



# The Impact of Procedural Justice in Enhancing the Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Employees at King Khalid University

**Dr. Asia Yagoub Alhadi Abdalkhair**

Business Administration Department, College of Business, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, Email: aa  
bdalkhair @ kku .edu.sa ,<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5624-6884>

## **Abstract:**

The study aimed to explore the impact of procedural justice on fostering organizational citizenship behavior at Khalid University. The research sample consisted of 421 employees, utilizing a descriptive-analytical approach. The findings revealed a statistically significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior, highlighting the role of procedural justice in promoting such behavior. The study recommended that the university adopt supportive organizational policies that encourage citizenship behavior and work to enhance employees' awareness of procedural justice and its importance in developing and strengthening organizational citizenship behavior.

**Keywords:** citizenship behavior, altruism, civility, procedural justice, King Khalid University.

**Received:**13 June 2024

**Revised:** 19 July 2024

**Accepted:**16 Aug 2024

## **Introduction**

Management is closely related to human behavior and its goal is to strive for administrative excellence through the human element, which is the central pillar in any organization, so organizations seek to achieve effectiveness and efficiency in achieving their goals through the optimal investment of available human resources, the human capital is not essential for the invested money, primarily if it is employed in an appropriate manner, which is reflected in production, productivity and quality of performance, and no matter how sophisticated organizational structures can not To be the reason for the success of the organization without regard to the human element Many modern administrative theories have emerged in the field of human resource management, such as organizational justice, which is an essential theory in the study of individual behavior because it contains reflections on the level of satisfaction of the individual for his needs that he wishes to obtain, which is a neglected dimension of motivation towards more discrimination in performance, which consists of several dimensions (distributive justice, transaction justice, procedural justice). Procedural justice has two procedural and structural parts: the individual's sense of fairness in the structure of decisions and impartiality in determining policies and rewards (Al-Amiri, 2020, p. 117).

Organizational citizenship behavior is among the modern concepts in organizational behavior and human resource management. It is one of the concepts that are concerned with organizational effectiveness, which is a voluntary behavior that does not come within the requirements of the individual's work and job and not within the formal system of rewards in the organization, in addition to that, the behavior of organizational citizenship is a voluntary behavior that is not apparent and not mandatory, and it is a behavior, outside The specific functional role does not entail a reward when it occurs or a punishment when it does not occur through the organization, but it benefits from it to improve its efficiency and continuity" (Hassina and Ben Aoun, 2020, p. 237)

Explained Ha, J.-C., & Lee, J.-W. (2022). Procedural justice is a key part of organizational justice, focusing on the fairness of the processes and procedures used in decision-making. Its concepts include criteria

such as transparency, consistency, and the opportunity for employees to participate and express their opinions. Studies have shown that procedural justice enhances the level of organizational trust and job commitment, which contributes to the organization's high performance.

He added (Abdullah, Falih, and Ahmed, 2008, p. 13) that Procedural justice is one of the main components of organizational justice, which allows for building positive behavior of organizational citizenship for the organization's employees and works to reduce the harmful effects of the lack of distributive justice, which refers to the individual's awareness of the fairness of the distribution of resources provided by the organization through comparison with others. Given the importance of Procedural justice for organizations, Organizations have adopted the philosophy of orientation towards democratic organizations and taking into account justice in their procedures, especially those related to the decision-making process and the participation of workers in decision-making, which contributes to enhancing organizational citizenship behavior and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of work.

The integrity of the procedures followed in the distribution of returns makes the worker feel procedural justice. The availability in organizations has an impact on many variables, the most important of which is performance and job satisfaction; procedural justice is one of the most critical determinants of human behavior within organizations and refers to justice in all procedures, such as promotion procedures and performance evaluation standards and the foundations of determining those entitled to bonuses. (Dahabi and Bokmbish2021, p. 194)

Recent studies show that procedural justice affects job commitment, promotes employee engagement at work, and increases their sense of belonging to the organization. Employees' sense of fairness in operations helps them improve their performance and engage in positive organizational behaviors that support the overall work environment. For this reason, organizations are encouraged to adopt strategies such as training managers on fair evaluation and ensuring employee participation in organizational processes to enhance a sense of fairness Gong, Ren, Sun, Zhang, Zhou& Chen 2025).

This study deals with the importance of procedural justice as one of the components of organizational justice and its direct impact on raising the level of job performance and enhancing job satisfaction among employees at King Khalid University. The study aims to explore the role of procedural justice as an influential mechanism on organizational citizenship behaviors by stimulating individual efforts, as it seeks to highlight the impact of procedural justice in improving these behaviors from the point of view of employees at the university.

