



**GROUP-DIRECTED ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP  
BEHAVIOUR, INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE, AND  
GROUP IDENTIFICATION AMONG LECTURERS IN  
THREE HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS**

**BY**

**MUHAMMAD HAIKAL B. AHMAD PUA'AD**

**A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of requirement for the  
degree of Master of Human Sciences in Psychology  
(Industrial and Organisational)**

**Kulliyyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and  
Human Sciences  
International Islamic University Malaysia**

**JANUARY 2017**

## ABSTRACT

This research examines the relationships among group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification in three Malaysian public universities. A total of 174 university lecturers (Males = 85; Females = 89) from the International Islamic University Malaysia, Universiti Teknologi MARA, and Universiti Malaya were recruited as participants using purposive sampling. Using paper-based questionnaires completed at their workplace, the participants answered questions from four established scales that measured group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice (i.e., interpersonal and informational), and group identification. Results of regression analysis show that there is: (1) a moderate and significant positive relationship between interpersonal justice and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour; (2) a moderate and significant positive correlation between informational justice and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour; (3) a weak but significant positive relationship between interpersonal justice and group identification; (4) a moderate and significant positive correlation between informational justice and group identification; and (5) a small but significant positive relationship between group identification and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour. However, the mediation analysis using Baron and Kenny's (1986) three-procedure approach and Preacher and Hayes's (2004) bootstrapping techniques showed that although interactional justice directly predicted group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, this relationship, however, was not mediated by group identification. The implications of these findings are discussed, and recommendations for future research are provided.

## ملخص البحث

يتناول هذا البحث العلاقة بين التوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة، والعدالة الانتقائية والانتماء إلى مجموعة محددة، في ثلاث جامعات ماليزية عامة، وتكونت عينة الدراسة من ١٧٤ محاضراً (٨٥ من الذكور، و٨٩ من الإناث)، من منتسبي الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية بماليزيا، وجامعة مارا للتكنولوجيا، وجامعة الملايا، وقد تمَّ تعيينهم كمشاركين باعتبارهم عينة مستهدفة. اعتماداً على الاستبانات الورقية التي تم ملؤها في أماكن عملهم، وقد أجاب المشاركون على الأسئلة المكونة من أربعة مقاييس متساوية لقياس التوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة والعدالة الانتقائية (أي: العلاقات البينية الشخصية والإعلامية)، والانتماء إلى مجموعة محددة. وقد أشارت نتائج المنحنى التحليلي إلى ثلاثة أمور، أولها: وجود علاقة ذات دلالة إحصائية معتدلة وإيجابية بين العدالة التفاعلية وبين التوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة، ثانياً: وجود ارتباط ذي دلالة إحصائية معتدل وإيجابي بين العدالة الإعلامية التوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة. ثالثاً: وجود مؤشر ضعيف لكنه ذو دلالة إحصائية بين العدالة بين الأفراد وبين انتمائهم لمجموعة محددة، رابعاً: وجود علاقة ذات دلالة إحصائية معتدلة وإيجابية بين العدالة الإعلامية وبين انتمائهم لمجموعة محددة، خامساً: وجود مؤشر صغير لكنه ذو دلالة إحصائية على وجود علاقة إيجابية بين الانتماء إلى مجموعة محددة والتوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة. وعلى كل حال فقد تمَّ التحليل باستخدام منهج بارون وكييني (١٩٨٦) ذي الإجراءات الثلاثية، وأداة بريتشير وهاييز (٢٠٠٤) المسماة بتقنيات الانتعال (Bootstrapping Techniques)، وعلى الرغم من أنَّ العدالة الانتقائية تتأثر بشكل مباشر بالتوجه الجماعي لسلوك تنظيم حقوق المواطنة، إلا أنه على كل حال فإنَّ هذه العلاقة لم تكن لها أي تأثير على الانتماء إلى مجموعة محددة، وقد تمت مناقشة الآثار المترتبة على هذه النتائج، كما تم طرح التوصيات المتعلقة بالدراسات المستقبلية.

