

Organizational Justice and its Relationship with Citizenship Behavior among Employees of Sports Institutions in M'sila, Algeria

Idriss Benredjem¹, Ahmed Benredjem², Lahcen Triche³, Layachi Salem⁴, Nadir Bouslah⁵, Bilal Bentoumi⁶, Abdelhadi Herizi⁷, Abdennour Ouali⁸.

1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8Institute of Sciences and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities , university of Mohamed boudiaf m'sila

Email : idriss.benredjem@univ-msila.dz

Received : 06/02/2026

Accepted : 01/04/2026

Published : 10/05/2026

Abstract

The study generally aimed to understand the correlational relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among a sample of employees from sports institutions. The researcher used the descriptive correlational method, and the questionnaire as a tool for data and information collection. The study sample was selected using the comprehensive survey method, with a total of 49 male and female employees from the Directorate of Youth and Sports and the Youth and Sports Complex in M'sila. The researcher concluded that there is no relationship between distributive justice and citizenship behavior, and there is a moderate positive relationship between both procedural and interactional justice, and organizational citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions in M'sila, Algeria.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Sports Institutions, M'sila, Algeria.

Introduction and the Study Issue:

Organizational justice is considered as one of the central theories in explaining individual behavior within organizations, due to its direct implications on the level of satisfying their needs and expectations (Greenberg, 1990). Organizational citizenship behavior, considered a discretionary behavior that goes beyond the formal role requirements and is not explicitly rewarded by the incentive system (Organ, 1988), is one of the most important outcomes of the sense of organizational justice.

Theoretically, there is a debate about the primary determinant of this behavior: while equity theory (Adams, 1965) sees the fairness of distributing material outputs as the main driver, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) asserts that the quality of treatment and procedures, independent of monetary compensation, generate a moral commitment that drives voluntary behaviors. Recent analytical reviews have settled this debate in favor of the "moral path," showing that procedural and interactional justice surpass distributive justice in predicting citizenship behavior (Colquitt et al., 2001; Moorman, 1991).

Many previous studies have found significant correlational relationships between dimensions of organizational justice and citizenship behavior, while other studies have indicated the absence of significant relationships between some dimensions of organizational justice and citizenship

behavior. This variation reflects the need for more studies that address this relationship in different contexts, especially in the government sector, which is characterized by stable material returns and adherence to a unified job ladder.

Based on the above, and given the importance of the topic of organizational justice in the field of sports management, this study aims to identify the most important variables of organizational justice that may contribute to the development of organizational citizenship behavior among employees in sports institutions in the state of M'sila. Accordingly, the main problem of the study revolves around the following question:

Is there a correlation between organizational justice and citizenship behavior in sports institutions in M'sila?

Partial questions:

- Is there a correlational relationship between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions?
- Is there a correlation between procedural justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions?
- Is there a correlational relationship between interactional justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions?

Study Objectives: The primary aim of this study is to reveal the nature of the correlational relationships between the variables of the dimensions of justice ("procedures, distribution, interactions") and the citizenship behavior of employees in sports institutions.

Importance of the study: The study gains its significance from the researcher's intention to follow a scientific approach that enriches knowledge, to understand the nature of the correlational relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions in M'sila. It is also hoped that this study will provide a practical addition to help researchers in this academic field identify the most important indicators of organizational justice that may contribute to increasing citizenship behavior, and consequently enhance efficiency and participation in sports institutions.

Study hypotheses:

- There is a correlational relationship between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.
- There is a correlational relationship between procedural justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.
- There is a correlational relationship between interactional justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.

Concepts and Terminology

Organizational justice: Organizational justice reflects the way an individual judges the fairness of the method used by the manager in dealing with both the functional and human levels (Greenberg, 1990, p. 401).

Distributive Justice: Defined as the fairness of outcomes or returns that an employee receives, which include wages, incentives, promotion opportunities, and the number of hours, burdens, and

job tasks. It is the perceived fairness of outputs, results, or distributions that an individual receives in the organizational environment (Adams, 1965).

Procedural Justice: It is defined as those fair decisions and procedures that affect the affairs of individuals working in the internal business environment (Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

Interactional Justice: It is the employee's perception and understanding of formal procedures and their acceptance of them after officials explain and clarify these procedures, as well as justify their purpose (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Citizenship behavior: Voluntary behavior performed by individuals in organizations that goes beyond the requirements of the formal role. It is not explicitly or directly included in the formal reward system and enhances work performance effectiveness in organizations (Organ, 1988).

