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Abstract: The aim of this study was 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 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. The researchers recommended several recommendations that the university should pay attention to the level of interactive and procedural justice in the heads of departments and to show more democracy in the decision-making mechanisms of Faculty Staff.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Given the growing importance of the issue of organizational justice, which is seen as a relative concept, i.e., the regulatory action that an employee considers to be a fair procedure in the social relationship between the worker, the subordinate, the employer or the President may be biased in the eyes of another employee, Creates a state of psychological tension that in turn creates a set of behavioral and cognitive interpretations of the individual, and lack of loyalty and belonging to the institution in which he works. It is obvious that a lot of studies and research and serious attempts to activate the results of these studies and research on the decision makers, because this study or that is a regulatory phenomenon, and what has a significant impact in achieving belonging and loyalty and job stability through the achievement of justice in various dimensions. The researchers found that the application of such studies, especially on universities as the backbone of any society seeking progress and advancement, and because universities are one of the unique systems and Are important in any society, and because their inputs and characteristics make them unique and unique in their objectives and outputs.

The role of universities in development is through multiple and complex roles and three main functions. Higher education experts have agreed to assign them to modern universities: education, practical research and community service. These three functions are interrelated, intertwined and difficult to separate from one another (Al Saud et al., 2009). Despite the fact that universities are generally preoccupied with scientific research, achievement and community service, the function of education is of particular importance, through the implementation of the educational function carried out by the Faculty Staff, who form the academic departments in the various faculties of the university. That the establishment of the academic section is the cornerstone of any university, whether formal or private, so we find it important that the department is doing its best, which depends heavily on the effectiveness and strength and performance of the head of the department between the achievement of equality and dealing between all members of the faculty, and thus influence their behavior and work and the distribution of the tasks assigned to them, and the sense that they are of great importance in this institution on the one
hand, on the other hand, imposed by the ethics of the academic profession on the mutual respect between all members of the faculty by the head of department and members for his department, as well as respect for laws, regulations, rules and regulations established by the university without distinction between a member of teaching and another body, and this in turn is reflected positively on the affiliation of the Faculty Staff of this institution.

Therefore, the current study attempts to identify this relationship through the theoretical and field study of the Faculty Staff of the faculties of Palestinian Technical University- Kadoorei in Palestine-West Bank.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Through the exploratory study conducted by the researchers of the faculties of Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei, which they conducted with some Faculty Staff of the various faculties, it was found that many heads of departments are doing their best to create suitable working conditions. Faculty Staff in each of the departments affiliated with each faculty, but in contrast, the teachers often complain about the poor conditions of the lack of justice in the distribution of salaries, wages, bonuses and incentives, and their participation in decision-making through the President. In addition, some employees have a lack of interaction between the Faculty Staff and the head of their department, which must be characterized by trust between the two parties, in addition to discrimination from department heads among some Faculty Staff, which generated many conflicts and negative effects, which reflected in turn, at the heart of the positive relationship between affiliation and loyalty to the University, and hence the difference is clear in the views between the heads of departments and members of the faculty and everyone believes that the right.

Therefore, researchers will study the fairness of transactions and the fairness of procedures and their relationship to organizational loyalty, as it did not specify exactly the role of the dimension of fairness of transactions and procedural justice in increasing organizational loyalty, and whether they have a statistical effect or not?

Thus, the research problem can be summed up in answering the following set of questions:

Q1:– Is there a statistically significant relationship between the fairness of transactions and organizational loyalty?

Q2:– Is there an intrinsically significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational loyalty?

Q3:– Are there fundamental differences between procedural justice and interactive justice according to demographic variables depending on years of experience?

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. Study the impact of each dimension of the fairness of transactions and its relevance to organizational loyalty to determine the relative importance.

2. Study the impact of each dimension of justice and its relevance to organizational loyalty to determine relative importance.

3. Identifying the impact of demographic variables on gender, degree, place of work, number of years of experience, and career level, on both the dimensions of procedural justice and procedural justice and its impact on organizational loyalty in the faculties of Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei.

4. To reach the most important recommendations and suggestions to the officials and administrative leaders and heads of departments to support the perceptions of the dimensions of the fairness of transactions and procedural justice and its impact on organizational loyalty in the faculties of Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei, to increase the organizational loyalty to this university.

4. RESEARCH IMPORTANCE

The importance of the study is in two aspects: academic, scientific, practical or practical:

1. This study deals with an important aspect of the behavior of individuals in organizations. It is a study of every dimension of the fairness of transactions and procedural justice and their relevance to organizational loyalty, which are relatively modern concepts in the Arab and Palestinian countries in particular.

2. This study is concerned with the development and increase of the available material in the university library. This study dealt with the concepts of modern and new management in the Palestinian administration.

