

## Organizational Justice and its Relationship to Organizational Commitment in Palestinian Universities

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rissj.v3i4.569>

| Husain Abedalqader<sup>1</sup> | Samir Abuznaid<sup>2</sup> |

<sup>1</sup>Al-Istiqlal University

<sup>2</sup>Hebron University

### ABSTRACT

*The study aimed to identify organizational justice and its relationship to organizational commitment of academics in Palestinian universities. The descriptive analytical approach was used, and a questionnaire was developed for the purpose of the study. The population consisted of all academics (826) at the universities of Hebron and Jerusalem, from which a random sample of 130 employees was taken. The results indicate that academics enjoy their vacations freely, that top administration delegates them some responsibilities, that university administration evaluates academics fairly and equally and assigns them work requirements and tasks that commensurate with their level of scientific expertise, and that academics receive promotions without delay. The administration takes into account the academics' personal considerations when making career decisions and treats them with respect and dignity when decisions need to be made about their employment. Academics are satisfied with their jobs, and the work climate is appropriate at the universities. Universities provide health insurance for academics and their families, and academics' loyalty to the university will never waver. Academics participate in departmental decision-making. However, the findings suggest that the role of academic oversight on academic performance at Palestinian universities be activated, including the positive monitoring role of the Palestinian Ministry of Higher Education. Monitoring includes positive oversight of performance and advancement of various university programs to ensure that they address the needs of the Palestinian society. The positive interventions of senior management in universities have a significant impact on motivating and guiding academics. Therefore, the researchers recommend activating and strengthening the positive management role of university administration while staying away from negative interventions. Such intervention would improve academics' performance, encourage creativity and innovation and enhance knowledge of academics.*

### KEYWORDS

*Organizational justice; organizational commitment; Palestinian universities*

### INTRODUCTION

Higher education is gaining traction in Middle Eastern universities and is being influenced by globalization. Organizational justice refers to the sense of fairness and equality on aspects of organization policies and regulations relating to employees' interests as viewed

by the organization internal members. Higher education work environments are of critical relevance to organizational management because of their impact on productivity, staff morale, and attitudes towards their jobs. Organizational justice is vital to the success and longevity of organizations because it influences employees' behavior and morale and promotes the spirit of justice among them in all aspects that satisfy them, such as appointment, motivation, promotion, and evaluation. Organizational justice bridges the gap between the organization's goals and those of its employees, enhancing organizational trust and fairness.

Furthermore, universities are among the institutions where employees commonly depart for a variety of reasons, one of which may be discontent with their position. As a result, human cadres are under increased pressure and competition to improve their capabilities and development in with the requirements of knowledge, modern scientific and technological progress.

This study examines four components of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and information justice. Employee job happiness, trust, dedication, and performance are all affected by these four components.

According to Greenberg and Baron (2009), organizational justice is the perception of fairness in the workplace or organization, which is usually evaluated by comparing the rewards employees receive from their jobs, such as salary, acknowledgment for effort, experience, education, and competence. Employees perceived fairness in an organization, according to Greenberg and Colquitt (2013), not only when their efforts are equitably rewarded in an organization, but also with respect to the procedures, policies, and different interpersonal treatment they are subjected to in different circumstances in the organization. Greenberg (2005) draws from psychological contract and social exchange theories to categorize organizational justice into three distinct dimensions: distributive justice (referring to fairness in outcomes such as rewards received for engaging in certain behavioral effort), procedural justice (referring to fairness in the formal process by which rewards outcomes are provided to employees, how work is allocated, and performance evaluation), and interactional justice (referring to fairness in interpersonal treatment including the dignity and respect that one receives in the process of evaluating their performance, distributing resources and rewards, allocating works, provision information and social supports).

Organizational commitment refers to employee commitment to an organization regarding desire-based (affective commitment), obligation based (normative commitment) and cost-based (continuance commitment). These form an ecosystem that encourages an employee to voluntarily continue working in an organization. Organizations often try to foster commitment in their employees, which provides an impetus to work harder and be more enterprising to achieve organizational objectives. A combination of these factors ensures that an organization attains stability and reduces costly employee turnover. Therefore, the faculty's commitment to their organization, students, teaching activities, occupation, and colleagues has a positive influence on the effectiveness of an academic institution. Universities worldwide strive to keep devoted faculty on their campuses (Timalsina et al, 2018, 1).

Paying close attention to the human element is a major concern. Institutional success is heavily reliant on employee satisfaction. Inequitable organizational justice may result in excessive employee turnover, lowering the quality of higher education.

The research aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the reality of distributive, procedural, and interactive organizational justice in Palestinian universities?