The study focuses on answering many fundamental questions, such as the level of application of procedural justice at the university and what is the level of organizational citizenship behavior among employees. How does procedural justice contribute to these behaviors? The importance of the study lies in providing a comprehensive theoretical framework that contributes to consolidating the concepts of procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior's, which fills the knowledge gaps among those interested in this field. Moreover, the study seeks to highlight the role of procedural justice in improving the performance of employees and increasing their job satisfaction, thus Promoting the success and excellence of organizations. It also seeks to clarify the concept of organizational citizenship behaviours and their significant impact on the efficiency of institutional performance. Through this study, findings and recommendations are presented aimed at helping decision-makers at the university and other organizations adopt the principles of procedural justice, which contributes to enhancing organizational citizenship behavior's and improving employee performance.

## 2.0 Literature Review

### **Procedural Justice:**

It is the fairness and integrity of procedures related to the performance of work, that is, the extent of honesty and integrity of converting inputs into outputs in the organization, such as decision-making within the organization, the more the employee feels integrity in the decision-making process for work,

the more confidence he has in those responsible for him, which develops his sense of organizational justice at work. (Bahri and Kharmoush, 2017, p. 79)

It was defined as the degree of feeling generated among workers towards the fairness of organizational procedures, which determines organizational methods. It is also related to the satisfaction of workers with the procedures related to their own work, and workers' awareness of justice is summarized in the worker's deprivation, warning, dismissal, promotion bonus, and distribution of bonus (Gouda, Yahya and Jaafar, 2021, p. 215).

He defined it as the worker's perceived justice concerning the process and procedures used in decision-making (Abdullah Falih and Ahmed, 2008, p. 13).

He added (Abdul Majeed, 2020, p. 378) that to achieve procedural justice, it is necessary to involve the most significant possible number of authorities when developing procedures, equality in the implementation of guidelines and regulations on all employees, giving workers the right to object, and the organization has the right to punish workers.

He mentioned (Abdul Latif, Ghobis, Al-Azab, 2020, p. 31) that the fairness of the procedures can be divided into two types, namely fair procedures, which relate to fair means and methods when making decisions and participating in the adoption of new procedures to reduce bias and error in the decisions that are taken. The second is unfair procedures that relate to unfair means when making decisions against workers, which leads to the formation of negative feelings, which leads to low job performance.

The importance of procedural justice :

Reducing pressure levels on employees Increasing job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment among employees, as well as increasing organizational confidence and reducing resistance to change among employees:( Abdullah, Falih & Ahmed 2008, p. 13)

Procedural justice is represented in applying procedures to all employees, involving workers in decision-making, and providing accurate information related to decisions when asked about them, as procedural justice works to achieve actual control over employees, as determined by the system of job obligations and penalties. It determines how to perform the required tasks to reach the goals, the system of job grievance, and solve work problems. (Al-Juhani and Al-Qarni, 2020, p. 757)

It works to clarify the special rules on which the decision is made, provides a detailed explanation of the measures taken towards workers, and clarifies the penalties and penalties that apply to workers, which leads to the employees' feeling of applying procedural justice, which leads to reducing the employees' sense of psychological conflict by knowing the reason for which the penalty was imposed by the administration (Judeh, Yahya and Jaafar, 2021, p. 215)

One of the negative effects of the lack of application of procedural justice is that the failure to apply procedural justice is the basis for all the organizational damage suffered by the organization and the decline and deterioration of the organization, and the failure to apply it results in a decrease in the quality of performance (Abdul Latif, Al-Azab and Ghobeish, 2020, p. 32)

### **Criteria for judging procedural justice:**

There is a set of standards that must be adhered to achieve the fairness of the procedures, such as consistency, as the procedures for distributing sanctions to everyone at all times must be consistent and harmonious and harmonious procedures for distributing sanctions to everyone at all times, and objectivity must not achieve personal interests or goals and based on honest and correct information, as there are opportunities to correct and change the decision if it appears justified and supported (Appeal rules must also be based on ethical standards, meaning that the sources are distributed according to the moral standards prevailing in society (the moral norm) and achieve the interests of all without there being bias when making decisions because of color, gender or other differences (the rule of non-alignment) (Radwan, 2020, p. 10) (Abdullah, Falih and Ahmed, 2008, p. 14)

Dimensions of procedural justice:

He explained (Abdullah, Falih, and Ahmed, 2008, p. 13) that the dimensions of procedural justice are two main dimensions, namely the structural dimension, which clarifies fair and formal procedures within the organization and shows the importance of setting a set of rules that must be followed when making decisions on the distribution of outputs (such as wage neutralization procedures, performance evaluation, promotion, transfer, granting incentives, etc.) and the social aspect (influence). This dimension relates to the treatment of supervisors with their subordinates. It is related to how the procedures related to returns are implemented, i.e., the distributional aspect, as well as expressing the extent of respect for management or decision-makers for employees by clarifying how decisions are made, and procedural justice can be divided into two aspects, the first is related to justice related to information, which is the clarifications provided to individuals to whom information associated with the application of procedures is transferred in a certain way. The second is justice, which is related to the treatment of individuals and focuses on how the individual is treated with respect by the administration during the legislation of procedures and reflects the fairness of the treatment between the superior and the subordinate and the quality of the personal relationship between them.

Benefits from the Application of Procedural Justice : (Abdullatif, Ghobeish, Al-EzzB., 2020, p. 31) Procedural justice plays a significant role in the cohesion of systems in all departments. Enhancing the confidence of employees in the organization Achieving the satisfaction of the organization's employees Providing the foundations of justice, integrity, and equality in duties and rights Increase the motivation of employees towards work and raise the level of performance. Clarifying the reality of the procedural system for salaries and wages Positively modify the attitudes of employees. The most critical elements that achieve procedural fairness (Judeh, Yahya, Jaafar, 2020, p. 216) pointed out that several elements achieve procedural justice, including: Continuity in the sense that it is constantly applied to different individuals and times. Be based on ethical standards Contain all accurate information and use it in decision-making It contains some means to correct inaccurate decisions The views of all parties affected by the decision should be taken into account.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior:

It is that discretionary behavior carried out by the individual in the organization voluntarily and voluntarily, which exceeds the requirements and scope of the official role specified in the job description and is not associated with the system of official rewards and incentives. This behavior is for individuals, groups, or organizations to achieve organizational effectiveness. (Meshmesh, 2016, p. 6)

He added (Al-Ta'amseh and Hassab Allah, p.296) that the behaviors that help in the climate and culture of the organization and how transformational and maintenance activities are carried out are not stipulated in the job description card, which are the activities carried out by the employee to accomplish the work indirectly in the work environment that requires the help of coworkers, commitment and maintaining the regulations and rules of the work environment, which indirectly contributes to the success of the organization.

He also added (Bahri and Kharmoush, p. 87) that the behavior of organizational citizenship reflects all the actions carried out by individuals that exceed the minimum requirements of the role expected of the organization and enhance the well-being of coworkers, which is the willingness of participants to make an effort beyond the formal obligations dictated to them and appear in the desire of individuals to cooperate to achieve and maintain the goals of the organization.

He also added (Belkacem, Abdel Salam Aziz .2020, p. 547) that Organizational citizenship behavior aims to promote positive aspects that affect job performance.

(Boubacar, Ahmed, 2020, p. 504) It is an optional, voluntary behavior that goes beyond the limits of the official role and is represented in the individual's keenness on his organization, goodness, success, property, time, and future, and interest in helping other employees, including new employees and

coworkers. He adheres to the policies and values of the organization and is dedicated to making a double effort to improve performance and increase productivity without expecting incentives or rewards.

From the above, we conclude that organizational citizenship behavior is essential for all organizations. It allows individuals to deal with unexpected situations that require innovative behavior and helps them carry out their job requirements correctly. It also helps to improve performance, increase organizational effectiveness, and increase job satisfaction for employees and their organizational commitment.

### **Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior:**

There is no agreement on the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, but there is a set of dimensions on which most of the research has agreed (Boubacar, Ahmed, 2020, p. 504), (Hasina and Bouaoun, 2020, p. 237) (Meshmesh, 2016, p. 9) (Abdullah, Falih and Ahmed, p. 18)

They are Altruism: Helping the employee to people around him with work-related tasks when the workload is high or advising new employees and going beyond this assistance to include auditors to receive optimal service in the organization.

Awakening (awareness) conscience: represents the behavior of the volunteer employee who exceeds the minimum understanding of the requirements of the job and the expression of opinions and proposals that help solve work problems and improve and develop work within the organization without waiting for a motivational reward, which is the dimension that pushes the person beyond the levels of job requirements and duties such as working after official working hours and maintaining Resources of the organization.

