0.82	0.411
PEIAVG	1	0.110	0.033	3.34	0.001

Table 4.23 Parameter Estimates

Source: Developed for the research

Based on Table 4.23, meaning, competence and impact are significant to predict organizational citizenship behaviour when their p-values are 0.012, <.0001 and 0.001 respectively which is less than alpha value 0.05. However, self-determination is not significant to predict organizational citizenship behaviour when the p-value of self-determination is 0.411 which is not less than alpha value 0.05.

Regression Equation:

 $Y = a + b_1 (X_1) + b_2 (X_2) + b_3 (X_3) + b_4 (X_4) + e$ By substituting the result collected: Y = OCBa = constant $X_1 = PEM$ $X_2 = PEC$ $X_3 = PES$ $X_4 = PEI$ b = regression of coefficient of xii=1, 2, 3,e = an error term, normally distributed of mean 0 (assumes e = 0)

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 2.310 + 0.083 (Meaning) + 0.161 (Competence) + 0.032 (Self-determination) + 0.110 (Impact)

From the equation above, competence is the predictor variable that contributes the highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour because the value of parameter estimate for competence is the largest (0.161) if compare to other predictor variables. This indicates competence makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the variation in organizational citizenship behaviour, when the variance explained by all other predictor variables in the model is controlled for. The variable that contributes the second highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour is impact with value of 0.110 while meaning is the third highest contribution with value of 0.083. Next, self-determination is the variable with least contribution to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour as the value of parameter estimate is the smallest among the variables, which is only 0.032.

In summary, competence makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the variation in organizational citizenship behaviour, when the variance explained by all other predictor variables in the model is controlled for.

4.3.2.2 Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Source	DF	Sum of	Mean	F Value	Pr > F
		squares	Square		
Model	3	19.738	6.579	57.21	<.0001
Error	424	48.764	0.115		
Corrected	427	68.502			
Total					

Table 4.24 Analysis of Variance

Source: Developed for the research

a. Predictors: Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice

b. Dependent variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 2

H₀: All the organizational justice dimensions are not significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Based on Table 4.24, p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05. The F-statistic is significant with value of 57.21. The model for this study is a good descriptor of the relation between the dependent and predictor variables. Therefore, the dimensions of organizational justice are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour.

Table 4.25 Model Summary

Root MSE	Dependent	Coefficient	Coefficient R-Square	
	Mean	Variance		Square
0.339	3.801	8.923	0.288	0.283

Source: Developed for the research

The R square indicates the extent or percentage the independent variables can explain the variations in the dependent variable. Based on Table 4.25, the dimensions of organizational justice can explain 28.80% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour. However, it still leaves 71.20% unexplained in this research. It shows that there are some other variables that are crucial in explaining organizational citizenship behaviour that have not been considered in this research.

|--|

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard	t-Value	Pr > t
			Error		
Intercept	1	2.209	0.123	17.96	<.0001
PJAVG	1	0.170	0.042	4.04	<.0001
DJAVG	1	0.101	0.039	2.63	0.009
IJAVG	1	0.151	0.039	3.86	0.0001

Source: Developed for the research

Based on Table 4.26, procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are significant to predict organizational citizenship behaviour when their p-values are <.0001, 0.009 and 0.0001 respectively which is less than alpha value 0.05.

Regression Equation:

$$Y = a + b_1 (X_1) + b_2 (X_2) + b_3 (X_3) + b_4 (X_4) + e$$

By substituting the result collected:

Y = OCB a = constant $X_1 = PJ$ $X_2 = DJ$ $X_3 = IJ$ b = regression of coefficient of xi i=1, 2, 3,e = an error term, normally distributed of mean 0 (assumes e = 0)

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 2.209+ 0.170 (Procedural Justice) + 0.101 (Distributive Justice) + 0.151 (Interactional Justice)

From the equation above, procedural justice is the predictor variable that contribute the highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour because the value of parameter estimate for this predictor variable is the largest (0.170)if compare to other predictor variables. This indicates that procedural justice makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the variation in organizational citizenship behaviour, when the variance explained by all other predictor variables in the model is controlled for. The variable that contributes the second highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour is interactional justice with value of 0.151. Next, distributive justice is the variable with least contribution to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour as the value of parameter estimate is the smallest among the variables, which is only 0.101.

In summary, procedural justice makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the variation in organizational citizenship behaviour, when the variance explained by all other predictor variables in the model is controlled for.

4.3.2.3 Multiple Regression Analysis between Psychological Empowerment Dimensions, Organizational Justice Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Source	DF	Sum of	Mean	F Value	Pr > F
		squares	Square		
Model	7	22.291	3.184	28.94	<.0001
Error	420	46.210	0.110		
Corrected	427	68.502			
Total					

Table 4.27 Analysis of Variance

Source: Developed for the research

a. Predictors: Meaning, Competence, Self-determination, Impact, Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice

b. Dependent variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Hypothesis 3

H₀: All the psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions are not significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₁: All the psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Based on Table 4.27, p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05. The F-statistic is significant with value of 28.94. The model for this study is a good descriptor of the relation between the dependent and predictor variables. Therefore, the dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination, impact and the dimensions of organizational justice including procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour.

Table 4.28 Model Summary

Root MSE	Dependent	Coefficient	Coefficient R-Square	
	Mean	Variance		Square
0.332	3.801	8.727	0.325	0.3142

Source: Developed for the research

The R square indicates the extent or percentage the independent variables can explain the variations in the dependent variable. Based on Table 4.28, the dimensions of psychological empowerment and the dimensions of organizational justice can explain 32.50% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour. However, it still leaves 67.50% unexplained in this research. It shows that there are other additional variables that are important in explaining organizational citizenship behaviour that have not been considered in this research.

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard	t-Value	$\Pr > t $
			Error		
Intercept	1	1.864	0.144	12.94	<.0001
PEMAVG	1	0.012	0.032	0.38	0.703
PECAVG	1	0.127	0.036	3.50	0.001
PESAVG	1	-0.007	0.037	-0.18	0.857
PEIAVG	1	0.048	0.032	1.51	0.133
PJAVG	1	0.143	0.042	3.38	0.001
DJAVG	1	0.066	0.039	1.72	0.086
IJAVG	1	0.119	0.039	3.01	0.003

Table 4.29 Parameter Estimates

Source: Developed for the research

Based on Table 4.29, competence, procedural justice and interactional justice are significant to predict organizational citizenship behaviour when their p-values are 0.001, 0.001 and 0.0027 respectively which is less than alpha value 0.05. However, meaning, self-determination, impact and distributive justice are not significant to predict organizational citizenship behaviour when their p-values are 0.7025, 0.8573, 0.1327 and 0.0858 respectively which are not less than alpha value 0.05.

Regression Equation:

 $Y = a + b_1 (X_1) + b_2 (X_2) + b_3 (X_3) + b_4 (X_4) + b_5 (X_5) + b_6 (X_6) + b_7 (X_7) + e$ By substituting the result collected: Y = OCBa = constant $X_1 = PEM$ $X_2 = PEC$ $X_3 = PES$ $X_4 = PEI$

 $X_5 = PJ$

 $X_6 = DJ$

 $X_7 = IJ$

b = regression of coefficient of xi

i=1, 2, 3,

e = an error term, normally distributed of mean 0 (assumes e = 0)

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 1.864 + 0.012 (Meaning) + 0.127 (Competence) - 0.007 (Self-determination) + 0.048 (Impact) + 0.143 (Procedural Justice) + 0.066 (Distributive Justice) + 0.119 (Interactional Justice)

Based on Table 4.29, procedural justice is the predictor variables that contribute the highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour when the value of parameter estimate is the highest 0.143. The second highest contribution is competence with value of 0.127 while interactional justice is the third highest contribution with value of 0.119. Followed by distributive justice, impact and meaning contribute with the value of 0.066, 0.048 and 0.012 respectively. Self-determination is the predictor variables

that contribute the lowest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the value of -0.007.