Employees of sports institutions (Directorate of Youth and Sports, Multi-Sports Complex Office): They are all the employees working within the executive bodies affiliated with the Ministry of Youth and Sports. These institutions are overseen by executive directors appointed by the governor, who ensure the proper functioning of both external and internal administration. They work to promote youth and sports associations, their structures, and organization, prepare targeted programs, and disseminate physical and sports education, especially in the educational and training sectors. They also develop sports development plans for the province in coordination with all relevant bodies and institutions.

Previous Studies:

- The study by Mohamed Nasser Rashid Abu Samaan (2015) titled "Determinants of Organizational Justice and Its Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior," a master's thesis from the Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine. The study generally aimed to understand the correlational relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior from the perspective of police officers in the Gaza Strip. The researcher used the descriptive-analytical method and a questionnaire as a tool to collect information from a sample of police officers. One of the most important findings was that there is a direct relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice, and citizenship behavior.
- Study by Ashraf Abdel Tawab Abdel Meguid and Zahour Samran Mazouq Al-Aufi (2016) titled "The Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior," a scientific article published in the Journal of Arab Studies in Education and Psychology (ASEP, Issue 80, December 2016). The study aimed to understand the correlational relationship between the determinants of organizational justice and citizenship behavior among educational supervisors in the city of Tabuk. The researchers used the descriptive method and a questionnaire as tools for data collection. One of the most important findings was that there is a direct relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, distributive justice, and citizenship behavior.
- The Study of Ben Radjam Idris (2018): "Organizational Justice and its Relationship to Organizational Citizenship Behavior", a scientific article published in the Journal of Sports Creativity at the University of M'sila. The general aim of the study was to identify the

impact of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior from the perspective of the employees of the Institute of Sciences and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities at the University of M'sila. The researcher used the descriptive-analytical method and a questionnaire as a tool for collecting data and information, on a random sample estimated at 27 employees. Among the most important findings reached: there is no correlation between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among employees, and there is a positive correlation between procedural and interactional justice and organizational citizenship.

The practical aspect:

1. The exploratory study:

We initially headed to the headquarters of the Directorate of Youth and Sports and the Bureau of Sports Institutions in M'sila at the beginning of October 2025. The researchers used the interview technique with the head of the user department to determine the size and type of the study sample. A study questionnaire was also distributed to a sample of 10 male and female employees to calculate the psychometric properties (validity and reliability) of the study tool. Among the most important results obtained are the following:

- Controlling the study population and sample and determining the most appropriate method for selecting that sample. See Table No. (05).
- The correlation coefficients for all the statements are statistically significant, indicating that the questionnaire statements are valid for measuring what they were intended to measure in this study. See tables number (01) and (02).
- The reliability coefficients are high and statistically significant, indicating the potential stability of the results that will be obtained using the questionnaire. See Table No. (03).

2. Tools for data and information collection:

The organizational justice scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was adopted, which consists of 18 items distributed across three dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale:

The organizational citizenship behavior scale was used based on Organ's (1988) theoretical framework and developed by Podsakoff et al. (2000). The scale consists of 15 items measuring three dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship.

The validity of the organizational justice and the citizenship behavior questionnaires: The internal consistency of the organizational justice questionnaire statements was calculated on a pilot study sample of 10 individuals by calculating the correlation coefficients between each statement and the overall score of the corresponding dimension as follows:

Table No. (01): Correlation coefficients between the statements of the dimensions of organizational justice and the overall score of the dimension.

No.	Dimension	Item Content	Correlation	Sig

01	Distributive Justice	The monthly salary is commensurate with the efforts I put into my work	0.734	0.001
02		The monthly salary is commensurate with the educational qualification I have obtained	0.953	0.001
03		The monthly salary is commensurate with your acquired work experience	0.734	0.002
04		The requirements and tasks of your job are commensurate with your personal abilities	0.748	0.009
05		You feel that your performance evaluation criteria are fair.	0.728	0.003
06		You feel that promotions at the institute are carried out fairly	0.899	0.004
07	Procedural Justice	Decisions regarding employees are implemented after gathering sufficient information.	0.754	0.002
08		Administrative decisions are applied to everyone without exception	0.755	0.005
09		Issued decisions are based on the principle of non-bias towards anyone	0.887	0.045
10		Administrative penalties are proportionate to the violations and infractions at the institute.	0.678	0.043
11		You see that your supervisor provides fair solutions for grievances and complaints	0.671	0.023
12		You are consulted before new procedures are issued.	0.723	0.033
13	Interactional Justice	My social relationships with employees are characterized by kindness	0.687	0.011
14		A spirit of teamwork and cooperation prevails among colleagues.	0.777	0.023
15		The direct supervisor understands and takes into account the special circumstances of each employee.	0.811	0.001
16		The direct supervisor's treatment is characterized by non-discrimination and lack of favoritism	0.844	0.003
17		The direct supervisor is characterized by open-mindedness and allows discussion and dialogue.	0.786	0.043
18		I feel the direct supervisor's integrity and fairness in resolving disputes among colleagues.	0.634	0.034