## **APPROVAL PAGE**

I certify that I have supervised and read this study and that in my opinion; it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Master of Human Sciences in Psychology (Industrial and Organisational).

.....  
Nor Diana Mohd Mahudin  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Master of Human Sciences in Psychology (Industrial and Organisational).

.....  
Jusmawati Fauzaman  
Examiner

This dissertation was submitted to the Department of Psychology and is accepted as a fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Human Sciences in Psychology (Industrial and Organisational).

.....  
Shukran Abd Rahman  
Head, Department of Psychology

This dissertation was submitted to the Kulliyyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences and is accepted as a fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Human Sciences in Psychology (Industrial and Organisational).

.....  
Rahmah Bt. Ahmad H. Osman  
Dean, Kulliyyah of Islamic  
Revealed Knowledge and Human  
Sciences

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own investigation, except where otherwise stated. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted as a whole for any other degrees at IIUM or other institutions.

Muhammad Haikal B. Ahmad Pua'ad

Signature.....

Date .....

**INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA**

**DECLARATION OF COPYRIGHT AND AFFIRMATION OF  
FAIR USE OF UNPUBLISHED RESEARCH**

**GROUP-DIRECTED ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP  
BEHAVIOUR, INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE, AND GROUP  
IDENTIFICATION AMONG LECTURERS IN THREE HIGHER  
LEARNING INSTITUTIONS**

I declare that the copyright holder of this dissertation are jointly owned by the student and IIUM.

Copyright © 2017 Muhammad Haikal B. Ahmad Pua'ad and International Islamic University Malaysia. All rights reserved.

No part of this unpublished research may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior written permission of the copyright holder except as provided below

1. Any material contained in or derived from this unpublished research may be used by others in their writing with due acknowledgement.
2. IIUM or its library will have the right to make and transmit copies (print or electronic) for institutional and academic purposes.
3. The IIUM library will have the right to make, store in a retrieved system and supply copies of this unpublished research if requested by other universities and research libraries.

By signing this form, I acknowledged that I have read and understand the IIUM Intellectual Property Right and Commercialization policy.

Affirmed by Muhammad Haikal B. Ahmad Pua'ad

.....  
Signature

.....  
Date

*This dissertation is dedicated to my beloved parents*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, The All- Beneficent, The All-Merciful. All praise is due to Allah (SWT) the Lord of mankind and universe. All Prayers and Blessings of Allah (SWT) be upon his messenger, our greatest educator, our master, and the best of human being; the Prophet Muhammad (SAWS).

First and foremost, I give my deepest gratitude to Allah for His blessing in giving me the strengths, ideas, insights, and knowledge which make the completion of this work possible. Words and knowledge are limited to praise Allah for all that I have received.

It is my utmost pleasure to dedicate this work to my dear Mother, Shikah Bt. Abu Samah, Father, Ahmad Pua'ad B. Zulkifli, and my family, who granted me the gift of their unwavering belief in my ability to accomplish this goal: thank you for your undying support and patience.

A special thanks and appreciation to my estimable supervisor Dr. Nor Diana Bt. Mohd Mahudin, International Islamic University Malaysia, for her unyielding patience, utmost sincerity, tireless guidance, continuous support, timely encouragement and stout leadership through the course of completing this research, and for that, I will be forever grateful.

Finally, I also wish to express my appreciation and thanks to all my friends and those who provided their time, effort and support for this research.

May Allah grant all mentioned above with the best rewards and happiness in this world and Hereafter.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Abstract in Arabic.....	iii
Approval Page .....	iv
Declaration .....	v
Copyright .....	vi
Dedication .....	vii
Acknowledgements .....	viii
List of Tables.....	xii
List of Figures .....	xiii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1 Statement of Problem.....	2
1.2 Significance of the Study .....	4
1.3 Research Objectives.....	4
1.4 Research Questions.....	5
1.5 Definition of Terms.....	5
1.5.1 Group-directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.....	5
1.5.2 Interactional Justice .....	6
1.5.3 Group Identification.....	6
1.5.4 Higher Learning Institutions .....	7
1.6 Conclusion.....	7
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.0 Introduction .....	8
2.1 Literature Review .....	8
2.1.1 Overview of the Variables in the Study.....	8
2.1.1.1 Group-Directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.....	8
2.1.1.2 Interactional Justice .....	10
2.1.1.3 Group Identification.....	12
2.1.1.4 The Role of Group Identification in the Relationship Between Interactional Justice and Group-Directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.....	13
2.2 Identification of Research Gaps.....	14
2.3 Theoretical Framework.....	15
2.4 Conceptual Framework.....	17
2.5 Conclusion.....	18
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD.....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.0 Introduction .....	19
3.1 Study Design .....	19
3.2 Participants .....	20
3.3 Measures.....	22
3.3.1 Group-Directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.....	23
3.3.2 Interactional Justice .....	23