In summary, procedural justice make the strongest unique contribution to explain the variation in organizational citizenship behaviour, when the variance explained by all other predictor variables in the model is controlled for.

4.4 Conclusion

In summary, distributed questionnaire has been collected and analysed critically. Firstly, demographic profile analysis has been conducted to identify the characteristics and background of respondents. Frequency analysis has been used for constructing the measurement of central tendencies in order to find the mean score of data. Secondly, scale measurement has been conducted through reliability test of each construct. Lastly, Pearson Coefficient and Linear Regression Analysis have been conducted to analyse the relationship. Research results will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter will draw conclusion and discussion based on the entire research project that had been conducted. Firstly, we summarize the demographic profile statistic, central tendencies, scale measurement and inferential analysis result in this chapter. The major findings of this study to show the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour are identified. Besides, the implication of the study is also included in this chapter. Several limitations are found during the progress of the research therefore recommendations are provided for future researchers with similar topic and methodology.

5.1 Summary of Statistical Analysis

5.1.1 Descriptive Analysis

From the demographic profile of 428 respondents, there are 26.87% are male respondents and 73.13% are female respondents. For the age group of target respondents, the age between 20-29 years old consists 41.36% among the respondents are the highest. While, for the age between 60 and above years old consists the least among the respondents, which is 0.93%

whereas for the age between 30-39 years old comprise of 28.27%. The rest of the age between 40-49 and 50-59 years old are consists of 18.69% and 10.75% of the respondents respectively. Moreover, the number of Chinese respondents (75.47%) is higher than Malay respondents (16.82%) through this research. Then, followed by Indian respondents are placed third highest, which consists of 7.24% whereas the others races just have 0.47% only. Furthermore, for the part of marital status, it shows that the single status, married status and divorced status have 52.10%, 47.66% and 0.23% among those respondents.

From the result of the research, it indicates that most of the respondents are Bachelor's degree holder (64.02%), followed by College Diploma holder, which consists of 22.66%. While for the STPM holder comprises 6.07% and the Master's Degree holder just has 5.14% of overall respondents. Then, for the Doctorate's Degree and others educational level, they consist of 0.47% and 1.64% respectively. Besides, most of respondents are associated with below 5 years of teaching experience in primary school, which consists of 46.73% while for the least of respondents (0.70%) have 31 years and above. Most of the respondents that provide less than 5 years of services in the educational industry consist of 37.38%. While for those provides more than 31 years and above of the services, which is the least number of the respondents (2.10 %) in this research. Furthermore, the highest of working hours per week is 40 hours, which consists of 161 respondents (37.62%) whereas for the lowest of working hours per week is 30 hours, which consists of 57 respondents only (13.32%). Lastly, it shows that most of the respondents had taught more than 3 subjects in schools but for those respondents who taught one subject, which have 11% only among the respondents.

5.1.2 Scale Measurement

In reliability test, there are nine variables tested in total. The nine variables are meaning, competence, self-determination, impact, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, and organizational citizenship behaviour. The variable that has highest Cronbach's coefficient alpha is informational justice, with the value of 0.898 and it followed by procedural justice with coefficient alpha value of 0.892. Next, third highest Cronbach's coefficient alpha value of 0.892. Next, third highest Cronbach's coefficient alpha value of 0.892. Next, third highest Cronbach's coefficient alpha value of 0.892. Next, the value of 0.872. Forth highest coefficient alpha variable is meaning, with the value of 0.864. It followed by Impact, which has 0.863 of coefficient alpha value. Then, the coefficient alpha of interpersonal justice and organizational citizenship behaviour are 0.860 and 0.803 respectively. Next is competence with the coefficient alpha value of 0.774. The lowest coefficient alpha value is self-determination, which is 0.762. As all the nine variables have Cronbach's alpha value that higher than 0.60, therefore, all of the variables are reliable.

5.1.3 Inferential Analysis

5.1.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Based on the results of Pearson Correlation Analysis, the seven independent variables which are meaning, competence, selfdetermination, impact, procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice have been used to examine the significant relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour. The correlation of organizational citizenship behaviour with meaning, competence, self-determination, impact, procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice were indicated 0.327, 0.388, 0.341, 0.354, 0.485, 0.446 and 0.469. Hence, the result indicated that all psychological empowerment dimensions are fall under the range of ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 which is small but definite relationship correlation with the organizational citizenship behaviour whereas all organizational justice dimensions are fall under the range of ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 which is moderate correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour.

5.1.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

For multiple regression analysis result among all psychological empowerment dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviour, the p-value is <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05 and the Fstatistic is significant with value of 28.71. Therefore, the dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination and impact are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour. The R square value from the result is 0.2135 which means that the dimensions of psychological empowerment can explain 21.35% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour however it still leaves 78.65% unexplained in this research. From the parameter estimates of the results, the regression equation is showed below:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 2.310 + 0.083 (Meaning) + 0.161 (Competence) + 0.032 (Self-determination) + 0.110 (Impact) Competence contributes highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the highest parameter estimate value of 0.161, while self-determination contributes least to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the smallest parameter estimate of 0.032.

For multiple regression analysis result among all organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviour, the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05 and the F-statistic is significant with value of 57.21. Therefore, the dimensions of organizational justice including procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour. The R square value from the result is 0.288 which means that organizational justice can explain 28.80% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour. However, it still leaves 71.20% unexplained in this research. From the parameter estimates of the results, the regression equation is showed below:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 2.209 + 0.170 (Procedural Justice) + 0.101 (Distributive Justice) + 0.151 (Interactional Justice)

From the equation above, procedural justice contributes highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the highest parameter estimate value of 0.170 while distributive justice contributes least to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the smallest parameter estimate of 0.101.

For multiple regression analysis result among all psychological empowerment dimensions, organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behaviour, the p-value <.0001 is less than alpha value 0.05 and the F-statistic is significant with value of 28.94. Therefore, the dimensions of psychological empowerment including meaning, competence, self-determination, impact and the dimensions of organizational justice including procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are significant explained the variance in organizational citizenship behaviour. The R square value from the result is 0.325 which means that the dimensions of psychological empowerment and the dimensions of organizational justice can explain 32.50% of the variations in organizational citizenship behaviour. However, it still leaves 67.50% unexplained in this research. From the parameter estimates of the results, the regression equation is showed below:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour = 1.864 + 0.012 (Meaning) + 0.127 (Competence) - 0.007 (Self-determination) + 0.048 (Impact) + 0.143 (Procedural Justice) + 0.066 (Distributive Justice) + 0.119 (Interactional Justice)

Procedural justice contributes the highest to the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour with the highest Parameter Estimate value of 0.143 while self-determination contributes the lowest to the variation of organizational citizenship the smallest parameter estimate value of -0.007.

5.2 Discussion of Major Findings

Major finding 1: Based on the result of Pearson's Correlation showed that all of the predicting variables (meaning, competence, self-determination, impact, procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice) were found to be significantly and positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviour at different strengths.

Hypothesis	Result	Supported
H _{1a} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.327	Support
between meaning and organizational	p = <.0001	
citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	
H_{1b} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.388	Support
between competence and organizational	p = <.0001	
citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	
H_{1c} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.341	Support
between self-determination and	p = <.0001	
organizational citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	
H_{1d} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.354	Support
between impact and organizational	p = <.0001	
citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	
H_{2a} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.485	Support
between procedural justice and	p = <.0001	
organizational citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	

Table 5.1: Summary of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Result

Table 5.1: Summary of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Result

H _{2b} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.446	Support
between distributive justice and	p = <.0001	
organizational citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	
H _{2c} : There is a significant relationship	r = 0.469	Support
between interactional justice and	p = <.0001	
organizational citizenship behaviour.	(p < 0.01)	

Source: Developed for the research

5.2.1 Meaning and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Table 5.1 shows the summary of findings on previous Pearson Correlation results in Chapter 4. Based on the result, the relationship between meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite positive relationship among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. When teacher feel the work he or she does is more meaningful, he or she will more willingly exert organizational citizenship behaviour and vice versa. Therefore, Hypothesis 1a is supported.