2. What is the level of job satisfaction among academics in Palestinian universities?
3. Is there a correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction among academics in Palestinian universities?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***Organizational Justice***

According to Darawsheh (2017: 376), organizational justice is defined as “the degree of achieving equality and integrity in rights and duties that express the individual's relationship with the organization, and the concept of justice embodies the principle of fulfilling employees' obligations to the organization for which they work, as well as confirming the required organizational trust between the two parties.” Organizational justice is defined as “the perceived justice by individuals of the exchanges, inputs and outputs, that arise from prevailing relationship in organization, which includes employees' relations with their managers, employees and colleagues at the same level of work and their relationship with their organization as a social system.” (Abu Tayeh, 2012: 149) Organizational justice is “the degree of achieving equality and integrity in the rights and duties that express the individual's relationship with the organization, and embodies the idea of justice as a principle to fulfill obligations by employees towards the organization in which they work, and to confirm the required organizational trust between the two parties.” This idea is based on Adams' Equity Theory which states that the main determinant of worker's efforts, performance, and satisfaction is the degree of justice or unfairness. (Geidel, 2014: 38)

Organizational justice can also be defined as “the degree of employees' satisfaction with their jobs, positions and powers and the tasks assigned to them fairly and objectively by the organization's leadership.

Organizational justice includes three dimensions that interact with each other. They are distributive, procedural and interactive. These three dimensions are linked to positive work behaviors and attitude.

### ***Distributive Organizational Justice***

Distributive organizational justice is defined as the justice of the outputs obtained by the employee, that is, it is related to the justice of reward distribution, and this justice is related to the results or outputs obtained by the individual from his job, particularly the outputs of wage distribution, benefits in kind, or promotions, and the employees' sense of distributive justice in an organization is achieved when the individual feels that the rewards received are commensurate with the effort he exerts compared to the efforts of his colleagues. (Kharmoush, 2014: 49) The concept of distributive justice reflects the workers' sense of justice regarding outputs, which may be in the form of wages, promotion and incentives in return for their efforts at work. (Jodat, 2010: 309). Distributive organizational justice refers to individual's awareness of the fair outputs he receives, as well as returns that individual obtains, which comes as a result of comparing his efforts, what he obtains on one hand, and what others make and obtain on the other hand. Some have expressed it as justice results of decisions. It was also known as perceived justice of distributing dependencies. (Al-Maghribi, 2007: 208)

It can be said that distributive organizational justice is nothing but a set of just rights that employees seek to achieve as a result of the services and the work they provide to their institution and may include an increase in salary and promotion.

Greenberg & Colquitt (2013) indicate that the procedural justice is perceived as fair when workers feel that they are equal to their coworkers in the day-to-day tasks of the

organization and that the information the organization gives them is true and their opinions are heard. When we apply the concept of procedural justice to the university context, we suggest making a distinction between two possible perceptions of this dimension: the evaluative context which only takes into account the procedures that involve assessment actions and the overall context which includes the other existing procedures within the universities, though they are not related to the assessment.

University students aim to pass their courses, and get the grade they expect at the end of course. Therefore, the effects of an inequality perception will decrease. Moreover, if the student does not pass the course, the effects of inequality perception will worsen. The difference that can exist between procedural justice in the university and in the organizational context could be future research. In the literature, there are studies that give procedural justice a very important intangible capital. (Castillo & Fernandez, 2016:286)

### **Interactive Organizational Justice**

*Interactive organizational justice* refers to employees' perceptions about the fairness of personal treatment they receive from decision makers in an organization (Tayyaba & al, 2017: 136), and also expresses the fairness of personal treatment that an individual receives from others in workplace (Wei, 2016: 1). Some regard interactive justice as an extension of the concept of procedural justice, which refers to how management behaves towards individuals and is primarily related to how managers deal with subordinates with a degree of credibility, respect, and diplomacy, i.e. the quality of interaction is followed by decision making (Suger, 2013: 413).

Moag & Bies (1986) describes interactive justice in two main dimensions: interpersonal justice and informational justice

*Interpersonal justice* refers to the degree of fairness that individuals perceive as they are treated by others in their organization (Gregory & Griffin, 2014: 394), and it represents the social aspect of distributive justice by demonstrating interest in individuals after the distribution results are received. (Jackson, 2019: 66)

*Informational justice* expresses the fairness of information utilized in decision-making (Gregory & Griffin, 2014: 394), and it represents the social aspect of procedural justice because it pertains to the accuracy and quality of the information received. (Jeanne and colleagues, 2012: 1343)

These two dimensions were later expanded (Moag & Bies, 1986) into four sub-rules that evolved to characterize managers' fair treatment (Scott & Al, 2007: 1597). They are as follows:

#### **Respect**

Respect can be demonstrated by treating subordinates with sincerity, dignity, and appropriateness, and by directors refraining from making inappropriate or destructive statements. Managers provide acceptable explanations for making decisions; explanations must be honest, transparent, and frank. Personal justice includes both standards of respect and appropriateness, whereas informational justice includes the bases of justification and honesty. These four rules were expanded by defining additional criteria to judge procedure implementation. Folger and Bies identified seven administrative responsibilities: honesty, justification, respect, feedback, worker's viewpoints, consistency, and bias suppression. (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005: 30)

#### **Job Satisfaction**

*Job satisfaction* can be described as the extent to which people have favorable feelings or attitudes regarding their jobs. When someone claims he has a high level of job satisfaction,

it suggests he enjoys his job. As a result, employees value their jobs and are satisfied with them.

