

The influence of distributive justice on the organizational citizenship behavior in Libyan Telecommunication Industry

¹Mohammed Abdullah Al Zarga, ²Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valliappan Raju, ³Dr. Asnidar Hanim Yusuf

¹PhD candidate, ^{2,3}Sr. Lecturer, Limkokwing University, Malaysia,

¹Faculty of business and management,

¹limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Cyberjaya, Malaysia.

Abstract:

This paper investigates the linkage between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in Libyan telecommunication industry. The cross-sectional approach is used to tests the impact of the distributive justice on the organizational citizenship behaviour. 377 respondents' managers in the middle management level and employees in the operational management level from different telecommunication companies are selected. The result of this study confirms a significant and positive impact of distributive justice on the organizational citizenship behaviour. It recommends that Libyan telecommunication companies should promote the organizational citizenship behaviour at workplace by providing training to employees on stress management, positive attitude and time management.

Keywords: Distributive justice, organizational citizenship behavior, telecommunication industry, Libya.

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behaviors have a crucial role for organizational effectiveness. The concept of organizational citizenship had been used by Dennis Organ and others in 1983 (Aguinis, 2013). Organ (1988) defined the organizational citizenship behavior as "the voluntary individual action which is not defined clearly in the formal reward and punishment system of the organization but supporting the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization as a whole". These behaviors are mostly not obligatory by job descriptions, do not need to be punished in case of violation and not rewarded directly and formally and are mostly based on choices of the individuals increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization as a whole. Greenberg and Baron (2008) defined the organizational justice as the action of an employee who performs more than the obligations of formal organizations (Armstrong and Taylor, 2014). Pointing out the target of the action along with the quality of the behavior and defined the organizational citizenship behavior as the functional behaviors directed towards individuals, groups and the organization as a whole. Beyond the formal necessities of the task, organizational citizenship means more of informal or official job descriptions. So it is called as "excess role behaviors", "social organization behaviors", "organizational spontaneity" or "civilian organizational behaviors" in literature. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined by "pro-social organizational behavior", "altruism", "volunteering" terms. Smith, Organ and Near (1983) described the organizational citizenship behaviors as individual contributions which are rewarded as achieving job performance beyond basic role requirements (Gelens et al., 2013).

It is important to highlight that there is robust evidence, which highlights the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (CCO) (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ, 1990, Konovsky & Organ, 1996, Moorman, 1991, Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). However, there are still questions related to the psychological mechanisms that explain the relationship between organizational justice and CCOs. As Moorman and Byrne (2005) point out, there are different mechanisms that can explain this relationship, so there are differences among the researchers about what psychological processes may occur to make the CCOs manifest. In this research work engagement is proposed as the possible motivational mechanism that explains the relationship between organizational justice and CCOs.

The telecommunication industry in Libya is considered as one of the vital industries within the country (Ahmed et al., 2013). Starting from 2011, the telecommunication industry performance has declined sharply. The internal conflicts have affected most of the country infrastructure, which led to impact this industry more (Elaiess, 2017). According to Almansuri (2018) most of the telecommunication company's employees have suffered within these circumstances, as well as, most of the customers become dissatisfied with provided services by these companies

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The marvel of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) that is, when people willfully help other people at work without the guarantee of prizes is intriguing. Inspecting such philanthropic lead is an appreciated much needed refresher for our models of organizational behavior that as a rule accept people are propelled fundamentally, if not exclusively, without anyone else intrigue. One gets a strong prologue to this marvel as Organ gives a complete audit of the developing OCB writing, including an exceptionally enlightening index area with various measures of OCB. Another important part of this book is Organ's exceptionally captivating and fortifying written work style. There are numerous rich cases of OCB all through the book that influence this unpredictable wonder to wake up for the peruse (Tyler and Blader, 2013).