3. This study seeks to identify the importance of applying the theory of organizational justice through studying the dimensions of the fairness of transactions and procedural fairness and their relevance to organizational loyalty. The existence of the application of organizational justice in its various dimensions is a prerequisite for maintaining the health of the organization. It is capable of achieving the participation between both the university and the Faculty Staff.

4. To reach the most important conclusions and recommendations that can constitute a scientific and practical reference, which helps decision-makers in the development of plans and procedures, which can contribute to increase the level of sense of organizational justice and work to increase the organizational loyalty of the University, which in turn is reflected positively on the universities in general and the University of Palestine Technical In particular.

5. RESEARCH LIMITS AND SCOPE

- **Time Limits:** This study was conducted in 2018.
- **Human Limit:** This study was limited to Faculty Staff
- **Spatial boundaries:** This study was limited to Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei.
Objective Limitations: The study was limited to an analysis of the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice represented by (the dimensions of the fairness of transactions and procedural justice and its relevance to organizational loyalty.

Personal variables were limited to "gender, age, marital status, academic qualification, years of experience, and administrative level.

6. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of organizational justice derives its historical origins from the "theory of equality" proposed by Adams.1963. This theory gained considerable attention at the time because of its direct influence on the motivation and efforts of the workers. This theory was considered one of the theories of human behavior in organizations for a long time through which assumes that workers in different organizations compare their functional outcomes (functional income) compared to inputs and outputs from the same organization.

Some researchers also agreed on the concept of organizational justice as the degree of equality and integrity in the rights and duties that reflect the relationship of the individual to the organization. In reviewing the previous definitions, the researchers consider that the concept of organizational justice is: the way in which staff are governed through equal rights and duties used by the director or his direct boss in dealing with him at the functional and humanitarian levels in the organization.

Dimensions of fair dealing:
The studies that dealt with the subject of organizational justice revealed that they differ according to the views and philosophies of their owners. El-Maghraby (1994) stated that there are four types or dimensions of organizational justice: the justice of distribution, the fairness of compensation, Virtue, while some scholars (Durra, 2008) spoke of five dimensions of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, fair dealing, corrective justice, and moral justice. (Nieh, Haml Moorman, 1993) states that there are three types of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactive justice. (Koopmann (2003) refers to four types of organizational justice: Image justice, information justice, and environmental justice. Here the researchers will talk about the views mentioned above. (El-Maghraby, 1994) divided it into four types or dimensions, as follows:

1. Distributive justice: It is concerned with the distribution of the benefits and burdens of society in a fair distribution of the goods and services available to the community from private and public institutions. There are three principles of interest to society in order to ensure justice in the distribution of benefits and burdens among its members:
   - The principle of equity in ownership, the original ownership process.
   - The principle of equity in property, the transfer of property from one side to another.
   - The principle of the evaluation of equity in ownership, the process of determining what can be done to correct the situation of injustice.

2. Compensation justice: It means the ways in which the victims are compensated for the mistakes of others.

3. Disciplinary justice: It is based on the imposition of penalties and fines on the agents of damage or error.

4. The justice of the achievement of virtue: This kind of justice is assumed if people who compete for the goods and services provided by society have no opportunity to achieve the virtue they are capable of achieving, virtue is not a fair basis for distribution and the recognition of virtue as a basis for distribution is considered unacceptable. This recognizes the principle of equality (El-Maghraby, 1994).

While some researchers (Durra, 2008) categorize the dimensions of justice as follows:

1. Distributive Justice: The justice of the employee's outputs or returns, which are: wages and incentives, promotion opportunities, number of working hours, and job burdens and duties.

2. Procedural Justice: Attention to mechanisms processes and methods used to identify outputs or outcomes. It is the intellectual development of the fairness of decision-making procedures affecting individuals.

3. Fairness of Transactions: The extent to which employees feel the fairness of the treatment obtained by the worker when the formal procedures apply to him or the extent to which he knows the reasons for the narrowing of such procedures.

4. Organizational justice: The degree to which the employee feels the integrity of the administrative evaluation of his performance, behavior and work, which enhances his satisfaction with the work systems and reassurance about his promotion, career growth and performance evaluation.
   - To determine the quality of the monitoring, monitoring and evaluation system.
   - Creating the ability to activate feedback roles.
   - Ability to re-evaluate organization, functions and organizational roles.
   - Deviations and developments necessary to ensure the sustainability of the organizational processes and achievements of Forum members.

5. Moral justice: The degree of the administrative staff's sense of human and moral justice derived from the sources of faith and cultural and civilizational values in their interaction with the prevailing atmosphere in the organization, and moral justice leads to:
   - Highlight the system of social, moral and religious values.
   - The methods of interaction and moral maturity of all members of the organization determine how they perceive and perceive common justice in the
organization in a way that indicates the controls of emotions to perform the desired performance and positive interaction. (Durra, 2008).