Similar to the study by Chiang and Hsieh (2012), the study indicates the positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour. It explained that when an individual found their job meaningful, they will tend to increase their job performance by finish related work tasks by themselves and having fewer

doubts. When job performance positively influenced by psychological empowerment, so as did organizational citizenship behaviour.

The result also supported by study of Yucel (2008) in Turkish elementary schools. It clarified that individual who see valued meaningful outcome when their contributions are encouraged and valued, may bring to high level of organizational citizenship behaviour. Besides, study of Shahri, Yazdankhak and Heydari (2015), also found a positive relationship between sense of meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour. The study explained that when the employees see values on the job they are doing, they tend to have high level of organizational citizenship behaviour.

5.2.2 Competence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

From our research finding showed that there is a positive relationship between competence and organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. The small but definite positive relationship indicates that the more teachers have an impact on what happens in his or her department, the more he or she will likely to perform more extra role behaviour. Therefore, Hypothesis 1b is supported.

Similar to the study of Neeta (2013), it also found that competence is positively related with organizational citizenship behaviour in college. The study explained that the employees are satisfied due to the opportunities they get in order to enhance their skills and competencies. By improving the competence level, they can perform better and work to the utmost.

Same goes to study carried out in Kyambogo University amongst engineering lecturers by Kagaari and Munene (2007). The study found that competence of engineering lecturer in university has positive relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour. The study of Moorman (1991) mentioned that employees with competent demonstrate discretionary behaviours. Guay, Simard & Tremblay (2000) indicated that teachers who have influence on the work and high level of autonomy as well as using competence had strong influence on organizational citizenship behaviour mobilization.

5.2.3 Self-determination and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Self-determination also showed small but definite positive relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. When teachers have more autonomy in determining how he or she do job, he or she will tend to show more citizenship behaviour. Therefore, Hypothesis 1c is supported.

This finding matches with the study that carried out by Tastan and Serinkan (2013), it showed the positive relation of self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational industry. The result indicated that self-determination is important to enhance employees in relation to the voluntary performance behaviour. In addition, the result also consistent with Deci and Ryan's (2000) study which also showed the positive relationship between self-determination in individual and organization's performance behaviour. It is because the study implies a significant association between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors such as rewarding, recognition, autonomy and individual's work performance.

Other than that, according to the Tahir's (2015) study, the positive relationship between self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour in service industry also been confirmed. The result showed that task performance of the organization staffs has linked through to their service organizational citizenship behaviours. Therefore, it explained that self-determinant staffs will react on which leads to increase the service quality of the organization and also perform the organizational citizenship behaviour at the same time.

5.2.4 Impact and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour is small but definite relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. The positive relationship showed that when teacher's confidentiality about his or her ability to do job is high, the willingness to carry out extra role behaviour will significantly become high. Therefore, Hypothesis 1d is supported.

This finding same goes to the study of Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemach (2014) also resulted that there is positive relationship between impact and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational industry. It is because they found that authentic leadership was positively related to the impact dimension of psychological empowerment. Therefore, an increase in authentic leadership led to higher psychological empowerment on impact and also results in higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviour.

5.2.5 Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

From the result of Pearson Correlation showed that the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour is moderate and positive. It indicates that the occurrence of organizational citizenship behaviour is high when the process of making decision about salary increment, bonuses and promotions is highly free of bias among teachers and vice versa. Therefore, Hypothesis 2a is supported.

Similar finding has been reported by Goudarzvandchegini, Gilaninia and Abdesonboli (2011) showed the positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in public hospital industry. It indicated that the employees will be more concern to the organizational procedures including promotion, salary, reward and reprimand whether it treat them fairly or not. The higher sensitivity towards procedures, the more affect to perform organizational citizenship behaviour in hospital industry.

Another research found that the fairness of decision making procedures has significant impact on employee's willingness to perform more organizational citizenship behaviour in organization (Nandan & Azim, 2015). Not only that, according to the study of Songür, Basım and Şeşen (2008), it stated that when the employees are treated by unfairness of procedures, it has influenced them to display organizational citizenship behaviour in the organization. So, the more employees perceived the organization as fair, the more they are engaged in performing organizational citizenship behaviour.

5.2.6 Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

There is a positive and moderate relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. Based on this result we can conclude that teacher more likely to feel that his or her outcome is justified by given performance will tend to increase organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore, Hypothesis 2b is supported.

According to research of Ucho and Atime (2013) showed the positive relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational industry. Teachers perceived that the fairness of distribution of the organizational resources has significant influenced them to perform organizational citizenship behaviour in school. The more fairness of distribution of organizational resources perceived by teachers, the more level of organizational citizenship behaviour will be exerted. Chegini (2009) concluded that the must adopt the distribution and allocation of resources fairly in order to encourage employees to perform more organizational citizenship behaviour. So, when employees are treated justly by distributive justice, they are more willing to perform organizational citizenship behaviour.

5.2.7 Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The moderate and positive relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour showed that the greater interaction and communication between principal and teachers, the greater citizenship behaviour teacher will more likely to exert. Therefore, Hypothesis 2c is supported.

The finding's outcome also supported by Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) when they investigate the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour in higher learning institution. The result supported the positive relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. It is because when teachers considered long term fairness such as interpersonal treatment evaluation is highly associated with organizational citizenship behaviour therefore institution should treated teachers with fair manner in order to encourage them showing innovative behaviour in institution.

Major finding 2.1: Based on the result of Multiple Regression Analysis, meaning, competence and impact were found to be significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour, while self-determination were insignificant.

H₁: All the psychological empowerment dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Variable	Parameter	Pr > t	Result	Pr > F	R-Square
	Estimate				
Intercept	2.310	<.0001			
Meaning	0.083	0.012	Significant		
Competence	0.161	<.0001	Significant		
Self-determination	0.032	0.411	Insignificant	<.0001	0.214
Impact	0.110	0.001	Significant		

Table 5.2: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result

Source: Developed for the research

The model is good to explain the relation between organizational citizenship behaviour and predictor variables in this study when the p-value is <.0001 therefore alternate hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) is supported.

Based on Table 5.2, competence (parameter estimate=0.161) is the best single predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia, followed by impact and meaning with parameter estimate value of 0.110 and 0.083 respectively. This result is consistent with Bogler & Somech (2004) which found that teacher will exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour when they believe in their own ability that able to make a change with students.

However, self-determination is not significant to predict organizational citizenships behaviour because its' p-value more than alpha value 0.05. The contradict results of self-determination toward organizational citizenships behaviour might be due to teachers' working experience in school as there had 46.73% respondents are less than 5 service years in school. According to David (1989), Casner-Lotto (1988), Wissler and Ortiz (1986), teachers with 5 to 10 years teaching experience are more willing to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour as they have authority in decision making.

Major finding 2.2: Based on the result of Multiple Regression Analysis, procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice were found to be significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour.

H₂: All the organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Variable	Parameter	$\mathbf{Pr} > \mathbf{t} $	Result	Pr > F	R-Square
	Estimate				
Intercept	2.209	<.0001			
Procedural justice	0.170	<.0001	Significant		
Distributive justice	0.101	0.009	Significant	<.0001	0.288
Interactional	0.151	0.0001	Significant		
justice					

Table 5.3: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result

Source: Developed for the research

The model is good to explain of the relation between organizational citizenship behaviour and predictor variables in this study when the p-value is <.0001 therefore alternate hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) is supported.

