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Abstract: This study aimed to measure the reality of the determinants of organizational justice from the point of view of the police officers in Gaza Strip, and this study comes to study the reality of human resources and their organizational behavior in the police apparatus, which is the largest security services operating in Gaza Strip, so it is expected that this study will contribute to upgrading In this aspect, to be reflected positively on serving the country and the citizen and achieving security and safety for them. The study relied on the descriptive and analytical approach, using the questionnaire, and targeting a stratified random sample of (400) officers, who hold the rank of captain and above, from the study population of 1550 officers, and the study tool was distributed to the sample members in all departments and governorates Police in Gaza Strip. (353) questionnaires were retrieved, with a recovery rate of (88.3%), and they were analyzed using (SPSS) software. The study found the existence of organizational justice in general in a medium degree and the order of its determinants was as follows: fairness of transactions and to a large degree, followed by fairness of procedures and a medium degree, and finally the fairness of distribution was to a small degree (Type of management, age group, job title, military rank, years of service). The study recommended working on observing the fairness of distribution by providing adequate and fair salaries, granting bonuses for the extra efforts exerted, budgeting in the distribution of duties and job burdens, and creating an organizational climate in which a sense of justice prevails, because of its prominent role in stability, calm and discipline at work, and thus the elevation of the institution Policing and achieving its desired goals.
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Introduction

In recent times, the world has witnessed progress and development in areas of life with all its components and details, and there has recently emerged a remarkable interest in the field of administration and its development among politicians and decision-makers, considering that administrative development has become part of the renaissance of peoples and countries, in light of the decrease and scarcity of resources, and an awareness of the role of institutions and organizations in shaping the dimensions of revival and development in societies; It was imperative to manage institutions and organizations effectively and efficiently in order to achieve the optimum utilization of available resources.

The interest in the behavior of individuals has emerged in organizations considering that motivating and developing them in a stable work environment is the basis for the success of organizations in achieving their desired goals, so it is not surprising that we find a small country like Japan that was able to rise from the war and the disasters that afflicted it in a short time thanks to their interest in behavior that motivates the individual within the organization.

Many studies and research have dealt with the behavior of individuals within organizations as an important level in the science of organizational behavior. Hence, organizational justice is an important theory in the study of individual behavior in the organization due to its implications on the level of individual satisfaction of the needs and expectations that he aspires to, as well as being a dimension. Important for the individual's motivation towards achievement and his feeling of satisfaction and stability, and in the end we can say that organizational justice affects the individual's orientation towards achieving the goals of the organization.

Organizational justice as a concept depends mainly on the social aspect or what is known as social comparison, where the individual compares what happens to him in the organization with others from his colleagues and the roots of organizational justice go back to (Adams, 1965) with equality, and what is meant here is distribution fairness in terms of the individual comparing his inputs from (Work and experiences) he performs with what he will obtain from the outputs (wages, bonuses and privileges) compared to other colleagues. The work generates a feeling of indifference in the absence of distribution justice, and in addition to the distribution justice dimension, there is another dimension to the concept of organizational justice and its source is the science of law, as justice here is procedural and has two parts, the first part is procedural and structural, which means the individual's sense of fairness in structuring decisions and impartiality in determining policies The reward and the other side includes fairness of treatment when these procedures and laws are applied, and thus the determinants of organizational justice can be summarized in three determinants (fairness in distribution, fairness of remuneration). No-deal and fairness (Gernberg and Barron, 2004: 177).

Hence, this study came to shed light on determinants of organizational justice from the point of view of officers in the police apparatus in Gaza Strip.
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The study population was chosen on the understanding that the police apparatus and the various security departments it contains have an important and vital role in providing various services and dealing with different segments of the public, and it is also entrusted with security tasks that affect the stability and safety of society from external dangers and threats, despite the abundance of Various studies and research in the field of organizational citizenship, but studies are still limited, especially in the security sector, as far as researchers know.

Problem Statement
The human element represents one of the tributaries of the success of organizations and institutions in achieving their goals, and in light of the decline in the level of justice within organizations due to bias and lack of objectivity and with the variation of procedures and standards followed against the various human energies in general, organizational justice has become a requirement for individuals in particular and organizations in general to ensure stability in an environment Work and create the optimal organizational climate to achieve the goals of the organization, and in order to ensure positive behavior that is reflected thanks to the sense of justice in its three forms, in terms of fair distribution compared to colleagues, fair procedures, decisions and privileges, and fair treatment that the employee receives from his managers (Al-Asmari, 2013). Based on the foregoing, the study is organized into several questions, and two main questions arise in them:

Q1: What is the reality of the determinants of organizational justice from the point of view of the officers in Palestinian police force?
Q2: Are there significant differences in the views of officers in the police apparatus in Gaza Strip towards determinants of organizational justice due to personal variables (Type of Administration, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Workplace (Governorate), Age Group, Job Title, Military Rank, Years of Service)?

Research hypothesis
In order to provide an appropriate answer to the scholarly questions raised, the study seeks to test the validity of the following hypotheses:

H0: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses to the determinants of organizational justice due to personal variables (management, marital status, educational qualification, workplace (governorate), age group, job title, military rank, years the service).

And branched from the main hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses:

H0_{1.1}: There are statistically significant differences at (α ≤0.05) level of significance between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice, attributable to management.
H0_{1.2}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the marital status.
H0_{1.3}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to scientific qualification.
H0_{1.4}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the workplace (governorate).
H0_{1.5}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the age group.
H0_{1.6}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of (α ≤0.05) of significance between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the job title.
H0_{1.7}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice, attributable to the military rank.
H0_{1.8}: There are statistically significant differences at the level of (α ≤0.05) of significance between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice due to years of service.

Research Objectives
The objectives of the study are as follows:
1. Identifying the level of awareness of organizational justice with its determinants (distribution fairness, fairness of procedures, and fairness of dealings) from the point of view of officers in the police apparatus in Gaza Strip.
2. Study and analyze the differences in the responses of officers in the police apparatus in Gaza Strip towards the determinants of organizational justice according to the diversity of the personal data of each officer in terms of: (Type of Administration, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Workplace (Governorate), Age Group, Job Title, Military Rank, Years of Service).

Research Importance
The importance of the study is shown by the benefits that will accrue to:
1. This study is expected to contribute to improving the level of performance and work of the security services in general and specifically the police, as it is the largest security apparatus in it, and because of its prominent role in protecting the home front and is responsible for daily contact with a large number of citizens in their daily dealings, as this study It will carry with
it the weaknesses and defects of the police force in particular and the security agencies in general, as well as the fact that the study opens horizons for security leaders and decision-makers to formulate policies and procedures that create a positive atmosphere in the administrative work environment, which will have a clear impact on the advancement and elevation of security work.

2. The Palestinian community is clearly and significantly affected by the policies of the security services, especially the police. Because it is the basis for creating an atmosphere of security and internal stability for the country, hence the positive impact through the high performance of the work of the security services will in turn be reflected in the local community in terms of meeting the desired good service.

3. This study is considered the only one that deals with organizational justice in security institutions - as far as researchers know-as it opens the door for researchers and those interested to delve into the reality of behavioral and administrative studies within security institutions and organizations.

Research Limits and Scope
The scope of the study shall be as follows:
1. Objective Limits: The study focused on The Reality of Determinants of Organizational Justice in Palestinian Police Force.
2. Human Limits: The study was conducted on Palestinian police officers.
3. Spatial Limits: The study was conducted in Gaza Strip, State of Palestine.
4. Temporal Limits: The study was conducted in (2020).