The importance of fair dealing:
1. That the fairness of the transactions highlights the organizational climate and the organizational climate prevailing in the organization, and then build special perceptions within the dimension of justice in dealing with contexts, transactions and organizational, humanitarian and social relations (Chan, 2000)
2. Low employee perceptions of fair trade can cause many negative outcomes, such as reduced job satisfaction and job commitment, poor organizational behavior, regulatory weaknesses, and increased functional pressures.

Specific factors for fair dealing:
The employees' understanding of the fairness of transactions is determined by four factors:
1. There is clear justification for the decisions taken.
2. The extent of sincerity and authority of the authority.
3. The extent of respect of the authority of the workers.
4. The extent to which the owner of the Authority has complied with the standards of tact in dealing with employees (Keller,j, 2002).

Procedural Justice:
The concept of procedural justice as: justice issues related to procedures used in the distribution of outputs or outcomes (Thibaut, 1975).

Conditions for availability of procedural justice:
1. That the parties affected by the procedures (management and personnel) of the Organization agree on the merits on which to base the formulation of the proceedings.
2. The administration provides employees with sufficient information and explanations on how to implement these procedures. Accordingly, the fairness of the procedures includes the following elements:
   - Official rules and standards for research.
   - Explanation of procedures and decision-making process.
   - Interaction between those who apply the rules (decision maker) and individuals who may be affected by the decision.

Organizational Loyalty:

The concept of Organizational Loyalty:
It is a degree of conformity of the individual with his organization and its association with it and his desire to make the greatest bid or effort for the organization in which he works, with a strong desire to continue membership of this organization, as this concept is characterized by total and positive, the relationship in accordance with this concept must be strong Positive, dynamic and based on internal conviction of the goals or objectives of the organization, not just to assess the individual's benefits and benefits. The emotional attachment to the organization and the desire to stay and work (Arqawi et al., 2018).

Kidron distinguishes between moral loyalty and is meant to adopt the individual values and objectives of the organization and to be part of its values and objectives, calculated loyalty means the desire of the employee to continue to work in the organization despite the existence of alternative work in another organization and better advantages. (Meyer, Allen, Smith, 1993).

Organizational Loyalty Components:
The organizational allegiances were varied by researchers in this field, but most researchers agreed that the components of organizational loyalty went through three main components:
1. Emotional or affective loyalty: This dimension is affected by the degree of individual perception of the characteristics of the work of the degree of independence, importance, entity, and skills required, and the proximity of supervisors and guidance. This aspect of loyalty is also affected by the degree to which the employee feels that the organizational environment in which he works allows for effective participation in the decision-making process, whether related to the work or what is related to it.
2. Moral loyalty is the employee's sense of commitment to staying with the organization and often enhances the sense of good support from the organization for its staff and allows them to participate and interact positively, not only in how the actions are carried out, but also by contributing to setting goals, of the Organization.
3. Continuous loyalty and individual loyalty: It relates to the individual's assessment of the costs associated with leaving the organization and the benefits of staying there (Khalifat and Al-Malahmah, 2009)

7. 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 package 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 (Mahimid, 2016) this study aimed to identify the level of sense of organizational justice in the academic staff at the Faculty of Management and Economics at the University of Tikrit. The researcher relied on three dimensions of justice, which is distributive, procedural and practical. The researcher used the questionnaire as a tool for data collection. To reduce work pressure. And that there is a sense of the availability of organizational justice in the work of the college in question, and the order of the dimensions first of the justice process and the fairness of the procedures and finally distributive justice.

- A study of (Al-Ali and Matala, 2016). This study aims to shed light on the organizational justice standards prevailing in the faculties of the Public Authority for Applied Education and Training, the correlation between the availability of the standards of organizational justice and the academic performance of the Faculty Staff. The most important findings of the study are: The standards of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactive) are weak in the faculties of applied education. There was also a positive correlation between statistical and non-statistical criteria between the combined organizational justice standards and the academic performance standards combined. And that there is a positive correlation between the role of Faculty Staff and the standards of organizational justice combined statistical significance

- A study of (Eres, et al, 2014) the researcher used a sample of 470 teachers working in primary schools in central Ankara. The results of the study indicated that there is a significant positive correlation between the sub-dimensions of the perception of justice and trust in school principals.

- Study (Abu Tayeh, 2012) which aims to analyze the impact of the sense of organizational justice on the behavior of organizational citizenship in the centers of government ministries in Jordan. The results of the study showed that there is a positive impact of the employees' understanding of organizational justice on the behavior of organizational citizenship and its dimensions. The results also showed that the sense of procedural justice has a greater role in influencing the behavior of organizational citizenship compared to other dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice and procedural justice).