Based on Table 5.3, procedural justice (parameter estimate=0.170) is the best single predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia, followed by interactional justice and distributive justice with parameter estimate value of 0.151 and 0.101 respectively. This result showed that all dimensions of organizational justice have significant relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour.

Among dimensions of organizational justice, procedural justice is the one that best predicts the organizational citizenship behaviour. This result is proven from previous researchers Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) as procedural justice is the strongest predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour in higher education institution. The research outcomes of Zeinabadi and Salehi (2011) also found that procedural justice can influence organizational citizenship behaviour when teachers satisfied from their job and become more committed to school. Due to their satisfaction on job, teachers will be more engaged in citizenship behaviours. According to Moorman, Niehoff and Organ (1993) and Clay-Warner, Reynolds and Roman (2005), they also found that procedural justice as an important antecedent of satisfaction on job. Thus, teachers will exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour as they have greater satisfaction on the job. **Major finding 2.3**: Based on the result of Multiple Regression Analysis, competence, procedural justice, interactional justice were found to be significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour, while meaning, self-determination, impact and distributive justice were insignificant.

H₃: All the psychological empowerment and organizational justice dimensions are significant explained the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Variable	Parameter	Pr > t	Result	Pr > F	R-Square
	Estimate				
Intercept	1.864	<.0001			
Meaning	0.012	0.703	Insignificant		
Competence	0.127	0.001	Significant		
Self-determination	-0.007	0.857	Insignificant		
Impact	0.048	0.133	Insignificant		
Procedural justice	0.143	0.001	Significant	<.0001	0.325
Distributive justice	0.066	0.086	Insignificant		
Interactional	0.119	0.003	Significant		
justice					

Table 5.4: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Result

Source: Developed for the research

The model is good to explain of the relation between organizational citizenship behaviour and predictor variables in this study when the p-value is <.0001 therefore alternate hypothesis (Hypothesis 3) is supported.

Based on Table 5.4, procedural justice (parameter estimate=0.143) is the best single predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia, while competence and interactional justice contribute second and third highest to organizational citizenship behaviour with parameter estimate value of 0.127 and 0.119 respectively. The result is proven by Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) as procedural justice is the strongest predictor among other variables when explaining the variances in organizational citizenship behaviour in higher education institution.

However, meaning, self-determination, impact and distributive justice are not significant to predict organizational citizenships behaviour because its' p-value more than alpha value 0.05.

The result of meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour differs from previous studies which found that teachers feel their job is meaningful and important to them which can greatly influence the outcome of citizenship behaviour (Ghani, Raja & Jusoff, 2009; Aksel et al. 2013). It can be explained that the job itself perceived by teachers are meaningful hence increase the positive feeling towards their work such as showing extra role behaviour however such behaviour particularly towards schools as a whole but not towards specific colleagues or students. The finding is supported by Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2011) when the researchers concluded that intrinsic satisfaction such as meaningfulness of the job are only significantly influence on organizational citizenship behaviour for individual (OCBI) in higher learning education.

The result of self-determination and organizational citizenship behaviour is inconsistent with Bogler and Somech (2004) which found that when teachers are involved in making decision will willing to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour towards students, colleagues and school. According to Wall and Rinehart (1998) stated that self-determination influenced the outcome of citizenship behaviour when teachers' working experience in school was taken into account. Many researchers concluded that teachers feel that they have authority in making decision and tend to exert their innovative behaviour when their teaching experience are between 5 to 10 years (David, 1989; Casner-Lotto, 1988; Wissler & Ortiz, 1986). Most of the target respondents in this research have not more than 5 years' service year in school which constitute to 46.73%. Since there are nearly to 50% of target respondents have not more than 5 years' service year in primary school therefore the insignificant result of self-determination to explain the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour occurred. Besides, when teachers' perceive self-determination is high, they have a tendency to reduce the willingness of help from colleagues which in return they will show less citizenship behaviours towards colleagues (Chiu & Chen, 2005).

The result of impact and organizational citizenship behaviour in this research is different from others previous research Ghani, Raja and Jusoff (2009). The insignificant result might happen when teachers feel that they have the great impact on in their workplace however it does not mean that such empowerment will allow them to perform extra role behaviour (Bogler & Somech, 2004). The result also supported by Cheasakul and Varma (2016) which focus on organizational citizenship behaviour of teachers in Thailand stated that teachers see themselves has significant influence on student achievement and school events however they are not emotionally inclined to the school solely due to the dissatisfaction of working conditions. Therefore, it is possible to explain that government primary school teachers in Malaysia has less tendency to show citizenship behaviour possibly because of less emotional attachment to schools such as ineffective communication system and complicated working conditions.

Distributive justice is found to have less influence on organizational citizenship behaviour in this research that consistent with previous researchers' result in educational sector (Moorman, 1991; Iqbal, Aziz & Tasawar, 2012; Buluc, 2015).

The possible explanation is that distributive justice more related to short term evaluation that is teachers' satisfaction however when comes to long term fairness, procedural and interactional justice are more related to long term evaluation that is organizational citizenship behaviour (Mohammad, Habib & Alias, 2010).

5.3 Implication of the Study

Since there are only few studies have proven the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour in educational sector (Bogler & Somech, 2004) and the relation between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour has limited studies in developing countries including Malaysia (Liu, Chen & Lin, 2004). Therefore, the research result has added value in developing countries educational context.

Based on the findings, overall psychological empowerment and organizational justice are closely related to organizational citizenship behaviour. As compared to psychological empowerment dimensions, organizational justice dimensions contribute more significant influence on organizational citizenship behaviour especially procedural justice contribute strongest influence while interactional justice has significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour. The result is supported by Mohammad, Habib & Alias (2011). Psychological empowerment namely competence has significant influence on organizational citizenship behaviour which consistent with Kasekende, Munene, Otengei & Ntayi (2016).

The result revealed that meaning, competence, impact, distributive justice have weak impact or not significant enough to explain the variances of organizational citizenship behaviour. This research provides initial stage for researchers to better understanding the causal relationship. Therefore, future researchers are encouraged to further investigate the other independent variables which are important and closely related to organizational citizenship behaviour.

In Malaysia educational context, the outcome of this research provides closer look to the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia which help Malaysian government including Ministry of Education (MOE), school authorities and teachers to better understanding the importance of extra role behaviour among teachers rather focusing on in role behaviour that eventually affect student achievement and academic performance.

Firstly, government and school authorities need to realize the importance of having empowering environment in the way of enhance work value done by teachers, enhance confidence of their skill and capabilities, give them power in making decision and influence the outcome in school. Such environment can increase teachers' intrinsic motivation which in return promotes teacher citizenship behaviour. Teachers found themselves more willing to contribute extra role behaviour when they are empowered by having high level of competence. It is important for principals and school authorities to recognize teachers' belief in their capability and skills that teachers may help themselves to update on new skill and knowledge therefore increase their competence.

Secondly, organizational justice plays an important role in school context. Ministry of Education should responsibly safeguard the fairness of making decision, distributing rewards and fairly informed teachers which demonstrate by school administrator. To enhance teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour, school administrator should foster the culture of fairness. It is especially important for principals to allow teachers to raise question or express disagreement in the process of making decision. Therefore, flexibility is necessary when applying fairly procedures. Besides, principals should communicate information regarding the process of making decision with teachers in a fair manner. Therefore, it is crucial for all level of schools and Ministry of Education to stress the fairness perceived by teachers in school. It allows teachers more willingly to show extra role behaviour which achieving the final objective of school, teacher and government that increases overall student performance and achievement in international level.