The ideological inclination shows itself in Organ's meaning of organizational citizenship behavior found in part 1, where OCB is characterized as "singular behavior that is optional, not specifically or expressly perceived by the formal reward framework, and that in the total advances the successful working of the association" (p. 4, accentuation included). Great citizenship behavior is portrayed by philanthropy (helping someone else with an organizationally important assignment or issue), uprightness (doing

part behaviors well past the base required levels), sportsmanship (ceasing from dissensions or negligible grievances), and politeness (attempting endeavors to keep an issue or making strides ahead of time to moderate an issue). From this definition, one is left with the feeling that Organ is searching for good staff who will work indefatigably and loyally to progress organizational objectives and goals, an impression which is additionally strengthened by the book's subtitle (DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Distributive justice refers to the perceptions of equity that workers have in relation to the distribution of results (salary, prizes, and promotions). To emphasize the benefits, distributive justice is mainly related to cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions directed to specific results. Long before the term was coined; it was already theorized about distributive justice. Perhaps the first theory of distributive justice can be attributed to Aristotle. In his *Ethics Nicomachean* argued that a just distribution involved "something proportional" what he defined as "equality of ratios". Later, Huseman et al. (1987), who laid the formal foundations of modern Social Psychology of Justice, represented his influential theory of distributive justice through the following equation: According to the equation proposed by Adams, people are interested in the results they obtain (outcomes or OA) according to their contributions (inputs or AI). The contributions (inputs) are what the person perceives as his in the labor exchange (capacity, experience, dedication, loyalty), and are the elements for which he expects to obtain fair results (outcomes), such as salary, recognition, personal satisfaction, or similar. The outcomes-inputs relationship only makes sense if it is compared with some measurement pattern. To do this, people compare with the results (OB) and with the contributions (IB) of some reference. It is usually compared to another person who does a similar job. When the ratios (not the individual terms) are similar, distributive justice is perceived; when the coefficients are misaligned, employees perceive injustice and often feel motivated to balance the equation by engaging in actions to eliminate dissonance and restore equity. As the feelings of feeling unfairly treated (perception of violation of proportionality) generate unpleasant emotional states, the worker will try to reduce that distress by altering their inputs or their outcomes. In this regard, Cropanzano et al. (2005) have pointed out that the experience of negative emotions due to the perception of injustice motivates the subjects to "balance the balance" through different attitudes and behaviors, so they will try to restore equity by resorting to cognitive strategies (for example, perceptive distortion of the situation or adjustment of evaluations); behavioral (for example, claim wage increase, decrease productivity, embark on negative interpersonal behavior), or "leaving the field" (for example, missing work or quit).

While perceptions of distributive justice promote personal satisfaction, work identification and positive emotions. Although people worry about receiving the "fair share", it is common for employees to receive different compensation and distributions at their place of work. Sometimes the benefits are evenly distributed (for example, when the most qualified person gets a promotion), but sometimes not (for example, when an upstart occupies hierarchical positions because of their political or personal relationships). Three distribution rules have been distinguished (Ismail, 2007) that can lead to distributive justice if they are applied correctly: the rule of equity (to each according to its contribution), the equality rule (to each one the same as the others), and the rule of necessity (to each one according to its greater urgency). The purpose of distributions based on the equity rule is to achieve greater productivity, differentially rewarding workers for their high returns. The rule of equality tends to build team spirit among peers, while the rule of necessity applies when the objective is to promote personal well-being in the face of a contingency. So if you want to stimulate individual motivation, it should be done through equity, while if you aspire to group cohesion it can be achieved through equality. Experiments with work groups indicate that, in general, it is convenient to provide a minimum basic benefit to all team members. This is analogous to equality. Above the minimum, however, it may be useful to reward for execution. This is analogous to equity. This hybrid approach has been (and still is) adopted by many organizations. Their compensation system has a fixed base, but when an employee goes beyond the minimum required, they earn an additional amount through the distribution of merit bonuses. Equity works well for some things, such as money, but not so well with others, such as status symbols. Among the North American managers it is common to perceive as fair the distribution of economic benefits according to the principle of equity (those who execute more and better can earn more). However, they prefer that social-emotional benefits, such as having a place reserved for parking the car, be distributed through the equality rule, because they are indicators that the organization considers them all equally valuable.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study has used the quantitative approach (questionnaire method) for the purpose of collecting primary data. This study follows the analytical technique type of researches. For this type of studies, the study has already executed some hypotheses that will be tested and analyzed. These hypotheses are executed according to the research's questions. This study has used a random sampling method to choose the sample for the research, so the sample of the research will receive survey questionnaire; this method is one of the sampling design probabilities, in this method each person of the population has an equivalent opportunity to be selected as a respondent for the questionnaire.