3.3.3 Group Identification.....	24
3.3.4 Controlling Common Method Bias .....	25
3.4 Procedure.....	26
3.4.1 Pilot Study.....	26
3.4.2 Main Study .....	27
3.5 Data Analyses .....	28
3.6 Ethical Considerations .....	29
3.6.1 Approval to Conduct the Research.....	29
3.6.2 Informed Consent .....	29
3.6.3 Confidentiality and Anonymity.....	30
3.7 Conclusion.....	30
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.0 Introduction .....	31
4.1 Descriptive Analysis .....	31
4.2 Data Screening and Assumptions Checking .....	32
4.2.1 Examining Data Entry Errors.....	32
4.2.2 Identifying Missing Data .....	32
4.2.3 Checking for Assumptions of Regression Analysis .....	33
4.2.1.1 Normality .....	33
4.2.1.2 No Multicollinearity .....	34
4.2.1.3 Independence of Errors.....	35
4.2.1.4 Homoscedasticity.....	36
4.3 Hypothesis 1, 2, and 3: Testing the Relationships among Group-Directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, Interactional Justice, and Group Identification.....	37
4.4 Hypothesis 4: Testing the Direct and Indirect (Mediating) Relationships among the Research Variables .....	39
4.4.1 Determining Study's Variables Order of Inclusion for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis .....	39
4.4.2 Testing the Direct and Indirect (Mediating) Relationships among the Research Variables Using Baron and Kenny's (1986) Three-Procedure.....	39
4.4.3 Testing the Direct and Indirect (Mediating) Relationships among the Research Variables Using Preacher and Hayes's (2004) Bootstrapping Techniques .....	45
4.5 Conclusion.....	50
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>52</b>
5.0 Introduction .....	52
5.1 Overview of Research Results.....	52
5.2 Hypothesis 1, 2, and 3: Discussion of Results on the Relationships among the Research Variables .....	53
5.3 Hypothesis 4: Discussion of Results on the Direct and Mediating Relationships among the Research Variables .....	55
5.4 Implications of the results .....	57
5.4.1 Theoretical Implications .....	57
5.4.2 Methodological Implications.....	58
5.4.3 Practical Implications .....	58

5.5 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research .....	60
5.6 Conclusion.....	61
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: THE STUDY'S QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>	<b>70</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Participant's Demographic Characteristics	21
Table 4.1	Descriptive Statistics of the Current Study's Variables	31
Table 4.2	Tolerance and VIF Values	35
Table 4.3	Durbin-Watson Statistics	36
Table 4.4	Correlations among the Study's Variables	38
Table 4.5	Regression Analysis Predicting Group-directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Procedure 1	41
Table 4.6	Regression Analysis Predicting Group Identification: Procedure 2	42
Table 4.7	Regression Analysis Predicting Group-directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Procedure 3	43
Table 4.8	Results from Mediation Analysis Using PROCESS: First Set: Interpersonal Justice	47
Table 4.9	Results from Mediation Analysis Using PROCESS: Second Set: Informational Justice	49

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Adapted Group Engagement Model based on Tyler and Blader (2003) and Colquitt et al. (2001)	16
Figure 1.2	The Current Study's Conceptual Framework	17
Figure 4.1	Histogram of standardised residual values (ZRESID) against the standardised predicted values (ZPRED)	34
Figure 4.2	Normal P-P plot of standardised residual values (ZRESID) against the standardised predicted values (ZPRED)	34
Figure 4.3	Scatterplot of standardised residual values (ZRESID) against the standardised predicted values (ZPRED)	37

