

# Organizational Justice in Administrative Thought: A Field Study at the National Centers for the Formation of Local Authority Personnel (CNFPCL)



Received: 17/07/2025; Accepted: 12/10/2025

Djoulanour BEZIEZ <sup>1\*</sup>, Hachemi LOUKIA <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psychological and Educational Practices Laboratory, University of Constantine 2 - Abdelhamid MEHRI (Algeria), djoulanour@gmail.com.

<sup>2</sup> University of Constantine 2 - Abdelhamid MEHRI (Algeria), loukiah2006@yahoo.fr

## Abstract

This exploratory study was conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation titled "The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior," through a field investigation at the National Centers for the Formation of Local Government Employees. The aim was to assess employees' perceptions of organizational justice across its three dimensions—distributive, procedural, and interactional—and to explore the influence of selected demographic factors on these perceptions. The research sample consisted of employees from the five national centers, chosen to ensure a diverse and representative dataset. Data were gathered primarily via a questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS software. The results revealed a moderate level of perceived organizational justice among the employees. Moreover, no statistically significant differences were observed in justice perceptions based on demographic characteristics.

## Keywords

Organizational Justice.  
Administrative Thought.  
Distributive Justice.  
Procedural Justice.  
Interactional Justice.

## الكلمات المفتاحية

العدالة التنظيمية؛  
ال الفكر الإداري؛  
العدالة التوزيعية؛  
العدالة الإجرائية؛  
العدالة التفاعلية.

## العدالة التنظيمية في الفكر الإداري: دراسة ميدانية على المراكز الوطنية لتكوين مسخدمي الجماعات المحلية (CNFPCL)

## ملخص

أجريت هذه الدراسة الاستطلاعية كجزء من أطروحة دكتوراه بعنوان "العلاقة بين العدالة التنظيمية وسلوك المواطن التنظيمية"، من خلال دراسة ميدانية في المراكز الوطنية لتكوين مسخدمي الجماعات المحلية. وهدفت إلى تقييم مستوى إدراك الموظفين للعدالة التنظيمية عبر أبعادها الثلاثة: التوزيعية، والإجرائية، والتفاعلية، واستكشاف تأثير بعض المتغيرات الديموغرافية المختارة على هذا الإدراك. شملت العينة موظفين من المراكز الوطنية الخمسة، تم اختيارهم لضمان تنوع البيانات وتمثيلها بشكل مناسب. جُمعت المعلومات عبر عدة طرق أهمها الاستبيان والذي تم تحليله بواسطة برنامج SPSS. أظهرت النتائج مستوى متوسطة من الإدراك للعدالة التنظيمية لدى الموظفين. كما لم تسجل فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في إدراك العدالة بناءً على الخصائص الديموغرافية.

\* Corresponding author. E-mail : [Djoulanour@gmail.com](mailto:Djoulanour@gmail.com)  
Doi:

## I. Introduction

### I.1. General Framework of the Study:

Justice is a foundational human value rooted in equality and fairness. It embodies respect for individual rights and dignity while fostering trust and collaboration within societies. As administrative thought has evolved, justice has gained an organizational dimension, becoming a core principle for achieving institutional efficiency and productivity. In contemporary organizational contexts, justice plays a crucial role through fair distribution of resources and rewards, transparency in procedures, and strong relational dynamics between management and staff. These elements contribute to equal opportunities, enhance the integrity of administrative decisions, and help cultivate a motivating work environment, thereby increasing employee commitment and overall institutional success. Against this backdrop, the present study explores the concept of organizational justice in administrative thought, focusing on its key dimensions and its influence on employee behavior and workplace dynamics. The research was conducted at the National Centers for the Training of Local Government Employees and aims to assess employees' perceptions of organizational justice and examine how variables such as professional experience and monthly income affect this perception, drawing insights from recent academic findings. This context raises important questions regarding how justice is perceived within public institutions.

**•Problem Statement:** Despite the rapid advancement of administrative thought, the issue of organizational justice remains a persistent challenge for institutions, particularly in balancing organizational goals with the needs of employees. Perceptions of organizational justice vary significantly among employees and are influenced by multiple factors, especially demographic characteristics such as job nature, professional experience, and monthly income. Understanding these perceptions is essential to determine whether they reflect actual organizational practices or are shaped by subjective experiences influenced by personal and social factors. Moreover, it is important to examine the role of management in addressing these disparities in a way that promotes a fair and balanced work environment aligned with institutional objectives. Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- What is the perceived level of the dimensions of organizational justice among employees of the National Centers for the Training of Local Government Employees?
- To what extent do demographic variables (job nature, professional experience, and monthly income) influence employees' perceptions of organizational justice?

These questions underline the broader importance of examining organizational justice in public administration

**•Significance of Study:** This study is significant as it highlights organizational justice as a foundational element in enhancing employee satisfaction and motivation, which in turn contributes to achieving institutional goals. Specifically, within the framework of administrative thought, organizational justice supports job satisfaction, increases productivity, and strengthens workplace relationships. By minimizing internal conflicts, it fosters trust between employees and management and encourages a more collaborative and stable work environment. Furthermore, the study investigates how demographic variables influence employees' perceptions of organizational justice, offering valuable insights for managers to design fair policies aligned with employee needs and ambitions. This contribution enriches the administrative literature by providing practical recommendations for promoting equity and transparency. Finally, the study adds value to Arabic academic discourse through its fieldwork in Algeria and clarifies the connection between justice and positive organizational behaviors, such as organizational citizenship behavior. The findings can assist managers in improving governance, fostering fairness, and enhancing employee morale and commitment.

**•Objectives of the Study:** This study aims to analyze the concept of organizational justice within administrative thought by examining its evolution across various schools of administration and highlighting its theoretical foundations and key dimensions. It also seeks to explore the role of organizational justice in enhancing the workplace environment and improving organizational performance. At the practical level, the study also pursues the following objectives:

- Measure employees' perceptions of organizational justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactional) in the National Centers.
- Investigate the impact of demographic variables, including nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income, on their perception of organizational justice.
- Provide actionable recommendations to help managers enhance justice practices and foster a fairer and more productive work environment.

#### **•Research Hypotheses:**

**Main Hypothesis:** The employees of the National Centers perceive organizational justice across its various dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactional) at a moderate level.

**Second Hypothesis:** There are no statistically significant differences in employees' perception of organizational justice dimensions based on demographic variables such as nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income.

#### Derived Sub-Hypotheses:

- Sub-Hypothesis 1: No significant differences are observed in employees' perception of organizational justice dimensions according to the nature of work.
- Sub-Hypothesis 2: No significant differences are observed in employees' perception of organizational justice dimensions according to years of professional experience.

- Sub-Hypothesis 3: No significant differences are observed in employees' perception of organizational justice dimensions according to their monthly income.

## I.2. Concept of Organizational Justice:

Justice is a core ethical principle and a fundamental human aspiration, reflecting integrity and equal treatment among individuals. It is regarded as one of the essential values that societies aim to uphold across personal, social, and institutional levels.

In organizational contexts, justice takes on a more defined scope. Colquitt et al. (2001) describes it as employees' perception of fairness regarding their treatment within the organization—whether in the allocation of resources, the transparency of decision-making procedures, or the quality of interactions between managers and employees. These dimensions are vital indicators of employees' perceived justice in the workplace.

Various researchers have offered differing perspectives on this concept, including:

- Greenberg (1990), who associates justice with perceptions of fairness in resource distribution, treatment, and interpersonal interactions.
- Moorman (1991), who highlights the relationship between perceived justice and organizational citizenship behaviors, noting its role in fostering collaboration and engagement.
- Folger and Konovsky (1989), who underscore the role of justice in enhancing employee satisfaction and trust in managerial decisions regarding resource allocation.
- Cropanzano et al. (2007), who argue that organizational justice transcends ethical ideals to become a strategic tool that drives institutional performance and promotes a positive work climate.