- A study of (Noruzy, 2011) the aim of this study was to find out the relationship between three variables: organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, loyalty to employees, and organizational support as an intermediate variable. An inverse relationship between the fairness of transactions and some dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, in addition to a strong and moral correlation between organizational commitment and organizational justice, as organizational commitment is a natural reaction to the employee's sense of fairness of distribution.

- A study of (Kezainen and Naserbad, 2010) aims to identify the positive role of organizational justice in the personal variables of the Faculty Staff in the university community. It also aimed to study the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship loyalty behaviors: The regulatory role of the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and trust, and reached the most important results, including: that the perceived organizational justice affects positively and directly on the behavior of organizational citizenship, and that organizational trust does not directly affect the academic justice of academics and Faculty Staff.

- A study of (Al Saud et al., 2009) which aimed to identify the level of organizational justice in the heads of departments in the official Jordanian universities and the relationship of organizational loyalty with Faculty Staff. The study reached a number of results, the most important of which is that the level of organizational justice among heads of academic departments was high. A statistical indication between the practice of the heads of the academic departments of organizational justice and the organizational loyalty of Faculty Staff.

- A study of (Abu Tayeh and Al-Qattana, 2009) which aimed to study the relationship between the employees' sense of organizational justice and organizational loyalty in the industrial city of Karak in Jordan. The most important results were that the employees' sense of organizational justice came to a medium degree. And that the sense of organizational justice, in particular the procedural justice, contributed to increasing the organizational loyalty of the employees.

- Study of (Ismail, A. Ibrahim, D.K, and Girardi, A, 2009) which aims to study the impact of distributive justice and wage structure on the attitudes of work behavior (job satisfaction, commitment and organizational loyalty), and reached a number of results. The most important of these results is that the relationship between the wage system and distributive justice is strongly related to the organizational commitment. Distributional justice with organizational commitment, and distributive justice plays a strong role in motivating staff to assess the structure and level of remuneration allocated to different types of job categories. This helps to alleviate the role conflict and the burden of overcrowding of staff. Anaajathm and aspirations.

- A study (Aweida, 2008) The study found that there is a high level of organizational loyalty in the NGOs in Gaza Governorate by 81%, in addition to a positive relationship between the factors of job satisfaction
represented by (improving wages, Reformulation of the promotion system applied, the establishment of a fair system for all staff to apply all types of justice, including procedural justice, interactive justice, etc., and the promotion of human relations among all staff) related to the work of the Organization and factors influencing organizational loyalty in their work and in organizations Other m.

- A Study of (Al-Qatawneh, 2003) which aimed to study the relationship between the impact of organizational justice on the organizational loyalty of employees working in the government departments in the governorates of Jordan, and reached the most important results, including that the relative importance of organizational justice in general is medium. The results also showed a strong correlation between organizational justice and organizational loyalty.

- A study of (Lee, H.R, 2003) Which aimed to know the relationship between presidents and subordinates on the understanding of the workers of organizational justice in the three dimensions of procedural justice and distributive justice) on job satisfaction and organizational loyalty, and reached the most important results, including that there is a positive impact of justice distributive and fairness of procedures on job satisfaction, Effect of fairness on organizational loyalty.

**Results of analysis of previous studies:**

In their analysis of procedural fairness and interactive justice and their impact on organizational loyalty from the above studies, the researchers conclude a number of outcomes:

1. Most of the previous studies aimed at reviewing the concept of organizational justice by describing and analyzing a situation either individually or in combination or in relation to some other organizational variables.

2. There have been studies on the relationship of organizational justice to organizational citizenship behavior such as (Abu Tayeh, 2012), (Noruzy, 2011) and (Razainen et al. 2010), all of which confirmed the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors at all levels.

3. There have been studies on the relationship of organizational justice to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, such as the study of (Lee, 2003), the Ismaili study, and Bakhsh et al, all these studies confirm a strong correlation between organizational justice.

4. The study attempts to benefit from the accumulated knowledge available in Arab and foreign studies on the relationship between the variables of the study, in order to review the development of administrative practices in the administration of Palestinian ministries, specifically the Ministry of Higher Education in Palestine, especially Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei. Dealing with Faculty Staff.

5. It is clear from the studies mentioned above regarding procedural justice and the fairness of the interactions with organizational loyalty, as they differed according to the objectives that they sought to achieve, in addition to the different sectors that dealt with them, while this study differs from its predecessors in determining the relative importance of each dimension. The dimensions of organizational justice and its relevance and impact on the organizational loyalty of Faculty Staff, which gives special importance to this study, especially as it is the first to know the researchers.