5.4 Limitation of the Study

5.4.1 Single Language Version

One of the limitations we found when doing this research is where there is English version available for questionnaire. In Malaysia, there are different races of teachers who may not major in teaching English language in primary school. Besides, some of them may not English educated. Therefore, it is quite problematic for respondents who are lack of English language background to understand some difficult words used in the questionnaire. When they do not understand some terms we used in questionnaire, it might be time consuming for them to finish respond the questionnaire because they need to find those words from dictionary. Besides, they also might simply guess the words and result inaccurate response from them.

5.4.2 Short Time Frame

Another limitation of this research is to finish it in short time frame. It is challenging to complete this research within approximately six months as there are many processes need to go through at every stage of this research. For instance, the process of gathering information and data, distributing questionnaire, running the test by using SAS and others are difficult to do in a short time frame. In addition, it is time consuming to get more respondents to participate in this research and consequently it limited the number of respondents in this research.

5.4.3 Difficulties of Distributing Questionnaire in Government Primary School

There are some difficulties that we faced when distributing the questionnaire. In order to distribute questionnaire to government primary school teachers, it is required to follow the rules that we have to apply permit from Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri Johor (JPN Johor). Due to the time constraint to process the procedure of applying permit, we enter into school by showing the approval letter from university and asking permission from school principal to allow us conduct survey. Therefore, some of the primary schools rejected our request to distribute the questionnaire.

5.5 Recommendation for Future Research

There are several limitations found in this research. Hence, recommendations are provided for future researchers when they do with the similar studies.

Future researchers are encouraged to have more different language version for their survey questionnaire such as Malay, Chinese, and Tamil since Malaysia is a multinational country. It may help the respondents to clearly understand the words or terms used in the questionnaire by not guessing the meaning of the word used which may lead them to simply choose the answer. Therefore, the target respondents will be more likely to respond and help the researcher to get more accurate result for their study.

Furthermore, future researchers are encouraged to proper plan the schedule of research. Since the process of gathering data, apply permit to conduct survey and analyze results are difficult to complete it in a short time frame hence future researchers need to proper schedule a time frame before conducting a research. During the research process, future researchers should keep track on each activities and ensure that each activities can be finished on time.

In addition, future researchers are recommended to add some other possible variable that in order to examine the other important factors that will encourage organizational citizenship behaviour among teachers in Malaysia.
5.6 Conclusion

This research contributes some important issues in educational sector in Malaysia. Firstly, this research investigates the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. As the result showed that psychological empowerment and organizational justice have significant relationship to organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teacher in Malaysia. Significant indicators towards organizational citizenship behaviour are provided that may help the government, school authorities and teachers to further understanding the how the outcome of organizational citizenship behaviour will influence student achievement. Several limitations and recommendations have been suggested for future researchers to take note.

REFERENCES

- A glance at the Malaysian education system. (2015, March). Retrieved March 23, 2016 from https://www.studymalaysia.com/education/higher-education-in-malaysia/a-glance-at-the-malaysian-education-system
- Adam, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2(267-299).
- Aksel, I., Serinkan, C., Kiziloglu, M., & Aksoy, B. (2013). Assessment of teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors and psychological empowerment: An empirical analysis in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 89, 69-73.
- Alanoglu, M., & Demirtas, Z. (2016). The relationships between organizational learning Level, school effectiveness and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(4), 35-44.
- Analisis 2014 SPM dan UPSR Perak. (2015). Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://jpnperak.moe.gov.my/jpn/attachments/article/2490/PPUPSRSPMEx co% 20KSPA.pdf
- Ashforth, B. E. (1989). The experience of powerlessness in organizations. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 43(2), 207-242.

- Bagheri, G., Matin, H. Z., & Amighi, F. (2011). The relationship between empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior of the pedagogical organization employees. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 4(2), 53.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment.*International journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
- Barlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research.*Information* technology, learning, and performance journal, 19(1), 43.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive* (Vol. 11). Harvard university press.
- Bies, R. J. (1987). Beyond "voice": The influence of decision-maker justification and sincerity on procedural fairness judgments. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 17, 3-13.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.
- Blau, P. M. (1968). Interaction: social exchange. International encyclopedia of the social sciences, 7(2000), 452-458.

- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20(3), 277-289.
- Buluc, B. (2015). The Relationship Between Academic Staff's Perceptions Of Organizational Justice And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Studia Psychologica*, 57(1), 49.
- Burns, W. R. T. & DiPaola, M. F. (2013). A study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools. *American Secondary Education*, 42(1), 4.
- Casner-Lotto, J. (1988). Expanding the Teacher's Role: Hammond's School Improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(5), 349-53.
- Cheasakul, U., & Varma, P. (2015, January). The Influence of passion and empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers in assumption university mediated by organizational commitment. In XIV International Business and Economy Conference (IBEC) Bangkok, Thailand.
- Cheasakul, U., & Varma, P. (2016). The influence of passion and empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers mediated by organizational commitment. *Contadur á y Administraci ón*.

- Chegini, M. G. (2009). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 1(2), 173.
- Chen, K. S. (2013, December 5). Malaysia ranks 52 out of 65 countries in international assessment programme. *The Star*. Retrieved May 25, 2016 from http://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2013/12/05/students-scorebelow-global-average-malaysia-ranks-52-out-of-65-countries-ininternational-assessmen/
- Chiang, C. F., & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180-190.
- Chiu, S. F., & Chen, H. L. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 33(6), 523-540.
- Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J., & Roman, P. (2005). Organizational justice and job Satisfaction: A test of three competing models. *Social Justice Research*, 18, 391-409.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Chertkoff, J. M. (2002). Explaining injustice: The interactive effect of explanation and outcome on fairness perceptions and task motivation. *Journal of Management*, 28(5), 591-610.

- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1183-1206.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of management review*, *13*(3), 471-482.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., Kessler, I., & Purcell, J. (2004). Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behaviour: Reciprocity or 'It's my job'?. *Journal of management studies*, *41*(1), 85-106.
- Cropanzano, R. & Greenberg J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robinson (Eds.), *International review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 317-372, Wiley, New York, NY.
- DarlingHammond, L. (1990). Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for teachers. *Peabody Journal of education*, 67(3), 123-154.
- David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management. *Educational leadership*, 46(8), 45-53.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.

- Dee, J. R., Henkin, A. B., & Duemer, L. (2003). Structural antecedents and psychological correlates of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 257-277.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(4), 387.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424.
- *Education Blueprint 2013-2025 Preliminary Report*. (2012). Retrieved March 23, 2016 from http://www.moe.gov.my/userfiles/file/PPP/Preliminary-Blueprint-Eng.pdf
- Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Malaysia. (2015). RetrievedMarch 23,2016http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002297/229719E.pdf
- Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M., & Halim, F. W. (2011). The relationships between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum*, 19, 115-121.

- Fatt, C. K., Khin, E. W. S., & Heng, T. N. (2010). The impact of organizational justice on employee's job satisfaction: The Malaysian companies perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2(1), 56.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational justice and human resource management. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. *Advances in organizational justice*, *1*, 1-55.
- Ghani, N. A. A., bin Raja, T. A. B. S., & Jusoff, K. (2009). The Impact of Psychological Empowerment on Lecturers' Innovative Behaviour in Malaysian Private Higher Education Institutions. *Canadian Social Science*, 5(4), 54.
- Gholami, Z., Soltanahmadi, J. A., Pashavi, G., & Nekouei, S. (2013). Empowerment as a Basic Step in Upgrading Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Case Study on Public Sector in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(11), 1693-1698.
- Glatthorn, A. A., & Fontana, J. (2000). Coping with Standards, Tests, and Accountability: Voices from the Classroom. NEA Professional Library Distribution Center, PO Box 2035, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-2035 (stock number 2015-4-00, \$16.95).