## I.3. Dimensions of Organizational Justice:

Initially, organizational justice was perceived as a unified concept, primarily concerned with overall fairness. However, as research on employee behavior progressed, it became clear that perceptions of justice also encompass additional factors, including transparency in procedures, quality of interpersonal treatment, and clarity of communication. Consequently, scholars have conceptualized the dimensions of organizational justice in various ways, depending on the theoretical framework adopted:

- Adams (1965) introduced the notion of "**distributive justice**" focusing on perceived fairness in the distribution of resources and outcomes. Employees evaluate fairness by comparing their contributions (effort, experience) to their returns (salary, promotion).
- Leventhal (1980) developed the concept of "**procedural justice**" emphasizing the impartiality and consistency of procedures, including decision-making processes and policy implementation, which in turn influence trust in the organizational system.
- Bies and Moag (1986) proposed "**interactional justice**" relating to the interpersonal aspect of justice, particularly respect, dignity, and proper communication between managers and employees.
- In 2001, Colquitt introduced "**informational justice**" reflecting the degree to which employees are kept informed with clear, timely, and honest explanations regarding procedures and decisions.

Despite these varied classifications, some scholars combine interactional and informational justice into a single category, arguing that both concern the communicative aspects of justice (Dorra Omar Mohamed, 2008).

This study adopts the tripartite model (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) based on alignment with the research objectives and measurement instrument.

**Table No. (01): Summary of organizational justice dimensions**

| Type of Justice       | Focus  | Criterion             | Objective  |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Distributive Justice  | Justice of results or outcomes                         | Equity                | Employee rewards are commensurate with their contribution.                   |
|                       |  | Equality              | Provision of the same resources equally to everyone.                         |
|                       |  | Need                  | Allocation of resources and benefits based on individual needs.              |
| Procedural Justice    | Justice of processes and procedures in decision-making | Consistency           | Application of procedures uniformly to all.                                  |
|                       |  | Unbiasedness          | Non-discrimination between individuals when applying decisions.              |
|                       |  | Accuracy              | Decisions are based on accurate information.                                 |
|                       |  | Representativeness    | Participation of all parties in the decision-making process.                 |
|                       |  | Correctability        | Provision of mechanisms (such as appeals) to correct errors.                 |
|                       |  | Ethicality            | Compliance with professional codes of conduct in procedures.                 |
| Interactional Justice | Justice of personal interactions and                   | Interpersonal Justice | Treating individuals with respect and dignity by all (employees, officials). |

|  |                                   |                       |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
|  | communication between individuals | Informational Justice | Providing appropriate, correct, and sufficient work-related information to all in a timely manner. |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|

Source: Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E., & Gilliland, S.W. (2007).

A clear understanding of these justice dimensions allows management to develop and implement effective organizational policies that foster a stable, fair, and motivating work environment, ultimately enhancing employee performance and institutional success.

#### I.4. Theories of Organizational Justice:

Organizational justice plays a central role in institutional life, influencing employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the display of citizenship behaviors. Over time, various theories have emerged to explain organizational justice, aligning with its multiple dimensions. These theoretical frameworks highlight how fairness can shape a just and efficient work environment:

- Distributive justice stems from Adams' (1965) equity theory.
- Procedural justice follows the principles proposed by Leventhal (1980).
- Interactional and informational justice are interpreted through Blau's (1964) social exchange theory.

•**Equity Theory (Adams, 1965):** Adams' (1965) equity theory is a foundational framework in administrative thought that explains how perceptions of fairness in resource and reward distribution influence employee motivation and satisfaction. According to this theory, employees assess justice by comparing their inputs (such as effort and experience) with their outputs, including salaries and promotions. They also compare these ratios with those of their peers. When employees perceive equity in this exchange, they tend to be more motivated and productive. Conversely, perceived inequity may lead to feelings of injustice, resulting in decreased performance, increased demands, or the search for alternative employment. This theory informs the development of compensation and incentive systems, thereby fostering organizational commitment and reducing workplace conflicts.

•**Procedural Justice Theory (Leventhal, 1980):** Leventhal's (1980) theory of procedural justice broadened the scope of organizational justice by highlighting that fairness is not only about the distribution of outcomes, but also about the fairness of the processes that lead to those outcomes. When employees feel excluded from decisions that affect them, they may experience frustration, reduced motivation, and resistance to change. In contrast, when procedures are clear, consistent, unbiased, and allow for employee participation and expression, perceptions of fairness increase, and acceptance of decisions improves. Leventhal outlined six essential criteria for procedural justice: consistency in process application, impartiality, accuracy of information, opportunities to correct decisions, inclusion of all stakeholders, and adherence to ethical standards. Applying these principles can strengthen employees' sense of belonging, trust in management, and overall satisfaction, while also minimizing workplace conflicts. Organizations that embrace these principles foster transparency and accountability, thereby enhancing employee engagement and overall performance.

•**Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964):** Peter Blau's (1964) Social Exchange Theory frames organizational justice within the context of reciprocal relationships between employees and management. According to this theory, justice is achieved when the interactions and exchanges between the two parties are balanced: employees feel fairly treated when the rewards they receive—whether tangible (e.g., salaries) or intangible (e.g., recognition, developmental opportunities)—correspond to the efforts they invest. When this perceived balance exists, trust in management rises and employees are more likely to demonstrate citizenship behaviors such as collaboration and innovation. In contrast, perceived injustice can lower morale, lead to frustration, and increase workplace conflict. The theory is commonly applied in organizational practices that emphasize respect for employees, transparent communication, and a culture of recognition, thereby fostering a more just and sustainable work environment.

•These three theoretical perspectives highlight that organizational justice encompasses more than the equitable distribution of outcomes; it also involves the fairness of decision-making processes and the quality of interpersonal relationships within the organization. When these dimensions are effectively integrated, they foster stronger organizational commitment, enhance employee performance, and contribute to a more supportive and stable work environment. Thus, organizational justice emerges as a pivotal strategic element in contemporary administrative thinking.

#### I.5. Evolution of the Concept of Organizational Justice in Administrative Thought:

Initially, organizational justice did not have a clear definition as an independent value, but it was implicitly applied in classical administrative thought through organizational mechanisms that focused on equality and discipline in the distribution of resources and rewards to ensure high performance. However, with the evolution of administrative thought, organizational justice acquired more comprehensive dimensions, as it was no longer limited to the fair distribution of resources but also included decision-making procedures and the quality of relationships within the organization, leading to the integration of this concept with modern administrative trends that embody organizational justice in applied administrative practices (Colquitt et al., 2001).

**•The Classical School: Organizational Justice and Administrative Discipline:** The classical school, which emerged in the early twentieth century through the works of Frederick Taylor (1911) and Henri Fayol (1916), relied on hierarchy and rational discipline as a basis for achieving efficiency and productivity. According to Greenberg (1990), fairness in the distribution of tasks and rewards was seen as a fundamental factor in motivating employees and enhancing performance. In this context, the focus was on the division of labor, centralization in decision-making, and effective control to ensure high organizational performance. However, there was no clear attention to the psychological and social effects of justice, as organizational justice was limited to uniform administrative practices for all employees without considering individual differences or personal contexts.

**•The Behavioral School: Organizational Justice and Human Relations:** With the emergence of the behavioral school in the early decades of the twentieth century, particularly in the works of Elton Mayo (1933), Abraham Maslow (1943), and Douglas McGregor (1960), the focus on human relations within the organization became more pronounced, leading to a reformulation of the concept of organizational justice. According to Maslow (1943) in his hierarchy of human needs theory, achieving fairness within the organization helps meet employees' basic needs, such as security, respect, and belonging, which positively affects their motivation and productivity. For his part, McGregor (1960) in his Theory X and Theory Y asserted that employees' perception of organizational justice directly affects their organizational behavior, as it promotes positive interaction and contributes to improving the work environment.

**•The Modern Approach and Systems Theory: Organizational Justice as an Integrated System:** With the development of modern administrative thought, a trend known as Systems Theory emerged, presented by Katz, D, & Kahn, R. L. (1966) and Bertalanffy (1968). This approach addressed organizational justice from a holistic perspective of relationships within the organization, showing that it was no longer merely an element related to resources and rewards but had become part of the interaction between administrative procedures and the fair behavior of managers. According to this approach, organizational justice became a psychological and social factor affecting organizational loyalty and trust between employees and management. It includes Distributive justice: Fairness in the distribution of resources and rewards. Procedural justice: Ensuring transparency and fairness of organizational decisions. Interactional justice: The quality of relationships between management and employees, which affects the organizational climate and job stability.