### **Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction**

Management and human resources, according to Al-About (2020), are concerned with understanding the factors that affect job satisfaction in order to devise effective measures that support employees satisfaction. The following are the most important of these factors:

- 1) **Respect in the workplace:** Respect in the workplace ranks first on the list of factors influencing job satisfaction. Respect encompasses how personnel are treated and communicated with, the degree of supervision they receive, and how they are warned and disciplined.
- 2) **Wages and material incentives:** One of the most essential factors in achieving job satisfaction is fair pay. Employees frequently assess their status based on their sense of financial sufficiency or justice in compensation and material incentives. This, of course, drives many institutions to establish consistent, stable reward and bonus systems.
- 3) **Promotions and career progression:** No one wants a stable job with no room for promotion and development. Employees in this type of job often record a low rate of job satisfaction, while promotion and competition represent an important incentive for employees in promising jobs.
- 4) **Work feasibility:** The concept of work feasibility is a broad and complex concept, starting with the employee's feeling of feasibility his work has on him personally, even if the work gives him opportunities for challenge and development. The concept does not end with the employee's observation of work feasibility, productivity and growth of company, bureaucracy, useless work and this can be considered enough reason for discontent and dissatisfaction.
- 5) **Mutual trust:** The employee's confidence in the manner in which administration deals with different situations is greatly reflected on job satisfaction. Notifying the employee of trust and reliance on him is also considered one of the decisive factors for job satisfaction.
- 6) **Job security:** Job satisfaction cannot be attained if the employee does not feel safe and secure in his or her job. He cannot have a good attitude toward his work when he is threatened with unemployment, wage reduction, or other unfair measures.
- 7) **Healthy work environment:** a healthy work environment can be achieved by guaranteeing basic safety standards for employees or by ensuring a quiet and stable work environment that reduces stress and tension..
- 8) **Communication and accessibility:** Management experts have always referred to communication in work environment as the most important factor in achieving job satisfaction. Communication and accessibility can be manifested in a wide range of equally important administrative goals, such as quickly resolving disputes, tendencies, discovering gaps early on, discovering latent talents and capabilities.
- 9) **Job equity and equality:** Even when this justice does not directly benefit employee; fairness in promotions, incentives, and assignments are main bases for achieving satisfaction, gender equality, respect for cultural and ethnic differences.
- 10) **Sub-relationships:** Sub-relationships are the relations that bring an employee together with his colleagues or managers outside performance of tasks and work, whether from dialogues, side communication during work times, or even sub-relationships that arise outside workplace. These relationships have an important role in enhancing job satisfaction.

11) Personal factors: There are many personal factors that affect job satisfaction. They include age, marital status, intellectual tendencies, educational attainment, and others. These factors are often among the main obstacles facing a company in its plans to achieve job satisfaction due to the great disparity among employees.

## RESEARCH METHODS

### *Approach*

The analytical descriptive approach was used to obtain the data, This approach is important in describing the phenomenon of study. For the purpose of dealing with facts, the data collection method was used to obtain the views of respondents. It seeks to answer the questions of the study and to survey their views on the subject of the study.

### *Population and Sampling*

The population of the study consisted of all academics at the universities of Hebron and Jerusalem with a total number of 826 members. A convenient sample of 130 academics was taken from both universities, which is equivalent to 16% of the population.

### *Instrumentation*

The researchers used the questionnaire as a main tool for collecting the data. A total of 130 questionnaires were distributed from which (114) questionnaires were retrieved and were valid for analysis.

### *Instrument Validity and Stability*

The questionnaire was presented in its initial form, and later was examined by ethical committees at the two universities. The committee has a number of arbitrators who have the experience to express their opinions and observations on the appropriateness of the questions. Their observations were positive, and then a final version of the questionnaire was issued. A Cronbach Alpha Equation was used to measure stability in the study tool by calculating the total stability value of the resolution paragraphs. Statistical analysis showed that the total stability of the resolution sheets was (0.92), which is an excellent value of stability.

### *Description of the Sample*

Table 1 shows the level, number and percentages of the sample under investigation.

**Table 1.** Number and percentages of members of the study sample by different variables

Variable	Level	Frequencies	Percentage %
Gender	Male	90	78.9
	Female	24	21.1
Academic Rank	Lecturer	37	32.5
	Assistant Professor	45	39.5
	Associate Professor	14	12.3
Experience	Professor	18	15.8
	5 years and less	16	14.0
	From 6-10 years	14	12.3
Age	More than 10 years	84	73.7
	30 years and less	8	7.0
	31- less than 45 years	63	55.3
University	45 years and above	43	37.7
	Hebron	60	52.6
	Jerusalem	54	47.4

Table 1 shows that 78.9% of the sample is male. It reveals that 39.5% of the study sample are assistant professors, with 73.7% having more than ten years of experience and 55.3% being between the ages of 31 and 45. It also shows that 52.6% of the sample has served for more than ten years, with Hebron University accounting for 34.5% of the study sample.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weighted average of the responses was calculated on the study dimensions using the five-dimensional Likert scale in order to learn about the respondents' perspectives and draw various comparisons. In this study, the Likert scale is considered to be the most effective method for measuring trends.

