

**EXAMINES THE LIBYAN POLICE FORCE PERCEPTION
OF CORRUPTION: IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL
STRUCTURE**

OMER M. OTHMAN DOMORO*

SYED OMAR SYED AGIL**

Abstract

This paper investigates the influence of organizational structure on corruption in the Libyan police force. Organizational structure is critical for both police organization and its employees. An explanation of this relationship offers possible solutions to reduce and ultimately eradicate corruption. This paper helps police management by providing useful information on the influence of organizational structure on corruption in the Libyan police organization and how they can benefit from this information in reducing the opportunity for corruption to occur among members of the police force. This paper is limited to study the influence of organizational structure on corruption in the Libyan police force. Results indicated the importance of organizational structure on the police management's efforts in fighting against corruption. The study found that organizational structure and its component has a significant positive relationship with corruption in the Libyan police force. This paper fills the current research gap by providing preliminary information on corruption in the Libyan Police Force; would be the first attempt to examine the influence of organizational structure on corruption in the [LPF].

KEY WORDS: Libya - police force - corruption – organizational structure – centralization-
formalization.

* Graduate School of Business, Tun Abdul Razak University, Malaysia.

** Razak School of Government, Tun Abdul Razak University, Malaysia.

Introduction:**Corruption**

The problem of corruption has existed for a long time and its negative effects extend to all aspects of life in various communities. In fact, the problem of corruption was known to the ancient Arabs, Indians, Chinese and Greeks (Yassin El-Ayouty, 2003). Although corruption has many definitions, it does not have a general and comprehensive definition. The more common definition of the term corruption is the one used by the World Bank which is “the use of public office for private gain” (Ian Bannon, 1999).

But the Asian Development Bank sees shortcomings in these definitions, as it focuses on corruption in the public sector and neglects corruption in the private sector. Due to this, the Asian Development Bank has formulated a more comprehensive definition that focuses on corruption in the public and private sector which is “the abuse of public or private office for personal gain” (A. D. B, 2010).

Corruption has many forms and it varies according to the different perspectives of corruption including political and administrative corruption (Mari-LiisLiiv, 2004). Corruption includes bribery, fraud, embezzlement, cronyism and nepotism that must be addressed collectively (Ali Ahmad Fares, 2008).

Corruption is an old phenomenon, but what is new is the size of the phenomenon which is getting worse to the point where it threatens societies, which leads to social disintegration, economic stagnation and political instability (AtalaKhalel, 2006).

Increased attention to the problem of corruption since the middle half of the eighties was due to the negative effects of corruption on the economic, social and political development. Since then there has been a continuous publication and research that address the issue of corruption, including types of corruption and its manifestations, and an analysis of this phenomenon in a serious and honest attempt, and advocacy to combat and prevent its spread (Ziad Arab Ibn Ali, 2005).

The table below shows the position of a few Arab countries on the corruption perception index (CPI) for 2009 and 2010 as published by Transparency International. Libya is placed

towards the bottom of the list of Arab countries. The top of the list is occupied by Qatar and United Arab Emirates and Oman; countries considered 'highly clean' in terms of corruption according to the index; whereas Libya, Yemen, Syria, Sudan, Iraq and Somalia are placed towards the bottom, indicating 'highly corrupt'. Where Libya recorded 2.5 point on the CPI and was ranked 15th among 20 Arab countries in 2009; and the following year (2010) its score dropped further to 2.2. This makes Libya one of the most corrupt countries in the Arab world. (See Table 1).

Corruption Perception Index for the Arab Countries (2009) & (2010), Table 1

Source: Developed by the Researcher Based on Transparency International Index (2009) & (2010).

Rank	Country	2009-CPI	Rank	Country	2010-CPI
1	Qatar	7.0	1	Qatar	7.7
2	UAE	6.5	2	UAE	6.3
3	Oman	5.5	3	Oman	5.3
4	Bahrain	5.1	4	Bahrain	4.9
5	Jordan	5.0	5	Jordan	4.7
6	Tunisia	4.2	6	Tunisia	4.3
7	Kuwait	4.1	7	Kuwait	4.5
8	Morocco	3.3	8	Morocco	3.4
9	Saudi Arabia	4.3	9	Saudi Arabia	4.7
10	Algeria	2.8	10	Algeria	2.9
12	Lebanon	2.5	12	Lebanon	2.5
13	Egypt	2.8	13	Egypt	3.1
14	Mauritania	2.5	14	Mauritania	2.3
15	Libya	2.5	15	Libya	2.2
16	Yemen	2.1	16	Yemen	2.2
17	Syria	2.6	17	Syria	2.5

18	Sudan	1.5	18	Sudan	1.6
19	Iraq	1.5	19	Iraq	1.5
20	Somalia	1.1	20	Somalia	1.1

Organizational structure

According to Fredrickson (1986), structure refers to an organization's domestic pattern of relationships, authority, and communication. It has been characterized on a variety of dimensions and the three dimensions of structure that have received more attention than any others, which are: centralization, formalization, and complexity and they appear to have the greatest implications for strategic decision making.