For this study, the population was all telecommunication industry staff in Libya, which is equal to 20,000. And for the sample of this study according to the sample size table of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), 377 respondents' managers in the middle management level and employees in the operational management level from different telecommunication companies will be selected (Cohen, 1992). There are 7 statements in the questionnaire to measure Distributive justice that are adopted from the study of Choi (2011). There are 6 statements in the questionnaire to measure organizational citizenship Behavior that are adopted from Fox et al (2009).

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the respondents profile for those participated in the study. As shown in the table, 72.1% of the participants belongs to the male gender category and (n=272), while 27.9% of the participants belongs to the female gender category and (n=105). The age levels of the participants divided into 5 categories, where 12.7% ranged between 17-25, 34.7% ranged between 26-30 years, 23.1% ranged between 31-35 years, 13.3% ranged between 36-40 years, and for the age above 40 years forms 16.2% from the sample. Most of the participants hold a bachelor degree certificate with a percentage of 65.3, for diploma degree 28.6%, and for the PhD level 6.1%. The experience of the participants ranged between 1 to 9 years, 56% of the participants has an experience from 4 to 6 years, 11.1% has an experience from 1 to 3 years, and 32.9% has an experience from 7 to 9 years.

Table 1 Respondents profile

	n	%		n	%
Gender			Education Level		
Male	272	72.1	Diploma	108	28.6
Female	105	27.9	Bachelor	246	65.3
			PhD	23	6.1
Age			Experience		
17-25 yrs	48	12.7	1 to 3	42	11.1
26-30 yrs	131	34.7	4 to 6	211	56.0
31- 35 yrs	87	23.1	7 to 9	124	32.9
36- 40 yrs	50	13.3			
> 40 years	61	16.2			

Table 2 shows the result of reliability test, which aim to measure the internal consistency of the variables items. The Cronbach alpha for distributive justice is 0.800 and for organizational citizenship behavior is 0.869, this clarifies a good internal consistency for the model construct.

Table 2 Reliability test

Factors	Items	Cronbach Alpha
Distributive justice	7	0.800
Organizational citizenship behavior	6	0.869

For the purpose of identifying the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior among Libyan telecommunication companies, the correlation test is employed. Table 3 shows a significant and positive relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior ($r=0.767$, $p=0.000$).

Table 3 Correlations test

		Organizational citizenship behavior
Distributive justice	Pearson Correlation	.767**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

Table 4 shows the result of path analysis test, which confirms a positive and significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior with $\beta = 0.067$, $t = 1.176$, and $p = 0.020$

Table 4 Regression test

Relationship	Std Beta	t-value	p-value	Decision
DJ -> OCB	0.067	1.176	0.020	Supported