**Methodology of the study:**

**Introduction:**

This study is mainly based on descriptive analytical methodology, because it is one of the most widely used methods in studying the social and human phenomenon, and because it fits the subject of the study, which is known as a method that depends on the study of reality or phenomenon as it is in fact, the qualitative expression describes the phenomenon and explains its characteristics. Quantitative expression gives us a numerical description of the size, size or degree of the phenomenon. It is not limited to describing the phenomenon, but rather extends it to interpretation and analysis in order to arrive at facts about the existing conditions in order to develop and evaluate them.

**Study variables:** Table (1) shows the study variables that the researchers will study, as follows:

**Table 1: Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of justice</td>
<td>- Procedural justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interactive justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic variables</td>
<td>Gender, Qualification, Place Of Work, Years of Experience, level of employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Prepared by researchers according to the field study data

**Study Society:**

The study population included all the Faculty Staff of the faculties of Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei (4) faculties, which were obtained through the Human Resources Department at the University. The size of the study society reached 164 employees as shown in Table (2).

**Table 2: The study population of Faculty Staff in the faculty of the Technical University of Palestine- Kadoorei**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Faculty Of Business And Economics</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choosing Poll List:
The survey list was selected prior to the generalization of its use on a simple sample of sampling parties and the use of one of the specialists in the statistical analysis. The following is a description of the final form of the agreed questionnaire consisting of three main parts:

- The first section illustrates the demographic characteristics of the respondents (gender, degree, place of work, number of years of experience, job level).
- The second part was devoted to the measurement of the dimensions of interactive justice and the dimensions of procedural justice. The researchers relied on the scores of the "Likert pentagram" in the design of this questionnaire. Table (3)
- Section 3: The objective is to measure the dimensions of organizational loyalty.

Table 3: Likert scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distribution of grades on the answer items for survey list questions based on the five-point Likert scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Absolutely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree of approval of the paragraphs of the questionnaire was determined by the value of the arithmetic average of these paragraphs according to Table (4).

Table 4: The weighted average of the five - dimensional Likert scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>The weighted average of the five - dimensional Likert scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Degree of approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1 to 1.79</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1.80 to 2.59</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2.60 to 3.39</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3.40 to 4.19</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 4.20 to 5</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection:
The researchers conducted the necessary contacts with the responsible authorities in the college to answer the questions in the survey questionnaires through the personal interview or contact with the department head offices, in addition to the great role played by the deans in the various faculties to urge the Faculty Staff to fill out the questionnaires.

Methods of statistical analysis used for data Study:
In the light of the objectives of the study, and to prove the validity of their validity or lack of validity, the researchers emptied the questionnaires in the program (SPSS) and then the use of specialists in the field of statistical analysis to assist in the analysis of the questionnaire correctly, in addition to the use of statistical methods descriptive, such as percentage. The researchers used to know the frequency and dispersion of each variable in the research sample, as well as
the use of parametric tests, because the scale of the "Likert" Five "ordinal scale, and many other statistical analytical methods required for the study were used as follows:
1. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was tested to identify the internal consistency rate and the stability of the explanatory vertebrae for each variable.
2. Test the simple correlation coefficient between each of the variables of the study except for the demographic variables, in order to identify the strength, direction and significance of the relationship between the two variables in their simple form.
3. Test the analysis of the variance of the variables of the study to test the statistical differences.
4. The regression analysis coefficient for sequential regression analysis (simple linear regression analysis and multiple regression analysis)
5. Distribution of vocabulary in accordance with demographic variables (gender, qualification, place of work, years of experience, level of employment) in terms of number, frequency and percentage.

Field study:
The field study details the results of the statistical analysis of the data collected for the study survey list. This section begins with an assessment of the honesty and consistency in the various parameters used for the variables of the study, then the results of the descriptive statistics of the collected data, and the hypotheses of the study.

Testing and evaluating honesty and consistency in the standards used:
To verify the validity of the multi-content measures used in the study for variables: organizational justice dimensions and sources of work stress, an internal consistency method was used to extract Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The validity and consistency of the measurements shall be judged as follows:

Internal Validity
Means the assessment of the degree to which the survey list used in the study represents the contents of the measurement subject. The idea of evaluating the validity of the survey list is statistically validated by the validity of the scale and its ability to measure the object to be accurately measured. Such as structural validity, conceptual validity, or content validity, is that the expressions of a variable measure contain all elements of the conceptual definition of that variable.
The conceptual definition of the variable is defined from previous theories and research on the same subject (in particular the variable standards used by previous researchers), and the other type of honesty is the convergent velocity, which expresses the extent to which the words that measure the same thing correlate with the overall score of the scale. Al., 1988)
It should be noted that the measures used by the researchers have been obtained from previous studies with minor modifications, the development of a scale based on the views of more than a previous researcher, or the formulation of a scale based on references and theoretical evidence in that area. Based on this, it is possible to achieve the conceptual truthfulness or validity of the content of the criteria used in this research.

