

# Impact of organizational justice on the organizational citizenship behavior: Evidence from Libyan telecommunication Industry

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

<sup>1</sup>PhD candidate, <sup>2,3</sup>Sr. Lecturer, Limkokwing University, Malaysia,

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of business and management,

<sup>1</sup>limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Cyberjaya, Malaysia.

**Abstract:** Telecommunication industry in Libya suffers over the last five years; this resulted from the lack of its employees to the citizenship affiliation. This study objective is to investigate to which extent organizational justice improves the citizenship behavior of the telecommunication companies' staff in Libya. three dimensions of organizational justice that developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) are tested toward the organizational citizenship behavior. The sample of this study represented by 377 employees from four Libyan telecommunication companies. The result of the study confirmed a significant and positive impact of the three dimensions of the organizational justice that distributive justice, procedural justice, and interpersonal justice on the organizational citizenship behavior of the telecommunication companies' staff.

**Keywords** – Distributive justice, Procedural justice, Interpersonal justice, organizational citizenship behavior, telecommunication industry, Libya.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Performance management is important for an organization, as it helps organizations ensuring employees are working hard to contribute to achieving the organization's mission and objectives (Pulakos, Hanson, Arad, & Moye, 2015). Performance management sets expectations for employee performance and motivates employees to work harder ways that is expected by the organization. Moreover, performance management system provides a completed and professional management process for organizations to assess the performance results of organizations and employees. Employee performance could be expected, assessed and encouraged. Heffernan and Dundon (2016) pressed that the importance of performance management system is on continuously improving organizational commitment and trust, and this is achieved by improved individual employee performance. Therefore, improving job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organization trust by using performance management system is away to improve organizational performance. To achieve their goals, organizations need their employees, on certain occasions, to go beyond what is required in their job and to be personally committed to achieving the collective goals, so that they become achievable. In complementarity with the good performance of the established task, today organizations are interested in a set of behaviors that have been designated with different labels, one of these being organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2005).

The behavior of organizational citizenship (BOC) is "that individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988). It should be noted that this behavior is discretionary in nature, and is not considered a specific requirement of the job description. On the contrary, this behavior involves a certain degree of personal choice, so that the person is not punished if he decides not to behave in that way. It is important to note that the main function of the OCBs is to support the social and psychological environment in which the performance of the task is carried out. This construct has been conceptualized by Organ (1997) in five dimensions: Altruism, Awareness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy and Civic Virtue. Altruism is shaped by those spontaneous behaviors aimed at helping other people with their tasks or with some problem related to the organization. Awareness refers to attendance at work and compliance with the rules and procedures of the organization. Sportsmanship is the willingness of employees to tolerate undesirable working conditions without complaining about them. Courtesy is defined as the behavior of consultation with other people before making decisions that may affect their work. Finally, civic virtue includes all those actions that indicate that the individual participates, gets involved and cares about the life of the organization. As noted, the study of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors are closely related. There is evidence that the perception of organizational justice is the variable that, to a greater extent, predicts organizational citizenship behaviors (Ali, Manzoor, Rashid, & Ahmad, 2017; Gan & Yusof, 2018; Ismail, 2015; Rana, Iftikhar, Abbasi, & Abbas, 2018).

At the same time, there is evidence that shows that engaged employees tend to give the extra mile in their work. That is, they reveal extra-performance behaviors (ie, organizational citizenship behaviors) that go beyond the demands of the job. In a study conducted by Sethi (2018), found that employee engagement is related to clients 'perception of employees' extra performance. In the same way, this external performance is positively related to the clients' intention to return (fidelity). In another study Babaei and Mafian (2016) carried out with nurses, found a positive relationship between work engagement and extraterritorial behaviors, which are considered a variant of organizational citizenship behaviors. Similarly, Lim and Loosemore (2017) also recorded a positive relationship between engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The interpretation 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 & Blader, 2013). The ideological inclination in Organ's definition prohibits imperative political and good contemplations that ought to be integral to an examination of OCB. For instance, the significance of censuring and changing the association for its own great and that of its individuals isn't seen as organizational citizenship behavior, despite the fact that such activities might be out of devotion to the association (Hirschman, 1970). Also, a basic and good examination of the integrity of organizational objectives and destinations isn't seen as citizenship behavior in Organ's reality. In reality, Organ's meaning of OCB is a model of the administrative conventionality that commands our field and demoralizes exchange of the ethical measurement of organizational marvels (Chun, Shin, Choi, & Kim, 2013).