**Table 2.** The Weighted Average of the Responses was Calculated on the Study Dimensions Using the Five-Dimensional Likert Scale

Response	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Degree	1	2	3	4	5
Weighted Arithmetic Mean	1-1.79	1.8-2.59	2.6-3.39	3.4-4.19	4.2-5
Level	Very weak	Weak	Medium	High	Very High

### Discussion of Research Questions

In this section, the study results or findings will be discussed in light of the research questions.

**Question (1):** *What is the reality of distributive, procedural, and interactive organizational justice in Palestinian universities?*

#### Distributive Organizational Justice

The arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the distributive organizational justice dimension were calculated as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.** The Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Distributive Organizational Justice Dimension

No.	Paragraph.	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	I receive fair rewards in comparison to work pressure I am facing	2.84	1.14	Medium
2	I enjoy my holidays freely	3.42	1.23	High
3	My administrator gives me some of his powers (delegates part of his authority)	3.58	0.82	High
4	Regulations are applied fairly among employees	3.32	0.98	Medium
5	I receive fair rewards in proportion to my effort	3.05	1.10	Medium
6	All employees receive equal opportunities for training and qualification	2.84	0.99	Medium
7	Eligibility for academics promotion at university is based on merit	3.21	0.90	Medium
8	I am evaluated with fairness and equality	3.53	1.00	High
9	Reward and punishment methods are applied in a balanced and fair manner	3.00	0.86	Medium

10	Equal opportunities are available to staff for missions and conferences	3.16	1.04	Medium
11	Incentives are distributed equitably to employees	2.95	0.95	Medium
12	The administration distributes job tasks according to efficiency and without discrimination	3.21	1.16	Medium
13	University administration allows all employees to participate in external activities	3.16	1.14	Medium
14	The requirements and tasks of my work are commensurate with my abilities to perform	3.84	0.94	High
15	My monthly salary is commensurate with the efforts I make in my work	2.84	1.19	Medium
16	I get a bonus from management for additional effort.	2.68	1.13	Medium
17	My salary is commensurate with my academic qualifications	2.95	1.10	Medium
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.15</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>Medium</b>

Table 3 reveals that the total score for all distributive organizational justice averages is (3.15), with a standard deviation of (1.03) and a medium level of agreement among respondents on this dimension. Paragraph (14), which states "The requirements and tasks of my work are commensurate with my abilities to perform," has the highest arithmetic mean (3.84), with a standard deviation of (0.94), indicating a high degree of consistency among respondents. Paragraph (3), which states "My administrator gives me some of his powers," comes in second place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.58) and a standard deviation of (0.82), indicating a high level of approval among respondents. Third place goes to Paragraph (8), which states, "I am evaluated fairly and equally," with an arithmetic mean of (3.53) and a standard deviation of (1.00), indicating a high degree of consensus among respondents. Paragraph (16), which states, "I get a bonus from management for additional effort," has the lowest degree of consistency among respondents, with an arithmetic mean of (2.68) and a standard deviation of (1.13), indicating a medium level of approval among respondents.

### **Procedural Organizational Justice**

additional effort," has the lowest degree of consistency among respondents, with an arithmetic mean of (2.68) and a standard deviation of (1.13), indicating a medium level of approval among respondents. The arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the procedural organizational justice were calculated as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4.** The Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Procedural Organizational Justice

No.	Paragraph.	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	Management encourages good relations among employees	3.68	0.73	High
2	All supplies are available to simplify work procedures	3.16	0.99	Medium
3	Regulations and instructions at university are clear and easy to adhere to	3.37	0.93	Medium
4	University provides amenities and public safety	3.26	0.97	Medium

5	University administration understands the needs of academics and works to meet them	2.95	1.10	Medium
6	Academics get the annual evaluation they deserve	3.21	1.11	Medium
7	Administrative decisions apply to all academics without exception	3.05	1.15	Medium
8	Administration holds all academics accountable without discrimination	3.00	1.03	Medium
9	Administrative decisions are made based on well-thought-out logical reasons	3.21	0.95	Medium
10	Administration is keen to provide information to all academics without exception	3.47	1.00	High
11	Administration is keen to take opinion of each academic before making decisions about work	3.32	1.18	Medium
12	Academics are evaluated based on a clear evaluation form.	3.58	0.94	High
13	Administration allows objection to decisions concerning academics	3.32	1.03	Medium
14	Administrator adjusts wrong decisions (corrects or repeals)	3.11	1.08	Medium
15	University administration involves me in making decisions	3.16	1.27	Medium
16	Management is characterized by integrity in resolving disputes among employees	3.42	1.05	High
17	University administrative procedures are applied fairly.	3.37	1.18	Medium
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.27</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>Medium</b>

The results in Table 4, which expresses procedural organizational justice, show that the total score for all averages of the first dimension is (3.27), with a standard deviation of (1.04), indicating a medium degree of agreement on this dimension among the respondents. Paragraph (1), which states "Management encourages good relations among employees," has the highest arithmetic mean (3.68), and a standard deviation of (0.73), indicating a high degree of agreement among the respondents. The second place goes to Paragraph (12), which says that "Academics are evaluated based on a clear evaluation form," with an arithmetic mean of (3.58) and a standard deviation of (0.94), indicating a high degree of agreement. The third place goes for paragraph (10), which states "Administration is keen to provide information to all academics without exception," with an arithmetic mean of (3.47) and a standard deviation of (1.00), indicating a high degree of agreement among the respondents. Paragraph (5), which states "University administration understands the needs of academics and works to meet them" comes in the last place, with an arithmetic mean of (2.95) and a standard deviation of (1.10), indicating a medium degree of agreement among the respondents.