- Goudarzvandchegini, M., Gilaninia, S., & Abdesonboli, R. (2011). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior case study: Rasht public hospitals. *International Journal of Business Administration*,2(4), 42.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of management*, *16*(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1996). The Quest for Justice on the Job. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Greenberger, D. B., Porter, G., Miceli, M. P., & Strasser, S. (1991). Responses to inadequate personal control in organizations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(4), 111-128.
- Guay, P., Simard, G., & Tremblay, M. (2000). Organizational and individual determinants of atypical employment: The case of multiple jobholding and self-employment (No. 2000s-26). CIRANO.
- Hair, J., Money, A., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007). Research Methods for Business. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Hoy, W. K., & DiPaola, M. F. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88(3), 35-44.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250-259.
- Ince, M. & Giil, H. (2011). The role of the organizational communication on employees' perception of justice: A sample of public institution from Turkey. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(1), 106-124.
- Iqbal, H. K., Aziz, U., & Tasawar, A. (2012). Impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical evidence from Pakistan. World Applied Sciences Journal, 19(9), 1348-1354.
- Jafari, P., & Bidarian, S. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1815-1820.
- Kagaari, J. R., & Munene, J. C. (2007). Engineering lecturers' competencies and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) at Kyambogo University. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(9), 706-726.
- Kasekende, F., Munene, J. C., Otengei, S. O., & Ntayi, J. M. (2016). Linking teacher competences to organizational citizenship behaviour: The role of empowerment. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(2), 252-270.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

- Khalid, S. A., Jusoff, H. K., Othman, M., Ismail, M., & Rahman, N. A. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of student academic achievement. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*,2(1), 65.
- Krastev, I. D., & Stanoeva, G. V. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and satisfaction with coworkers among Bulgarian teaching staff. *Baltic Journal* of Career Education and Management, 1(1), 40-44.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educ psychol meas*.
- Lee, A. N., & Nie, Y. (2013). Development and validation of the school leader empowering behaviours (SLEB) scale. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 22(4), 485-495.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(1), 131.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *9*, 91-131.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? (pp. 27-55). Springer US.

- Lin, L. F. (2013). Effects of psychological empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior in life insurance industry. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 6(1), 119.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Lishchinsky, O.S. & Tsemach, S. (2014). Psychological empowerment as a mediator between teachers' perceptions of authentic leadership and their withdrawal and citizenship behaviors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(4) 675-712.
- Liu, C. W., Chen, C. H., & Lin, S. L. (2004). Besides American Value, What Else Do We Know about Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in a Non-US Context? In 9th APDSI Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Malakolunthu, S., & Vasudevan, V. (2012). Teacher evaluation practices in Malaysian primary schools: Issues and challenges. Asia Pacific Education Review, 13(3), 449-456.
- Mohammad, J., Habib, F. Q. B., & Alias, M. A. B. (2010). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in higher education institution. *Global Business and Management Research*, 2(1), 13.
- Mohammad, J., Habib, F. Q., & Alias, M. A. (2011). Job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour: An empirical study at higher learning institutions. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, *16*(2), 149-165.

- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of applied psychology*, *76*(6), 845.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and procedural justice. *Employees Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.
- Moye, M. J., Henkin, A. B., & Egley, R. J. (2005). Teacher-principal relationships: Exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal* of Educational Administration, 43(3), 260-277.
- Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Azar, H. K., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. R. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), 5241.
- Nandan, T., & Azim, A. M. M. Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Psychological Capital.
- Neeta, (2013). Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Faculties in Private Engineering Colleges W.E.F Lucknow. International Journal of Management and Business Studies, 3(1), 116-123.

- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of Management journal, 36(3), 527-556.
- Nord, W. R., Brief, A. P., Atieh, J. M., & Doherty, E. M. (1990). Studying meanings of work: The case of work values.
- Oplatka, I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: Toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 385-423.
- Oplatka, I. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. *International Journal of educational management*, 23(5), 375-389.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance*, *10*(2), 85-97.
- Perangkaan Pendidikan Malaysia. (2015). Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://www.moe.gov.my/v/terbitan-view?id=174&

- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,94(1), 122.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The leadership quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Price, J. L. and Mueller, C. W. (1986), "Handbook of Organizational Measurement", Marshfield, MA: Pitman. Rawls
- Quinn, R. E., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1997). The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *organizational Dynamics*, 26(2), 37-49.
- Raub, S. (2008). Does bureaucracy kill individual initiative? The impact of structure on organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry.*International journal of hospitality management*, 27(2), 179-186.

- Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader-member exchange. *Teaching and teacher education*,30, 99-108.
- Saad, N. (2012). The effects of teachers' participation in decision making on Commitment. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences,6(9).
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research method of business: A skill Building Approach* (4th ed.). New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2012). Research methods for business: A skill building approach (6th ed.). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sekolah Kluster Kecemerlangan. (2016). Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://www.moe.gov.my/my/sekolah-kluster-kecemerlangan
- Shahri, M. H. M., Abdi, S., Yazdankhah, M., & Heydari, F. (2015). The relationship between empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior of staff in youth and sports general office of Khorasan Razavi. *International Journal of Sport Studies*, 5(4), 475-481.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O., & Tsemach, S. (2014). Psychological empowerment as a mediator between teachers' perceptions of authentic leadership and their withdrawal and citizenship behaviors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

- Shapiro, D. L., Buttner, E. H. & Barry, B. (1994). Explanations: What factors enhance their perceived adequacy? Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 58, 346-368
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: The relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5), 649-659.
- Somech, A., & Oplatka, I. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools: Examining the impact and opportunities within educational systems (Vol. 128). Routledge.
- Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 38-66.
- Songür, N., Basım, H. N., & Şeşen, H. (2008). The Antecedent Role of Justice Perception on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. TODAİE's Review of Public Administration, 2(4), 87-111.
- Spector, P. E. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work. *Human relations*,39(11), 1005-1016.

- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of management Journal, 38(5), 1442- 1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A., & Nason, S. W. (1997). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness satisfaction, and strain. *Journal of management*, 23(5), 679-704.
- Tahir, M. M. (2015). Psychological Empowerment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Task Performance; an Interrelationship.(Literature Review). *Literature Review)*(November 11, 2015).
- Tastan, S. B. & Serinkan, C. (2013). An empirical research on the relationship between individuals' psychological empowerment and voluntary performance behaviors: An assessment of the combination of psychological power and intimate will. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*.
- The public schooling system for primary, secondary and post-secondary levels.(n.d.).RetrievedMarch23,2016fromhttp://www.schoolmalaysia.com/resources/public_schooling.php
- Thibaut, J. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of management review, 15(4), 666-681.

- Ucho, A., & Atime, E. T. (2013). Distributive Justice, Age and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Non-teaching Staff of Benue State University.*International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 3(4), 77-85.
- Vengrasalam, R. (2000). A survey of teacher's participation in decision making process in Batu Pahat district schools. Master's thesis, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Wall, R., & Rinehart, J. S. (1998). School-based decision making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*,8(1), 49-64. Wiley.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., & Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment. *The Journal of social psychology*, 142(1), 33-44.
- Wissler, D. F., & Ortiz, F. I. (1986). The Decentralization Process of School Systems: A Review of the Literature. Urban Education, 21(3), 280-94.
- Yangaiya, S. A., & Abubakar, A. (n.d.). Examining the relationship between empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour of secondary school teachers in Katsina state Nigeria. *Proceeding of the 3rd Global Summit on Education GSE 2015*, 468-475.

- Yucel, C. (2008). Teacher burnout and organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish elementary schools. *Educational Planning*, 17(1), 27-43.
- Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model.*Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1472-1481.
- Zikmund, W. G., Babin, B. J., Carr, J. C., & Griffin, M. (2013). *Business Research Methods* (9th ed.). New York: South-Western/Cengage Learning.