This theoretical evolution across schools of thought highlights how the concept of organizational justice has progressively developed over time, both in scope and in application. The concept of organizational justice has witnessed remarkable development across various administrative schools, gradually reflecting on management philosophies and objectives. While classical schools focused on justice from the perspective of efficiency and productivity, where fairness in the distribution of tasks and rewards was seen as a motivating factor, such as Taylor's scientific management, modern administrative thought has become more concerned with motivating employees, their satisfaction, and fair treatment (Dorra Omar Mohamed, 2008).

This development has led to the expansion of the concept of organizational justice to include psychological and social dimensions, where it has become an influential factor in organizational loyalty, trust between employees and management, and job stability. Through this modern vision, organizational justice has become a fundamental pillar of effective management, forming part of institutional strategies to ensure the achievement of a fair and sustainable work environment.

## I.6. Organizational Justice in Administrative Trends:

Modern administrative trends demonstrate that organizational justice is not merely a theoretical concept but is reflected in practical administrative practices that enhance organizational performance and stability. It has a direct impact on employees' behavior, turning abstract administrative thought into tangible practices in the workplace, which positively affects their satisfaction, commitment, and performance.

- In Motivational Management, organizational justice is reflected in clear and equitable reward policies, where employees receive compensation that matches their efforts and achievements, thereby boosting motivation and productivity.
- In Total Quality Management (TQM), organizational justice is realized through employee participation in quality improvement and ensuring that organizational processes are fair and transparent, which reinforces employee satisfaction and sense of justice.
- In Management by Objectives (MBO), organizational justice appears in setting clear and suitable objectives for each employee and evaluating performance based on transparent and objective criteria, ensuring fairness in appraisal and reward systems.
- In Strategic Management, organizational justice involves thoughtful and sustainable decision-making characterized by transparency and fairness, which strengthens employees' trust in leadership and enhances organizational commitment.

These trends confirm that organizational justice is not merely a moral value, but an effective managerial tool that enables organizations to establish a positive and supportive work environment, increasing employee satisfaction and stability. (Dorra Omar Mohamed, 2008).

## I.7. The Reality of Organizational Justice in Administration:

Despite the theoretical importance of organizational justice, its application varies from one institution to another, depending on several organizational and administrative factors. Studies have shown that institutions that rely on transparency and fairness achieve a higher level of organizational justice, which positively reflects on employee satisfaction and their trust in management (Moorman, 1991; Al-Zubi, 2010).

Conversely, some institutions face fundamental challenges in achieving organizational justice, such as administrative bias and lack of transparency, which may lead to a decline in employee trust in organizational decisions (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

The application of organizational justice differs across institutions depending on several factors, including:

- **Organizational Culture:** Some institutions adopt transparency and fairness as guiding principles in their interactions with employees, whereas others may base decisions on arbitrary or biased practices, thereby limiting employees' perception of justice (Croppanzano et al., 2007).
- **Leadership Orientation:** Leaders who uphold ethical principles and transparency are more committed to achieving organizational justice, which boosts employee satisfaction and fosters trust in management (Moorman, 1991).
- **Human Resources Policies:** Institutions that implement clear and equitable performance appraisal systems tend to promote a higher level of organizational justice, as employees perceive fairness and objectivity in their professional evaluations (Al-Zubi, 2010).
- **Limited Participation:** Disregarding employees' opinions in decisions that directly affect them reduces their sense of belonging and diminishes their organizational loyalty (Moorman, 1991).

Studies have shown that applying organizational justice in the workplace results in:

- Higher employee satisfaction when they perceive fairness in their professional environment (Colquitt et al., 2001).
- Greater organizational commitment, as employee loyalty to the institution increases (Moorman, 1991).
- Improved performance, driven by stronger motivation to invest additional effort (Croppanzano et al., 2007).
- Fewer conflicts, due to the reduction of perceived discrimination or injustice (Greenberg, 1990).

## I.8. Previous Studies:

The concept of organizational justice is one of the fundamental pillars influencing employee behavior and performance in the workplace. In recent decades, it has garnered significant attention in scientific literature, with researchers striving to understand how employees' perceptions of justice affect their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and positive workplace behaviors. This growing interest has led to numerous studies that examined various dimensions of organizational justice and their effects, thereby contributing to the development of a robust body of knowledge in this domain.

• The study conducted by Folger and Konovsky (1989) aimed to investigate the effects of two types of organizational justice—procedural justice and distributive justice—on employee reactions to salary increase decisions. It focused on how fairness in resource allocation and the perceived justice of decision-making processes influence employee satisfaction and trust in management. The sample consisted of 217 employees from an American organization, and the researchers used a questionnaire to assess perceptions of procedural justice (concerning fairness in processes) and distributive justice (concerning fairness in outcomes). The results revealed that distributive justice was directly associated with employee satisfaction regarding salaries, while procedural justice had a more significant influence on trust in supervisors and organizational commitment. Accordingly, the researchers concluded that procedural justice exerts a stronger impact on employee trust and commitment than distributive justice, emphasizing the crucial role of transparency and integrity in administrative procedures to foster employee satisfaction and organizational stability.

• Greenberg (1990) examined the concept of organizational justice in a comprehensive manner, emphasizing its influence on employee satisfaction and behavior. He elaborated on distributive justice, which pertains to the fairness of distributing resources and rewards, and procedural justice, which relates to the fairness of the processes and procedures used in decision-making. He underlined the importance of distinguishing between these two dimensions, asserting that both are vital in shaping employees' perceptions of justice within the organization. Furthermore, he introduced interactional justice, concerning the quality of interpersonal interactions within the organization, describing it as a distinct and independent dimension. He stressed the importance of considering this dimension to gain a deeper understanding of how employees perceive justice. Greenberg also advocated for the development of research methodologies in this field, urging scholars to expand studies to include diverse organizational contexts, improve measurement instruments, and strengthen the integration among the various dimensions of organizational justice.

• Moorman's (1991) study investigated the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, with a particular emphasis on the three primary dimensions of justice. The study utilized questionnaires to assess employees' perceptions of organizational justice and their corresponding citizenship behaviors. The findings revealed that both procedural and interactional justice had the strongest influence on organizational citizenship behavior, underscoring the critical role of perceptual and relational factors in fostering effective organizational behavior. Based on these results, the study recommended promoting transparency and mutual respect in organizational interactions as a means to encourage positive employee behaviors and cultivate a motivating and supportive work environment.

•The study conducted by Colquitt et al. (2001), titled "*Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research*," is considered a seminal contribution to the theoretical understanding of organizational justice. This research developed a robust and comprehensive model for assessing the various dimensions of organizational justice and examining their influence on job-related outcomes. By analyzing data from 183 prior studies, the authors identified four core dimensions of organizational justice: distributive justice (fairness in the distribution of rewards and resources), procedural justice (fairness in decision-making processes), interactional justice (quality of interpersonal treatment), and informational justice (clarity and transparency of information shared with employees). The findings indicated that distributive justice is closely linked to job satisfaction, while procedural justice exerts a strong influence on organizational commitment.

•Another significant study is that of Cropanzano et al. (2007), which serves as a key reference in the literature on organizational justice. The authors emphasized that justice is not merely an ethical concern but a strategic managerial tool that influences the quality of relationships between employees and management. Their findings highlighted how organizational justice enhances employee performance, boosts customer satisfaction, and minimizes workplace conflict. The study placed particular emphasis on the importance of interactional justice in fostering institutional trust. Cropanzano and colleagues proposed a practical framework for implementing organizational justice across five major administrative domains: recruitment—by applying objective and transparent selection criteria; performance evaluation—through consistent standards and constructive feedback; reward systems—balancing equity (rewards based on performance) with equality (uniform rewards); conflict resolution—via fair and transparent dispute-handling procedures; and layoff procedures—by respecting employee dignity and providing clear, honest justifications. This comprehensive approach helps institutions create a more transparent and trustworthy work environment, positively influencing employee behavior and overall organizational performance.