Stability test used in the study:
The researchers investigated the study questionnaire in two ways:

Study tool:
The researchers used the study tool (questionnaire) after reviewing the literature of the study and the previous studies related to the subject. The tool was finalized in three areas and (32) paragraphs dealing with the effect of interactive justice and procedural justice among the heads of departments on organizational loyalty in Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei.

Tool Validation:
In order to ensure the safety of the study questions, the validity of the study was verified by presenting it to a group of arbitrators with expertise and experience in the field of administrative and economic sciences and asked them to express their opinion on the paragraphs of the questionnaire by deleting and modifying and proposing new paragraphs and appropriate tool for the subject of the study. Modification of the study tool and it became a final form of (32) paragraph.

Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient :
The researchers adopted the Alpha Cronbach method using the SPSS program. In this area, (Hair et al., 1998) points out that the value of the alpha correlation coefficient ranges from 1.0 to the constant. The minimum laboratory value in this test should not be less than 70.0).
In order to extract the stability coefficient of the tool, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the resolution paragraphs. It reached (0.913). This value indicates that the tool has an appropriate stability and satisfies the purposes of this study. After collecting, coding and processing the data using appropriate statistical methods, using the SPSS program, the researchers used frequency, arithmetical averages, standard deviations and percentages, simple regression test, and algebraic formula.

View and analyze descriptive statistics results:
Including a detailed analysis of the data and presentation of the results through the statistical treatments conducted on the sample of the study, and then analyze and discuss the results and determine the extent of statistical significance.

Analysis of the vocabulary of the study sample according to the demographic variables:
The researchers described and analyzed the demographic data (characteristics and personality traits) of the respondents obtained from the survey form through the frequency and percentage of the demographic variables in the survey form (gender, qualification, place of work, years of experience, place of work). Distribution of study data by these variables.
The following are the results of the study sample according to the demographic variables. It is shown in the following table (5).
Table 5: Distribution of Study Sample Members by Type Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Of Work</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Of Business And Economics</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Of Engineering And Technology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Of Sciences And Literature</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine Technical College- Diploma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and less</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and less than 10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and under 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level of employment</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Staff – Part Time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Staff</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researchers according to field study data and SPSS statistical analysis

The descriptive statistics of the study variables:
The researchers present descriptive statistics (arithmetic mean, standard deviation) for all study variables except for demographic variables. (3) For the purposes of comparative comparison in the comment on descriptive statistical indicators. The comment on the results was based on the nearest average of each variable / field for any of the answers specified in the study tool. (5, strongly agree), (4, agree), (3, neutral), (2, disagree), (1, strongly disagree).
The study dealt with two dimensions of organizational justice (justice, fairness of transactions) and their impact on organizational loyalty as a dependent variable.
The descriptive statistical indicators for each variable of the study are presented below.

Table 6: Mathematical averages and standard deviations of the field of interactive justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie from the point of view of the Faculty Staff ranked descending order by the arithmetic mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The head of the department is interested in dealing fairly with me without discrimination</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The head of the department treats me with all the interest and affection with regard to the decisions related to my work</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The head of the department shows interest in the staff members' functional rights</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The head of department discusses with me the consequences of decisions that may affect my job</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Head of Section takes into account all my rights</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The Head of the Department encourages Faculty Staff to participate in professional meetings</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel that the democratic style is the basis for dealing with all Faculty</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from the data in Table (6) that: The degree of interactive justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie - essential - from the point of view of Faculty Staff was between the medium and large. The averages are between (3.33) to (3.98) for the paragraphs (the head of department is keen to motivate Faculty Staff to research and publish) and (the head of department is concerned with fair treatment without discrimination). This finding indicates that the degree of interactive justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorei from the point of view of Faculty Staff were large, in terms of the average arithmetic (3.72).

It is also clear from the data in Table 10 that there is a high degree of fair dealing, showing interest in the decisions related to the Faculty Staff and his / her professional rights, discussing the decisions of the Faculty Staff, taking into consideration all the rights of the employees. As a basis for dealing, and discuss the consequences of the decisions of Faculty Staff, and to allow the member of the faculty to participate in the decisions.

**Question 2: What is the degree of procedural justice in the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University- Kadoorei in view - from the point of view of Faculty Staff?**

In order to answer this question, the arithmetical averages and the standard deviation of each of the procedural justice areas were extracted.