Literature Review
- Study of (Arqawi et al., 2018) aimed to identify the interactive justice and its impact on the organizational loyalty of the Faculty Staff in the Technical University of Palestine-(Kadoorei). In order to achieve this, the researchers used a questionnaire consisting of (22) paragraphs where the first area (10) paragraphs looking at interactive justice, while the second area (12) in the area of organizational loyalty to the Faculty Staff at the university, where it was distributed to (105) individuals from the study sample, and after the process of distribution of the questionnaire was collected and coded and entered into the computer and processed statistically using the statistical program of social sciences. The results of the study indicated that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) between the interactive justice at the Technical University of Palestine (Kadoorei) at the level of organizational loyalty among the teaching staff of the university. In light of the results of the previous study, the researchers recommended several recommendations, namely, the need for the university to pay attention to the level of interactive justice at department heads and to show more democracy in the decision-making mechanisms of Faculty Staff.
- Study of (Arqawi et al., 2018) aimed to identify the effect of procedural justice on organizational loyalty from the point of view of Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei. It also aimed to identify the differences in the views of the study sample on the study variables according to the years of service. In order to achieve this, the researchers used a questionnaire consisting of (22) paragraphs where the first area (10) paragraphs looking at procedural justice while the paragraphs of the second area and the number of (12) paragraph in the field of organizational allegiance to Faculty Staff at the university, (105) questionnaires were distributed on the sample of the study, and after the process of distribution of the questionnaire was collected and coded and entered into the computer and processed statistically using the statistical program of social sciences (SPSS). One of the most important findings of the study was that the degree of procedural justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei, from the point of view of Faculty Staff was between the medium and large, where the average arithmetic (3.65). Respondents also showed a high level of organizational loyalty (3.84). The study also showed a statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) for procedural fairness in achieving organizational loyalty, and the absence of differences attributed to years of experience. In the light of the results of the previous study, the researchers recommended several recommendations, the most important of which is to increase the awareness of the employees on the principles of procedural justice, to encourage adherence to them and to indicate their importance in job performance by creating systems and methods that ensure commitment to justice by raising the ability of leaders to build new policies and visions Which would promote the work of institutions.
- Study of (Arqawi et al., 2018) aimed to identify the dimensions of the interactive justice and procedural justice of the heads of departments and their relation to organizational loyalty in Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei. It also aimed at identifying some variables of the study such as gender, academic qualification, work place, years of experience, and career level. In order to achieve this, the researchers used a questionnaire consisting of three fields and 32 paragraphs. The first field includes 10 paragraphs related to interactive justice, while the second field includes 10 paragraphs related to procedural justice, while the paragraphs of the third field contains (12) paragraph related to organizational loyalty of the Faculty Staff at the university which was distributed to (105) members of the sample of the study, and after the process of distribution of the questionnaire was collected and coded and entered into the computer and processed statistically using the statistical program of social sciences SPSS. The results of the study indicated that there was a high degree of response in the three fields. It also indicated that there was a statistically significant effect at the level of (α = 0.05) between the procedural and interactive justice
of the department heads at Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of (α = 0.05) between the responses of the respondents to the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and organizational loyalty at the faculty of Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei attributed to the variable years of experience.

- Study of (Gim, et al., 2014) aimed at analyzing the effect of distribution justice and procedural justice as two independent variables on the intentions to leave work (work rotation) through emotional commitment as a mediating variable. From work-leaving behavior, a total of (226) respondents participated in all parts of Malaysia. The results showed that distribution fairness and procedures have an influential and clear relationship with emotional commitment as a mediating variable, and therefore there is an influential relationship to the rate of leaving work by emotional commitment, and the results also showed that the type of sector in which the employee works does not affect the mediation of the relationship between emotional commitment and rates of leaving work. In light of these results, the researchers recommended fair compensation and bonuses, and attention to fair distribution and procedures, as they have a clear effect on reducing job abandonment rates.

- Study of (Al-Shehri, 2014) aimed at identifying the level of organizational justice and its dimensions (distribution fairness, procedures, transactions, evaluation and ethics), and the level of achievement motivation among secondary school teachers in Jeddah, and aimed to reveal the correlative relationship between the degree of application of organizational justice and motivation. Achievement, where the questionnaire was used as a study tool, and the questionnaires were distributed to a randomly available sample consisting of (580) teachers from the study population consisting of all secondary school teachers in Jeddah, who numbered (3732) teachers. The most important results indicated that the degree of achievement of organizational justice was (high) for the tool as a whole, where the field (moral justice) ranked first, then the field (transactional justice) ranked second, and the field (evaluative justice) ranked third, with a grade of (medium). The field (procedural justice) came in fourth place, with a rating (medium), and the field (distribution justice) came in fourth place with a rating (medium). Achievement motivation. The study recommended the following: Work on the continuity of achieving organizational justice, and improving administrative practices by school principals to achieve corrective justice.

- Study of (Al-Sukkar, 2012) aimed to analyze the effect of distributive justice rules on increasing organizational loyalty according to the opinions of managers working in Jordanian ministries, using the descriptive analytical approach. Which amounted to (172) individuals representing the population of the study, and then the study questions were answered and their hypotheses tested, and the study reached several results, the most important of which are the following: The opinions of the respondents towards the rules of distributive justice were moderate, as the arithmetic average showed (2.982), The quality rule came at a medium level (3.318), then the equality rule at a medium level (3.155), and the need rule at a low level (2.473). The study recommended, in light of the above results, the need to pay attention to behavioral and ethical studies and to promote positive aspects and maximize them among managers to improve the level of distributive justice, and enhance Organizational loyalty in Jordanian ministries.

- Study of (Abu Tayeh, 2012) aimed to analyze the impact of employees' sense of organizational justice on the behavior of organizational citizenship in government ministries centers in Jordan, and the study assumed that there is a positive effect between organizational justice represented in its following dimensions, fairness of distribution, fairness of procedures and fairness of dealings on organizational citizenship behavior and its following dimensions Altruism, civility, mathematical spirit, civilized behavior and awareness of conscience. The questionnaire was used to collect study data and achieve its objectives and hypotheses. The results obtained from (326) respondents from employees in Jordanian ministries ’centers showed that employees’ sense of organizational justice in all its dimensions was above average, while the results showed an increase in organizational citizenship behavior in all its dimensions among the study sample. The results of the study showed that there is a positive effect of employees’ perception of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior and all its dimensions. The results also showed that employees’ sense of procedural justice has the largest role in influencing organizational citizenship behavior compared Along with other dimensions of organizational justice (distributive fairness, equity Transactions), and based on these results, the study recommended strengthening the values of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Jordanian government ministries.

- Study of (Al-Atwi, 2011) aimed to test the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice (distributional, procedural and transactional) and deviant work behavior through the mediating role of the organizational integration variable, and through data collected from a sample of employees in Al-Muthanna Cement Factory that included (108) Individual researchers tested the research hypotheses, which revolve around direct and indirect influence relationships between the research variables, and the results of the research proved the validity of most of the hypotheses, as the level of organizational justice in its three dimensions was unsatisfactory and the psychological link between the organization and its employees was low, and perhaps the most important reasons for this, according to the researchers The level of employees’ perception of organizational justice, and in light of these results, researchers see that the integration of employees in their organizations is not only an important factor in increasing positive volunteer work behavior, but also has an important role in reducing deviant work behavior, and accordingly he recommended a set of recommendations that benefit the reality of organizational work.
Study of (Asgari, Nojabaee, & Arjmand, 2011) aimed to identify the relationship of organizational justice with its dimensions (procedural, distributive, interactive, and informational) and its impact on the organizational citizenship behavior of employees at Islamic Azad University, Chalus Branch, in Iran. The study used the questionnaire to test the established hypotheses to be analyzed by the necessary statistical methods, and the sample consisted of (127) employees out of (190) employees who are the population of the study, and the results indicated that there is a statistically significant relationship between procedural justice, information justice, and citizenship behavior for employees as for distributive justice and justice. Interactivity There is no significant relationship between it and citizenship behavior, as the study indicates that distributive and interactive justice is obtained with the least weight from the viewpoint of the participants in the questionnaire, and the study concluded with a set of recommendations that contribute to supporting procedural justice by involving subordinates in decision-making and carrying out courses and activities to promote behavior Organizational Citizenship The researchers also suggested creating a clear information system that contributes to procedural justice.

Study of (Abu Jasser, 2010) aimed to identify the effect of organizational justice on the contextual performance dimensions of organizational loyalty and organizational citizenship among employees in the ministries of the Palestinian Authority. This study was applied to a stratified random sample of the study population of (1554) employees from Employees at the headquarters of all ministries operating in Gaza Strip, and the sample size was (311) employees of all grades and titles, and the researchers used the questionnaire to measure the study variables, and the most important results of the study were the presence of organizational justice and organizational commitment to a medium degree while the organizational citizenship behavior was high, in addition to the existence of a relationship Statistically significant between employees' perception of organizational justice and organizational commitment, and the study recommended the need to develop employees' awareness of organizational justice, reconsider the civil service law with regard to the financial aspect, and involve employees in making decisions affecting their work, and it also called for officials' interest in motivating employees and developing the relationship Character with them.

Study of (Shaban, 2010) aimed at knowing the role of organizational justice in achieving distinguished university performance among a sample of the teaching staff in the College of Administration and Economics at the University of Kufa, through a tool that includes paragraphs representing organizational justice variables (independent variables) distributed in three areas (distributive justice), Fairness of procedures, and fairness of interactions), in addition to 16 paragraphs representing the variables of distinguished university performance (dependent variables) distributed into four areas: (reducing costs and increasing profits, improving quality, scientific research, community service) and the sample consisted of (43) members of The teaching staff at the College of Administration and Economics at the University of Kufa, and the results showed that all members of the research sample agree on the importance of organizational justice in achieving distinguished university performance.

Study of (Al-Emian and Al-Saudi, 2009) aimed to identify the analysis of the impact of organizational justice in improving job performance among employees in Jordanian ministries, and to achieve the objectives of the study, a questionnaire was used, for the purpose of collecting data and distributing it to the individuals of the study sample, and a sample of Its net number is (742) single, and the study reached a set of results, the most prominent of which were: Employees' perceptions of organizational justice dimensions came in a moderate degree, and their perceptions of the level of job performance came in a high degree, and there is a significant effect of organizational justice dimensions on job performance in Employees in Jordanian ministries, and the study reached a set of recommendations, the most important of which are: The need for ministries to adopt many concepts that reflect the dimensions of organizational justice, which is reflected as a behavior in identifying the performance levels of their employees, by spreading the concepts of transparency and right and linking it to the duty, and reconsidering the methods of evaluating performance and moving away from stereotypes and red tape, which positively affects the best performance in the organizations in which they work. The study also recommended fairness in decision-making involving employees in that.