•In the Arab context, Omar Mohamed Dorra (2008), in his book *Organizational Justice and its Relationship with Some Contemporary Administrative Trends*, presents organizational justice as a foundational element of modern management. He underscores its role in enhancing institutional performance and fostering job satisfaction. The book traces the evolution of the concept from its classical roots (where distributive justice was viewed primarily as a means to improve efficiency and productivity) to the contemporary approach that incorporates distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Dorra links these three dimensions to key modern administrative trends, including transformational leadership, administrative empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior, illustrating how organizational justice contributes to the advancement of these practices. He also conducted a field study involving employees from various institutions, using a questionnaire to assess the impact of the three dimensions of justice on job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. The findings revealed a positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction, with distributive and procedural justice emerging as the strongest predictors of organizational loyalty. The author concluded with several recommendations: establishing equitable and transparent policies for resource and reward distribution, refining organizational procedures to be more inclusive and participatory, and strengthening interactions between management and employees through ongoing training and development.

•Al-Zu'bi (2010) conducted a study examining the impact of organizational justice on employee satisfaction within the Jordanian public sector. The research sample consisted of 229 employees selected through stratified random sampling from companies in the electrical industry. Using a structured questionnaire, the study measured employees' perceptions of the three dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) and assessed their influence on job satisfaction levels. The findings revealed that procedural justice had the strongest effect on job satisfaction, surpassing the influence of the other two dimensions. This underscores the critical role of fair and transparent administrative practices in promoting satisfaction within the governmental work environment.

•Based on the foregoing, it appears that organizational justice is not merely a theoretical construct but a fundamental component in achieving employee satisfaction and motivation. Previous studies have demonstrated that procedural and interactional justice are the most influential dimensions, underscoring the importance of establishing transparent and fair organizational policies and procedures. Building on this theoretical foundation, the current study aims to explore the relationship between organizational justice and job-related outcomes within the context under investigation.

## II– Field Study Axis:

### II.1. Institutional Context:

The National Centers for the Formation of Local Authority Personnel and the Improvement and Renewal of Their Skills (CNFPCL) are public institutions of an administrative nature operating under the supervision of the Ministry of Interior, Local Authorities, and Urban Planning. They were established by Executive Decree No. 95-59 (February 18, 1995), with the aim of enhancing employee efficiency through specialized training programs. These centers are currently distributed across five provinces: Constantine, Oran, Djelfa, Ouargla, and Bechar, with plans to open two new centers in Annaba and Tiaret to expand their national coverage.

Joint Ministerial Decision No. 6559 (December 24, 1997) outlines the administrative structure of these centers, which includes two main directorates: the first oversees administration and resources, while the second focuses on studies and internships. These centers are tasked with several core responsibilities, such as:

- Overseeing training courses for local authority personnel (supplementary and promotional).

- Organizing development programs aimed at enhancing employee efficiency and updating their knowledge.
- Administering recruitment and promotion competitions for local authorities.
- Executing cooperation agreements signed between the ministry and both national and international organizations in the field of administrative training.
- Providing logistical support, including accommodation and catering for trainees.
- Offering training and services to public sector bodies and institutions.

These responsibilities illustrate the strategic importance of CNFPCL in developing local administration and ensuring operational efficiency at the municipal level.

These centers are characterized by a dynamic work environment that combines administrative and academic training, with a focus on interactive education and experience sharing. They are supervised by a diverse organizational structure that includes administrators and professors with experience in administrative fields, contributing to enhanced organizational understanding and more effective interaction opportunities. Based on this institutional background and professional diversity, the researcher found these centers to offer a suitable context for conducting the present study.

These centers were selected as the study sample for several reasons, most notably the researcher's prior experience within the institution, which gave her direct insight into the internal work environment. Additionally, their diverse and integrated organizational structure presents a realistic model for studying organizational justice. The researcher also coordinated the study period with training programs targeting employees from the five centers, which provided an ideal opportunity to collect data through direct observation and field engagement, enhancing the credibility of the findings.

In addition to structural and logistical considerations, a crucial financial aspect also influenced the research site selection: the issue of "off-budget profits". One of the key factors that led the researcher to select these centers is the issue of "off-budget profits." These centers generate additional revenue by providing services to public institutions, a portion of which—determined by law—is allocated to employees. While these bonuses serve as a strong incentive, their distribution remains at the discretion of the center's director and lacks a clear legal mechanism or transparent criteria. This ambiguity, particularly due to annual variations based on services rendered, has triggered internal tensions fueled by ongoing comparisons, which in turn have impacted on employees' productivity and professional commitment.

Given their vital role in supporting local authorities, these centers constitute a cornerstone in enhancing administrative performance. Thus, studying organizational justice within these institutions is essential for understanding the dynamics of public administration and fostering more effective governance.

## **II.2. Study Methodology:**

Since the study includes both theoretical and practical components, the researcher employed a descriptive approach to examine the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the phenomenon, enabling a broader understanding of its overall context. Additionally, the analytical approach was used to interpret statistical findings and provide a detailed analysis of the data. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to measure variables and identify the relationships among the studied factors. To gather data and ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the information, the researcher adopted several integrated methodological tools. These included direct observation to explore the work environment, conducting informal individual and group interviews to spontaneously capture employees' perspectives, and listening to their concerns and suggestions regarding the study topic. Additionally, the questionnaire served as the primary instrument for systematically collecting and analyzing employees' opinions.

The study sample comprised thirty (30) employees from the targeted National Centers, all of whom attended training sessions at the Oran Center aimed at improving their professional level. Participants were selected based on multiple criteria to ensure diversity and comprehensive representation. They originated from five distinct centers across the country, including two newly established and three older institutions, enabling the study to compare the influence of institutional maturity on perceptions of organizational justice. The sample included both newly recruited staff and employees approaching retirement, offering a wide range of professional experience. Furthermore, participants held positions across various departments and administrative roles, from entry-level staff to senior executives. This distribution facilitated a comprehensive examination of organizational justice across hierarchical levels and supported the collection of diverse data that enhances the generalizability of the study findings.

This study is based on a set of hypotheses aimed at measuring employees' perceptions of the dimensions of organizational justice within the National Centers, as well as examining the influence of certain demographic characteristics on these perceptions. Based on the findings, the study seeks to offer practical recommendations for improving the work environment and enhancing organizational justice within these institutions.

## II.3. Data Analysis and Presentation of Results:

To assess perceptions of organizational justice, the researcher developed a questionnaire comprising twenty (20) items, categorized into three primary axes corresponding to the dimensions of justice, as outlined in the table below:

**Table No. (2): Distribution of the Organizational Justice Questionnaire Axes**

| Axis <sup>2</sup> | Title                 | Number of Statements |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| First Axis        | Distributive Justice  | 07                   |
| Second Axis       | Procedural Justice    | 06                   |
| Third Axis        | Interactional Justice | 07                   |

Developed by the researcher.

The questionnaire covered three key dimensions of organizational justice. Seven (7) items were devoted to distributive justice, reflecting the degree of fairness in resource and reward distribution. Procedural justice was assessed through six (6) items focusing on the transparency of organizational procedures. Another seven (7) items addressed interactional justice, examining the influence of communication and administrative behavior on perceived fairness. This structure enables an independent analysis of each dimension and provides insights into their roles in shaping participants' justice perceptions.

To ensure the accuracy of measuring employees' perception of these dimensions, the researcher adopted an ordinal scale using the five-point Likert scale. This scale enables measuring the degree of organizational justice based on ranked levels. Such a classification supports analyzing variations among participants and identifying potential gaps in the perceived levels of fairness within the work environment:

**Table No. (3): Weights assigned to response options in the questionnaire.**

| Response Options | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
|------------------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Weight           | 5      | 4     | 3         | 2      | 1     |

Source: (Ezz, 2008, p. 540)

To facilitate the interpretation of results, the researcher classified responses into five equal categories based on a specific equation. The weighted averages and their corresponding directions were presented as follows:

$$\text{Category Length} = (\text{Largest weight} - \text{smallest weight}) / \text{Number of Categories} = (5-1) / 5 = 0.80$$

**Table No. (4): Weighted Averages and Response Directions**

| Category | Average Value | General Direction | Degree of Availability |
|----------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| First    | 1-1.80        | Never             | Very low degree        |
| Second   | 1.81-2.60     | Rarely            | Low degree             |
| Third    | 2.61-3.40     | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| Fourth   | 3.41-4.20     | Often             | High degree            |
| Fifth    | 4.21-5.00     | Always            | Very high degree       |

Elaborated by the researcher based on Ezz (2008).