Looking at the previous table number (01), it is clear: The correlation coefficients between each item of the sub-dimensions (distribution, procedures, and interactions) and the overall score of the questionnaire ranged between (0.953- 0.634) and are considered significant at the significance level (0.01-0.05). Thus, the items of the organizational justice questionnaire are considered valid for what they were designed to measure.

Table No. (02): Correlation coefficients between citizenship behavior statements and the overall score of the questionnaire.

No.	Dimension	Item Content	Correlation	Sig
01	Altruism	you help your colleagues when they have heavy workloads without expecting anything in return	0.629	0.042
02		You help your colleagues who have been absent from work.	0.610	0.016
03		You care about helping new employees adapt to the work environment	0.687	0.040
04		You try to perform your job to the best of your ability.	0.664	0.001
05		You prioritize the interest of work over personal interest	0.733	0.003
06	Conscientiousness	I maintain my reputation at work.	0.883	0.004
07		You handle the devices and equipment in the workplace with care.	0.796	0.002
08		You accept continuing work beyond official working hours when necessary.	0.687	0.050
09		You are keen to perform your work with precision and dedication.	0.621	0.020
10		I volunteer for extra tasks to improve and develop the work environment.	0.546	0.010
11	Sportsmanship	I avoid stirring up problems at work.	0.769	0.001
12		I make sure to take preventive measures for problems before they occur.	0.647	0.020
13		I am mindful of the impact my behavior has on others.	0.646	0.009
14		I do not violate the rights of others	0.603	0.042
15		You accept criticism with an open mind and without complaint	0.722	0.001

Looking at the previous table number (02), it is clear: The correlation coefficients between each item of the sub-dimensions (Altruism , Conscientiousness and Sportsmanship) and the overall

score of the questionnaire ranged between (0.883- 0.603) and are considered significant at the significance level (0.01-0.05). Thus, the items of the citizenship behavior statements questionnaire are considered valid for what they were designed to measure

Table No. (03): Shows the value of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the reliability of the organizational justice and citizenship behavior questionnaire.

No.	Questionnaire	Number of statements	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
01	organizational justice	18	0.754
02	citizenship behavior	15	0.848

From the previous table number (03), it is clear that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the organizational justice scale reached 0.754, while it reached 0.848 for the citizenship behavior scale. This indicates a high reliability value, suggesting that the study tool has significant reliability.

1- **Study Method:** The researchers used the descriptive method, specifically the method of mutual correlation relationships.

4- **Study Population and Sample:** The study population consists of all employees of the Youth and Sports Directorates in the M'sila Province of Algeria, totaling 45, and all employees of the Multi-Sports Complex in the M'sila Province of Algeria, totaling 14 employees. The study sample was selected using the comprehensive survey method, where 10 individuals from the original population who participated in the pilot study were initially excluded. Consequently, questionnaires were distributed to a group of 49 employees.

Table No. (05) shows the distribution of the study population according to the administrative and technical sectors they belong to.

Institution	Number of employees	Exploratory sample	Basic sample
Directorate of Youth and Sports	45	8	37
Complex Multi-Sports	14	2	12

6. Presentation, analysis, and discussion of the results of the first hypothesis, which states that there is a correlational relationship between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.

Table No. (06): Pearson correlation coefficient between distributive justice and citizenship behavior.

Variant	Sample members	Pearson correlation coefficient	Significance level
---------	----------------	---------------------------------	--------------------

distributive justice	49	0.229	0.114
Citizenship behavior			

From Table No. (06), the Pearson correlation coefficient between distributive justice and citizenship behavior reached (0.229), with a significance level of (0.114), which is greater than (0.05). This indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables from the perspective of employees of sports institutions in M'sila.

This result is explained by the nature of the government sector to which the respondents belong, where salaries and bonuses are subject to a unified job scale system linked to qualifications and seniority, rather than individual performance. Thus, the employee develops a "conviction of conditional material satisfaction" that makes the financial return a fixed variable not related to their voluntary behavior. This aligns with Adams' (1965) equity theory, which posits that individuals compare their ratios, and Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, which emphasizes that citizenship behavior is governed more by trust and treatment than by material benefit.