Theoretical Framework
First- Organizational Justice
Contemporary management scholars considered that organizational justice is an advantage for active and high-end organizations (Al-Asmari, 2013). If the individual sees himself being rewarded with less or more than he deserves, then he tries to do something about this sense of injustice, such as changing the inputs or the level of work performance (Tawfiq) Thus, the injustice resulting from the increase in the rate of returns compared to others results in feelings of reprimand and guilt, and vice versa, which makes him feel unjust and unfair (Al-Qaisi, 2010: 34). The interest in organizational justice is due to several reasons and trends, and among the most prominent of these reasons: the need to abandon the destructive organizational policy based on bureaucracy and feelings of injustice and threats to the right of employees, and this is consistent with the modern trend to define the features of the contemporary active organization based on adopting ethical policies and providing organizational support in a way that reflects continuity. And the achievement of the long-term goals of the individual and the organization (Mustafa, 2008). Also stems from concern for organizational justice to legalize or prevent anti-social and unwanted behaviors that may result mainly from the absence of a sense of justice within the organization.
Based on the above, this is organized. The study includes several elements that include the definition of the concept of organizational justice and the basis and emergence of the theory of justice in organizations, highlighting the importance of justice, starting in our true Islamic religion, as well as its necessity in contemporary active organizations with exposure to organizational justice dimensions and their effects as follows: The concept of fairness was used in the early indications of research in the organizational field, by describing the role of integrity and fairness in different work environments and the ways in which employees define their transactions in an objective manner free of bias (Al-Shehri, 2014).

Justice Theory: This theory relates, according to (Al-Qaryouti, 2000: 49) between the degree of motivation of the individual and his feeling of the unfairness of the incentive system used in the institution or organization in which he works. "In general, the theory sees that people are affected in their behavior by the relative rewards they receive or expect. (Abbas, 2004), where the individual measures the degree of justice by comparing the efforts he exerts (inputs) in his work to the returns (outputs) he gets with his counterparts at work under the same conditions (Al-Emian, 2004). The evaluation includes measuring inputs such as (merit, level of education, skills, effort exerted, etc.) and outputs such as (financial returns, promotions, appreciation, respect, etc.). As for behavior, it is the outcome of the individual's perception of the relationship between evaluation and comparison, when the person realizes that the situation is unfair. He seeks to correct it through certain behaviors at work (Al-Emian, 2004). According to the theory, if a person does not feel injustice, he will behave one of the following behaviors (Mahmoud, 2011):

1. Change work input (example: reduce the effort expended).
2. Demanding remuneration changes (example: an increase in pay).
3. Leave the position (ex: leave work).
4. Change comparison points (example: self-comparison with different workgroups).
5. Relative adjustment for comparison (example: justifying unfairness that it is temporary and will be resolved in the future).

Concept and Definition of Organizational Justice:
The organizational procedure that an individual views as a fair procedure may be biased or subjective in the view of others, as it is determined in the light of what the individual perceives in terms of objectivity and integrity in the procedures and outputs (Shaban, 2010) and defines them (Al-Bashabasha, 2008: 429): As "the degree of achieving equality and integrity in rights and duties that expresses the individual's relationship with the organization, and the idea of justice embodies the principle of fulfilling the obligations of employees towards the organization in which they work."
The researchers believe that organizational justice is the employee's perception of fairness and integrity at the level of return and in all organizational aspects and administrative procedures followed within organizations of different nature, whether service or industrial.

Dimensions of Organizational Justice:
The first precursors to the concept of organizational justice focused on the axis of distributive justice, or what was included in the theory of justice in terms of a distributional comparison of the inputs with the outputs with work colleagues, then the focus began on the justice process itself regardless of the outputs granted, that is, the focus on making decisions and actions taken towards individuals. According to the perception of justice based on individuals (Hawass, 2003). (Abu Tayeh, 2012) believes that the employee evaluates the fairness of any procedure or decision in the organization according to the principles of (balance and correction), and balance is done by evaluating the outputs related to the employees compared to the value of the inputs in the organization. As for the correction, it indicates the quality of the decisions or procedures that Makes it look fair and appropriate.

Accordingly, organizational justice includes the procedural dimension as well as the distributional dimension. According to (Gim, Desa, & Mat, 2014), there is a shortage in the number of studies that dealt with the dimensions of organizational justice. Some of them make it three dimensions (distribution fairness, fairness of procedures, and fairness of dealings) and some of them counting them. There are four (fairness of distribution, fairness of procedures, fairness of dealings) in addition to fairness of information), but according to (Usmani, & Jamal, 2013), the main dimensions of organizational fairness are (fairness of distribution, fairness of procedures, fairness of dealings), but the third dimension, which is fairness of dealings, includes (fairness of interactions and dealings).

The researchers believe that the previous three dimensions are the basis for organizational justice, and that any other dimensions are nothing more than related to the three dimensions, so this study will focus on the following dimensions (fairness of distribution, fairness of procedures, and fairness of transactions):

1. Distribution Justice: Distribution justice means the fairness of the outputs that the employee obtains from the organization (Al-Sukkar, 2012), and thus it indicates the employees' sense of fair distribution of organizational outputs, and one of the most important things that individuals focus on in their job outputs is to compare those outputs with the output Their peers in the same organization or outside it in similar organizations (Abu Tayeh, 2012), and the outputs are only tangible (wages and material incentives) and intangible such as (promotion opportunities, number of working hours, and job duties and burdens) (Ince, & Gül, 2011).

From the above, we can conclude that distributive justice is a relative concept that varies according to a person's sensitivity to justice in light of the tangible resources he obtains such as (wages and material rewards) or intangible (such as promotions and
work and returns. This includes the involvement of others in the decision-making process and the motivation in this behavior is the comparison or analogy with others.

2. **Fairness of Procedures**: Justice is achieved when employees take their opportunity to participate and make decisions related to determining outcomes and returns (Usmani & Jamal, 2013). (Wadi, 2007) believes that the fairness of procedures is achieved when the employee has the opportunity to discuss the foundations and rules on the basis of which his performance will be evaluated.

The researchers believe that the fairness of procedures is a reflection of employees' awareness of the fairness of procedures and the structuring of decisions related to the distribution of outputs and returns. This includes the involvement of employees in respect and appreciation of their humanity, and to ensure impartiality, accuracy and realism in the measures taken against them.

3. **Transaction Justice**: Transactional justice is the third dimension of organizational justice, and according to (Usmani & Jamal, 2013), and (Al-Shehri, 2014), Bies and Moag (1986) was the first to refer to this dimension. Close to the procedural fairness dimension, where the fairness of transactions is linked to the quality of the transaction received from the decision-maker and reflects the correct application of official procedures. (Gernberg and Barron, 2004: 177) defined it as "the fairness of treatment that an employee receives when implementing official procedures or interpreting these procedures.

The researchers believe that transactional justice expresses the sense of justice generated by the employee as a human being by dealing with him with dignity and respect and opening horizons for interaction with him by allowing him to express his opinion on the decisions and procedures issued against him, and this includes presenting logical and realistic justifications about the reasons for these procedures in an objective and complete impartiality.

**Relationship between Dimensions of Organizational Justice:**

The organization may be fair in distributing the outputs, but it is not objective in the treatment and procedures, which spoils its efforts and wastes them on one side at the expense of another, and this is confirmed by (Al-Asmari, 2013: 25), through his study that "reached a direct correlation relationship. Strong between organizational justice dimensions with each other and with the overall concept of organizational justice.

Based on the foregoing, researchers see that organizational justice is an integrated and multifaceted concept in terms of different dimensions, and it is based primarily on human behavior and social behavior within the organization. The moral (respect, appreciation, good treatment and feeling), and therefore there is a disparity in the perception of organizational justice among employees, but this disparity does not mean that a person as a social being neglects one side at the expense of another, as the human needs do not stop and do not end between feelings and material and moral needs with the difference in views And the different work environments, and this strengthens the statement of the interconnectedness between the desired organizational justice dimensions and components.