This classification enables a nuanced analysis of responses based on perception levels. The first category (1.00–1.80) indicates a very low perception of organizational justice, whereas the fifth category (4.21–5.00) signifies a very high perception. It helps assess employee satisfaction with the work environment and identify perceptual gaps based on demographic and job-related variables, ultimately supporting recommendations to enhance justice within institutions.

## II.4. Psychometric Properties of the Study Instrument

•**Normality Test:** To ensure that the data follows a normal distribution, the researcher relied on the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results are presented in the following table:

**Table No. (5): Results of the Normality Tests**

| Variable               | Shapiro-Wilk Test |       | Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test |       |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
|                        | Test Statistic    | Sig.  | Test Statistic          | Sig.  |
| Organizational Justice | 0.919             | 0.025 | 0.133                   | 0.188 |

\*\*Lilliefors Significance Correction

Prepared by the researcher using SPSS v25

Although the significance value (Sig.) in the Shapiro-Wilk test is slightly below the conventional threshold (0.05), the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test yields a p-value above 0.05. This suggests partial support for normality. Given the sample size and the robustness of parametric tests, the data can be considered approximately normally distributed for subsequent analyses.

•**Internal Consistency:** To ensure the reliability of the study instrument, the researcher applied the split-half method to the instrument as a whole:

**Table No. (6): Reliability using the Split-Half Method**

| Dimension                | Part                | Number | Correlation | Spearman-Brown Coefficient | Guttman Split-Half Coefficient |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Questionnaire as a whole | Odd-numbered items  | 10     | 0.736       | 0.848                      | 0.839                          |
|                          | Even-numbered items | 10     |             | 0.848                      |                                |

Elaborated by the researcher based on SPSS.V25.

The Spearman–Brown coefficient (0.848) and the Guttman Split-Half coefficient (0.839) indicate an excellent level of internal consistency, confirming the reliability of the instrument and its capacity to yield consistent results if administered to the same sample. Therefore, the questionnaire is considered highly reliable and suitable for statistical analysis.

•**Construct Validity:** To ensure the construct validity of the study instrument, the researcher used Pearson's correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between each sub-dimension and the overall score of the questionnaire, as detailed below:

**Table No. (7): Construct Validity via Pearson Correlation**

| No. | Dimensions            | Pearson Correlation Coefficient |
|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 01  | Distributive Justice  | .625**                          |
| 02  | Procedural Justice    | .796**                          |
| 03  | Interactional Justice | .828**                          |

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level or below.

Formulated by the researcher with the aid of SPSS v25.

As shown in the table, the correlation coefficients range from .625 to .828, all of which are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This indicates strong positive relationships between each dimension and the total score, thus confirming that the instrument effectively measures what it is intended to.

•**General Conclusion:** The results of the statistical analysis confirm that the study instrument demonstrates both high reliability and robust construct validity, indicating its adequacy in accurately measuring organizational justice dimensions.

### III-Analysis of Results:

#### III.1. Presentation and Analysis of the Characteristics of the Study Sample Individuals:

Given the exploratory nature of the study and the limited sample size, the researcher focused on three basic variables: nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income, and attempted to understand the influence of these variables on the perception of organizational justice.

**Table No. (8): The distribution of the study sample according to their personal variables.**

| Characteristics         | Categories              | Frequency | Percentage % |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Nature of Work          | Contract Worker         | 0         | 0.0          |
|                         | Permanent Worker        | 6         | 20.0         |
|                         | Administrative Employee | 13        | 43.3         |
|                         | Senior Position         | 11        | 36.7         |
|                         | Total                   | 30        | 100.0        |
| Professional Experience | Less than 5 years       | 7         | 23.3         |
|                         | 5 to 15 years           | 12        | 40.0         |
|                         | 16 to 25 years          | 5         | 16.7         |
|                         | More than 25 years      | 6         | 20.0         |
|                         | Total                   | 30        | 100.0        |
| Monthly Income          | Less than 1.5 million   | 0         | 0.0          |
|                         | 1.5 to 2.5 million      | 8         | 26.7         |
|                         | 2.5 to 3.5 million      | 9         | 30.0         |
|                         | More than 3.5 million   | 13        | 43.3         |
|                         | Total                   | 30        | 100.0        |

Prepared by researcher based on the SPSS. V25 program.

•The table shows that most of the sample participants are either administrative staff (43.3%) or hold senior positions (36.7%), while permanent workers represent 20%. The sample did not include any contract employees, indicating that most participants enjoy a certain level of job stability, which may influence their perception of organizational justice. Administrative employees often have different experiences regarding the fairness of resource distribution compared to permanent workers. These results are related to the nature of the centres' work and the types of employment required. The centres primarily depend on administrative personnel for managing human resources and supervising pedagogical tools, courses, and exams, whereas workers are typically involved in simpler field tasks. As for contract workers, none attended the training where the study was conducted, likely due to the nature and limitations of their roles.

• The professional experience of the sample participants varies, with those having 5 to 15 years of experience representing the largest group (40%), followed by newer employees with less than 5 years of experience (23.3%), most of whom are recent graduates from universities and institutes. As previously mentioned, this is related to the nature of the centers' operations and their ongoing recruitment efforts to attract young talent, especially considering the recent establishment of two out of the five centres. Next are employees with more than 25 years of service (20%), followed by those with 16 to 25 years of experience (16.7%), whose skills and expertise are often utilized in training and supervising new staff during internships. This diversity in experience enables an analysis of how length of service influences perceptions of organizational justice, particularly regarding administrative procedures and access to job-related benefits.

• The table also highlights disparities in monthly income levels, with 43.3% of the sample earning more than 3.5 million, followed by 30% earning between 2.5 and 3.5 million, and 26.7% earning between 1.5 and 2.5 million. No participants reported earnings below 1.5 million. This income variation may directly influence perceptions of distributive justice, as salary differences can foster either a sense of fairness or dissatisfaction among employees based on their income brackets. The researcher attributes this disparity to the fact that employees in the personnel formation centres fall under the public service category, which is known for having one of the lowest pay scales compared to other ministries. Furthermore, senior officials benefit from positional allowances, and three of the centres are in special zones, granting their staff an additional income bonus. These factors explain the income differences observed in relation to professional experience and align with the variations seen in the nature of work

• Finally, the results indicate that the sample includes adequate diversity in characteristics, enabling the examination of differences in perceptions of organizational justice across various categories. This diversity supports an in-depth analysis of the factors that influence employees' sense of justice within the workplace. It also enhances the potential for generalizing the findings, despite the study's limited sample size and the possibility that other influential factors may not have been captured.

### III.2. Presentation and Analysis of the Sample Individuals' Responses to the Questionnaire Axes Questions:

**Table No. (9): Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviations, and Overall Trend of the Dimensions of Organizational Justice**

| No                             | Organizational Justice Questionnaire Item   | Arithmetic Mean | Standard Deviation | General Direction | Degree of Availability |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1                              | Working hours are compatible with my personal circumstances                                   | 3.57            | 1.01               | Often             | High degree            |
| 2                              | The burdens and duties assigned to me are consistent with my abilities and skills             | 4.23            | 0.86               | Always            | Very high degree       |
| 3                              | Regular working hours are sufficient to complete my tasks                                     | 3.90            | 0.99               | Often             | High degree            |
| 4                              | My monthly salary is commensurate with my qualifications and experience                       | 2.20            | 1.54               | Rarely            | Low degree             |
| 5                              | The financial income obtained is consistent with the efforts I exert                          | 2.57            | 1.55               | Rarely            | Low degree             |
| 6                              | I receive good incentives for the overtime work I do  | 2.60            | 1.38               | Rarely            | Low degree             |
| 7                              | The rewards distributed to workers are divided fairly   | 2.80            | 1.24               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| Distributive Justice Dimension |   | 3.12            | 0.72               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| 8                              | Management makes functional decisions neutrally   | 3.37            | 1.16               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| 9                              | Officials gather sufficient information before making organizational decisions                | 3.67            | 1.27               | Often             | High degree            |
| 10                             | Employees and workers participate in making work decisions and express their opinions on them | 3.03            | 1.38               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| 11                             | Workers are provided with necessary details when they inquire about any decisions             | 3.10            | 1.35               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| 12                             | Workers are allowed to refuse or oppose decisions issued by management                        | 2.23            | 1.22               | Rarely            | Low degree             |
| 13                             | Functional decisions are applied to all workers in the center without exception               | 3.47            | 1.50               | Often             | High degree            |
| Procedural Justice Dimension   |   | 3.14            | 0.88               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| 14                             | I anticipate work problems before they occur  | 3.57            | 1.50               | Often             | High degree            |
| 15                             | I plan to face work problems that may occur   | 4.00            | 1.02               | Always            | Very high degree       |
| 16                             | I am keen to know the shortcomings or weaknesses in the work I do                             | 3.03            | 1.30               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |

|                                 |  |      |      |           |               |
|---------------------------------|--|------|------|-----------|---------------|
| 17                              | I can often predict the solution to work problems                    | 3.40 | 1.30 | Sometimes | Medium degree |
| 18                              | I do not give up on my goals and insist on achieving them            | 3.27 | 1.44 | Sometimes | Medium degree |
| 19                              | I have a strong motivation to achieve success and high ranks in life | 3.17 | 1.34 | Sometimes | Medium degree |
| 20                              | I focus on my work tasks more than anyone else                       | 2.80 | 1.03 | Sometimes | Medium degree |
| Interactional Justice Dimension |  | 3.31 | 0.83 | Sometimes | Medium degree |

Developed by researcher using SPSS version 25.

•The high mean indicates that most employees are satisfied with their working hours and how they align with their personal circumstances. This is due to the administrative structure, which is based on standard working hours, enabling employees to organize their personal lives accordingly. Some exceptions are reflected in the standard deviation, possibly caused by pressure during intensive training periods. This suggests the need for flexible task distribution procedures and additional support during such times.

•The respondents agree that their tasks match their abilities, as this item received the highest arithmetic mean. This indicates an effective task distribution system, with responsibilities clearly defined by department and employees selected based on their skills and qualifications. The workforce is adequate to handle the centers' main duties, which fosters job satisfaction and improves both efficiency and productivity. Conducting regular assessments is recommended to ensure ongoing compatibility.

•Regarding working hours, slight opinion differences were noted, though employees generally find the hours adequate. This is due to well-organized task planning and efficient workload distribution, allowing employees to prioritize and complete their duties within scheduled hours, enhancing organizational performance. Variations may arise between departments or during peak course periods, which calls for task reallocation to other staff when needed. Regular workload reviews and flexible arrangements are advisable.

•Unlike working hours, the low mean indicates clear dissatisfaction among the respondents regarding their wages, as their salaries do not correspond to their qualifications. There is a significant variation in perspectives, which may negatively impact motivation and job satisfaction. This can be attributed to the rigid and outdated public service wage system, which evolves very slowly. While this may be acceptable for older employees, it is insufficient for new recruits. These results highlight the need to revise the wage structure to ensure it aligns more fairly with employees' qualifications and experience, especially considering ongoing economic changes.

•Furthermore, the financial compensation received by most employees does not reflect their actual efforts and workload, potentially leading to frustration and diminished motivation. This is particularly true in the absence of a system for assessing individual performance, and the continued reliance on academic qualifications and job ranks to determine salaries—regardless of the specific nature of the tasks performed. As with the previous item, the high standard deviation further supports the need to reassess the basis of wage distribution and to implement a fair performance appraisal system, which could enhance job satisfaction and boost motivation.

•Regarding incentives, the data reveal a general sense of dissatisfaction among respondents concerning the compensation for overtime work. This is mainly because the current system compensates overtime with recuperation time rather than monetary rewards, coupled with the difficulty of obtaining rest days during the training year and periods of high workload. It is therefore recommended to revise the incentive policy to include meaningful financial compensation and provide flexible options for compensating extra hours.

•Likewise, with respect to financial bonuses, the findings show a moderate perception of fairness in their distribution, accompanied by moderate disagreement among participants. This suggests partial satisfaction with the bonus system, alongside concerns about its transparency. Since off-budget bonuses are not governed by clear guidelines, there is a pressing need to establish transparent and objective standards to enhance perceptions of fairness.

•Participants' views differ moderately regarding the neutrality of decision-making, indicating some doubts about objectivity. This could stem from unclear decision-making mechanisms or the potential influence of personal relationships within the center. Such perceptions may result from insufficient transparency and weak communication. Management can strengthen employee trust by implementing well-defined and transparent decision-making criteria.

•Although the results show that most respondents believe decisions made by officials are based on adequate information, this positive perception may be attributed to regular evaluation meetings organized by management. However, the variability in responses may also suggest that the information gathered is not always sufficient or comprehensive. To address this, data collection methods should be improved and communication channels enhanced to ensure all relevant employees are informed—thereby fostering trust and improving procedural justice in the organization.

•There is noticeable variation in the sample's views regarding the degree of employee involvement in decision-making. While some participants feel adequately involved, others perceive their participation as limited or inconsistent. This shortcoming may be attributed to a centralized management culture where consultation is restricted to senior staff, excluding broader employee engagement. Strengthening participatory mechanisms and enabling employees to contribute according to their roles in relevant organizational decisions may enhance their perception of procedural justice.

•Employee responses also reveal differing opinions on the availability of sufficient information regarding decisions made, indicating weak communication practices and a lack of clear explanations. This may stem from overreliance on informal channels that allow for ambiguity and misinterpretation. The variation in standard deviations further suggests

that information dissemination may vary across departments, pointing to inconsistencies in communication strategies. Improving formal communication systems and ensuring uniform access to decision-related information can enhance employee understanding and trust.

• The low mean suggests that employees perceive limited ability to refuse or object to administrative decisions. This perception is associated with a centralized organizational structure, which may undermine trust in officials and management. Although decisions are often based on sufficient information, they are typically finalized at higher levels, leaving minimal room for open discussion. Some employees perceive a narrow space for objection through informal means. Enhancing trust in management decisions can be achieved by establishing formal channels that allow employee feedback without disrupting the administrative hierarchy.

• Conversely, most participants believe that decisions are implemented uniformly across the organization, reflecting transparency in policy execution and a reasonable level of procedural justice. This implies the existence of standardized decision-making processes. However, variations in responses suggest that exceptions and inconsistent authority practices may cause perceptions of inequality. To strengthen procedural justice, it is essential to standardize criteria for decision implementation and ensure consistent application to all employees.

• The low mean indicates that employees perceive limited ability to refuse or object to administrative decisions. This perception is related to the presence of a centralized organizational structure, which may negatively impact employees' trust in officials and management. Although officials collect sufficient information, decisions are often made at higher levels with limited opportunity for discussion, and some employees perceive a minor possibility for objection through informal means. Trust in decisions can be enhanced by introducing formal mechanisms that enable employees to voice their opinions without disrupting the administrative hierarchy.

• On the other hand, most of the sample participants believe that decisions are applied uniformly to all employees, reflecting transparency in policy implementation and a satisfactory level of procedural justice. This suggests that clear policies are in place to guide decision application. However, variations in individual perceptions point to possible exceptions or inconsistent authority practices that result in a sense of inequality. Enhancing procedural justice requires unifying and clarifying the criteria for decision implementation and ensuring they are applied consistently to all employees.

• The results demonstrate that employees are capable of anticipating problems, reflecting a solid level of experience and situational awareness. This can be attributed to the diversity of employee backgrounds and their cooperation within and across centers. However, the standard deviation suggests noticeable variation, possibly due to more experienced employees having the analytical skills to foresee problems and prevent crises, whereas newer employees may struggle with this. To bridge this gap, it is recommended to organize training workshops on risk assessment and crisis management, encouraging senior staff to share their practical knowledge and experiences.

• Similar patterns are observed in proactive problem-solving, where employees show competence in preventive planning and crisis response, indicating a strong level of professionalism in addressing challenges methodically. Nonetheless, this competence could be further strengthened through specialized training in strategic planning.

• Analyses also reveal a moderate level of self-awareness among employees in assessing their performance, with noticeable differences in their ability to identify areas for improvement. Many employees feel they are not consistently able to recognize their own weaknesses. This may stem from differences in experience, limited access to training, and the lack of structured mechanisms for regular performance evaluations, which currently rely solely on annual assessments by supervisors. These findings highlight the need to cultivate a culture of self-evaluation and continuous feedback within the organization.