Motivation for work explains why employees or members of a given organization behave as they do. There are mainly four theories about motivation at work, the theory of necessity, the theory of expectations, the theory of equity and the theory of organizational justice. These theories provide us with complementary approaches for the understanding and management of motivation in organizations. In this post we will focus on the approach to organizational justice. Obviously, the conclusions drawn from the study and observation of the work and business environment are easily extrapolated, *mutatis mutandis*, to any human organization that seeks to achieve certain objectives or results in an environment with scarce resources and distributing rewards of some kind among members of the group based on their actual or potential contributions. The perception of members and employees about global justice, transparency and fair play in their organizations is increasingly recognized as an important determinant of the motivation of members and employees, their attitudes and their behaviors. The Theory of Organizational Justice does not refer to a single theory by itself, but describes a group of theories that focus on the nature, the determining factors and the consequences of justice in the organization. Based on this group of theories, researchers have identified four forms of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice

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. G. S. 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 (G. Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). In other words, equity theory recognizes the relevance of only one justice rule, the contributions rule. The justice judgment model assumes that an individual's judgments of fairness may be based not only on the contributions rule, but also on an equality rule, or a needs rule. According to a justice judgment model, individuals evaluate allocation procedures used by decision-makers based on the situation, in effect proactively employing various justice norms such as equity, needs, and equality. While equality rule dictates that everyone should receive similar outcomes regardless of needs or contributions, a needs rule dictates that individuals with greater need should receive higher outcomes (Gao & He, 2017). In other words, the central concept of the justice judgment is that an individual applies distribution rules selectively by following different rules at different times. Thus, the individual's basic criteria for evaluating fairness may change in various situations (Leventhal, 1980). For example, equitable reward allocations would maximize an individual's positive work behaviors such as work performance over the long term, whereas equality of rewards may foster a high level of satisfaction, harmony, and solidarity among group members. Leventhal shifted the focus of research on justice toward allocation and the role of the allocator, and raised fundamental questions about the allocator's role in matters of distributive justice (Mo & Shi, 2017).

Procedural justice it refers to the perception of justice of the procedures used to make decisions about the distribution of results and benefits. Not putting so much emphasis on the actual distribution of results. Procedural decisions refer to how performance levels are evaluated, how complaints or disputes are managed (if, for example, an employee disagrees with a manager's evaluation of their performance), and how the results (as salary increases) are distributed. Employee perceptions are of fundamental importance for procedural justice. The reactions of the employees to the procedures depend on the degree of justice they perceive in them, rather than on the fairness, fairness and real transparency of said procedures, although it goes without saying that, obviously,

The theory of procedural justice holds that employees are more motivated to develop a high level of performance when they perceive that the procedures used to make decisions about the distribution of results are fair. In other words, they will be more motivated if they think their performance will be evaluated accurately. Conversely, if employees think that their performance will not be evaluated accurately because the supervisor is not aware of their contributions to the organization or lets their personal feelings affect the evaluations, the employees will not be so strongly motivated to assume high performance levels

### III. 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. The population of this study is staffing those works in telecommunication industry in Libya. Determining the sample size of this study was at 377 as suggested by the table of sample size of Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

### IV. FINDINGS

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	%
<b>Gender</b>			<b>Education Level</b>		
Male	272	72.1	Diploma	108	28.6
Female	105	27.9	Bachelor	246	65.3
			PhD	23	6.1
<b>Age</b>			<b>Experience</b>		
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			

For the purpose of measuring the internal consistency of the data, Cronbach Alpha coefficient is used to test the reliability of the factors items, table 2 shows that the internal consistency of the model items ranged between 0.657 to 0.797, which is within the accepted range as suggested by Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, and Mena (2012).