Key: DJ; Distributive justice, OCB; Organizational citizenship behaviour

The result of this study is consistence to the result in the literature; it provides evidence that organizational citizenship behaviors are characterized by their discretion. People do them because they want to; it is not part of their obligations, they are not a forced requirement of the job or the role they must assume. They are not recognized by the formal rewards system, which makes them less visible to the organization as a whole. However, they contribute in a noticeable way, through time and through people, to the effectiveness of the organization. Therefore, distributive justice finally deals with the degree of perceived fairness in distribution and allocation of outcome, as an organization refers with input of employees (Westphal et al., 2012). The key to this theory consists of four interlocking propositions: individuals will try to maximize their outcomes; groups evolve definitions of equity and sanction group members on the basis of those definitions; inequity leads to psychological distress proportional to the size of the inequity; and such distress will lead to attempts to eliminate it by restoring equity. Individuals can arrive at the belief that distributive fairness exists by distorting implementations, rather than by actually changing the situation (Sun et al., 2013). The theory is also relevant to the present study in that it was anticipated that the strategic performance systems, used as inputs significant determine organizational justice which is the outcome. Accordingly, the major structural components of equity theory are inputs and outcomes. Inputs are described as what a person perceives as his or her contributions to the exchange, for which he or she expects a just return.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study provides an empirical evidence of the impact of Distributive justice on the Organizational citizenship behaviour of Libyan telecommunication companies. Thus far, distributive justice has been discussed from the perspective of the individual who receives the outcome. On the other hand, another body of research has emerged that focuses on the allocation of outcomes among two or more recipients. Leventhal (1980) considered distributive justice from the perspective of the individual making the allocation. Leventhal (1980) provided a critique of equity theory and developed a justice judgment model to explain implementations of justice. According to equity theory, an individual perceives fairness when rewards are in proportion to contributions. Thus, an individual's implementation of fairness is influenced by a contributions rule which dictates that individuals who do better work should receive higher outcomes (Leventhal et al., 1980). It recommends that Libyan telecommunication companies should promote the organizational citizenship behaviour at workplace by providing training to employees on stress management, positive attitude and time management

VI. REFERENCES

- AGUINIS, H. 2013. *Performance management*, Pearson Boston, MA.
- AHMED, A. M., MEHDI, Q. H., MORETON, R. & ELMAGHRABY, A. E-government services challenges and opportunities for developing countries: The case of Libya. *Informatics and Applications (ICIA)*, 2013 Second International Conference on, 2013. IEEE, 133-137.
- ALMANSURI, A. A. 2018. *Libya. E-Learning in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region*. Springer.
- ARMSTRONG, M. & TAYLOR, S. 2014. *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*, Kogan Page Publishers.
- CHOI, S. 2011. Organizational justice and employee work attitudes: The federal case. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41, 185-204.
- COHEN, J. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin*, 112, 155.
- CROPANZANO, R., GOLDMAN, B. M. & BENSON III, L. 2005. Organizational justice. *Handbook of work stress*, 63-87.
- DIPAOLA, M. & TSCHANNEN-MORAN, M. 2014. Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447.
- ELAIESS, R. 2017. Digital Divide in Libya: A General Assessment. *International Research: Journal of Library and Information Science*, 7.
- GELENS, J., DRIES, N., HOFMANS, J. & PEPERMANS, R. 2013. The role of perceived organizational justice in shaping the outcomes of talent management: A research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23, 341-353.
- HUSEMAN, R. C., HATFIELD, J. D. & MILES, E. W. 1987. A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of management Review*, 12, 222-234.
- ISMAIL, A. 2007. Relationship between pay distribution system, distributive justice and work attitudes and behaviours within Malaysian institutions of higher learning. *UNITAR e-Journal*, 3, 1-22.
- KREJCIE, R. V. & MORGAN, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- LEVENTHAL, G., KARUZA, J. & FRY, W. 1980. Beyond fairness: a theory of allocation preferences [w:] Mikula G.(ed.), *Justice and Social Interaction: Experimental and Theoretical Contributions from Psychological Research*. Springer, New York.
- SUN, L.-Y., CHOW, I. H. S., CHIU, R. K. & PAN, W. 2013. Outcome favorability in the link between leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: Procedural fairness climate matters. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 215-226.
- TYLER, T. & BLADER, S. 2013. *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*, Routledge.
- WESTPHAL, J. D., PARK, S. H., MCDONALD, M. L. & HAYWARD, M. L. 2012. Helping other CEOs avoid bad press social exchange and impression management support among CEOs in communications with journalists. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57, 217-268.