This finding aligns with Idris Ben R'djem's conclusion (2018) of no relationship between distributive justice and citizenship among employees, but differs from Mohamed Nasser Rashid's (2015) finding of a statistically significant relationship between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among officers in the police force in the Gaza Strip - Palestine. This discrepancy may be attributed to the nature of the security sector, where distribution is linked to risk.

7. Presentation, interpretation, and discussion of the results of the second hypothesis, which states that there is a correlational relationship between procedural justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.

Table No. (07): Pearson correlation coefficient between procedural justice and citizenship behavior.

Variant	Sample members	Pearson correlation coefficient	Significance level
procedural justice	49	0.447	0.001
Citizenship behavior			

From the previous table number (07), it is clear that: The Pearson correlation coefficient between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior was (0.447), with a significance

level of (0.001), which is less than (0.01). This indicates a moderate and statistically significant positive relationship between the two variables among employees of sports institutions in M'sila. Thus, the validity of the second hypothesis is confirmed.

This result is explained by the employee's sense of procedural justice and the policies followed in decision-making—in terms of their consistency, absence of bias, and correctability (Leventhal, 1980)—which generates a feeling of organizational trust and belonging, prompting them to engage in voluntary behaviors that exceed their official role. This is consistent with Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, which posits that unconditional fair treatment creates a moral obligation for the employee to reciprocate by benefiting the organization.

This result aligns with what Moorman (1991) indicated, that procedural justice is the strongest indicator of promoting organizational citizenship behavior, as it reflects the extent to which the institution respects the employee's dignity and right to fair treatment. It also aligns with the results of the study by Idris Ben R'djem (2018), which confirmed that the sense of procedural justice drives employees toward more voluntary behaviors.

8. Presentation, interpretation, and discussion of the results of the third hypothesis, which states that there is a correlational relationship between interactional justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions.

Table No. (08): Pearson correlation coefficient between interactional justice and citizenship behavior.

Variant	Sample members	Pearson correlation coefficient	Significance level
interactional justice	49	0.631	0.001
Citizenship behavior			

According to Table No. (08), it is evident that the Pearson correlation coefficient between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior reached (0.631), with a significance level of (0.001), which is less than (0.01). This indicates a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between the two variables among employees of sports institutions in M'sila. Thus, the third hypothesis is confirmed.

This result is explained by the quality of personal treatment that the employee receives from the manager, in terms of respect, politeness, honest justification of decisions, and refraining from public blame (Bies & Moag, 1986), which creates a sense of dignity and self-worth in the employee. This feeling drives him to reciprocate the organization with voluntary behaviors that do not fall

within his official duties, such as helping colleagues and protecting the organization's property, in accordance with the principle of reciprocity in social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). As indicated by (Durra, 2008, p. 163), the close supervision style based on respect increases the likelihood of employees adopting citizenship behaviors. This result is similar to what Idris Ben R'djem (2018) concluded, that there is a direct relationship between the fairness of interactions and citizenship behavior among the employees of the Institute of Sciences and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities in M'sila.

9. Conclusions:

- ✓ There is no correlation between distributive justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions in M'sila.
- ✓ There is a positive correlation between procedural justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions in M'sila.
- ✓ There is a positive correlation between interactional justice and citizenship behavior among employees of sports institutions in M'sila.

10. Suggestions:

- ✓ -Giving employees enough opportunity to express their opinions on the results of their work evaluations.
- ✓ -Respecting and ensuring fairness for employees in all matters affecting their work reality.
- ✓ -Enhancing employees' sense of justice by educating them on the criteria used for granting bonuses and promotions.
- ✓ -Reviewing and improving employee wages to match their purchasing power.
- ✓ -Facilitating opportunities for collective collaboration among employees, and increasing coordination between various departments and administrative offices.

References:

- Abdel Tawab, S. (2016). Organizational justice and its relationship with citizenship behavior among female educational supervisors in Tabuk. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University*, 35(168), 112–145.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

No. 1(2026)

- Al-Khamis, A. A. (2001). Organizational justice in Kuwaiti public organizations (Unpublished master's thesis). Kuwait University.
- Al-Qahtani, S. M. (2014). Organizational justice and its relationship with organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Master's thesis). Naif Arab University for Security Sciences.
- Benredjem, I. (2018). Organizational justice and its relationship with citizenship behavior among employees of the Institute of Sciences and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities at the University of M'sila. *Journal of Sports Creativity*.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.
- Durra, O. M. (2008). Determinants of organizational justice and their effects on contextual performance (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Jordan.
- Farah, A. H. A. (2013). The impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior (Master's thesis). Cairo University.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). Plenum Press.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527–556.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.