Table 2: Reliability Test

Factors	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Distributive justice	7	0.755
Procedural justice	3	0.657
Interpersonal justice	4	0.797
Organizational citizenship behavior	14	0.780

Table 3 illustrates the descriptive analysis of the data, the mean, standard deviation, and normality test. For the mean analysis, the model factors have a range of mean between 3.28 and 4.45, this indicates to an agreement of the participants toward the statements constructed toward the impact of organizational justice dimensions on the organizational citizenship behavior. The standard deviation of the factors has ranged between 0.605 to 0.803, which refers to narrow tendency of the sample's opinion. The normality has examined by two measurements that Skewness and Kurtosis, for these two indicators, the alternative hypothesis of the normality accepted if the values ranged between -3 and +3 as suggested by the study of Kothari (2004).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
DJ	3.2845	.80255	-.034	.126	-.197	.251
IJ	3.9881	.64039	-.170	.126	-.677	.251
PJ	4.3404	.64271	-1.693	.126	2.309	.251
OCB	4.4474	.60542	-1.707	.126	2.976	.251

DJ: distributive justice, IJ: Interpersonal justice, PJ; Procedural justice, OCB; Organizational citizenship behavior

Table 4 composites the result of KMO test, which refers to an adequate sampling uses for the study as the value higher than 0.5. Table 5 confirmed a good factor loading for the factors items, which is higher than 0.50 as suggested by the study of Hair et al. (2012).

Table 4: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.820
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square
	3482.533
	df
	190
	Sig.
	.000



Table 5: Rotated Component Matrix

Items	Component			
	1	2	3	4
DJ1	.655			
DJ3	.856			
DJ4	.841			
DJ5	.806			
IJ1		.729		
IJ2		.816		
IJ3		.804		
IJ4		.744		
PJ1			.835	
PJ2			.759	
PJ3			.776	
PJ4			.792	
PJ5			.765	
PJ6			.767	
OCB9				.842
OCB10				.783
OCB11				.825
OCB12				.788
OCB13				.782
OCB14				.780
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.				

For the purpose of examining the relationship between the organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior, table 6 contains the correlation test for the model construct; it confirms that a significant and positive relationship is found between all the organizational justice dimensions that distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and procedural justice with the organizational citizenship behavior. The higher relationship was found between distributive justice and the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $r=0.074$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), followed by the relationship between interpersonal justice and the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $r=0.026$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), and between procedural justice and the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $r=0.011$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

Table 6: Correlations

		DJ	IJ	PJ	OCB
DJ	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
IJ	Pearson Correlation	.368**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
PJ	Pearson Correlation	.005*	.057*	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.007		
OCB	Pearson Correlation	.074**	.026**	.011**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	

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

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

DJ: distributive justice, IJ: Interpersonal justice, PJ; Procedural justice, OCB; Organizational citizenship behavior

Table 7 presents the regression test of the model construct, regression tests uses to illustrate to which extent independent variable predicts the dependent variable. The result shows a significant and positive impact of distributive justice on the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $\beta=0.056$ ,  $t=2.342$ ,  $p=0.001$ ), a significant and positive impact of interpersonal justice on the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $\beta=0.001$ ,  $t=2.010$ ,  $p=0.002$ ), and a significant and positive impact of procedural justice on the organizational citizenship behavior at ( $\beta=0.011$ ,  $t=11.227$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). The adjusted R-square result indicates that this model interprets the organizational citizenship behavior at 46.3%, which considers a good level of explanation by the construct model.

Table 7: Regression Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4.582	.288		15.897	.000
DJ	.056	.042	.075	2.342	.001
IJ	.001	.053	.001	2.010	.002
PJ	.011	.049	.012	11.227	.000
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	46.3%				
F	26.481				

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

DJ: distributive justice, IJ: Interpersonal justice, PJ: Procedural justice, OCB; Organizational citizenship behavior

## V. DISCUSSION

Organizational justice is related positively and negatively with different variables that affect the behavior and attitudes of people. For example, there is evidence that organizational justice is negatively related to intentions of abandonment (Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009), burnout (Van Dierendonck, Schaufeli, & Buunk, 2001) and psychological tension (Francis & Barling, 2005). Similarly, there is evidence to show that organizational justice is positively related to job satisfaction (Moorman, 1991), organizational trust and support (DeConinck, 2010) and work engagement (Moliner, Martinez-Tur, Ramos, Peiró, & Cropanzano, 2008). It is important to highlight that there is robust evidence, which highlights the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Gao & He, 2017).