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.0 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

Both the National Higher Education Strategic Plan 2007-2020 and the Malaysian Education Blueprint (Higher Education) 2015 – 2025 have set out the country's vision for research and teaching, access and equity, internationalisation and lifelong learning, as well as the overall management of higher education. Under its quality aspirations, the most recent Plan (i.e., Malaysia Education Blueprint {Higher Education} 2015 – 2025) outlines graduate employability, research output, international student intake, and university global rankings as key indicators of high performing institutions.

One of the ways to uphold these aspirations is by maintaining or improving the performance of lecturers in delivering educational services. This is because teaching staff make up the majority of personnel employed within higher learning institutions and their work activities are closely linked to students' performance (Molefe, 2010). Lecturers' work performance is thus integral to quality higher learning institution and quality clientele (i.e., students) experience; both are major criteria indicating high performing institutions according to the Malaysia Education Blueprint (Higher Education) 2015 – 2025.

Performance at work has been found to be related to organisational citizenship behaviour. Within academic institutions, Jafari and Bidarian (2012) reported that it is necessary for teaching staff to practice organisational citizenship behaviour as part of their work performance due to the complex, vast, and various activities existing in the institutions. Studies have also shown that quality work performance is positively related to workers' organisational citizenship behaviour (Allen & Rush, 1998;

Hopkins, 2002; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Organisational citizenship behaviour, in turn, is related to interactional justice (Liao & Rupp, 2005; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000) and group identification (Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2004). Interactional justice refers to the amount of respect that staff feel they receive from their organisation (Aharon & Gil, 2014) while identification within an organisation, i.e., group identification, refers to the way members define themselves with reference to their work-group membership (He & Brown, 2013).

Based on the above discussion, it can be seen that the quality of higher learning institutions is associated with lecturers' work performance, which can be measured in terms of their organisational citizenship behaviour. Organisational citizenship behaviour, in turn, is related to interactional justice and group identification. Consequently, this scenario provides a basis to investigate the variables of interest within the academic setting.

## **1.1 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

Studies such as those by Borman and Motowidlo (1997) and Hopkins (2002) have shown that work performance is important to organisations. Ideally, an organisation's management should provide a balanced emphasis on the types of work performance valued within the organisation. However, the current performance assessment in higher learning institutions is aimed at capturing the quantity of work completed (Abdullah, 2012), which reflects that less attention is given to the performance of citizenship behaviours in the institutions. This situation can be detrimental to workers' attitude and behaviour as they may feel that the assessment is unfair or that they have

been treated unjustly (Mamman, Kamoche, & Bakuwa, 2012). The scenario may highlight the influential role of justice in organisations towards the performance of organisational citizenship behaviour.

As justice and citizenship behaviour are both important to organisations, there is a need to explore a variety of variables that are related to the justice-organisational citizenship behaviour relationship (Rego & Cunha, 2010). However, among the variables that have been studied, there is a paucity of literature in terms of examining identification in the justice-organisational citizenship behaviour relationship (Kwon Choi, Koo Moon, Ko, & Min Kim, 2014). In particular, the majority of existing studies (e.g., Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Gupta & Singh, 2013; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002) have not considered the different types of organisational justice and identification in relation to the specific categories of organisational citizenship behaviour. This situation may limit a functional understanding of the associations among the three variables, especially on the role of identification in explaining the relationship between organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour.

In addition, studies of organisational citizenship behaviour have been largely conducted in industries and business organisations (e.g., Elamin & Tlaiss, 2015; Gupta & Singh, 2013; Muzumdar, 2012) rather than in the academic setting. This lack of studies of organisational citizenship behaviour in an academic setting may have some limitations that make generalising the findings to the particular setting difficult. Given these realities, it is important to examine the relationship between citizenship behaviour, particularly group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour and its associated variables of interactional justice and group identification among teaching staff in higher learning institutions. Therefore, the current study seeks to examine the

relationships among group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification.