**Table 7:** The arithmetical averages and standard deviations of the field of procedural justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University from the point of view of the Faculty Staff ranked in descending order by the arithmetic mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The head of the department shall ensure that each member expresses his or her opinion before taking decisions regarding the work</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The head of department opens the field to object to the decisions he makes</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The head of department collects accurate and complete information before making business decisions</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The systems within the university guarantee you the right to contact the higher management if you have a personal problem with your department head</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Head of department shall make functional decisions before they are issued in an unbiased manner</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel that the behavior of department heads in my college is fair and cooperative</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have a significant reward from the head of the department for the extra effort I make in the lecture</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The administrator explains the decisions in each section and provides department heads with additional details when they are asked before and after decisions are made</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>When management makes decisions about employees, they discuss them very frankly before decisions are made</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>You feel that the head of your department is deliberately blocking certain actions and decisions from you</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total degree of second field degree (procedural justice)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the data in Table (7) that: The degree of procedural justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie - essential - from the point of view of Faculty Staff were between medium and large. (3.33) to (3.83) are the paragraphs (feel that the head of your department deliberately obscures certain actions and decisions) and (the head of the department is keen to show each member his opinion before making decisions on the work), that the degree of procedural justice at the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie - essential - from the point of view of the Faculty Staff was large, in terms of the average arithmetic (3.65). It is also clear from the data in Table (7) that there is a high degree of acceptance of the opinion of each member of the
faculty, the existence of a field of objection to decisions, the existence of sufficient information before making decisions and the existence of access to senior management in the event of a personal problem with the head of department, impartial and unbiased behavior decisions, moral equivalence over the Faculty Staff's extra effort, pre-and post-decision inquiries, and explicit discussions when making decisions with Faculty Staff.

**Question 3: What is the degree of organizational loyalty of Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorei?**

In order to answer this question, the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation of each paragraph of the organizational loyalty field were extracted.

**Table 8: Mathematical Meanings and Standard Deviations of Organizational Loyalty at Faculty Staff of the Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie Ranking in descending order by the arithmetic mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I feel that my university is part of my life and it's hard to get away from it</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I do my work sincerely to serve my university</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I gladly accept any duty that I have to take in this university</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is a consensus between me and my university that encourages me to stick to it</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I will not accept to work at a university other than the university I work in, even if my working conditions are better than working conditions in my life</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My newest friend is that my university is very great</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am late after the end of working hours if necessary to complete my work without any financial claims</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I will stay at this university even if others have gone to work in other universities</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel good if I feel that what I do is appropriate with what I get from my salary</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>In my opinion, this university is one of the best universities to work in Palestine</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I certify efficiently my colleagues at the university</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The values and philosophy adopted by the university are in line with my personal values</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Degree of Field Degree (Organizational Loyalty)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Average Squares</th>
<th>(F) Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Selection Factor (R2)</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is clear from the data in Table (8) that the degree of organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff has been significant. The mathematical averages ranged from 3.57 to 4.32 (the values and philosophy adopted by the university in line with my personal values) and (I feel that my university is part of my life and difficult to move away from). This result indicates that the degree Organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff was significant, in terms of the mean (3.84). It is also clear from the data in Table (8) that there is a great degree of sense of the value of the university in the lives of the respondents, work faithfully, and accept duties, the compatibility between the university and the Faculty Staff, the love of work in the same university. The need to remain in the university, and the satisfaction of the consensus between the financial return and work, and the sense that the university is one of the best universities, and the respect of colleagues and the certificate of competence, and the compatibility between the philosophy of the Faculty Staff and its values and those adopted by the University.

**8. STUDY HYPOTHESES TEST:**

1. **The first main hypothesis of the study hypotheses, which was formulated in the form of Null Hypothesis, states:**

   - There is no statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) for the interactive justice of the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorei the need to achieve organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff.

   In order to examine the validity of the first hypothesis, the regression analysis and the results of the following table were used:
We observe from the data in the previous table that the calculated value of F is 48.525 and the level of significance is 0.000 at the degrees of freedom (1 and 103). This negates the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of significance the explanatory power of the R2 model is 0.320 and the correlation coefficient (R) is 0.566, which is a strong explanatory force. Means that the paragraphs of the independent variable (interactive justice) of department heads explain 32.0% of the total is the (organizational loyalty) when Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei.

2. The second main hypothesis of the study hypotheses, which was formulated in the form of Null Hypothesis, states that:

- There is no statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) for procedural justice in the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University-Kadoorei the need to achieve organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff.

In order to examine the validity of the second hypothesis, the regression analysis and the results of the following table were used:

Table 10: Results of Regression Analysis to Evaluate the Effect of Procedural Justice on the Heads of Departments at Palestine Technical University Achieving organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Average Squares</th>
<th>(F) Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Selection Factor (R2)</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>9.357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.357</td>
<td>47.439</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The error</td>
<td>20.317</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.674</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.525</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (statistically significant at α = 0.05)

The data in the previous table shows that: There were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) between the average responses of the sample of the study towards the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and organizational loyalty in Faculty Staff due to the variable years of experience.