APPENDIX 3.1 Questionnaire



UNIVERSITY TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND FINANCE BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (HONS) FINAL YEAR PROJECT

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia.

Dear Respondents:

We are students of Bachelor of Business Administration (HONS) from Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR), Perak Campus. We are conducting a survey on educational industry in Malaysia. The purpose of this research is to study the influences of psychological empowerment and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among government primary school teachers in Malaysia. Your co-operation to answer those questions is very important in helping our research.

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

If you have any question or inquiry, please contact our members.

NAME	PHONE NO	EMAIL
Chong Phey Ling	016-7963098	ling798@1utar.my
Chew Hooi Yean	017-4909357	hooiyean@1utar.my
Hee Yuan Yuan	016-5956653	yuanyuan94@1utar.my
Tan Su Zen	011-10873463	suzentan@1utar.my
Tang Huei Thing	011-12910061	stefinn.hueithing@1utar.my

Instruction for Completing the Questionnaire

- 1. There are **THREE** (3) sections in this questionnaire. Kindly answer **ALL** the questions in Section A, Section B and Section C.
- 2. Completion of this questionnaire will take you approximately 10-15 minutes.
- 3. This questionnaire will be kept strictly **CONFIDENTIAL**.

PERSONAL DATA PROTECTION STATEMENT

Please be informed that accordance with Personal Data Protection Act 2010 ("PDPA") which came into force on 15 November 2013, Universiity Tunku Abdul Rahman ("UTAR") is hereby bound to make notice and require consent in relation to collection, recording, storage, usage and retention of personal information.

Acknowledgement of Notice

- [] I have been notified by you and I hereby understood, consented and agreed per UTAR notice.
- [] I disagree, my personal data will not be processed.

Date:

Section A: Respondent's Demographic Information

Please tick ($\sqrt{}$) for the most appropriate answer in the following items.

1. Please indicate your gender:

	Male
--	------

Female

2. Which of the following age groups you belong to?



] Chinese	Malay



7. How long have you been service in the educational industry?



8. What is your average working hours per week?



9. How many subjects you taught in school?



Section B:

Please describe your personal views of the following statements related to your current working environment as objectively as you can, by encircling number against each statement from the rating scale given below.

Part 1: Psychological Empowerment

	Meaning	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The work I do is very important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
2	My job activities are personally meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
3	The work I do is meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
	Competence					
1	I am confident about my ability to do my job.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.	1	2	3	4	5
	Self-determination					
1	I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how	1	2	3	4	5
	I do my job.					
	Impact					
1	My impact on what happens in my department is large.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I have significant influence over what happens in my department.	1	2	3	4	5

Part 2: Organizational Justice

Procedure refers to the process of making decision of evaluation, promotions, demotions, terminations, salary increment, bonuses, and other types of benefits.

	Procedural Justice	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I am able to express my views and feelings during those procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I am able to influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I believe those procedures are applied consistently.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I believe those procedures are free of bias.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I believe those procedures are based on accurate information.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I am able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I believe those procedures are upheld ethical and moral standards.	1	2	3	4	5

	Distributive Justice	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	My outcome is reflected the effort I have been put into my work.	1	2	3	4	5
2	My outcome is appropriate for the work I have completed.	1	2	3	4	5
3	My outcome is reflected what I have contributed to the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
4	My outcome is justified by given my performance.	1	2	3	4	5

	Interpersonal Justice	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The principal has treated me in a polite manner.	1	2	3	4	5
2	The principal has treated me with dignity.	1	2	3	4	5
3	The principal has treated me with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
4	The principal has refrained from improper remarks or comments.	1	2	3	4	5

	Informational Justice	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
		Disagree				Agree
1	The principal has been candid in his/her communications with me.	1	2	3	4	5
2	The principal has been explained the procedures thoroughly.	1	2	3	4	5
3	The principle's explanations regarding the procedures were reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
4	The principal has communicated details in a timely manner.	1	2	3	4	5
5	The principal has seemed to tailor his/her communications to	1	2	3	4	5
	individuals' specific needs.					

Section C: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Please describe your personal views of the following statements as objectively as you can, by encircling number against each statement from the rating scale given below.

No	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
		Disagree				Agree
1	I help students on my own time.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I waste a lot of class time.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I schedule personal appointments at times other than during the school	1	2	3	4	5
	day.					
4	I am rarely absent.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I voluntarily help new teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I volunteer to serve on new committees.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I arrive to work and meetings on time.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I take the initiatives to introduce myself to substitutes and assist them.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I begin class promptly and use class time effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I leave immediately after school is over.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I give an excessive amount of busy work.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Teacher committees in this school work productively.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our	1	2	3	4	5
	school.					

Thank you very much for your participation. Your time and opinion are greatly appreciated.



Appendix 3.2 Reliability Test Result – Meaning (Pilot Test)

Appendix 3.3 Reliability Test Result- Competence (Pilot Test)



File Edit View Tasks Program Tools Help 🗎 🖬	- 💁 🔒 🌮 ங 🛝 🗙 I 🕫 🍽 🗖 - I Beg Process Flow 🕞	
Project Tree • × Correlations5 •		,
Applications A		*
Server List - X	PEQ9 30 3.83333 0.59299 115.00000 2.00000 5.00000 PEQ9 Cronbach Coefficient Alpha Raw 0.659002 Standardized 0.704752 Cronbach Coefficient Alpha with Deleted Variable	E
Some Constant Stop Some Constant Stop Some Constant Stop Private OLAP Servers	Raw Variables Standardized Variables Deleted Correlation Correlation Variable with Total Alpha Veriable Alpha with Total PEQ7 0.49437 0.512216 0.512116 0.512116 0.542898 PEQ8 0.526560 0.542716 0.464974 PEQ8 0.42873	
	Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N - 30 Prob - I/I under H0: RNo-0 PEQ7 100000 0.37084 0.30251 PEQ7 0.0010 0.01017 0.1037 PEQ8 0.0010 0.45349 0.0014 PEQ8 0.0029 0.45549 100000 PEQ9 0.30291 0.45549 100000 PEQ9 0.0114 PEQ9 0.0114	
Ready	Ne No.	profile selected

Appendix 3.4 Reliability Test Result – Self-determination (Pilot Test)

Appendix 3.5 Reliability Test Result - Impact (Pilot Test)





Appendix 3.6 Reliability Test Result – Procedural Justice (Pilot Test)

Appendix 3.7 Reliability Test Result - Distributive Justice (Pilot Test)





Appendix 3.8 Reliability Test Result – Informational Justice (Pilot Test)

Appendix 3.9 Reliability Test Result - Interpersonal Justice (Pilot Test)



<u>Appendix 3.10 Reliability Test Result – Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</u> (<u>Pilot Test</u>)





Appendix 4.1 Reliability Test Result – Meaning (Full Study)

Appendix 4.2 Reliability Test Result - Competence (Full Study)