Sportsmanship (tolerance): The employee desires to carry out the tasks required of him without complaining or complaining and is willing to accept some occasional organizational harassment and adapt to exceptional working conditions as well as maintain calm and fun even if the opposite of colleagues or if the circumstances that the organization is going through are complex and are all the patterns that make the employee perform temporary or additional tasks to get along with less than what is ideal in the work environment with satisfaction and without complaining.

Civility: The employee attempts to prevent problems related to work and his knowledge of the impact of his behavior on others and not to exploit the rights of others and avoid raising issues with them, as well as informing colleagues of all information about them and respecting colleagues.

Civilized behavior: includes all the activities that the individual volunteers carry out to preserve the security of the institution and its property, and a statement of the behavior of belonging and loyalty to it, and includes respecting the rules, regulations, and laws, maintaining the status and reputation of the organization, ensuring its success and attending events and meetings associated with it.

The importance of organizational citizenship behavior:

He explained (Meshmesh, 2016, p. 8) that the importance of organizational citizenship behavior for organizations as a whole is shown by:

Improving the performance levels of individuals and managing the reciprocal relationships between workers in administrative departments

reducing the rate of work turnover and absence, which leads to organizational stability

High-performance rates and increased level of productivity, effectiveness, and organizational efficiency

Enhance mutual trust between employees and job satisfaction and reduce organizational conflicts.

### **Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior:**

(Omran, 2019, p. 8) mentioned that three factors affect the willingness of individuals to exert more effort than required of them The job specifications that they harm were considered one of the determinants of organizational citizenship Individual tendencies: This determinant relates to the characteristics of the individual's personality associated with acceptance by others, how easy or difficult it is to get along with

them, or the extent of the individual's openness or openness concerning relationships between individuals.

**Positional introductions:** These introductions are associated with the concept of organizational justice, especially concerning procedural justice. Citizenship behavior is linked to perceptions related to procedural justice. The organization that provides fair and equitable treatment will have workers likely to exchange it by engaging in organizational citizenship behavior and functional trends such as job satisfaction. Organizational commitment, mission characteristics, and trust among individuals are all reasons behind employees deciding to perform citizenship behavior, as well as factors related to the organizational context, such as the size of work and the stability of membership in the organization, all of which affect individuals' decisions regarding orientation towards organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Organizational culture:** The organizational culture that is built on the interest of the individual tends to consider its employees as independent human entities seeking to achieve their goals, which have precedence over the goals of the group and that their rights above the rights of the group, either organizational cultures that care about the group they consider the individual part of the group and that the rights of the group and its interests precede individual rights and interests and that these differences Cultural behavior is what leads individuals to practice different types of citizenship behavior in its negative aspects, while behavior that conforms to the interests of the group is one of the negative aspects of collective organizational citizenship behavior.

### 3.0 Methodology

.The descriptive analytical approach and the questionnaire were used as a tool for the studyAnalyticdescriptive statistics were used using the statistical package (SPSS), and .frequencies and percentages were extracted Arithmetic averages and standard deviations and the simple regression test were used, and trajectory analysis was used to test the study's hypotheses. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of the data, which include the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of all axes of the independentresearchand the paragraphs that make up each axis, were relied upon

We expected to collect data from 120 samples of university students based on the rule of thumb suggested by the methodologist for sample size determination. Thus, according to Kerjcie and Morgan (1970) and Cohen (1969) table of minimum sample size (Krejcie and Morgan 1970; Sekaran 2003; Sekaran and Bougie 2016). As a result, we collected 421 through Google Forms questionnaires, which was attractive for increasing the degree of accuracy and achieving good results in the future

The research community consisted of all employees of King Khalid University. The data was collected through a questionnaire distributed to the study sample, which amounted to (421) employees, to identify their attitudes and opinions about the impact of procedural justice in promoting organizational citizenship behavior for employees of King Khalid University.

**Table (2): Characteristics of the sample that responded to the study**

Percentage	Number of sample members	Category	Variable
52%	217	male	Gender
48%	204	female	
100	421	Total	
24%	100	years and under 30	lifetime
23. %	98	and less than 40 years 30 old	

Percentage	Number of sample members	Category	Variable
32%	131	and less than 50 years 40 old	
21. %	90	years and above 50	
100%	421	Total	
29%	120	Master	Qualification
26%	111	Higher Diploma	
15%	63	secondary	
30%	127	Bachelor	
100%	421	Total	
18%	74	Administrative Supervisor	Job Title
35%	145	Security personnel	
31%	132	Secretarial	
16%	70	Director of Administration	
100%	421	Total	

Table (2) Characteristics of the sample that responded to the study from the results of the Field study and the SPSS program 52 % are males and 48% are females, which indicates equal employment opportunities at the university for both sexes. 32% of the age group (40 and less than 50 years), followed by the group (30 and less) with 24%, and the group (30 years and less than 40) percentage reached (24%) It is noted that the majority of the sample surveyed is from the age group (30 years and over), which indicates the quality of the sample and the experience of its members.