In order to examine the validity of the third hypothesis related to the variable years of experience, the analysis of the mono-variance was used, and the results of the following tables show that:

3. The third main hypothesis of the study hypotheses, which was formulated in the form of Null Hypothesis, states that:

Table 11: The arithmetical averages and the standard deviations of the responses of the sample of the study towards the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and the organizational loyalty of Faculty Staff due to the variable of years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactive justice when heads of departments</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years and less</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years and less than 10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years and under 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 years and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice at department heads</td>
<td>5 years and less</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years and less than 10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years and under 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 years and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational loyalty to Faculty Staff</td>
<td>5 years and less</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years and less than 10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years and under 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 years and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the previous table, there are differences in the average responses of the sample of the study between the levels of years of experience in the responses of the sample of the study in the areas of interactive justice and procedural justice.

Table 12: Results of the analysis of the single variance to indicate the differences in the responses of the sample of the study towards the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and organizational loyalty in Faculty Staff due to the variable years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactive justice when heads of departments</th>
<th>Source of Contrast</th>
<th>Total Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Average Squares</th>
<th>(F) Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>42.520</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.720</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice at department heads</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>30.712</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.522</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational loyalty to Faculty Staff</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>28.616</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.674</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (statistically significant at α = 0.05)

The data in the previous table indicate that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) in the responses of the sample of the study towards the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei attributed to the variable Years of Experience. The values of the three dimensions are respectively (0.924, 0.450 and 0.298) and these values are greater than (α = 0.05). Therefore, we accept the hypothesis and say that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) Towards Interactive Justice and Procedural Justice at the Heads of Departments and Organizational Loyalty among Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei due to the variable years of experience.

9. RESULTS

- The measure of organizational justice is a scale based on a single structure or structure.
- The possibility of practical discrimination between two dimensions of organizational justice is procedural justice, fairness of transactions and their impact on organizational loyalty.
- That the perceptions of the workers at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei in all its dimensions - to the interactive justice of the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei - the need to achieve organizational loyalty is approaching the middle degree of the scale.
- The perceptions of the workers at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei in all its dimensions - to the procedural justice of the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei - the need to achieve organizational loyalty is the necessity of achieving the intermediate level of the scale.
- That the perceptions of the workers at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei of the demographic variables, especially the years of experience with the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University - the need to achieve organizational loyalty is approaching the middle degree of the scale.
- The most interactive dimensions of justice in the faculty of Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei were the two paragraphs: (The head of the department is keen to motivate Faculty Staff to research and publish) and (the head of the department is concerned with fair dealing with me without distinction) (The mean of the arithmetic mean) in terms of the mean of the arithmetic mean (3.72).
- The most practical dimensions of procedural justice, recognized by Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei, were: "You feel that the head of your department is deliberately blocking certain actions and decisions from you." The head of the department ensures that each member expresses his or her opinion before taking action decisions), In terms of the mean (3.65).
- The organizational dimensions of the faculty of Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei were the most important aspects of organizational loyalty: "The values and philosophy adopted by the university are consistent with my personal values." (I feel that my university is part of my life and it is hard to get away from it) In terms of the mean (3.84).
- The study showed that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) for the interactive justice of the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei - the necessity of achieving organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff.
The study showed that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of significance (α = 0.05) for procedural justice in the heads of departments at Palestine Technical University. Kadoorei - the necessity of achieving organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff.

The study showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) in the responses of the sample of the sample towards the interactive justice and procedural justice at the heads of departments and organizational loyalty among Faculty Staff at Palestine Technical University. Kadoorei attributed to the variable years of experience.

10. Recommendations

- The necessity of working to raise the level of the interactive justice between the employees and the university administration by giving more access to the employees to participate in the decision-making mechanisms related to the employees and work with them to discuss them and accept objections that they may consider and study and modify them in line with the public good at the university.

- The necessity of working on introducing more motivation factors by the head of the various departments at the university for the employees in terms of encouraging them morally and financially towards going to scientific research and carrying out appropriate and renewable studies in various subjects that are of interest to scientific research in general and scientific research in Palestine Technical University - Kadoorei in particular. Is working to raise the efficiency of the areas of scientific research and upgrading to advanced levels comparable to other universities.

- To provide more transparency, clarity and openness and to develop the atmosphere of democratic treatment by the head of the departments in relation to the subject of decision-making and to implement procedures related to Faculty Staff, which leads to increase the degree of procedural justice and mutual trust between the parties.

- The need for the head of the departments to provide more procedures to ensure the fairness of Faculty Staff regarding the additional efforts of these. Which leads to the increase of procedural justice provided by the university administration to Faculty Staff without bias or favoritism in order to reflect on the performance of employees and raise the degree of organizational loyalty to them.

- The need for the head of departments in the university to develop and improve the methods of interactive and procedural interaction with Faculty Staff, and maintain the achievements in this area as it works to increase organizational loyalty, which reflects positively on their professional performance and academic work.
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