## **1.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The current study offers two contributions to existing research in industrial and organisational psychology. First, it contributes towards better understanding of the relationship between group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification among lecturers since research of this nature is fairly limited in academic institutions (Erturk, 2007; Hnat, Mahony, Fitzgerald, & Crawford, 2014). Second, this study provides an empirical support that might be useful for the improvement of management practices, e.g., leadership training on organisational justice to increase citizenship behaviours (Skarlicki & Latham, 1997), especially within the selected higher learning institutions.

## **1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The four research objectives of the study followed by the four corresponding research questions are outlined below:

1. To examine the relationship between employees' group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour and interactional justice.
2. To examine the relationship between employees' group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour and group identification.
3. To examine the relationship between interactional justice and group identification.
4. To investigate the interrelationships between group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification.

## **1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. Does group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour correlate with interactional justice?
2. Does group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour correlate with group identification?
3. Does interactional justice correlate with group identification?
4. Do group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification have any relation with each other?

## **1.5 DEFINITION OF TERMS**

This section outlines the definition of terms for variables investigated in this study.

### **1.5.1 Group-directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour**

Conceptual definition: Group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is conceptually defined as individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the efficient and the effective functioning of the work-group (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2003).

Operational definition: In this study, group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is operationalised as ratings of altruism and courtesy items as measured by Williams and Anderson's (1991) seven-item Organisational Citizenship Behaviour towards Individuals (OCBI) scale.

### **1.5.2 Interactional Justice**

Conceptual definition: Interactional justice is defined as the fairness in communications of decisions (Bies & Moag, 1986) and can be conceptualised as having two components: interpersonal and informational (Colquitt, 2001). The interpersonal component refers to the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes while the informational component refers to the perceived fairness of how decisions are enacted by organisational communication (Colquitt, 2001).

Operational definition: In this study, interactional justice is operationalised as the extent to which employees feel that their interpersonal treatment by organisations is with respect, courtesy, and proprietary rights, as measured by Colquitt's (2001) five-item Informational Justice scale and four-item Interpersonal Justice scale.

### **1.5.3 Group Identification**

Conceptual definition: This variable refers to the extent to which an organisational member defines him/herself with reference to his/her work-group membership (He & Brown, 2013).

Operational definition: In this study, group identification refers to four elements of identification (i.e., self-categorisation, goodness of fit, affective-attachment, and behavioural involvement), as measured by Stoner, Perrewé, and Hofacker's (2011) 14-item Multidimensional Identity Scale (MIDS).

#### **1.5.4 Higher Learning Institutions**

Conceptual definition: Higher learning institutions refers to a system that incorporates post-secondary education, namely colleges and universities (Arokiasamy, 2011).

Operational definition: In this study, higher learning institutions refers to three universities, i.e., International Islamic University Malaysia, Universiti Teknologi MARA, and Universiti Malaya; all of which have been awarded Tier 1 status by the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA) (Choong, 2015). Because earning the Tier 1 status is typically based on the organisation's work performance, the current study, which examined employees' work behaviours, identity formation, and perceptions of justice, would provide relevant insights to the government regarding factors that can impact on lecturers' work performance.

#### **1.6 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, the background of the research was put into context and the problem areas were presented. More importantly, this chapter provides introductory information describing the problems being investigated in the current study, the significance of conducting the current study, and the research questions to be answered. Having placed the introductory information, the next chapter provides a review of key research and literature that have informed this current study and assisted in the refinement of research scope and selection of the data collection method.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter reviews the existing research in the literature to provide an overview of variables of interest for this study. This discussion is followed by identification of important gaps in the literature and how the present thesis adds to existing knowledge in the industrial and organisational psychology area. Next, the theoretical framework used in the current study is described. The chapter then continues with a discussion of the conceptual framework where the current study's hypotheses are devised and ends with a conclusion of the chapter.

#### **2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW**

This review serves two main objectives: first, to provide an overview of the variables of interest (i.e., group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour, interactional justice, and group identification), and the reasons for including each variable in the current study; and second, to highlight the gaps in the literature that merit the investigation of the selected variables and elaborate on how the current study intends to address these gaps. Based on these objectives, the review is structured accordingly.