The highest category was holders of a bachelor's degree (30%), followed by holders of a master's degree (29%), while the diploma category reached (26%). The secondary category reached 15%. It is noted that all members of the sample surveyed hold a bachelor's degree and above, which indicates their ability to absorb the questionnaire questions and answer them. of their job title is a security individual, which (%35) represents the highest category, followed by the secretarial titleat followed by ,(%31) the chief inspector at and the administrative supervisor with 18% of the total sample surveyed, which represents the lowest ,(%16) category. It is also noted that job titles vary insuitableproportions for all administrative positions at all .administrative levels, which enables them to answer the questionnaire questions objectively

### 3.2 Data analysis and results

**The averages and standard deviations were extracted to identify the responses of the study sample members about their attitudes toward the application of procedural justice and its impact on enhancing organizational citizenship behavior.** The arithmetic averages and standard deviations were extracted to identify the responses of the study sample members for the **Application of procedural justice and level of organizational citizenship behavior, the following answers to the following study questions:**

**Table 3: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the responses of the study sample members on the level of application of procedural justice at the university in descending order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
medium	1	1.21	3.54	All management decisions are applied to all employees .without exception	8
medium	2	1.14	3.51	My boss makes career decisions unbiasedly	1
medium	3	1.12	3.50	Raisi makes sure that every employee has their say before making business decisions.	2
medium	4	1.18	3.49	The two heads explain the decisions and provide employees with additional details of their inquiry about those decisions.	3
medium	5	1.21	3.46	The procedures applied are based on ethical standards	5
medium	6	1.21	3.46	Employees are allowed not to accept or oppose .decisions made by their boss	6
medium	7	1.22	3.30	Raisi collects accurate and complete information before .making business decisions	7
medium	8	1.21	3.31	Actions are corrected if they are wrong	4
medium		1.02	3.45	Arithmetic mean	

Source: The researcher counters the results of the field studies

It is clear from Table (3) that the arithmetic averages of the level of procedural justice at the university ranged between n (3.54 and 3.30), where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.45), which is from the average, and paragraph No. (8) won the highest arithmetic average, reaching (3.54) and a standard deviation of (1.21), which is from the average level, and the paragraph stipulated (all administrative decisions are applied to all employees without exception.)

On the other hand, and in the last place, paragraph (7) came with an average of (3.30) and a standard deviation of (1.22), which is the average level, as the paragraph stipulated (my boss collects accurate and complete information before making decisions about work), which explains that the application of procedural justice at the university was at an average level.

**Table 4: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the responses of the study sample members on the level of organizational citizenship behavior among university employees in descending order**

**Table (4)**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	0.95	3.98	Altruism	2
High	2	1.01	3.90	Awareness of conscience	1
High	3	0.95	3.84	Kindness and courtesy	3
High	4	1.04	3.83	Civilized behavior	5



medium	5	1.02	3.66	Sportsmanship	4
High		0.90	3.84	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

It is clear from Table (4) that the arithmetic averages of the level of organizational citizenship behavior among university employees ranged between (3.98 and 3.66), where the behavior of organizational citizenship as a whole won a total arithmetic average of (3.84), which is from the high level, and altruism ranked first and obtained an arithmetic average of (3.98) and a standard deviation of (0.95) and in second place came the awareness of conscience, and it won an arithmetic average of (3.90) and a standard drift (1.01), which is from the high level and in the rank The third came civilized behavior has won an arithmetic average of (3.84) and a standard deviation (0.95) which is from the high level and in the fourth place came kindness and civility has won an arithmetic average of (3.79) and a standard deviation (1.04) which is from the high level and in the last place came sportsmanship, which won an arithmetic average of (3.66) and a standard deviation (1.02) The arithmetic average of all dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (3.84) and a standard deviation (0.90), which is the high level and this explains that the behavior of organizational citizenship It was a high standard of university staff.