**Importance of Organizational Justice:**

The concept of organizational justice has received the attention of researchers in the field of organizational behavior due to the importance of organizational justice and its relationship to the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. Organizational justice can be perceived through the following indicators, as indicated by (Al-Asmari, 2013), which indicate its importance from several different angles:

1. Organizational justice illustrates the fact that the distributional system of salaries and wages in the organization is related to the concept of distribution justice.
2. Organizational justice leads to achieving effective control and empowerment in the decision-making process. The fairness of procedures is an important dimension in this aspect.
3. Organizational justice is reflected in behavior on cases of satisfaction with heads and decision systems issued, and on organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment.
4. Organizational justice sheds light to reveal the organizational atmosphere and the organizational climate prevailing in the organization, and here the role of justice in transactions emerges.
5. Organizational justice leads to determining the quality of the monitoring, control and evaluation system and the ability to activate the roles of feedback in a way that ensures the quality of the sustainability of organizational processes and achievements of the members of the organization.
6. Organizational justice highlights the system of moral, social and religious values of individuals and determines the methods of interaction and moral maturity of the members of the organization in how they perceive and their perceptions of comprehensive justice in the organization.
7. Organizational justice affects the spirit of the team and the group, and this would affect the motivations of the individual worker to increase the rewards and returns of the group and not the individual, as fair procedures and dealings are a means of spreading the spirit of the group, because fair procedures and fair treatment send a message to the individual that the group appreciates Everyone in it.
8. Organizational justice is an effective administrative tool that organizations that want to shift from focusing on production to the concept of focusing on knowledge that is based on innovation, creation and sharing of ideas, as justice provides the
opportunity to build bridges of trust and openness between employees on the one hand and higher management on the other hand.
9. Organizational justice is an important indicator for management about strengthening the job security of employees in organizations.
10. The concern for organizational justice is due to the importance and growing need to abandon destructive organizational policies based on bureaucracy and feelings of threat against employees in developed organizations.
11. Organizational justice contributes to reducing and reducing the behavior of idleness, deviation and hostility towards society and organizations as a result of the absence of justice.

**Second: Palestinian Police:** It is a civil regulatory body specially trained to preserve the safety of people, implement regulations and implement state orders and instructions without prejudice to people's money, honor and personal freedoms except within the limits of the law. The organization for all its affairs and systems of work (Palestinian Police Handbook. 2011).

**The Reality of the Palestinian Police Force in Gaza Strip:**
The police force in Gaza Strip faces significant challenges and difficulties that are not hidden from anyone, and despite these difficulties, the police were able to achieve great achievements, both internally in developing performance and providing various services to citizens, or at the external level by facing external threats of attacks. The repeated Israeli bombing of police sites and stations and their infrastructure and the unjust siege on Gaza Strip (Police Organization and Administration, 2014).

Military ranks in the police force: The police force, according to Articles (6) and (138) of the Palestinian Security Forces Law No. (8) Of 2005, consists of the following categories (Al Waqi’a Palestinian Magazine, 2005):

A. **Officers:** their ranks are arranged in descending order as follows: (major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, lieutenant colonel, lieutenant).

B. **Assistants of Police Officers:** Their ranks are arranged in descending order as follows: (First Assistant, Assistant).

C. **Non-Commissioned Officers and Individuals:** their ranks are arranged in descending order as follows (first sergeant, sergeant, corporal, and policeman).

**Methodology and Procedures:**
**Study Methodology:** In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers used the descriptive and analytical method through which they attempt to describe the phenomenon under study, analyze its data, and the relationship between its components, opinions raised about it, the processes it includes and the effects that it produces.

**The Researchers Used Two Primary Sources Of Information:**
1. **Secondary Sources:** Researchers have tended to address the theoretical framework of the study to secondary data sources, which are the relevant Arabic and foreign books and references, periodicals, articles and reports, and previous research and studies that dealt with the subject of study, and research and reading on various Internet sites.
2. **Primary Sources:** To address the analytical aspects of the subject of the study, the researchers resorted to collecting primary data through a questionnaire as a main tool for the study, designed specifically for this purpose.

**Study Population:** It consists of officers of the police force in Gaza Strip of the rank of captain and above, whose number is 1550 officers, according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Captain</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Colonel</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Major General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Number</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Police Service, unpublished documents, 2020

**Study Sample:** The researchers used the stratified random sampling method, where 30 questionnaires were distributed as a survey sample to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, and they were excluded from the final analysis, after which 400 questionnaires were distributed by 25.8% of the study population, and 353 questionnaires were retrieved at 88.3. %, and appropriate sample size is at least 308.

**Study Tool:** A questionnaire was prepared on "determinants of organizational justice from the viewpoint of the police officer in Gaza Strip."

**The Study Questionnaire Consists Of Two Main Parts:**
**The First Section:** It is the personal and organizational data about the respondent (administration, marital status, educational qualification, workplace (governorate), age group, job title, military rank, and years of service).

**The Second Section:** It is about organizational justice, and it consists of 24 items. The scale developed by Niehoff, & Moorman, 1993 has been relied on, distributed into 3 areas:

**The First Field:** distribution justice, and it consists of (9) paragraphs.

**The Second Field:** fairness of procedures, and it consists of (8) paragraphs.

**The Third Field:** fairness of dealings, and it consists of (7) paragraphs.

The five-dimensional Likert scale was used to measure the respondents' responses to the questionnaire items according to the following table:
Table 2: The degrees of the five-point Likert scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Very Few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researchers chose the degree (1) for the response or approval with a degree of "very little", so the relative weight in this case is 20%, which is commensurate with this response.

Validity of The Questionnaire: The validity of the questionnaire was verified in two ways:

1. Honesty from the Viewpoint of the Arbitrators, "Virtual Honesty": The questionnaire was presented to a group of arbitrators, and the researchers responded to the opinions of the arbitrators and made the necessary deletion and amendment in light of the proposals submitted. Thus, the questionnaire came out in its final form.

2. Validate scale:

First: Internal Validity: The internal consistency sincerely means the extent to which each paragraph of the questionnaire is consistent with the area to which this paragraph belongs, and the researchers calculated the internal consistency of the questionnaire by calculating the correlation coefficients between each paragraph of the areas of the questionnaire and the total degree of the same field.

Internal Consistency of the "Organizational Justice" Domains

The following table shows the correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field of "fairness of distribution" and the total degree of the field, which shows that the correlation coefficients shown are a function of a significant level (α ≤0.05), and thus the field is considered true to what was set to measure it.

Table 3: the correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field "distribution justice" and the degree for the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The monthly salary is commensurate with the efforts I put into my work</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>*0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a fair reward for the extra efforts I put in</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job burdens and duties are distributed fairly among the employees</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>*0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The demands and tasks of the work match my own capabilities</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>*0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The monthly salary is proportional to the educational qualification and the courses you have taken</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monthly salary is proportional to work experience</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary matches those of similar effort colleagues</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Law on Service in the Palestinian Security Forces provides appropriate incentives</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There is fairness in the salary scale according to the military ranks</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05).

The following table shows the correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field of "justice of procedures" and the total degree of the field, which shows that the correlation coefficients shown are a function of a significant level (α ≤0.05) and thus the field is considered true to what was set to measure it.

Table 4: The correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field "justice of procedures" and the total score of the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management decisions are applied to everyone without exception.</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decisions are made for employees after adequate information is gathered</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The police force allows to object to decisions concerning employees.</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The manager makes sure to consult his employees before making decisions on the job.</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decisions are based on the principle of impartiality.</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative penalties are appropriate for violations and transgressions in the agency.</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The official discusses with his employees before taking any action against them.</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Security Forces Service Law is characterized by clarity of administrative policies and regulations.</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is statistically significant at the significance level of (α ≤0.05)
The following table shows the correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field of "transactional justice" and the total score of the field, which shows that the correlation coefficients shown are a function at a significant level (α ≤0.05) and thus the field is considered true to what was set to measure it.

**Table 5:** The correlation coefficient between each paragraph of the field "transactional fairness" and the total score of the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social relations are characterized by goodness among employees</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team spirit and cooperation prevail among colleagues</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The line official is always honest and forthright in work issues</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a sense of fairness and fairness of the responsible in resolving disputes among colleagues</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The director is open-minded and allows for discussion and debate</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The manager’s treatment is characterized by non-discrimination and favoritism</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The manager understands and takes into account the special circumstances</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is statistically significant at the significance level of (α ≤0.05)

**Second: Structure Validity:** Constructive validity is one of the measures of validity of the tool, which measures the extent to which the objectives that the tool wants to reach is achieved, and shows the extent to which each field of study relates to the total degree of the paragraphs of the questionnaire.

The following table shows that all correlation coefficients in all areas of the resolution are statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05). Thus, all areas of the resolution are considered valid for what they are measured.

**Table 6:** The correlation coefficient between the degree of each field of the questionnaire and the total degree of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is statistically significant at the significance level of (α ≤0.05)

**Reliability:** The researchers verified the stability of the study’s resolution through Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient, and the results were as shown in the following table:

**Table 7:** Cronbach’s alpha parameter to measure the stability of the resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Number Of Paragraphs</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha coefficient</th>
<th>Self-Honesty *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Self-honesty = the positive square root of Cronbach's alpha

It is clear from the results shown in the previous table that the value of the Cronbach alpha coefficient is high for each domain, ranging between (0.822, 0.903), while it reached (0.928) for all paragraphs of the questionnaire. Likewise, the value of self-honesty is high for each field, ranging between (0.907, 0.950), while it reached for all paragraphs of the resolution (0.963), which means that the reliability coefficient is high.