Verma (1999) reported a positive relationship between corruption and organizational structure, in that corruption was pervasive in every rank from the lowest to the highest. Among the senior ranks, most of the corruption arose from the administrative power of the organization's management. Because senior management staff control the transfer of subordinate officers, it is easy for them to post their own trusted officers who extort and share the rewards with them. It is also common for senior officers to maintain lavish lifestyles with "official" expenses. Officers are provided with large government accommodations from official funds diverted from other sources. Senior police officers—and even their friends and family—keep constables as orderlies and enjoy personal guards, official cars for 24-hour usage, and many other privileges.

Loree (2006) argued that the hierarchical structure of policing can contribute not only to corruption, but also to barriers against addressing it. Historically police have used a rigidly hierarchical command and control structure. While there has been some alleviation of this in recent years with the introduction of the community policing philosophy, it remains as a serious issue. Police leaders need to recognize that rigid hierarchical structures affect moral reasoning, and take appropriate action. Within the hierarchy, officers often operate with considerable independence and little direct supervision. This may occur because of the strength and influence of the cultural values that govern their behavior.

Osipian (2010) described three major types of corrupt organizational structures—vertical, horizontal, and hierarchical—based on major characteristics, conditions or environment, degree of monopolization and distribution of discretionary power, levels of secrecy, tolerance, transparency, predominant forms, and scale of corruption. The two major engines perpetuating corruption in bureaucracies and public services are opportunism and financial survival of employees. Individuals attain better material positions and financial sustainability through different organizational structures. These structures or nets of corrupt interrelations evolve and replace each other, increasing corruption. Changing the characteristics of organizations, such as increasing transparency, will not necessarily lead to the expected results. Fundamental changes might be needed to disintegrate organizational structures of corruption and reduce corruption in bureaucracies.

Given the importance of the corruption and organizational structure as discussed earlier, this paper will focus on examining the impact of organizational structure in the efforts to combat corruption in the Libyan police force, in order to narrow the opportunity for corrupt practices in the (LPF) Libyan police force.

METHOD

Design and sample size

This paper utilizes quantitative research approach using questionnaires to investigate the relationship between variables. A questionnaire is an efficient data collection mechanism when the researcher knows exactly what is required and how to measure the variables of interest. A questionnaire is the best way to collect data in a short period of time, and the researcher has the opportunity to introduce the research issue and motivate the respondents to offer their frank answers. It is also less expensive and consumes less time than an interview, Uma Sekaran (2003). In general, questionnaires can be administered personally, mailed to the respondents, or electronically distributed. In this paper, the questionnaire was administered personally by the researcher. The sampling design that used in this paper was probability sampling procedure, specifically; stratified random sampling (Str. R. S.), and the questionnaire was administered to a total of 384 members of the Libyan police force.

Measurement of variables

Police corruption was used as the dependent variable in this paper. Police corruption was measured using measurement adopted from Almir Maljevic, et al. (2006). The Cronbach's Alpha reported 0.78. The dependent variable contains 38 items. All these items were ranked on a five-point scale of (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) to measure respondents aspects of corruption perception in the Libyan police force. **Organizational structure** was used as an independent variable in this paper. A total of nine items were used in the study. The centralization scale contains five items used to assess the degree of hierarchical authority within police organization. The formalization scale contains four items were measured formalization developed by (Caruana et al. 1998) and adopted from Pamila Dembla, Prashant Palvia and Balaji Krishnan (2007). The response format of the scale contains of a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The Cronbach's Alpha for organizational structure recorded very high reliability, 0.82. The centralization and formalization scale are appropriate for this study because they contain most of the structural parameters which has received a great deal of attention in organizational research and measure the behavior prevailing in the police organization.

FINDINGS

Results of multiple regression analysis in the descriptive table below show the mean and standard deviation (M (SD)) of all the variables in the paper. The highest mean score for independent variables was organizational structure, 4.38(0.365). The dependent variable, police corruption has a mean score of 3.67(0.180). The respondents were 384 in total.

Regression Analysis Table 2

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for all Variables

	Mean	SD	N
Police corruption	3.6682	.17961	384
Organizational structure	4.3848	.36475	384

The next output table below was the correlations analysis between police corruption and organizational structure. From the table, the researcher can detect which of the variables that shows a significant correlation. They are shown as colored values. The researcher can determine that the dependent variable, police corruption were significantly correlated with organizational structure ($p < 0.05$). The results of the correlations can be reported as;

Police corruption and Organizational structure, $r = 0.362$, $p < 0.05$, and

From the results above, police corruption has positive relationships with the organizational structure. The highly correlation reported between police corruption and organizational structure, $r = 0.362$. The closer the r value to 1, the stronger the relationship is.