#### **Arithmetic averages of organizational citizenship behavior dimensions The first question: What is the level of altruism among university employees?**

**Table 5: Arithmetic averages and deviations of university staff responses to the altruistic level of university employees in descending order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	1.04	4.07	.I help my coworkers of any kind	2
High	2	1.07	3.96	Respond to my superiors' directives to act	1
High	3	1.01	3.95	I spend part of my time solving some of my colleagues' work problems	3
High	4	1.08	3.93	I share some work tools with my colleagues to help Others to accomplish their tasks	4
High		0.94	3.98	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

It is clear from Table (5) that the arithmetic averages of the level of altruism among the university employees ranged between (4.07 and 3.93), where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.98), which is a high level, and paragraph No. (2) won the highest arithmetic average, reaching (4.07) with a standard deviation (1.04) It is a high level, and the paragraph has stipulated (I assist my colleagues at work of any kind)

We note from the table that the arithmetic mean of the altruism dimension reached (3.98), which is a high level, which explains that the altruism of the university employees is high, as paragraph (4) came with the lowest arithmetic mean (3.93) and standard deviation (1.08).

**The second question: What is the level of awareness of conscience among the university staff?**

**Table (6) Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Responses of the Study Sample Members on the Level of Conscience Awareness among Employees at the University in Descending Order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	1.12	3.96	Commit to attendance and departure in accordance with the controls specified at the university	2
High	2	1.05	3.92	I make proposals for the development of work at the university	1
High	3	1.09	3.90	Work to preserve university property	3
High	4	1.14	3.84	Ask permission from my immediate supervisor if an emergency happens to me	4
High		1.01	3.90	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

We note from Table (6) that the arithmetic averages of the level of conscience awareness among university employees ranged between (3.96 and 3).84) where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.90), which is a high-level won paragraph (2) (committed to attendance and departure following the controls specified at the university) on the highest arithmetic average where it reached (3.96) and standard deviation (1.12), which is high in the last place came paragraph (4) with an arithmetic average (3.84) and a standard deviation (1.14), which is high paragraph stipulated (I ask permission from my direct boss if it happens to me Emergency circumstance), which explains that the conscience awareness of university staff was high.

**Third question: What is the university staff's level of kindness and civility?**

**Table (7) Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of University Staff Responses to the Level of Kindness and Civility in Descending Order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	1.04	3.90	Respect the rights of others at work	2
High	2	1.05	3.84	Contribute to resolving differences and misunderstandings that may arise between my coworkers	1
High	3	1.02	3.83	.I avoid creating problems for my coworkers	3
High	4	1.09	3.79	Take care of courtesy to colleagues at work, .even in times of work pressure	4
High		0.95	3.84	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

It is clear from Table (7) that the arithmetic averages of the level of kindness and civility of the university staff ranged between (3.90 and 3.79) where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.84), which is a high level, paragraph No. (2) won the highest arithmetic average where it reached (3.90) and a standard deviation (1.04), which is a high-level stipulated paragraph ( respect the rights of others at work), and in

return and the last place came paragraph No. (4) with an arithmetic average (of 3.79) and a standard deviation (of 1.09), which is a high level, where the paragraph stipulated (take care of courteous colleagues at work even in times of work pressure), which explains that the spirit level of kindness and civility for workers The university is high.

**Fourth question: What is the level of civilized behavior among university employees?**

**Table (8) Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of University Staff Responses to the Level of Civilized Behavior in Descending Order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	1.03	3.89	Be actively involved in work-related .meetings	2
High	2	1.04	3.83	Work on developing my skills and personal abilities	1
High	3	1.01	3.82	Ensure the success of the university's activities and events voluntarily	3
High	4	1.08	3.78	Make sure to improve the reputation of the university in front of others	4
High		0.94	3.83	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

It is clear from Table (8) that the arithmetic averages of the level of civilized behavior among university employees ranged between (3.89 and 3.78), where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.83), which is a high level, paragraph No. (2) won the highest arithmetic average, reaching (3.89) and a standard deviation of (1.03), which is a high level, and the paragraph stipulated (Be sure to participate in work-related meetings actively) and paragraph (4) was keen to improve the university's reputation in front of others at least an arithmetic average (3.78) with a deviation Standard (1.08), which explains that the spirit level of civilized behavior of university employees is high

**Fifth question: What is the level of sportsmanship among university employees?**

**Table (9) Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of University Staff Responses to the Level of Sportsmanship in Descending Order**

Appreciation	Order	Standard deviation	Arithmetic average	Paragraph	figure
High	1	1.11	3.72	I apologize if I made a mistake to a colleague at work	2
High	2	1.17	3.70	I accept and do the extra work, complaining	1
High	3	1.16	3.68	I overlook the conflicts that arise in the work environment	3
medium	4	1.31	3.63	Accept the comments of others about the work with an open heart	4
High		1.05	3.68	Arithmetic mean	

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

It is clear from Table (9) that the arithmetic averages of the level of sportsmanship among the employees at the university ranged between (3.72 and 3.63), where the axis won a total arithmetic average (3.68), which is a high level, and paragraph No. (2) won the highest arithmetic average, reaching (3.72) and a standard deviation (1.11), which is a high level, and the paragraph stipulated (I initiate an apology if I made a mistake against anyone. from colleagues at work) and paragraph No. (4) came with an arithmetic

average (3.63) and a standard deviation (1.31), which is an average level Paragraph (.I accept the feedback of others about the work with open arms), which explains that the sportsmanship of the university staff is high.