Thus, the researchers have made sure of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire of the study, which makes them fully confident of the validity and validity of the questionnaire to analyze the results, answer the study questions and test its hypotheses.

### Analyzing the Data, Testing and Discussing the Hypotheses of the Study

Statistical treatments were performed for the data collected from the study questionnaire. (SPSS) software was used to obtain the results of the study that were presented and analyzed.

### Statistical Description of the Study Sample According To Personal and Organizational Data:

The following is a presentation of the characteristics of the study sample according to personal and organizational data:

**Table 8:** Distribution of the study sample according to personal and organizational data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal And Organizational Data</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Police</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Departments</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is evident from the previous table that 49.9% of the study sample work in the police governorates, while 50.1% work in the specialized departments, and the researchers attribute these results to the nature of work in the police force, which is divided into two parts, the first part: It relates to patrol and investigation work or what is related It has field policing work, and it is often concentrated in the work of (Police Governorates Administration) distributed over all the governorates of the Strip. Police stations are distributed in each district of the governorates, while the other part is related to administrative work such as: administration, organization, financial management and others, or “support departments. For fieldwork in the police apparatus, such as: the General Investigation Department and Public Relations, this part is known as (specialized departments), and through the percentages and results the distribution of the study sample is shown that closely approximates the current reality in the police apparatus in Gaza Strip.

It is clear that 96.6% of the study sample is of their marital status, while 3.4% of their marital status are unmarried, and the researchers believe that these results are realistic and are similar to the nature of the study population in terms of ages and suitability for marriage, as the study community is from the officer class (from the rank of captain and above), The age of the officer with the rank of captain should not be less than 24 years old, and therefore most of the study sample was of those over this age , where the percentage (96.3%) of those over the age of 25 years, and this age is suitable for marriage In our conservative
Muslim Palestinian society, which seeks to fortify itself by marriage, as it has implications for psychological and social stability, as well as the administrative positions that this group occupies and their financial and psychological returns qualify them for marriage.

It is also evident that 16.1% of the study sample have a general secondary education qualification or less, 11.0% have an intermediate diploma, 66.9% have a bachelor’s degree, while 5.9% have a higher education qualification, and the large percentage of bachelor’s holders is attributed to the fact that the study sample is of the grade. The leader and senior police officers, and this indicates that the Ministry of Interior and Police in Gaza Strip took into account educational qualification as a condition for occupying administrative and leadership positions and this is consistent with the conditions for promotion in the military ranks according to the Palestinian Security Forces Law of 2005, as the maximum military rank is for those below High school is the rank of (captain) (Ministry of Interior, Organization and Administration Authority, 2014).

And that 8.8% of the study sample work in the North Governorate, 64.6% work in Gaza Governorate, 6.8% work in the Central Governorate, 10.5% work in Khan Yunis Governorate, while 9.3% work in Rafah Governorate, and this means that the largest percentage work in the Governorate. Gaza and the rest of the percentages are distributed over the rest of the governorates of the Strip, and the Gaza Governorate is the center of the Strip, which is the largest of the governorates, and the most vital city, as it contains all government institutions, vital ministries and others. It also contains the largest population concentration in Gaza Strip, in addition to the specialized and central departments located in the governorate Gaza, or what is known as the (Police Passports) headquarters, so it is logical to find that this large percentage of the study sample are those who work in Gaza Governorate, followed by the rest of the governorates, in close proportions, according to the concentration of police officers' work in it.

And 3.7% of the study sample is less than 25 years old, 55.0% are between 25 and less than 35 years old, 32.6% are from 35 to less than 45 years old, and 8.2% are from 45 to less than 55 years old. While 0.6% are aged 55 years or over, and the researchers point out here that the age group of less than 45 years represented (91.3%) of the study sample, which means that most of the police personnel are from the youth and productive category, and this is consistent with the nature of police work that needs To the activity, vitality and physical strength, which are available in this age group, it is also noted that there is a connection and harmony with the years of service mentioned, as the police force is formed on the responsibility of a segment of young people appointed by the eleventh government after the events of 2007, and that After the government took control of the security services and various ministries, and the accompanying denial of the majority of old police employees.

It is also evident that 4.0% of the study sample is based on the job title of Director of Public Administration, 20.1%, Director of Department, 50.4%, Head of Department, while 25.5% are other than that, and this indicates the flow and hierarchy of the organizational structure of the Police Authority according to the levels and ranges of balanced administrative supervision. Therefore, we find that the highest percentage of the study sample in job titles is a department head, and this percentage decreases the higher the grade of the job title, which is in line with the study sample and the distribution of the number of military ranks in each, as is consistent with that. With the nature of the organizational structure applied in the Ministry of Interior (hierarchical form) in terms of expansion from top to bottom, the public administration is the highest supervisory and administrative level in the job title, followed by the department, then the department, and so on according to the organizational structure of the police. 69.7% of the study sample had a military rank of captain, 21.5% of them had a major military rank, 5.9% had a lieutenant colonel, 2.5% had a colonel, and 0.3% had a brigadier general, and according to the hierarchy of supervisory positions in the police apparatus, the military ranks took a hierarchical form The greater the scope of supervision, the higher the military ranks with it, and vice versa, that is, the lower the rank, the narrower the scope of supervision with it, so we find that the rank of (brigadier) was one rank due to the broad scope of supervision for this rank, while the rank of (captain) was (246) ranks. This is due to the narrow scope of supervision compared to the higher ranks, and this hierarchical flow of ranks from top to bottom, and this is similar to the reality of the study community in terms of the percentage of ranks in each of the military ranks that exist for police officers in Gaza Strip, and there is a proportionality with job titles and their occupancy.

It is also clear that 2.8% of the study sample have years of service of less than 5 years, 71.7% of years of service ranging from 5 to less than 10 years, 13.0% of years of service from 10 to less than 15 years, and 7.6% of years of service from 15 years. It is clear that the largest percentage in the study sample according to the years of service is represented by the group falling between (5 to 10) years of service, as this percentage reached (71.7%) of the total The study sample.

**Analysis of the Paragraphs of the Questionnaire:**

For the analysis of the paragraphs of the questionnaire, a T-test was used for one sample to find out whether the average degree of response had reached the average degree of approval, which is 3 or not. In essence, the average approval score is 3, and if Sig <0.05 (Sig less than 0.05), the average opinions of individuals differs fundamentally from the average approval score of 3, and in this case it can be determined whether the average response significantly increases or decreases the degree of approval. Medium and is 3. And that is through the test value. If the test value is positive, then it means that the arithmetic mean of the answer exceeds the average approval score, and vice versa.

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers will highlight the paragraph that received the highest approval and the paragraph that received the least approval in each field of study.

**Analysis of the "Organizational Justice" Paragraphs**
Analysis Of The Paragraphs In The Field Of "Distribution Justice"

The T-test was used to see if the average response score had reached a median consent score of 3 or not. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 9: The arithmetic mean and the probability value (Sig.) for each paragraph of the field "Equity of Distribution"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Relative Arithmetic Mean</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The monthly salary is commensurate with the efforts I put into my work</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>-8.99</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a fair reward for the extra efforts I put in</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>-31.05</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job burdens and duties are distributed fairly among the employees</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>58.41</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The demands and tasks of the work match my own capabilities</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>72.71</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The monthly salary is proportional to the educational qualification and the courses you have taken</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>56.51</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
<td>*0.002</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monthly salary is proportional to work experience</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>56.98</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>*0.006</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary matches those of similar effort colleagues</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Law on Service in the Palestinian Security Forces provides appropriate incentives</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>-11.75</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There is fairness in the salary scale according to the military ranks</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>59.71</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>All Paragraphs Of The Field Together</strong></td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-7.67</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean is statistically significant at the level of significance of (α ≤0.05)

From the previous table, the following can be drawn:

The arithmetic mean of the fourth paragraph, "The requirements and tasks of work are compatible with my own abilities" is equal to 3.64 (total score out of 5), meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 72.71%, the test value is 11.99 and the probability value (Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered statistically significant when the significance level of α 0.05 ≥, which indicates that the average score for the response to this paragraph has exceeded the average approval score, which is 3, and this means that there is a large degree of approval by the sample members for this paragraph.

The arithmetic mean of the second paragraph "A fair reward is obtained for the additional efforts I make" is equal to 1.57, meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 31.40%, the test value is -31.05, and the probability value (.Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered significantly significant at one significant level. (α ≤0.05), which indicates that the average score for the response to this paragraph has decreased from the average approval score, which is 3, and this means that there is little agreement on the part of the sample members for this paragraph.

In general, it can be said that the arithmetic mean equals 2.73, that the relative arithmetic mean equals 54.56%, the test value is -7.67, and that the probability value (.Sig) equals 0.000. Therefore, the field of "fairness of distribution" is statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05), Which indicates that the average degree of response to this field differs fundamentally from the average degree of approval, which is 3, which means that there is agreement to a small degree by the sample members on the paragraphs of this field.