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are actions that go beyond the requirements of the job (and also of the role), which the collaborators implement voluntarily and which are beneficial for the Organization. This type of behavior is critical for the effectiveness of organizations, since they are unable to anticipate and translate into job descriptions all the behaviors that are required to achieve the objectives. This type of behavior acquires greater relevance in the uncertain and dynamic environments in which organizations move today. 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. They are considered pro-role behaviors or facilitators of their functionality. These include altruism (spontaneous behaviors that are meant to help others), civic virtue (being involved with responsibility in the life of the Organization), courtesy (informing with delicacy so that others do not feel misplaced), sportsmanship (tolerate adverse circumstances without complaining) and awareness (responsibility to comply with the rules and perform their obligations).

## VI. CONCLUSION

Organizational justice, as a concept; is the vindication of employees by the authorities in the workplace. Justice is discussed as a social structure in organization studies. There are many studies in the field of organizational justice by Lim and Loosemore (2017). In these studies, organizational justice has been addressed as a favorable value related to the various organizational and work oriented outputs. Khan, Abbas, Gul, and Raja (2015) defined organizational justice as “the perceptions and evaluations towards the compliance of organizational practices and related process and results”. According to another description, it is the structure which affects the work attitudes of employees towards division of labor, wages, rewards and recreation conditions along with determining the quality of social interaction. Besides, it is emphasized that the perception of people about the rights and fairness in the organizational life is one of the definitions of organizational justice.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, S. Z., Manzoor, H., Rashid, M., & Ahmad, W. (2017). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Case Study of PTCL, Pakistan. *City University Research Journal*, 7(1), 134-150.

- Babaei, M. R., & Mafian, A. A. (2016). Assessing the impact of organizational justice on Organizational citizenship behavior in contracting companies. *Journal of productivity and development*, 2(4), 14-27.
- Chun, J. S., Shin, Y., Choi, J. N., & Kim, M. S. (2013). How does corporate ethics contribute to firm financial performance? The mediating role of collective organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 853-877.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(12), 1349-1355.
- Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Organizational injustice and psychological strain. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 37(4), 250.
- Gan, J. L., & Yusof, H. M. (2018). The Dimensionality of Organizational Justice and Its Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Malaysian Context. *Jour of Adv Research in Dynamical & Control Systems*, 10(6).
- Gao, Y., & He, W. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and employee organizational citizenship behavior: the pivotal roles of ethical leadership and organizational justice. *Management decision*, 55(2), 294-309.
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 40(3), 414-433.
- Heffernan, M., & Dundon, T. (2016). Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems (HPWS) and employee well-being: the mediating effect of organisational justice. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(2), 211-231.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Vol. 25): Harvard university press.
- Ismail, H. (2015). Organizational justice and citizenship behavior, the mediating role of trust. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(1), 86.
- Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2015). Organizational justice and job outcomes: Moderating role of Islamic work ethic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 235-246.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*: New Age International.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 30(3), 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.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? *Social exchange* (pp. 27-55): Springer.
- Lim, B. T., & Loosemore, M. (2017). The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(2), 95-106.
- Loi, R., Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Four-factor justice and daily job satisfaction: a multilevel investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 770.
- Mo, S., & Shi, J. (2017). Linking ethical leadership to employees' organizational citizenship behavior: Testing the multilevel mediation role of organizational concern. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(1), 151-162.
- Moliner, C., Martinez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiró, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 327-348.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*: Sage Publications.
- Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(01), 51-76.
- Rana, M. S., Iftikhar, U., Abbasi, S. G., & Abbas, M. (2018). The role of organizational justice to develop organizational citizenship behavior: moderating effect of islamic work ethics. *Amazonia Investiga*, 7(16), 46-60.
- Sethi, U. J. (2018). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior-A Study of Telecom Industry*.
- Tyler, T., & Blader, S. (2013). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*: Routledge.
- Van Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (2001). Burnout and inequity among human service professionals: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 43.