### Hypothesis testing

#### The first main hypothesis

**The first main hypothesis is that there is a relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior, as illustrated in Table 10.**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	291.520	0.409	0.639	0.639

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician (F) was (291.520) with a statistical significance level of less than (0.05), which indicates a relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior, where the value of (R) was (0.639), and the impact of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior at the university was (40.9%), which indicates the acceptance of the hypothesis

**The central hypothesis is divided into the following sub-hypotheses:**

**\*There is a relationship between procedural justice and altruism dimension as shown in Table (11)**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	221.818	0.345	0.587	0.587

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician F was (221.818) with a statistical significance level less than (0.05), which indicates a relationship between procedural justice and altruism, where the value of R (0.587) and the effect of procedural justice on altruism at the university was (34.5%), which indicates the acceptance of the hypothesis.

**\* There is a relationship between procedural justice and the dimension of conscience awareness is illustrated in Table (12)**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	210.901	0.332	0.577	0.577

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician (F) was 210.901 with a statistical significance level less than (0.05), which indicates a relationship between procedural justice and conscience awareness, where the value of R was (0.577). The impact of organizational justice on conscience awareness among university employees was (33.2%), indicating the hypothesis's acceptance.

**\* There is a relationship between procedural justice, dimension, kindness, and courtesy, as shown in Table (13)**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	212.620	0.335	0.579	0.579

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician (F) with a level of statistical significance less than (0.05), which indicates a relationship between procedural justice and sportsmanship, where the value of (R) (0.579) and the impact of procedural justice on kindness and civility for university employees was (33.5%), which indicates the acceptance of the hypothesis.

**\* There is a relationship between procedural justice and the dimension of civilized behavior is evident from Table (14)**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	251.680	0.374	0.611	0.611

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician (F) was (251.680) with a level of statistical significance less than (0.05), which indicates a relationship between procedural justice and civilized behavior, where the value of (R) was (0.611). The impact of procedural justice on civilized behavior at the university was (37.4%), indicating the hypothesis's acceptance.

**\* There is a relationship between procedural justice and the dimension of sportsmanship as shown in Table (15)**

Statistical significance	F value	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>	Beta relationship direction	LinkR
0.000	189.145	0.310	0.556	0.556

Source: Prepared by the researcher from the results of the field studySPSS

The value of the statistician (F) with a level of statistical significance less than (0.05), which (189.145) ( ) indicates a relationship between procedural justice and conscience awareness, where the value of R and (0.556) the impact of organizational justice on the sportsmanship of university employees was (31%), which indicates the acceptance of the hypothesis

## 5.0 Discussion and Conclusion

At the end of the study, which dealt with the impact of procedural justice on enhancing organizational citizenship behavior at King Khalid University, the researcher concluded a set of essential results that highlight the close relationship between the application of procedural justice and the high levels of voluntary organizational behavior among employees. The results showed that procedural justice applied at the university enhances employee trust and satisfaction, raising job performance efficiency and increasing organizational processes' effectiveness.

The study found that procedural justice applied at King Khalid University is essential in promoting employee organizational citizenship behavior. The more fair employees feel in administrative decisions and procedures, the higher their desire to demonstrate voluntary behaviors that go beyond the boundaries of their job duties, such as altruism, cooperation, and concern for the interest of the organization as a whole. This was reflected in their initiatives to assist their colleagues, make development proposals, and commit to performing their roles efficiently, which contributed to creating a

positive organizational climate within the university. The impact of procedural justice on promoting sportsmanship among employees was evident, as they were willing to tolerate challenges and accept additional tasks without complaining, raising the bar of performance and strengthening fellowship bonds.

In light of these findings, the study recommended enhancing employee participation in decision-making, emphasizing gathering accurate and precise information to support their sense of fair procedures. She also pointed to the importance of building an organizational culture based on procedural justice to enhance employee trust, increase job satisfaction, and improve overall performance. Educating workers at various administrative levels about the importance of procedural justice and its role in creating a productive and positive work environment is also advisable. Moreover, the study stressed the need to adopt regulatory policies supporting organizational citizenship behavior while encouraging managers to adhere to clear and transparent standards to ensure everyone feels equal and fair.