The researchers attribute this to the fact that the field of distribution justice is related to the amount of bonuses, salaries and financial returns that the employee receives, and given that the study was applied in a delicate and sensitive circumstance that the employees of the former Gaza government are going through, in terms of salaries irregularity, lack of budgets disbursement, and employees' lack of full salaries, the answers were Respondents are affected to a large extent by the financial conditions they are going through, as police employees suffer, like other employees of the previous government of Gaza, from irregular salaries and lack of full salaries, and the financial deficit in the operational budgets disbursed to the police force has cast a shadow over the grants and material and financial rewards that may be granted To the employee or officer in the police force, in exchange for the exceptional services and work he provides.

These results are in agreement with the study (Abu Jasser, 2010), the results of which showed that the respondents disagreed with the field of fairness of distribution, with a relative mean of (56.9%).

While each of: (Al-Shehri, 2014), (Al-Sukkar, 2012), (Al-Atwi, 2011), (Shaban, 2010), (Al-Emian and Al-Saudi, 2009) on the existence of fair distribution in a medium degree and with a relative arithmetic mean of (65.4%), (59.6%), (62%), (63.4%), (60%), and (62%) according to studies referred to.

The current study differed with each of the studies of: (Abu Tayeh, 2012), which indicated the existence of fair distribution with a degree above average and with a relative arithmetic average (76%).
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The researchers believe that the difference in the perception of fairness of distribution among the surveyed samples is due to the nature of the study population and the circumstances surrounding it, such as: the level of public income and the society’s culture regarding grants and rewards and other economic and political conditions prevailing in each country of the different type of sector to which the study is applied, whether it is general In particular, and in general, most of the previous studies indicated a medium or low level of fairness of distribution, and this approximates and matches the results of this study.

2. Analysis Of The Paragraphs Of The Field "Procedural Justice"

The T-test was used to see if the average response score had reached a median approval score of 3 or not. The results are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Relative Arithmetic Mean</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management decisions are applied to everyone without exception.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>59.09</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decisions are made for employees after adequate information is gathered.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The police force allows to object to decisions concerning employees.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>51.86</td>
<td>-7.35</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The manager makes sure to consult his employees before making decisions on the job.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>57.65</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>*0.030</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decisions are based on the principle of impartiality.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative penalties are appropriate for violations and transgressions in the agency.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The official discusses with his employees before taking any action against them.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>*0.019</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Security Forces Service Law is characterized by clarity of administrative policies and regulations.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>66.93</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Paragraphs Of The Field Together

2.99 59.70 -0.38 0.351

*The mean is statistically significant at the level of significance of (α ≤0.05)

From the previous table, the following can be drawn:

The arithmetic mean of the eighth paragraph "The service law is characterized by security forces with clarity of administrative policies and regulations" is equal to 3.35 (total score out of 5), meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 66.93%, the test value is 6.03, and the probability value (Sig) equals 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered a function. Statistically at a significance level of α 0.05≥, which indicates that the average score for the response to this paragraph has exceeded the average approval score, which is 3, and this means that there is an acceptable degree of approval from the sample members for this paragraph.

The arithmetic mean of the third paragraph "The police force allows objections to decisions that concern employees" equal to 2.59, meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 51.86%, the test value is -7.35, and the probability value (Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered statistically significant at a level of significance 0.05 ≥ α, which indicates that the average score for the response to this paragraph has decreased from the average score of 3, and this means that there is little agreement on the part of the sample for this paragraph.

In general, it can be said that the arithmetic mean equals 2.99, that the relative arithmetic mean equals 59.70%, the test value is -0.38, and that the probability value (Sig) is equal to 0.351. Therefore, the field of "justice of procedures" is not statistically significant at a level of significance of 0.05, which indicates that the average degree of response in this field does not differ substantially from the average degree of approval, which is 3, which means that there is agreement of a moderate degree by the sample members on the paragraphs of this field.

The researchers attribute this result to the managers 'awareness of the acceptable limits of the importance of observing the fairness of procedures in their practices in terms of taking decisions in an objective and clear manner within the police apparatus, but within the controls and privacy of the work of the apparatus, and this is consistent with the nature of police work, which sometimes requires the issuance of firm decisions as the police apparatus is semi Military, so the results related to discussing and reviewing decisions were medium, unlike objection to decisions, and they came below average because objection in the security services is a form of rebellion, as evidenced by the results of impartiality towards the laws, regulations and regulations applicable to the police because laws and regulations are generalities that apply to everyone without Exception and bias, and in general the results of the procedural fairness field were acceptable or medium, as mentioned.
These results are in agreement with the study (Abu Jasser, 2010), the results of which showed that the respondents agreed on the field of fairness of procedures with a medium degree with a relative arithmetic average of (61.5%). The researchers attribute this to the correspondence in the environment of the Palestinian study community and the field of application in the public sector. It also agreed with the study of (Al-Shehri, 2014), (Al-Atwi, 2011), (Shaban, 2010) and (Al-Emian and Al-Saudi, 2009), whose results showed the existence of procedural justice to a degree. Medium and with a relative arithmetic average according to their order: (66.4%), (63.4%), (59.2%) and (66.4%). The results are similar to the current study for the similarity of the Arab environment with the local Palestinian and the fact that the samples surveyed are from the public sector.

The results differed with the study (Abu Tayeh, 2012), which showed an increase in the degree of fairness of procedures with a relative arithmetic average of (74.4%), which the author of the study attributes to the consistent application of laws and regulations to all employees in Jordanian ministries centers without exception.

The researchers attribute the disagreement to the difference in the study environment as it is a western environment and was applied to the private sector in the United States of America, which is concerned with the fairness of systems and procedures for employers and organizations, and in general, most of the previous studies indicated a medium level or closer to the low regarding the field of fairness of procedures, and this is close and similar to the results this study.

3. **Analysis Of The Paragraphs Of The Field "Transactional Justice"**

The T-test was used to see if the average response score had reached the average approval score of 3. The results are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Relative Arithmetic Mean</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social relations are characterized by goodness among employees</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>77.39</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team spirit and cooperation prevail among colleagues</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>77.55</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The line official is always honest and forthright in work issues</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a sense of fairness and fairness of the responsible in resolving disputes among colleagues</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The director is open-minded and allows for discussion and debate</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>71.94</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The manager’s treatment is characterized by non-discrimination and favoritism</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>69.86</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The manager understands and takes into account the special circumstances</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>73.85</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| All Paragraphs Of The Field Together | 3.67 | 73.36 | 16.36 | *0.000 |

* The mean is statistically significant at the level of significance of (α ≤0.05)

From the previous table, the following can be drawn:
The arithmetic mean of the second paragraph “Team spirit and cooperation among colleagues prevails” equals 3.88 (total score out of 5), meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 77.55%, the test value is 18.39, and the probability value (Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered a statistically significant level at the level of the significance of (α ≤0.05), which indicates that the average score for the response to this paragraph has exceeded the average score of 3, and this means that there is a large degree of approval by the sample members for this paragraph.

The arithmetic mean of the sixth paragraph “The advantage of the manager’s treatment of non-discrimination and favoritism” is equal to 3.49, meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 69.86%, the test value is 8.91, and the probability value (Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, this paragraph is considered a statistically significant function at the level of significance (α ≤0.05), which indicates that the average degree of response to this paragraph has exceeded the average degree of approval, which is 3, and this means that there is agreement to a large degree by the sample members on the paragraphs of this field.

In general, it can be said that the arithmetic mean equals 3.67, that the relative arithmetic mean equals 73.36%, the test value is 16.36, and that the probability value (.Sig) is equal to 0.000. Therefore, the field of "transaction fairness" is statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05), which indicates that the average degree of response to this field differs substantially from the average degree of approval, which is 3, and this means that there is agreement to a large degree by the sample members on the paragraphs of this field.

The researchers attribute this result to the managers and colleagues ‘awareness of the importance of observing the fairness of dealings, and this is explained by the existing human relations in the police apparatus, which were based on respect and kindness according to the results, and the results can be inferred from the spirit of cooperation and harmony prevailing between colleagues.
and managers, and this is due to the nature of the police work system Which is built on cooperative and disciplined teams and formations to ensure the privacy of police work, and to ensure that it proceeds to the fullest in an atmosphere free from conflicts, quarrels and disturbance of treatment.

The results of the current study are in agreement with the study (Al-Shehri, 2014), which indicated that there is a high degree of transactional justice among secondary school principals in Jeddah, with a forgotten arithmetic average of (73.6%). The researchers attribute this to the similarity of the Arab environment with the local Palestinian. The two studies were applied to a leadership class, or from the category of managers in the public sector, and not to the category of employees. The current study was applied to senior officers who occupy various administrative positions.

Whereas the following studies indicated the existence of fair transactions with a medium degree, which are as follows: (Abu Jasser, 2010), (Abu Tayeh, 2012), (Al-Atwi, 2011), (Shaban, 2010), and (Al-Emian) and Al-Saudi, 2009), with relative arithmetic averages according to the order of studies (66%), (57.2%), (63%), (64.8%), (62.6%) and (67.4%), respectively. In general, most of the previous studies indicated a medium or close to high level in the field of transaction fairness, and this approximates and is similar to the results of this study.