### ***Procedural Organizational Justice***

The arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the interactive organizational justice were calculated as shown in the table 5.

**Table 5.** The Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Interactive Organizational Justice

No.	Paragraph.	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	My colleagues at university treat me with respect and friendliness	4.16	0.37	High
2	Administration treats academics with respect	3.89	0.45	High
3	Management behaviors are positive towards academics	3.79	0.70	High
4	Administration respects academics opinions and suggestions.	3.63	0.99	High
5	There is mutual trust between academics at university	3.68	0.92	High
6	Administration follows a democratic, non-authoritarian administrative style	3.26	1.12	Medium
7	I get my academic promotion without delay	2.92	1.20	Medium
8	Administration's treatment of academics is characterized by non-discrimination and favoritism	3.37	0.99	Medium
9	Academics are informed of official activities and seminars prior to their implementation	3.47	0.76	High
10	Administration discusses with academics everything related to their job duties frankly	3.21	1.11	Medium
11	Management takes into account personal considerations of academics when making career decisions	2.95	1.15	Medium
12	Administration provides justifications for its administrative decisions taken against academics	3.32	0.92	Medium
13	The university administration behavior is fair.	3.26	1.12	Medium
14	The official appreciates any positive role I play that will make the work successful	3.26	1.07	Medium
15	Management treats me with interest and friendliness when making a decision regarding my job	3.00	1.08	Medium
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.41</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>High</b>

The results in Table 5, which expresses interactive Organizational Justice, show that the total score for all averages of the first dimension is (3.41), with a standard deviation of (0.93), indicating a high degree of agreement on this dimension among the respondents. Paragraph (1), which states "My colleagues at university treat me with respect and friendliness," has the highest arithmetic mean (4.16), and a standard deviation of (0.37), which indicates a high degree of agreement among the respondents. Paragraph (2), which states, "Administration treats academics with respect," comes in the second place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.89) and a standard deviation of (0.45), which is a high degree of agreement. Paragraph (3), which states "Management behaviors are positive towards academics," comes in the third place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.79). ) and a standard deviation of (0.70), indicating a high degree of approval among the respondents. In the last place comes Paragraph (7), which states "I get my academic promotion without delay," with an arithmetic mean of (2.92) and a standard deviation of (1.20), indicating a medium degree of approval among the respondents.

**Question (2): What is the level of organizational commitment among academics in Palestinian universities?**

The arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the of organizational commitment among academics in Palestinian universities were calculated as shown in Table 6.

**Table 6.** The Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Organizational Commitment among Academics in Palestinian Universities

No.	Paragraph.	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	I am committed to my academic job	3.53	1.15	High
2	Academic rank in which I was placed is appropriate to my qualifications and abilities	3.58	1.32	High
3	The salary I get in my job is adequate.	3.37	1.04	Medium
4	I get financial rewards other than salary.	2.42	1.28	Weak
5	End of service benefits are rewarding at this university	3.11	1.12	Medium
6	The work climate at this university is generally favorable.	3.58	1.14	High
7	The college administration interferes in my work unsatisfactorily.	3.11	1.17	Medium
8	The university supplies my office with a personal computer.	3.42	1.14	High
9	The university provides me with appropriate internet services.	3.47	1.19	High
10	The university provides appropriate financial for publishing and scientific research.	2.89	1.21	Medium
11	The university provides financial support for conferences participate.	3.05	1.20	Medium
12	There is good health insurance for me, my family.	3.63	1.04	High
13	There is a social club for faculty members.	2.63	1.09	Medium
14	The university evaluates my performance objectively.	3.16	0.99	Medium
15	Good performance is the basis for work of administrative positions in college.	2.74	1.26	Medium
16	Good performance is used as a criterion for contract renewal.	2.84	1.27	Medium
17	We work according to a career path in tasks, duties	3.16	1.14	Medium
18	All requirements for scientific research and development are available.	2.84	1.27	Medium
19	The administration offers financial incentives to support innovators at university	2.68	1.18	Medium
20	I will stick to my job even if I have a chance at another university	3.32	1.35	Medium
21	My loyalty to my university will not change no matter what obstacles I face	3.68	1.18	High
22	Performance evaluation at university is characterized by fairness and transparency	3.16	1.19	Medium
23	Academic promotions at university are fair to all academics	3.05	0.95	Medium
24	University pays salaries on time every month	3.37	1.35	Medium
25	University is committed to granting annual bonus on time	3.11	1.30	Medium
26	Academic burden is distributed equitably among academics	3.37	1.14	Medium
27	I participate in decision-making in department or faculty.	3.59	0.99	High
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.18</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>Medium</b>

The results in Table 6, which deals with the level of job commitment among academics in Palestinian universities, show that the total score for all averages of the first dimension is