##### **2.1.1 Overview of the Variables in the Study**

###### ***2.1.1.1 Group-Directed Organisational Citizenship Behaviour***

Group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is a sub-set of the general organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Organisational citizenship behaviour is defined as work behaviours that are not compulsory although indirectly accepted by

the formal reward system, and that, in the collective, can positively influence the efficiency and effectiveness of an organisation (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). It is further conceptualised as having two categories: (1) conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue dimensions, which are subsumed under organisational citizenship behaviour towards organisations (OCBO), and (2) altruism and courtesy dimensions, which are under organisational citizenship behaviour towards individuals (OCBI) (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007).

Studies that have examined the organisational justice-organisational citizenship behaviour relationship such as those by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) as well as by Tyler and Blader (2003) suggest that OCBI and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour are targeted at the individual level. Furthermore, they found that group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour and OCBI are significantly correlated with interactional justice. Since OCBI and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour are targeted at the individual level and both are significantly related to interactional justice, it is inferred that group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is interchangeable with OCBI and thus inherits the same dimensions of altruism and courtesy. In short, group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is considered as a part of the general organisational citizenship behaviour and hence viewed as sharing the same definition as the general organisational citizenship behaviour.

Several factors have been identified as the antecedents to organisational citizenship behaviour (Colquitt, 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995); two of which are interactional justice and group identification. As group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour is inferred to be a part of organisational citizenship behaviour,

both interactional justice and group identification are also deemed to be related to it and hence they are discussed in the next sections.

### ***2.1.1.2 Interactional Justice***

Organisational justice, which is defined as the employee's perceptions of fairness of their employment relationship (Fortin, 2008), has been conceptualised as having three major components: (1) distributive justice (i.e., perceived perception about rewards distribution in the organisation), (2) procedural justice (i.e., perceived fairness in the processes through which organisational decisions are reached), and (3) interactional justice (i.e., the extent of respect that employees feel they receive from the organisation and its managers) (Aharon & Gil, 2014; Oberoi & Islam, 2014).

While distributive and procedural justice have been widely researched, less focus has been placed on examining interactional justice (Fortin, 2008). Interactional justice consists of two dimensions, which are interpersonal and informational (Muzumdar, 2012). The former reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in making decisions while the latter focuses on the explanations provided by authorities that convey information about why decisions were made in a certain fashion (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).

Researchers have advocated that more studies on interactional justice are needed for three reasons. First, the types of organisational justice have been reported to correspond differently to the categories of organisational citizenship behaviour (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Liao & Rupp, 2005; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). For example, Colquitt et al. (2001) found that (1) both distributive and procedural justice were moderately correlated with

OCBO while weakly related to OCBI, (2) interpersonal justice was moderately correlated with OCBI, and (3) informational justice was moderately correlated to OCBI while weakly correlated to OCBO. Given these findings, it is supported that distributive and procedural justice are related to OCBO while interactional justice is related to OCBI (Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006).

Second, negative reactions to distributive and procedural justice can be mitigated or exacerbated due to the extent of interactional justice (Greenberg, 1990; 2006), thus highlighting the influential role of interactional justice and its importance compared with the other two types of organisational justice. Third, interactional justice emphasises the communication between an organisation's authorities and the employees (Colquitt, 2001). Hence, practicing managers are in a good position to bring about beneficial effects (e.g., organisational citizenship behaviour/group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour) by virtue of the way they treat others (i.e., interactional justice) in the workplace compared with organisation-controlled rewards allocation (i.e., distributive justice) and decisions' procedures (i.e., procedural justice), which are not always under the control of the managers (Greenberg, 2009).

Two main points can be drawn from this review. First, interactional justice is related to OCBI (Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006) and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour (Tyler & Blader, 2003) and since OCBI and group-directed organisational citizenship behaviour are interchangeable, it is likely that interactional justice may predict organisational citizenship behaviour directed at identified groups. Second, interactional justice has been found to have more practical applications to organisational citizenship behaviour compared with the other two types of organisational justice as it can mitigate negative reactions to distributive and procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990; 2006). Based on these points, research is