Analyze All "Organizational Justice" Paragraphs

The T-test was used to see if the average response score had reached a median consent score of 3 or not. The results are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Relative Arithmetic Mean</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>-7.67</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>*0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>*0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean is statistically significant at the level of significance of (α ≤0.05)

From the previous table it was found that the arithmetic mean of all organizational justice items is equal to 3.09 (total score out of 5) meaning that the relative arithmetic mean is 61.82%, the test value is 2.93 and the probability value (Sig.) equals 0.002. Therefore, the items are considered statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05. ≥ α, which indicates that the average degree of response has exceeded the average degree of approval, which is 3, and this means that there is agreement by the sample members on the items of organizational justice in general.

According to these results, there is a general feeling of organizational justice in a moderate degree and acceptable to the sample surveyed in the police force, with the difference in the order of feeling of justice, where fairness of transactions came first, followed by fairness of procedures and finally fairness in distribution.

The researchers attribute this to the fact that organizational justice is a relative concept that varies according to the position or circumstances prevailing in the internal or external environment of the organization. The low degree of fairness in distribution, as we mentioned, is due to the economic and political conditions that police employees are going through, like other employees of the previous Gaza government, from irregularity and lack of payment of salaries and budgets. Which negatively affected the sense of justice, in addition to the participation of most employees and employees feeling dissatisfaction with salaries, grants and wages in exchange for their efforts on the one hand, and their lack of proportionality with the requirements and requirements of living life. Here we find that the fairness of the procedures is affected by the fairness of distribution, as the fairness of the procedures includes the procedures and decisions on which the incentives, grants, penalties and wages are structured, so it came to a moderate degree in this study, while the fairness of transactions was affected, but to a lesser extent because it has a human and social dimension related to the method of dealing, so it is logical That there be a disparity in the dimensions of organizational justice, and this disparity is due to the different concepts related to the dimensions or to disparity The circumstances and the specifics of each organization.

This study agreed with the study (Abu Jasser, 2010), in terms of the overall result and the order of dimensions, which indicated the existence of organizational justice with a medium degree and a relative arithmetic average (61.4%). For the study (Al-Shehri, 2014), (Al-Atwi, 2011) and (Al-Emian and Al-Saudi, 2009), the averages of organizational justice were ranked respectively (69.4%), (62%) and (64.8%). This is due to the similarity of the Arab reality with the Palestinian in terms of the conditions and the foster environment. While the following studies agreed with the current study in terms of the overall outcome of organizational justice, but they differed with (Shaban, 2010) in the order of dimensions, and in the averages of justice with a medium degree and an average of (59.6%).

Test Hypotheses of the Study:

H0: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses to the determinants of organizational justice due to personal variables (management, marital status, educational qualification, workplace (governorate), age group, job title, military rank, years the service).
A "T-test for two independent samples" was used to find out if there were statistically significant differences. It is a parameterized test suitable for comparing the averages of two data sets. The "single-factor variance" test was also used to find out if there were statistically significant differences. This test is instructive, and is suitable for comparing 3 or more averages.

And branched from the main hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses:

H01: There are statistically significant differences at (α ≤0.05) level of significance between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice, attributable to management.

Table 13: "T-test results for two independent samples" - Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial Police</td>
<td>Specialized Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-3.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-2.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-1.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>-3.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the two averages is statistically significant at a significance level of (α ≤0.05).

From the results shown in the previous table, the following can be concluded:

It was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the "T test for two independent samples" is less than the level of significance (α ≤0.05) for the fields “Equity of distribution, fairness of procedures, organizational justice.” Thus, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant differences between the averages of the estimates of the study sample about these areas are attributed to the administration for the benefit of those working in the specialized departments.

This is due to the nature of the work in the specialized departments represented in administrative and organizational work, which has nothing to do with the field side, and this is in contrast to the work of the police governorates, whose work is based on investigation, interrogation and patrol work that requires physical effort and bears more pressure, and this is reflected in the officers' sense of justice compared to other in charge. In administrative work, this is evident through the fairness of distribution and procedures, as they are related to material returns, privileges and work rules.

As for the field of transactional fairness, it was found that the probability value (Sig.) is greater than the significance level 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample's estimates of dealings fairness attributable to the administration.

With regard to the fairness of transactions, there is no dispute in terms of feeling it in both types of departments, and this is due to the unity of thought and the compatible nature of the employees of the police in terms of qualification and training, and this matter applies to all components of organizational citizenship behavior that indicates charity and volunteerism among employees of all kinds The type of their department.

This result is similar to (Muhammad and Othman, 2012), which indicated that the sense of organizational justice varies according to the type of administration and the nature of work in it.

H02: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the marital status.

Table 14: Results of "T-test for two independent samples" - marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the two averages is statistically significant at a significance level of (α ≤0.05).

From the results shown in the previous table, it was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the "T test for two independent samples" is greater than the significance level 0.05 for all domains and domains combined together, and thus it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates about these fields and domains. Taken together, they are attributed to marital status.

This is due to the fact that (96.5%) of the sample individuals are married, while the unmarried people are the remaining percentage, and therefore the large discrepancy in the percentages may not reflect differences for either of them, and this may be the reason for the absence of differences attributed to the marital status variable.

H03: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to scientific qualification.

Table 15: Results of the "mono-variance" test - academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Or</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 16: Results of the "unilateral variance" test - workplace (governorate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>North Governorate</th>
<th>Gaza Governorate</th>
<th>Central Governorate</th>
<th>Khan Yunis Governorate</th>
<th>Rafah Governorate</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the averages is statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05).

From the results shown in the previous table, it was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the "single variance" test is greater than the significance level of 0.05 for all domains and domains combined together. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates about these domains and domains. Taken together, they are attributed to the place of work (province).

This is due to the homogeneous nature of the Palestinian society inside Gaza Strip, through the unity of identity and culture that the officers working in the police carry inside the Strip, in addition to the fact that they carry one burden and fall into similar working conditions.

**H0_{1,5}:** There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α ≤0.05) between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the age group.

**Table 17: The results of the "mono-variance" test - the age group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Less Than 25 Years Old</th>
<th>From 25 To Less Than 35 Years Old</th>
<th>From 35 To Less Than 45 Years Old</th>
<th>From 45 To Less Than 55 Years Old</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dealings</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the averages is statistically significant at the level of significance (α ≤0.05).
From the results shown in the previous table, the following can be concluded:

It was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the “one-on-one variance” test is greater than the significance level 0.05, and thus it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates on these domains and the fields combined together attributable to the age group.

This is due to the fact that (58.6%) of the sample individuals are young people under the age of 35 years, while the remaining percentage (8.8%) is for those over the age of 45 years, and therefore the large discrepancy in the percentages may not reflect differences for either of them, and it may be This is the reason for the absence of differences attributed to the rest of the age groups, most of which appear to be young people, and it is known that this group has common denominators and characteristics that differ from other age groups. This result differed with the study (Al-Shehri, 2014) through the positive relationship between the age group and the feeling of organizational justice, and the existence of differences in favor of the group under 30 years of age in relation to justice according to the order of the two studies, and this is possibly due to the difference in the study population concerned and its environment and the different study variables.

\( \textbf{H}_{0.16} \): There are statistically significant differences at the level of (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)) of significance between the averages of the respondents' responses about the determinants of organizational justice due to the job title.

\begin{table}
\caption{The results of the “unilateral variance” test - job title}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Domain} & \textbf{Director Of General Administration} & \textbf{Director Of The Department} & \textbf{Head Of The Department} & \textbf{Other} \\
\hline
Equitable Distribution & 2.88 & 2.74 & 2.73 & 2.70 \\
\hline
Fairness Of Procedures & 3.62 & 3.08 & 2.97 & 2.85 \\
\hline
Fair Dealings & 3.90 & 3.79 & 3.62 & 3.63 \\
\hline
Organizational Justice & 3.43 & 3.16 & 3.07 & 3.02 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

* The difference between the averages is statistically significant at the level of significance (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)).

From the results shown in the previous table, the following can be concluded:

It was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the “one-way variance” test is less than the significance level (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)) for the field of “fairness of procedures. Whose job title is Director of General Administration.

This is due to the fact that directors of departments enjoy many privileges, such as furniture, office equipment, personal cars and other privileges and allowances, and by virtue of their positions they participate in developing regulations, policies and procedures and they are responsible for their implementation, and this explains their sense of fairness of procedures more than others and this applies to the rest of the areas in which they are Difference in their favor over others.

This result is in agreement with (Abu Jasser, 2010), which indicated that there are statistically significant differences in favor of the name of the general manager at the expense of the rest of the names in terms of organizational citizenship behavior.

As for the rest of the fields, it was found that the probability value (Sig.) is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates in these areas attributable to the job title.

This is attributed to the fact that (70%) of the sample individuals are directors of departments and divisions, and they can be classified as middle leadership, which shares the same working conditions, privileges and homogeneity in the nature of their orientations.