Correlations Analysis Table 3

Table 3 Correlations between variables

		Police corruption	Organizational structure
Pearson Correlation	Police corruption	1.000	.362
	Organizational structure	.362	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Police corruption	.	.000
	Organizational structure	.000	.

N = 384

The next part of the output, the Coefficients table, shows which variables are significant with the dependent variable (police corruption). The significant values are shaded in color.

The Unstandardized Coefficients B column, gives the coefficients of the independent variables (organizational culture, ethics, organizational structure and leadership styles) in the regression equation including all the variables.

$$\text{Police corruption} = 2.894 + (-0.164) + 0.159 \text{ Organizational structure}$$

The largest influence on Police Corruption was Organizational Structure (0.159). T – tests were performed to test the two-tailed hypothesis that the beta value is significantly higher or lower than zero. From the table the significant value is shown in the colored coefficient table), $p < 0.05$.

Coefficients between variables Table 4

Table 4 Coefficients between variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.894	.204		14.209	.000
Organizational structure	.159	.019	.232	6.869	.000

Dependent Variable: Police Corruption

Multiple Regression analysis for Organizational Structure dimensions and Police Corruption.

Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Structure Dimensions and Police Corruption Table 5

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Structure Dimensions and Police Corruption

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Police Corruption	3.6682	.17961	384
Centralization	4.5234	.40657	384
Formalization	4.2116	.55915	384

The descriptive table above shows the mean and standard deviation (M (±SD)) of the dimensions in the organizational structure and corruption. There were two dimensions in the organizational structure. The highest mean score in the dimensions was centralization 4.52(±0.407), and the second dimension, the formalization mean score was 4.21(±0.559). The dependent variable, police corruption mean score was 3.67(±0.180). The respondents were 384 in total.

Correlations between Police Corruption and Organizational Structure dimensions Table 6

Table 6 Correlations between Police Corruption and Organizational Structure dimensions

		Corruption	Centralization	Formalization
Pearson Correlation	Corruption	1.000	.276	.281
	Centralization	.276	1.000	.181
	Formalization	.281	.181	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Corruption	.	.000	.000
	Centralization	.000	.	.000
	Formalization	.000	.000	.

$p < 0.05$.

The next table above is the correlations between all the organizational structure dimensions. From the table, the researcher can detect which of the dimensions that shows a significant correlation to police corruption. Both of the dimensions were correlated with police corruption at $p < 0.05$. They are shown as colored values. The highest correlation is recorded by formalization (28%) followed by centralization (27%). The results of the correlations can be reported as;

Police corruption and Centralization $r = 0.276, p < 0.05$, and

Police corruption and Formalization, $r = 0.281, p < 0.05$.

They have positive relationships, which were positively correlated with police corruption. However, the correlation is moderate. The closer the 'r' value to 1, the stronger the relationship is. The researcher can assume that, the higher the police corruption, the higher the centralization and formalization of the organizational structure.

Table 7 Model Summary

Table 7 Model Summary				
Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.363	.131	.127	.16783

The next table is the Model Summary. The R² value in the Model Summary table shows the amount of variance in the dependent variable (Police corruption) that can be explained by the organizational structure dimensions (centralization and formalization).

The R value (0.363) indicates the multiple coefficients between all the entered dimensions (centralization and formalization) and the dependent variable (police corruption). The police corruption was correlated with the centralization and formalization. The R value indicated that the closer the value to 1, the stronger the relationship is. In this finding, the R = 0.363 has shown a moderate relationship and positively correlated with the combined dimensions.

Table 8 ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.624	2	.812	28.834	.000 ^a
	Residual	10.732	381	.028		
	Total	12.356	383			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Formalization, Centralization

b. Dependent Variable: Police Corruption

The ANOVA table above shows that Sig. (p value) = 0.001. As $p < 0.05$, the predictions are significantly better than expected. It is reported as; $F(2, 381) = 28.834$; $p < 0.05$. This implied that the predictor variables jointly and significantly predict the dependent variable (police corruption). The ANOVA table further revealed that the predictor variables, when combined together accounted (R^2) 13% of the total variance observed in performance ($R = 0.363$, $F = 28.834$ and $p < 0.05$).

Table 9 Coefficients table between the Organization Structure dimensions^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	2.880	.107		26.856	.000
Centralization	.103	.021	.233	4.794	.000
Formalization	.077	.016	.239	4.927	.000

Table 9 Coefficients table between the Organization Structure dimensions^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.880	.107		26.856	.000
Centralization	.103	.021	.233	4.794	.000
Formalization	.077	.016	.239	4.927	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Police Corruption

The next part of the regression is the Coefficients table, shows which dimensions were significant to the dependent variable (police corruption).