• Likewise, when it comes to anticipating solutions to problems, the results indicate a moderate level of proficiency, accompanied by a wide range of responses. This contrasts with their earlier confidence in preventive planning. The discrepancy may be due to the overlap of some problems with periods of high workload, the absence of effective tools for problem resolution, and a lack of agility and decisiveness among certain staff. These competencies could be enhanced through workshops incorporating case studies and simulated scenarios, ideally led by experienced professionals.

• The data also indicate a moderate level of motivation in achieving goals, along with noticeable variability in employees' commitment to task completion. This may be attributed to work conditions, the structure of reward distribution, and the availability of professional advancement opportunities. Enhancing motivation requires establishing clear and attainable objectives, improving the reward and incentive systems, and strengthening professional development policies.

• The findings further reveal a moderate drive to achieve professional success, although the standard deviation indicates significant differences in ambition levels. While some employees demonstrate a strong desire for advancement and identify institutional growth opportunities, others experience professional stagnation. This gap is often linked to limitations in the promotion and allowance system in public service, particularly for specific roles. These observations highlight the need for well-defined incentive programs that offer transparent pathways for career progression.

• The results also suggest a moderate perception of individual focus on job tasks compared to colleagues. This could reflect either an unequal task distribution or diminished motivation and may be influenced by the nature of duties within the center, which tends to emphasize collective effort. To address this, it is recommended to clearly define individual responsibilities within teams, thereby fostering a greater sense of accountability and increasing employees' awareness of their contributions to institutional success.

### III.3. Hypothesis Testing:

#### III.3.1. Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the First Hypothesis:

• The first hypothesis addresses the level of perception of the dimensions of organizational justice among the employees of the National Centres for the Formation of Local Authority Personnel (CNFPCL), assuming that this perception is at a moderate level. To verify this hypothesis, the perception averages were measured across three main dimensions of organizational justice:

-Distributive justice, which relates to the distribution of resources and rewards.

-Procedural justice, which reflects the extent of fairness in organizational processes and decision-making.

-Interactional justice, which highlights the quality of relationships between management and employees.

• To verify this, arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated, and the general trend was analyzed, as shown below:

**Table No. (10): The arithmetic means, standard deviations, and general direction of the dimensions of organizational justice.**

| Dimensions of Organizational Justice | Arithmetic Mean | Standard Deviation | General Direction | Degree of Availability |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Distributive Justice                 | 3.12            | 0.72               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| Procedural Justice                   | 3.14            | 0.88               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |
| Interactional Justice                | 3.31            | 0.83               | Sometimes         | Medium degree          |

Compiled by the researcher through the SPSS v.25 software.

• According to the Likert scale, the arithmetic mean falls between 3.00 and 3.50, which corresponds to a medium perception category. This indicates that employees express varied, but not high, satisfaction regarding the application of organizational justice.

-Regarding the first dimension (Distributive Justice), the arithmetic mean of 3.12 reflects a moderate level of perceived distributive justice. This suggests that the distribution of resources and rewards is not consistently fair. This perception may stem from the lack of clear distribution criteria, which can negatively impact job satisfaction and professional motivation. The standard deviation of 0.72 indicates limited variation in perceptions of distributive justice. Such variation may result from disparities in salaries, job benefits, or favouritism in reward allocation. Therefore, it is recommended to establish transparent and standardized criteria for distributing rewards to ensure fairness and clarity across all employees.

-The arithmetic mean for the procedural justice dimension was 3.14, with a standard deviation of 0.88, indicating a similarly moderate level of perceived procedural justice but with greater variability than in the distributive justice dimension. This suggests differences in how organizational policies are perceived across departments. Employees expressed dissatisfaction with certain applied procedures, including workload distribution and access to benefits, as well as limited involvement in decision-making processes. These concerns may reduce trust in management. Enhancing procedural justice can be achieved by involving employees in policy discussions and ensuring that decisions are made based on accurate and objective data, thus increasing employees' sense of fairness and trust in administrative processes.

-Regarding the interactional justice dimension, the arithmetic mean was 3.31, the highest among all dimensions, yet it still reflects a moderate level of perceived justice. Some employees report that their interactions with management lack personal appreciation and effective communication, which undermines the quality of daily workplace interactions. The standard deviation of 0.83 suggests a relative variation in employees' perceptions of interactional justice. While certain employees acknowledge good administrative communication, others feel overlooked and perceive a lack of managerial interest in their individual concerns. This dimension can be enhanced by fostering a culture of recognition and appreciation, and by implementing training programs aimed at improving communication skills among administrative staff, thereby promoting a more inclusive and engaging work environment.

• These findings support the hypothesis. The researcher attributes this to noticeable shortcomings in administrative policies, particularly in terms of interaction quality and equitable resource allocation, highlighting the need for more comprehensive strategies to enhance organizational fairness.

• This is consistent with previous studies emphasizing the critical role of organizational justice in influencing job satisfaction and motivation. Research indicates that a moderate perception of justice may result in fluctuating levels of organizational commitment and performance, and that employees who experience ambiguity in organizational standards are more susceptible to work-related stress and diminished motivation.

• This perception aligns with organizational justice theory, which posits that fairness within an organization encompasses not only resource allocation but also employee involvement in decision-making and acknowledgment of contributions. Consequently, achieving higher levels of perceived justice requires management to implement transparent and systematic policies across all areas of employee engagement.

Based on the study's findings, it is recommended to implement administrative measures aimed at promoting organizational justice, including:

- Enhancing distributive justice through the adoption of a transparent evaluation framework grounded in performance and competence, clearly defining the criteria for allocating rewards, tasks, and resources to ensure equitable distribution.

- Strengthening procedural justice by involving employees in administrative processes and organizational policymaking and establishing clear and effective communication channels between management and staff.
- Improving interactional justice by organizing training programs focused on communication and interpersonal skills, and implementing a transparent, periodic performance evaluation system to foster a supportive work environment.

### III.3.2. Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the Second Hypothesis:

The second hypothesis aims to analyze the impact of demographic variables on employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice, determining whether there are statistically significant differences according to variables such as nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income. To verify the validity of this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to measure the extent of the influence of these variables on the general perception of organizational justice within the work environment.

#### • Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the First Sub-Hypothesis:

The first sub-hypothesis posited that there are no statistically significant differences in employees' perceptions of the dimensions of organizational justice at CNFPCL centers based on the nature of work. To test this hypothesis, the researcher employed a one-way ANOVA to determine whether statistically significant differences exist among the groups. The table below displays the computed values for each dimension of organizational justice according to the nature of work variable.

**Table No. (11): Results of the F-Test for Differences in Mean Responses on the Dimensions of Organizational Justice According to the Nature of Work Variable**

| Dimensions            | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | Calculated F Value | Significance Level |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Distributive Justice  | Between Groups      | 0.898          | 2                  | 0.449       | 0.835              | 0.445              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 14.520         | 27                 | 0.538       |                    |                    |
|                       | Total               | 15.418         | 29                 |             |                    |                    |
| Procedural Justice    | Between Groups      | 0.673          | 2                  | 0.336       | 0.414              | 0.665              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 21.924         | 27                 | 0.812       |                    |                    |
|                       | Total               | 22.596         | 29                 |             |                    |                    |
| Interactional Justice | Between Groups      | 1.984          | 2                  | 0.992       | 1.474              | 0.247              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 18.166         | 27                 | 0.673       |                    |                    |
|                       | Total               | 20.150         | 29                 |             |                    |                    |

Prepared by the researcher using SPSS version 25.

It is evident from the table above that the significance levels are greater than 0.05 in all three dimensions, and no statistically significant differences were recorded in any of them. Therefore, the nature of work is not an influential factor in employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional).

This result can be explained by the Following factors:

- The centers apply a clear resource distribution policy based on the needs of departments and administrations, rather than individuals.
- A unified administrative structure exists in the centers, which relies on fixed organizational mechanisms and procedures. This contributes to a consistent evaluation of all employees regardless of the differences in the nature of their work.
- Operations and decision-making are implemented according to unified decrees and laws issued by the Ministry of Interior and Public Service. This ensures consistent application for all employees and fosters a work environment that supports the sense of justice.