### **Acknowledgment**

"The authors extend their appreciation to the Deanship of Research and Graduate Studies at King Khalid University for funding this work through small group research under grant number RGP1/84/45

### **References:**

1. Abdel Latif, Tahani Shehata Ahmed, Ghobeish, Nasser Fouad Ali and Al-Azab, Hani Al-Sayed (2020). The Journal of Education and Child Culture, Volume (16), Issue 1, page. 26-51.
2. Abdullah Anis and Fleih, Hikmat Muhammad and Ahmad, Hamid Anwar. (2008). Procedural justice and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior, Tikrit Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences, Volume (4), Number 12, page. 9-33.
3. Al-Amiri, Abdulaziz Abdul-Hadi. (2020). Organizational justice and its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors among employees of the Ministry of Education in the Republic of Yemen, Al-Nasser University Journal, Issue (16), Volume 2, page. 115-168.
4. Al-Ta'abasa, Salama Abdullah Khalaf, Wasab Allah, Abdel-Hafeez (2015). The impact of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior. An analytical study of the opinions of workers in QIZ companies (Jordan, Journal of Economic Sciences, Vol. (2), No. 16 page.
5. Bahri, Saber and Kharmoush Mona. (2017). Organizational justice and its relationship to organizational citizenship behavior among workers in the field of local administration in Algeria, Journal of the Arab American University for Research, Volume (3), Issue 2. Page. 74-108
6. Belkacem, Belsheikh and Abd al-Salam, Makhoulfi and Aziz Dahmani. (2020). Human management on the behavior of organizational citizenship, Al-Bashir Economic Journal, Volume (6), Issue 2, page. 544-559
7. Hamdan Haiyan (2015). The Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Improving the Performance of Service Institutions, Science Research Network The Influence of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) On Improving the Performance of Service Institutions), Volume, Issues, page 1-30
8. Hasina, Talib and Ibn Awn Al-Tayeb. (2020) the Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Knowledge Management (Participation and Use), Journal of Economic Sciences and Management Sciences, Volume (20), Issue 1, page 236-247.
9. Judah, Iman Ahmed, Yahya, Nihad Muhammad Yahya and Jaafar, Hibat Allah Ali (2021). The impact of procedural justice on the creative behavior of workers in tourism companies, Journal of the College of Tourism and Hotels, Volume (5) Issue 2, page. 214-226.
10. Meshmesh, Ashraf Muhammad Zaidan. (2016). the reality of organizational citizenship behavior among members of the administration in Palestinian universities in the Gaza Strip from the viewpoint of workers in supervisory positions. Journal of the Palestine Technical College for Research and Studies, Issue (4), page. 1-33
11. Naroura Boubaker and T. Ahmed. (2020) The Impact of Organizational Silence on the Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Economic Institutions, Knowledge Collectives Journal, Volume (6) Issue 2, page. 497-513

12. Omran, Hassan Abd al-Salam Ali. (2019). the role of knowledge management in achieving organizational citizenship behaviors. An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of employees at the Sabha Medical Center. *Journal of Development and Human Resources Management*, Volume (6), Issue 2, page. 1-20.
13. Radwan, Alaa Farag (2020). The impact of job oppression on the relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and employee silence, *Journal of Commerce and Finance*, Volume 40, Issue 3, page 126-171.
14. Al-Dhabi, Hayat and Ali Bukmeish. (2017). Procedural justice and its relationship to the turnover of administrative work in the Algerian institution, *Journal of Intellectual Dialogue*, Vol. (12), No. 14, Pages 193-220.
15. Al-Juhani, Saud Fahd Dakhil Allah, Al-Qarni, Saleh, Bin Ali Bin Yaan. (2020). The authentic leadership of the leaders of educational schools and its relationship to the perceived procedural justice on the part of the teachers, *Journal of the College of Education, Mansoura University*, Issue 112, pp. 747-772.
16. Ha, J.-C., & Lee, J.-W. (2022). Realization of a Sustainable High-Performance Organization through Procedural Justice: The Dual Mediating Role of Organizational Trust and Organizational Commitment. *Sustainability*, 14(1259). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031259>
17. Gong, Z., Ren, M., Sun, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhou, W., & Chen, X. (2025). How Does Procedural Justice Affect Job Crafting? The Role of Organizational Psychological Ownership and High-Performance Work Systems. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15010004>