(3.18) and the standard deviation is (1.17), which indicates a medium degree of approval on this dimension among the respondents. Paragraph (21), which states that “My loyalty to my university will not change no matter what obstacles I face,” has the highest arithmetic mean (3.68) and standard deviation (1.18), which indicates a high degree of agreement among the respondents. Paragraph (12), which states: “There is good health insurance for me and my family,” comes in the second place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.63) and a standard deviation of (1.04), which indicates a high degree of approval among the respondents. Paragraph (27), which states “I participate in decision-making in department or faculty,” comes in the third place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.59) and a standard deviation of (0.99), which is a high degree of approval. Paragraph (4), which states “I get financial rewards other than salary,” comes in the last place, with an arithmetic mean of (2.42) and a standard deviation of (1.28), which is a medium degree of agreement among the respondents.

**Question (3): Is there a relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among academics in Palestinian universities?**

**Table 7.** Results of the Pearson Correlation Test

	Organizational Commitment	
Organizational Justice	Pearson Correlation	0.191**
	sig	0.085
	N	114

Table 7 clearly shows that there is a positive and strong correlation (0.191) as well as a statistical significance (0.085) between the two variables of the study: organizational justice and organizational commitment, or simply job satisfaction.

### **Discussion of Research Hypothesis**

As previously stated, the major hypothesis of the present study states that *there are no statistically significant differences between organizational justice and academics' organizational commitment (job satisfaction) in Palestinian universities.*

T-test was performed to check whether there are statistically significant differences due to gender at the significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between organizational justice and organizational commitment of the academics in Palestinian universities.

**Table 8.** T-Test Results Based on Participants' Gender Variable

	Gender	N	Standard Deviation	Arithmetic Mean	DF	T	Sig
<b>Hypothesis</b>	Male	90	0.70	3.38	112	4.954	0.177
	Female	24	0.56	2.71	44.7		

Significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

The t-test results in Table 8 reveal that there are no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample at the significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) towards organizational justice and academics' organizational commitment in Palestinian universities attributed to the gender variable. The T value is (4.954), and the statistical significance is (0.177), which conforms with the hypothesis and prompts us to accept it when the variable gender is present.

To identify the significance of the differences due to the variable of academic rank, one-way ANOVA test was used. The results are shown in Table 9.

**Table 9.** Results of One Way ANOVA Test for Significant Differences Due to Participants' Academic Rank

Source of Contrast	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	47146.005	3	15715.335		
Within Groups	296976.100	110	2699.783	5.821	0.001
Total	344122.105	113			

Table 9 shows that the overall score has a T-value of (5.821) and a significance level of (0.001), which is less than the level of significance ( $\alpha \geq 0.05$ ). This indicates that there are statistically significant differences due to the academic rank between the average responses of the study sample in the level of organizational justice and organizational commitment on the part of the academics working in Palestinian universities, leading to the rejection of the premise pertaining to the academic rank.

Because this discrepancy could be between two of the four categories, the source of the ensuing disparity had to be determined. One of the numerous and varied Post Hoc tests was carried out. The Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was used to determine the source of the difference in the participants' responses based on the academic rank (job title) variable, as shown in Table 10.

**Table 10.** LSD Test Results

Academic A	Academic B	Mean Difference	Sig
Lecturer	Assistant Professor	-5.81982	0.615
	Associate Professor	-61.77220*	0.000
	Professor	7.18018	0.632
Assistant Professor	Lecturer	5.81982	0.615
	Associate Professor	-55.95238*	0.001
	Professor	13.00000	0.372
Associate Professor	Lecturer	61.77220*	0.000
	Assistant Professor	55.95238*	0.001
	Professor	68.95238*	0.000
Professor	Lecturer	-7.18018	0.632
	Assistant Professor	-13.00000	0.372
	Associate Professor	-68.95238*	0.000

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The LSD test results in Table 10 show that there are statistically significant differences between the average answers of the participating academics with the academic rank of lecturer and those with the academic rank of assistant professor or associate professor. In addition to these distinctions between members of the study sample with the position of associate professor and those with the rank of professor. Furthermore, the existence of differences in organizational commitment between those with the academic degree of professor and those with the academic degrees of lecturer, assistant professor, and associate professor in Palestinian universities is due to the academic rank variable, prompting researchers to reject the hypothesis.

**Table 11.** Results of One Way ANOVA Test for Significant Differences Due to Participants' Experience

Source of Contrast	Sum Of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	12237.962	2	5618.981		
Within Groups	224884.143	111	1926.884	3.286	0.97
Total	237122.1	113			

According to Table 11, the overall score has a T-value of (3.286) and a significance level of (0.097), both of which are greater than the level of significance ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). This suggests that there are no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample of academics working in Palestinian universities related to the variable of experience, prompting the hypothesis pertaining to the experience variable to be rejected.