The Unstandardized Coefficients B column, gives the coefficients of the dimensions (centralization and formalization) in the regression equation including all the variables.

$$\text{Police corruption} = 2.880 + 0.103 \text{ Centralization} + 0.077 \text{ Formalization}$$

The standardized Beta Coefficient column shows the contribution that an individual variable makes to the model. The beta weight is the average amount the dependent variable increases when the independent variable increases by one standard deviation (all other dimensions were held constant). The largest influence on Police Corruption was Formalization ($\beta = 0.239$), followed by Centralization ($\beta = 0.233$) reported in the Standardized Beta Coefficient column. T-test was also performed to test the two-tailed hypothesis that the beta value is significantly higher or lower than zero. This enables the researcher to see which predictors were significant. From the table, both of the dimensions were significant predictors to police corruption. Formalization contributed the highest, explains about 24% ($B = 0.007$, $t = 4.927$, $p < 0.05$), followed by Centralization, 23% ($B = 0.103$, $t = 4.794$, $p < 0.05$).

RESULT

Discussion

The organizational structure dimensions; centralization ($r = 0.276$) and formalization ($r = 0.281$) had significant positive relationships with police corruption. They also had significant relative contribution to the police corruption; formalization explained about 24% ($B = 0.077$, $t = 4.927$, $p < 0.05$) contributed higher than centralization which explains a slightly lower, 23% ($B = 0.103$, $t = 4.794$, $p < 0.05$). The $R^2 = 0.131$ (13%) was the amount of variance in the dependent variable (Police Corruption) that can be explained by the organizational structure dimensions when combined together.

Conclusion

The study found that organizational structure has a significant positive relationship with the corruption in the Libyan police force. A highly centralized and formalized police organization lead to the police corruption based on the positive relationship; both of them did contribute to police corruption. Results of the study suggested that organizational structure is important for the police management efforts to fight against corruption. In addition, it also important for police department to improve the integrity of the police by restructuring the organization, and energize police leadership in order to enable the police organization to carry out its duties successfully. Future research will be focus on conducting quantitative and qualitative research using questionnaire and interview in investigating the influence of organizational structure on police corruption in Libya.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ali, Ziad Arab Ibn (2005), "Corruption: its forms - causes and motives - its control and reduction strategies growth deal with it", Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 16, pp. 1-18.
- [2] Asian Development Bank (2010). Definitions of corruption. Available at: <http://www.adb.org/Documents/Policies/Anticorruption/anticorrupt300.asp?p=policies>
- [3] Bannon, Ian (1999), The fight against corruption a World Bank perspective. Paper presented in workshop on transparency and governance, as a part of the consultative group meeting for the reconstruction and transformation of central America, in Stockholm, Sweden.
- [4] Caruana, A., Morris, M. H. & Vella, A. J.: (1998), "The effect of centralization and formalization on entrepreneurship in export firms", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 36, pp.16-29.
- [5] Dembla, Pamila., Palvia, Prashant and Krishnan, Balaji (2007), "Understanding the Adoption of Web-Enabled Transaction Processing by Small Businesses". Journal of Electronic commerce Research, Vol.8, 1-17.
- [6] El-Ayouty, Yassin et al. (2003), Combating corruption for development: the role of law, transparency and accountability. Greenwood Publishing Group, pp. 1-18.
- [7] Fredrickson, James W. (1986). "The strategic decision process and organizational structure", Academy of management review, Vol. 11, 280-297.
- [8] Fares, Ali Ahmad (2008), Resolve the crisis: a model of administrative corruption. The Future Centre for Studies and Research, pp. 1-6.
- [9] Khalel, Atala (2006), The entrance to proposal to combat corruption in the Arab world: the experience of Jordan. Publications of the Arab Organization for Administrative Development, pp. 1-25.
- [10] Liiv, Mari-Liis (2004). The causes of administrative corruption: hypotheses for Central and Eastern Europe. Unpublished Master dissertation [MPA]. University of Tartu.
- [11] Loree, Don (2006), Corruption in Policing: Causes and Consequences A Review of the Literature. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pp. 1-31.
- [12] Maljevic, Almir., Datzer, Drake., Muratbegovic, Elmedin and Budimlic, Muhamed (2006), Overtly about police and corruption. Association of criminalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, pp. 1-265.
- [13] Osipian, A. (2010), "Corrupt Organizational Hierarchies in the Former Soviet Bloc", Transition Studies Review, Springer, Vol.17, pp. 822-836.
- [14] Sekaran, Uma (2003), Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach, 4th ed. Illinois: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- [15] Transparency International (2010), Corruption perception index results available at: http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results
- [16] Transparency International (2009), Corruption perception index. Available at: http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009/cpi2009table
- [17] Verma, Arvind (1999), "Cultural roots of police corruption in India", Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, Vol. 22, 264-279.