=	RAR PES.pdf - 阅	读器														2	-	٥	×
							Re	liability	Analysis F							1			
								and the second second	CORR Pro										
							8	3 Variable	s: PES1	PES2 PE	53								
									imple Stati										
					Variable	e N Mean	Std Dev	Sum Minis	num Maxin		aly dispare	e, 2=disagree,							
					PES1	428 3.82477	0.68071	1637 1.0	0000 5.00	000 3=neut	ral, 4=agre	e, 5=strongly agree							
					PESZ	428 3.76636	0.80780	1612 1.0	0000 5.00			e, 2=disagree, e, 5=strongly agree							
										1=stror	gly disagre	ee, 2=disagree,							
PES3 428 3.73131 0.77746 1.00000 5.000001 3.9metrial, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree Cronback Coefficient Cronback Coefficient Algha Algha <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>																			
							Cronba	ach Coeffic	ient Alpha	with Deleter	I Variable								
							Raw Varia	bles	Stand	ardized Var	iables								
					Deleted		Correlation with Tota			Correlation with Tota		Label							
					PES1	e		7 0.758989				1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutra 4=agree, 5=strongly	al,						
					PES2		0.654174	0.609151				1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutra 4=agree, 5=strongly	ul,						
					PES3		0.617772	0.652921		0.610126	0.659349	1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutra 4=agree, 5=strongly agree	al,						
							Pea		elation Coe		- 428		1						
					_			Prob	r under H	0: Rho=0	PE	S1 PES2 PES3							
					PES	1 ongly disagree	000 0.49181 0.44184 <.0001 <.0001												
					PES		, z=ulsagre	ee, s-neuu	an, a-agree,	s-suongly a							- + -		
<							~ ~						10						>
-		е	9	山	٥			S					~ 📢	(h.	¢× ∎				7 PM /2016

<u>Appendix 4.3 Reliability Test Result – Self-determination (Full Study)</u>

Appendix 4.4 Reliability Test Result - Impact (Full Study)



三 RAR PJ.pdf - 阅读器										_		2	1.77	٥	×
			R	eliability Ar	alysis Resu	ult for P	J								
				The C	ORR Procedur	re									
		7 V	ariables:	PJ1 PJ2	PJ3 PJ4	PJ5	PJ6	PJ7							
		-		Sim	ple Statistics										
	Variable	N Mean	Std Dev	Sum Minimu	m Maximum L										
	PJ1	28 3.70794	0.73151	1587 1.0000	5.00000 3	eneutral,	4=agree	e, 2=disagree, e, 5=strongly agree							
	PJ2	28 3 56542	0.80276	1526 1.0000				e, 2=disagree, , 5=strongly agree							
					1	=strongly	disagre	e. 2=disagree.							
	PJ3 4	128 3.69393	0.67214	1581 1.0000				e, 5=strongly agree e, 2=disagree,							
	PJ4 4	28 3.71262	0.74603	1589 1.0000	5.00000 3	eneutral,	4=agree	, 5=strongly agree							
	PJ5	128 3.75467	0.73271	1607 1.0000	5.00000 3	eneutral,	4=agree	e, 2=disagree, 5=strongly agree							
	PJ6	128 3.66822	0.70940	1570 1.0000				e, 2=disagree, , 5=strongly agree							
	PJ7	28 3.77804	0.75580	1617 1.0000				e, 2=disagree, 5=strongly agree							
			Cronba Raw Varia		t Alpha with D										
	Deleted		orrelation			elation	les								
	Variable		with Total				Alpha								
	PJ1		0.704574	0.873795	0.7	01213 0.	875249								
	PJ2		0.674407	0.878013	0.6	375492 0.8	878323								
	PJ3		0.699233	0.874965	0.6	98927 0.		1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree							
	PJ4		0.708291	0.873306	0.7	10604 0.		1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree							
I P 🛛 🤤 🥥 🛄 🖸		W		5					~ 🤇	i (a	٩×	=	**		18 PM 3/2016

Appendix 4.5 Reliability Test Result – Procedural Justice (Full Study)

<u>Appendix 4.6 Reliability Test Result – Distributive Justice (Full Study)</u>

	RAR DJ.p	odf - 阅读	**											_		2	 ٥	×
						Coefficien h Deleted	at l	Reliability A	nalysis F		IJ							
						able	-	4 Variables: [4							
								bearen and a second sec	nple Statist			1						
							Variable	N Mean	Std Dev Su	m Minimum	Maximum	i i						
						lisagree, 3=neutral	DJ1	428 3.85514	0.68613 16	50 1.00000	5.00000							
						strongly		428 3.85047	67479 16	1.00000	5.00000							
						tisagree, 3=neutral		428 3.76402			5.00000							
				strongly		428 3.78972	0.75138 16	1.00000	5.00000									
	isagree, 3-neutral strongly				Cronbach Coefficient Alpha Variables Alpha Raw 0872046 Standardized 0873700													
						lisagree, 3=neutral strongly		Cronbach Coefficient Alpha with Deleted Variable										
								Raw Variables				ables						
							Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total			orrelation with Total	Alpha						
							DJH	0.710811	0.842401		0.714208	0.844188						
							DJ2	0.795994	0.809668		0.797590	0.810643						
							DJ3	0.730331	0.834640		0.730426	0.837779						
							DJ4	0.675901	0.858580		0.675762	0.859159						
-	Q	D	е	9	2	2	W	S					~ 1	3 (a.	🖬 d×	₽ (6 PM /2016



<u>Appendix 4.7 Reliability Test Result – Informational Justice (Full Study)</u>

Appendix 4.8 Reliability Test Result - Interpersonal Justice (Full Study)

Coefficient h Deleted	F	Reliability /	Analysis	Res	ult for IPJ						
able		The	CORR P	rocedu	ire						
	6	4 Variables:	IPJ1 IF	J2 I	PJ3 IPJ4						
			imple Sta			1					
tisagree,	Variable	N Mean	Std Dev	Sum I	Minimum Maximur						
3=neutral,	IPJ1	428 4.01168	0.69279	1717	1.00000 5.0000						
strongly	IPJ2	428 3.89953	0.74764	1669	1.00000 5.0000						
lisagree, 3=neutral,	IPJ3	428 3.99299	0.70292	1709	1.00000 5.0000						
strongly		428 3.60047									
lisagree,	1934										
3=neutral,		Variable	ch Coeff	4	Alpha						
strongly	Raw 0.860489 Standardized 0.866840										
tisagree, 3=neutral,		Starruar	012.00	0.00	10040	-					
strongly											
	Cron	bach Coeffici	ent Alph	a with I	Deleted Variable						
Delet	had	Raw Varia Correlatio		Standardized Variables Correlation							
Varia		with Tota		a	with Total	Alpha					
			8 0.8019		0.770641						
IPJ1		0.76258	8 0.8019	50	0.770641	0.807963					
IPJ2		0.72972	1 0.8125	22	0.735860	0.822327					
		0.70040	2 0.7997		0.771151	0.007764					
10.10		0.70013	c 0.1991	10	0.771151	0.001/51					
IPJ3											
IPJ3											

<u>Appendix 4.9 Reliability Test Result – Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Full</u> <u>Study)</u>







Appendix 5.2 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Competence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

\equiv	Pearson PEC.pdf - 阅	读器															2	-		J >	×
																					^
	Correlation Analysis																				
	The CORR Procedure																				
				1 With Variables: PECAVG 1 Variables: OCBAVG																	
				Simple Statistics Variable N Mean Std Dev Sum Minimum Maximum PECAVG 428 3.97741 0.56229 1702 2.00000 5.00000 OCBAVG 428 3.800781 0.40053 1627 2.66667 5.00000																	
							Pears	on Corre Prob >	elation C	oefficie er H0: R	nts, N = ho=0	428		1							
					1								OCBAVG								
					PEC	AVC			-				0.38760								
					I LO								<.0001	1							
																					١.
																					• •
-	מס				-	W	S						~				< ₽			3:32 PN	
				1			-						~		116	- 47	-		180 C	7/8/201	6

Appendix 5.3 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Self-determination and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour



Appendix 5.4 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Impact and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour



Appendix 5.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour



Appendix 5.6 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour









Appendix 5.8 Linear Regression Results for Psychological Empowerment Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Appendix 5.9 Linear Regression Results for Organizational Justice Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour



<u>Appendix 5.10 Linear Regression Results for Psychological Empowerment</u> <u>Dimensions, Organizational Justice Dimensions and Organizational Citizenship</u> <u>Behaviour</u>