**Table 12.** Results of One Way ANOVA Test for Significant Differences Due to Participants' Age

Source of Contrast	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	38417.972	2	19208.986		
Within Groups	305704.133	111		6.975	0.001
Total	344122.105	113	2754.091		

Table 12 shows that the overall score has a T-value of (6.975) and a significance level of (0.001), which is less than the level of significance ( $\alpha \geq 0.05$ ). This indicates that there are statistically significant differences due to the age variable between the average responses of the study sample in the level of organizational justice and organizational commitment on the part of the academics working in Palestinian universities, leading to the rejection of the hypothesis pertaining to the age variable.

Because this discrepancy could be between two of the three categories, the source of the ensuing disparity had to be determined. One of the numerous and varied Post Hoc tests was carried out. The Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was used to determine the source of the difference in the participants' responses based on the age variable, as shown in Table 13.

**Table 13.** The Least Significant Difference (LSD) Test was Used to Determine the Source of the Difference in the Participants' Responses Based on the Age Variable

Age A	Age B	Mean Difference	Sig
30 years and less	31- less than 45 years	54.47619*	0.007
	45 years and above	22.88372	0.260
31- less than 45 years	30 years and less	-54.47619*	0.007
	45 years and above	-31.59247*	0.003
45 years and above	30 years and less	-22.88372	0.260
	31- less than 45 years	31.59247*	0.003

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The findings in Table 13 reveal that there are statistically significant differences between the average responses of the participating academics aged (31- less than 45 years) and the average answers of the participating academics aged (30 years and less) and (45 years and above). There are disparities in the average responses of participating academics aged 45 and above and those of participating academics aged under 45. (30 years and less). These disparities represent evidence of statistically significant differences between the means of the sample responses at the significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ), prompting the hypothesis pertaining to the age variable to be rejected.

**Table 14.** T-Test Results Based on Participants' University Variable

Hypothesis	University	Repetition	Standard Deviation	Arithmetic Mean	DF	T	Sig
	Hebron	60	0.79	3.10	112	-1.594	0.191
	Jerusalem	54	0.64	3.35	111		

It is not statistically significant at the significance level (0.05).

Table 14 shows that the overall score has a T-value of (-1.594) and a significance level of (0.191). This finding supports the study hypothesis and indicates that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) due to the university variable between the average responses of the study sample in towards the level of organizational justice and organizational commitment on the part of academics working in Palestinian universities, allowing the hypothesis pertaining to the university variable to be accepted.

## CONCLUSION

This section contains the key findings of the study. The following are the conclusions:

- 1) Academics in Palestinian universities receive fair rewards compared to the work pressures they face. Academics receive equal opportunities for training and rehabilitation during their work at the university; the monthly salary is commensurate with the efforts they make; they receive a reward from the administration for any extra effort they perform with a moderate degree of the study population's responses.
- 2) Academics enjoy their leaves freely; officials delegate some of their powers to academics. The university administration evaluates academics with fairness and equality; the requirements and tasks of academics work commensurate with their scientific abilities, and to a large extent with the responses of the interviewees.
- 3) University administration encourages good relations between academics. Administration is keen to provide information of interest to academics without any exceptions. Academics are evaluated based on a clear evaluation model; the university administration is characterized by integrity and transparency in resolving disputes between academics, and to a large extent from the responses of the study community.
- 4) The results of the study show that the university administration understands the needs of academics and works to meet them; administrative decisions are applied to all academics without exception; the administration holds all academics responsible without exception and without discrimination with a moderate degree of responses from the study community.
- 5) The results of the study indicate that the academics at the university treat each other with affection and respect, and the administration treats them with respect and appreciation. The administration's behavior towards academics is positive and respects academics' opinions and suggestions. There is a mutual trust between academics at the university with significant responses from the study community.
- 6) The results of the study show that academics obtain their promotions without delay. The administration takes into account the personal considerations of academics when making career decisions and treats them with respect and interest when a decision is made with regard to their jobs, with a moderate degree of responses from the study community.
- 7) The results of the study show that academics are committed to their organizations. Academics obtain salaries that are commensurate with their qualifications and scientific abilities. The work climate is appropriate in general. There is health insurance for academics and their families. Academics' loyalty to the university will not change no matter what problems and obstacles they face and this may be due to their commitment to succeed under occupation. Academics participate in decision making in department or college meetings.
- 8) The results of the study indicate that some universities provide financial support to encourage publishing and scientific research. There is a social club or faculty common room in most universities. Good performance is critical for occupying administrative

positions; good performance is adopted as a criterion for renewing the employment contract at the university. All requirements for scientific research and development are available with a moderate degree of responses from the study community.

- 9) The results of the study show that academics in some universities do not receive any financial rewards from the university other than the monthly salary.
- 10) The results of the study show that there are no statistically significant differences between organizational justice in its three dimensions: distributive, procedural and interactive. Job commitment among academics in Palestinian universities is due to the study variables of gender, experience, and university.
- 11) The results of the study indicate that there are statistically significant differences between organizational justices in its three dimensions: distributive, procedural, interactive. Job commitment among academics in Palestinian universities is due to the variables of academic rank and age.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings, the researchers present the following recommendations:

- 1) Organizational justice in its three dimensions (distributive, procedural, interactive) will inevitably lead to academics commitments if it is implemented transparently and impartially. In order for this to be achieved, academics must receive fair rewards and remunerative salaries that are commensurate with the work pressures they face in Palestinian universities.
- 2) University administrations need to understand academics' needs in order to perform their tasks. Administrative decisions must be applied to all academics without exception.
- 3) Academic promotions are important for faculty members in order to improve their performance and living conditions. Therefore, the university administration should work to promote those who deserve academic promotion without delay or procrastination.
- 4) Universities need to deal with academics with care due to its importance to job performance. Therefore, it is recommended that the university administration should take into account personal considerations when making administrative decisions against academics and treat them with respect and appreciation.
- 5) Scientific research is one of the most important features of universities and their classification locally and globally. Therefore, the university administration needs to provide academics with all means of material and moral incentives to encourage them to publish scientific research in prestigious scientific journals.
- 6) The interest of universities in community service is one of the major priorities. It is recommended that university administrations maintain social and cultural clubs for faculty members and their families taking into account that universities have swimming pools and common rooms for faculty members and families, though swimming pools are managed by the private sector with clear policies and monitoring from universities.
- 7) Performance evaluation is one of the necessary means for monitoring and motivation of academics. Therefore, university administration must set clear scientific criteria for evaluating the performance of academics with integrity and transparency.
- 8) Universities maintain proper equipments like computers, internet, printers, etc. that are necessary for carrying out research and accessing electronic libraries.
- 9) Effective administrative policies and proper academic supervision are necessary for the implementation of university plans and programs fairly. Therefore, the study recommends activating the role of academics' oversight on academic performance in

Palestinian universities, including enhancing the role of Palestinian Ministry of Higher Education in monitoring academic programs, performance and advancement of their various programs so as to meet Palestinian society's need of conscious and educated scientific cadres.

- 10) The positive interventions of senior management and boards of trustees in universities have a great impact on motivating and guiding academics. Therefore, the study recommends activating and strengthening management role of university administration away from negative interventions. Such intervention, if implemented impartially, would improve academics' performance, encourage creativity, innovation, and enhance knowledge of academics.

## REFERENCES

- Abdel Karim, Sugar. (2013). The Impact of Interactive Justice on Job Performance: A Exploratory Study of the Opinions of Managers in Jordanian Ministries. *Journal of Administrative Sciences Studies*, Vol. 40, Vol. 2.
- Abu Tayeh, Bandar Karim. (2012). The Impact of Organizational Justice on the Behavior of Organizational Citizenship in Governmental Ministries Centers in Jordan, *Journal of the Islamic University of Economic and Administrative Studies*: Vol (20),No (2).
- Al-Aboud, Amer. (2020). The concept of job satisfaction and the factors affecting it, <https://www.hellooha.com/articles/3116>
- Bies, R.J. and Moag, J.F. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness. In: Lewicki, R.J., Sheppard, B.H. and Bazerman, M.H., Eds., *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, Vol. 1, JAI Press, Greenwich, 43-55.
- Cristian Castillo, Vicenc Fernandez. (2016). Relationships between the dimensions of organizational justice and students' satisfaction in university contexts, *Intangible Capital, IC*, 2017 – 13(2): 282-301.
- Darawsheh, Najwa (2017). Organizational justice prevailing in Jordanian universities and its relationship to organizational trust from the point of view of faculty members, *The Jordanian Journal of Educational Sciences*, Vol 13, No. 3.
- Geidel, Somaya (2014). Organizational justice and its relationship to organizational commitment. Master's Thesis, University of Mohamed Khider Biskra, Algeria.
- Gouda, Mahfouz Ahmed (2010). *Human Resources Management*, first edition: Dar Wael for Publishing and Distribution, Amman.
- Greenberg, J. (2005). Using explanations to manage impressions of performance appraisal fairness. *Journal of Employee Responsibilities and Rights*, 4(1), 51 – 60.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2013). *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Griffin, R. W., & Gregory, M. (2014). *Organizational Behavior Managing People and Organizations* (11th ed.). CENGAGE learning.
- Jeanne, I. r., & al. (2012). Interactional justice and social counterproductive work behaviors: the mediating role of negative emotions. *social behavior and personality*, 40(8), pp1341-1356.
- Kharmoush, Murad Ramzy. (2014). The role of organizational justice in the occupational mobility of workers from the private industrial sector towards the public sector. A field study in the state of Setif, Master's thesis, Mohamed Khider University, Biskra.
- Maghribi, Abdelhamid. (2007). *Behavioral and organizational skills for human resource development*, Cairo, Al-Asriya Library.

- Scott, B. A., & al. (2007). Justice as a Dependent Variable: Subordinate Charisma as a Predictor of Interpersonal and Informational Justice Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), pp1597-1609.
- Tayyaba, A., & al. (2017). The effect of organizational justice on knowledge sharing: Empirical evidence from the Chinese telecommunications sector. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*(2), pp134-145.
- Timalsina, R. , Sarala K.C. Nilam R. Anita, C. (2018). Predictors of organizational commitment among university nursing Faculty of Kathmandu Valley, Nepal, <https://bmcnurs.biomedcentral.com/articles>
- Wei, H., & al, e. (2016). Interactional justice, leader–member exchange, and employee performance: Examining the moderating role of justice differentiation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.