\( \textbf{H}_{0.17} \): There are statistically significant differences at the level of (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)) between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice, attributable to the military rank.

\begin{table}
\caption{Results of the “unilateral contrast” test - military rank}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Domain} & \textbf{Captain} & \textbf{Major} & \textbf{Presenter And Above} & \textbf{Test Value} & \textbf{Probability Value} (Sig.) \\
\hline
Equitable Distribution & 2.72 & 2.71 & 2.86 & 0.649 & 0.523 \\
\hline
Fairness Of Procedures & 2.92 & 3.08 & 3.30 & 4.863 & *0.008 \\
\hline
Fair Dealings & 3.62 & 3.83 & 3.66 & 2.210 & 0.111 \\
\hline
Organizational Justice & 3.05 & 3.16 & 3.24 & 2.164 & 0.116 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

* The difference between the averages is statistically significant at the level of significance (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)).

From the results shown in the previous table, the following can be concluded:

It was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the “one-way variance” test is less than the significance level of (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)) for the field of “fairness of procedures.” Thus, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant differences between
the averages of the study sample estimates in this field attributed to the military rank in favor those who were arranged by the presenter and above.

This is due to the fact that this rank and what is above it is a candidate for higher administrative positions and close to decision-making, as they are like directors of departments, and by virtue of their positions they participate in developing systems, policies and procedures and they are responsible for their application, and this explains their sense of fairness of procedures more than other ranks.

As for the rest of the fields and domains combined, it was found that the probability value (Sig.) Is greater than the significance level 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates about these fields and the fields combined together attributed to the military rank.

This is due to the fact that (91.3%) of the sample members are of ranks below the lieutenant colonel, and they can be classified as the middle leadership, in which the two ranks (captain and major) meet and share the same working conditions, privileges and homogeneity in the nature of their orientations.

**H0 _15_: There are statistically significant differences at the level of ( α ≤0.05) of significance between the averages of respondents' responses about determinants of organizational justice due to years of service.

**Table 20:** Results of the "single variance" test - years of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>Probability Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than 5</td>
<td>From 5 To Less Than 10</td>
<td>From 10 To Less Than 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Old</td>
<td>Years Old</td>
<td>Years Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Of Procedures</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the averages is statistically significant at the level of significance ( α ≤0.05).

From the results shown in the previous table, the following can be concluded:

It was found that the probability value (Sig.) Corresponding to the “one-way covariance” test is less than the significance level 0.05 α α for the fields “distribution fairness, fairness of procedures, organizational justice.” Thus, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant differences between the averages of the study sample estimates about these domains. They are attributed to the years of service in favor of those whose years of service range from 10 to less than 15 years.

This is due to the fact that this group has relatively high experience, and by virtue of their accumulated experience and the sequence of their ranks, they have reached positions that qualify them for the higher leadership and to participate in the development of systems, policies and procedures and they are responsible for their application, and this explains their feeling of fairness of procedures more than other ranks, as well as for fair distribution and organizational justice in general peer Experience, location and privileges obtained.

This result agrees with (Al-Sukkar, 2012), which indicated that there are statistically significant differences in favor of the category of experience from (15 to 20 years) at the expense of the rest of the groups in terms of fairness of distribution, and this is possibly due to the similarity with the environment of the Arab study community and being applied to managers from the sector The year. This result differed with (Abu Jasser, 2010), which indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in favor of years of experience in terms of organizational justice, and who indicated an inverse relationship between organizational justice and years of service, and this was possibly due to the difference in the particular study population and its environment and the different study variables.

**Conclusions**

The following Results and recommendations were reached:

- The results of the study showed a general feeling of organizational justice to a degree higher than the average (acceptable) among the sample surveyed of police officers in Gaza Strip, and this is a good indication of the state of justice within the police apparatus, and the results showed a variation in the order of the feeling of justice, where the fairness of transactions came first and to a large extent, This was followed by fairness of procedures, to a moderate degree, and finally fairness in distribution to a small degree. The researchers attribute that to the fact that organizational justice is a relative concept that varies according to the position or circumstances prevailing in the internal or external environment of the organization. The fairness of distribution was affected by the results of the economic conditions experienced by the employees of the previous Gaza government, and this was reflected. On the fairness of procedures, it includes the procedures and decisions on which incentives, grants, penalties and wages are structured, so their results came to a moderate degree, as for the fairness of
transactions affected, but to a lesser extent, because it has a human and social dimension related to the method of dealing, and this is the explanation of the disparity in justice according to the prevailing position and circumstances.

- The results of the feeling of fairness of distribution came to a small degree among the sample surveyed of police officers in Gaza Strip, and this means that there is no sense of fairness of financial outcomes and returns compared to inputs and employees of other countries in the same work, and the results of this field showed clearly in the lack of a sense of justice towards obtaining a fair reward for efforts In addition, most of the results of this field came within this direction, except for the proportionality of the requirements and tasks of work with self-abilities and fairness of the salary scale in the service law, whose results came in an acceptable rate. The irregularity of salaries and the lack of full salaries, and the financial deficit in the operational budgets spent for the police force cast a shadow over the material and financial grants and rewards that may be granted to the employee or officer in the police force, in exchange for the exceptional services and work he provides.

- The results of the feeling of fairness of procedures were of a moderate degree among the sample surveyed of police officers in Gaza Strip, and this means that managers are aware of the acceptable limits of the importance of observing fairness of procedures in their practices in terms of taking decisions in an objective and clear manner within the police apparatus, but within the controls and privacy of the work of the agency, and the results of this The field was distinguished in the sense of justice towards the law of service in the security forces with clarity of administrative policies and regulations and to a large extent, and most of the results of this field were in the middle degree, with the exception of the police's permission to object to decisions concerning employees, which came to a small degree, and researchers attribute this to the nature of policing that The issuance of firm decisions is sometimes required because the police apparatus is quasi-military, so the results related to objection to decisions were sub-intermediate because objection in the security services is considered a form of rebellion, as evidenced by the results of impartiality or approval to a large extent towards the laws, regulations and regulations applicable to the police because the laws and regulations Of the generalities that apply to everyone without exception and prejudice.

- The results of the sense of fairness of dealings came to a large degree among the sample surveyed of police officers in Gaza Strip, and this means that the existing human relations in the police apparatus are based on respect and kindness as well as the spirit of cooperation and harmony prevailing between colleagues and managers, and the results of this field showed distinction in the sense of justice towards sovereignty Team spirit and cooperation among colleagues to a large degree, just as most of the results of this field came within a large degree, with the exception of the manager’s treatment and lack of separation and favoritism to anyone, which was an acceptable gradient. Researchers attribute this to the nature of the police work system that is based on cooperative and disciplined teams and formations for the specificity of police work, and to ensure its functioning according to the most complete face in an atmosphere free from conflicts, quarrels and disturbance of treatment.

- The results showed that those working in the specialized departments feel more generally than others in organizational justice, and there are no significant differences between all employees at different levels of management, nor between married and single officers surveyed with their views on organizational justice.

- It was found that there are no significant differences between the officers surveyed with their views on organizational justice due to the variables (academic qualification, workplace) in the different governorates of the sector.

- The results showed that (Lieutenant Colonel and above) has a higher response than other military ranks in terms of fair procedures, as for the rest of the ranks, there are no significant differences between them.

- The results showed that the group that spent years of service ranging between (10 to 15 years) had a higher response than others in terms of fair distribution, procedures and organizational justice in general.

**Recommendations**

Based on the above from the previous results, the researchers recommend a set of recommendations as follows:

- Work to provide fairness to the employees and officers of the police service with regard to the payment of their salaries, by providing appropriate and fair financial payments that guarantee them a decent life.

- Paying attention to the observance of justice towards the additional efforts made by police employees and officers, and working to provide material and moral rewards for that.

- Work to employ the human energies in the police force according to fair assessments that include consideration of specialization, abilities and personal qualifications.

- Balancing the distribution of duties and job burdens in a way that ensures the employee's sense of fairness towards the work assigned to him, reducing the phenomenon of social indolence, and relying on people other than others in performing the tasks within the police.

- Reconsidering the policy of military promotions subject to the law of service in the Palestinian security forces, by linking promotion to indicators of efficiency and performance, and not considering the expiration of the legal period to remain in the rank alone.

- Paying attention to the material and moral motivation of police work that requires special risks and difficulties (field work).
- Increase the spirit of competition among police employees and officers, through distinction and comparison between them, given that they present voluntary and charitable work and efforts outside the scope of the official mandate of the police institution, and take this into account when promotions, bonuses and leadership positions are occupied.

- Recommending that managers and the leadership of the police apparatus need to pay attention to the interests of employees and officers when making decisions, including a justified explanation of decisions, and to avoid interferences and personal whims when issuing and implementing decisions.

- Ensure that police employees and officers feel fair, given their prominent role in stability and tranquility within the work, and thus encourage and motivate employees to work with dedication and tender to raise the police institution.
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