These results are consistent with what previous studies have indicated. Research by Moorman (1991) has shown that environments with unified and transparent administrative policies provide a similar level of perception of organizational justice regardless of differences in the nature of work.

Considering these results, some recommendations can be made to ensure the continued fair application of policies without differentiation based on the nature of work:

- Maintain the approach of unified administrative policies, ensuring they are practiced transparently and fairly for all employees, with periodic reviews to confirm their alignment with the needs of the work environment.
- Despite the absence of significant differences, it is advisable to improve internal communication channels to ensure that employees clearly understand organizational procedures and resource distribution criteria.
- Organize training courses on the concepts of organizational justice and effective communication, emphasizing the importance of fair policies regardless of the nature of work.
- Review resource and benefit distribution policies to ensure their compatibility with the needs of all job categories, thereby minimizing the impact of individual differences on perceptions of fairness.
- Involve employees in decision-making processes that affect their work to enhance their sense of participation and transparency, and to foster a balanced perception of justice within the institution.

In conclusion, the nature of work variable does not significantly affect employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice within the centers. This is due to the unified administrative policies and clear organizational structure that ensure the application of justice standards across all job categories. Therefore, the focus should be on

enhancing communication and transparency practices while considering the evaluation of other demographic variables that may contribute to building a more just and inclusive work environment.

**•Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the Second Sub-Hypothesis:**

This hypothesis aims to examine whether professional experience influences employees' perceptions of the dimensions of organizational justice in the CNFPCL centers. To test this, the researcher investigated potential differences in perceptions based on varying levels of professional experience within the work environment.

**Table No. (12): Results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Differences in Mean Responses on the Dimensions of Organizational Justice According to the Professional Experience Variable**

| Dimensions            | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F Value | Significance Level |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|
| Distributive Justice  | Between Groups      | 0.343          | 3                  | 0.114       | 0.197   | 0.897              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 15.074         | 26                 | 0.580       |         |                    |
|                       | Total               | 15.418         | 29                 |             |         |                    |
| Procedural Justice    | Between Groups      | 2.640          | 3                  | 0.880       | 1.147   | 0.349              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 19.956         | 26                 | 0.768       |         |                    |
|                       | Total               | 22.596         | 29                 |             |         |                    |
| Interactional Justice | Between Groups      | 4.615          | 3                  | 1.538       | 2.575   | 0.076              |
|                       | Within Groups       | 15.535         | 26                 | 0.597       |         |                    |
|                       | Total               | 20.150         | 29                 |             |         |                    |

\*Significance at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level

Formulated by researcher using SPSS V25.

The table indicates that none of the studied dimensions of justice recorded statistically significant differences based on professional experience, as the significance levels in all tests exceeded 0.05 ( $p > 0.05$ ). This confirms the second sub-hypothesis, suggesting that years of experience do not significantly influence employees' perception of justice within the centers under study.

The researcher attributes this result to the following factors:

- The implementation of unified resource distribution policies based on departmental needs. The researcher observed that the centers supply all required materials to administrators and trainees upon request, without exception.
- The distribution of "off-duty profits" bonuses to all employees ensures a certain level of fairness. Although bonus amounts vary, they are linked to individual achievements rather than years of experience.
- The stability of the administrative system contributes to the convergence of employees' views, regardless of differing experience levels.
- New employees are quickly integrated into the work environment and regularly trained by more experienced colleagues, leading to a shared perception of justice.
- Administrative respect and interaction methods are determined by position and rank rather than years of service.
- The presence of unified evaluation criteria applied consistently to all employees mitigates the impact of experience as a differentiating factor.

These results are consistent with organizational justice theory, which posits that the perception of justice is influenced not only by professional experience but also by the transparency of organizational processes and the fairness of evaluation criteria. Greenberg's (1990) study emphasized that employees' perceptions of justice are more strongly affected by the clarity and consistency of administrative policies than by the length of their professional experience, which explains the lack of significant differences found in the present study.

To achieve a higher level of organizational justice, the following measures are recommended:

- Regularly review administrative policies to ensure they meet the needs of all employee groups.
- Establish clear and transparent criteria for resource distribution, with employee involvement to enhance fairness and job satisfaction.
- Involve experienced employees in decision-making to strengthen their sense of justice and engagement.
- Provide onboarding sessions for new staff on organizational justice principles to support cultural integration.
- Offer training for senior staff to reinforce their role in promoting fairness.
- Foster open communication channels across all employee groups to encourage knowledge sharing and a shared understanding of justice.

It can be concluded that professional experience is not a significant factor influencing employees' perception of organizational justice in the studied centers. The findings indicate that perceptions are shaped more by the clarity of organizational policies and the consistency of evaluation mechanisms. Therefore, internal communication should be enhanced, and equal opportunities should be guaranteed through transparent and equitable administrative policies.

**•Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the Third Sub-Hypothesis:**

The final sub-hypothesis aims to analyze the impact of the monthly income variable on employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice in the centers, this was investigated by analyzing potential differences in the evaluation of justice dimensions across various income levels.

**Table No. (13): Results of the F-Test for Differences in Mean Responses on the Dimensions of Organizational Justice Based on Monthly Income**

| Dimensions           | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | Calculated (F) Value | Significance Level |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Distributive Justice | Between Groups      | 1.054          | 2                  | 0.527       | 0.991                | 0.384              |
| Within Groups        |                     | 14.364         | 27                 |             |                      |                    |
| Total                |                     | 15.418         | 29                 |             |                      |                    |

|                       |                |        |    |       |       |       |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| Procedural Justice    | Between Groups | 0.486  | 2  | 0.243 | 0.297 | 0.746 |
| Within Groups         |                | 22.111 | 27 |       |       |       |
| Total                 |                | 22.596 | 29 |       |       |       |
| Interactional Justice | Between Groups | 0.276  | 2  | 0.138 | 0.187 | 0.830 |
| Within Groups         |                | 19.875 | 27 |       |       |       |
| Total                 |                | 20.150 | 29 |       |       |       |

Significant at the significance level =  $\alpha$  0.05

Prepared by the researcher using SPSS version 25.

The results of the (F) test and the analysis of arithmetic means show that monthly income level does not have a significant effect on the perception of organizational justice, as the significance level (p-value) was greater than 0.05 for all dimensions. This confirms the homogeneity in employees' overall perception of organizational justice, regardless of income differences. This suggests that monthly income (despite its variation among employees) does not substantially affect their perception of organizational justice. This can be explained by the following factors:

- The adoption of a unified and transparent wage and allowance system for all public service employees, distributed based on rank, tasks, and experience, which limits feelings of injustice.
- Relative equality in the distribution of resources and rewards, which enhances the sense of fairness despite income differences.
- The application of standardized organizational procedures and fixed, unified policies in dealing with employees, with no evident influence of income level on administrative decision-making mechanisms.
- Administrative interaction based on principles of equal treatment, mutual respect, and performance evaluation regardless of income, which reduces the impact of income differences on the perception of justice within the institution.

These results are consistent with previous studies suggesting that monthly income is not a significant factor influencing the perception of organizational justice; instead, transparency and evaluation policies play a major role in shaping this perception. According to organizational justice theory, employees assess justice based on the clarity of organizational rules and the fairness of resource distribution, rather than solely on income disparities among colleagues (Greenberg, 1990).

Based on the foregoing, the following measures are recommended to enhance organizational justice for all employees, regardless of their income level:

- Conduct periodic reviews of administrative policies to ensure their compatibility with the needs of all job categories and to reduce the potential impact of financial differences on justice perception.
- Strengthen transparent reward distribution criteria by involving employees in discussions about distribution mechanisms, which can contribute to improving job satisfaction.
- Engage all employee categories in decision-making processes to ensure fairness and transparency regardless of salary level.
- Organize orientation sessions to enhance employees' understanding of organizational justice and clarify internal mechanisms for resource allocation.
- Improve communication channels between management and staff to ensure the availability of clear information about wage policies and evaluation procedures

In summary, the analysis revealed that the monthly income variable does not influence employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice within the centers. The findings suggest that salary differences do not significantly impact employees' evaluations of justice in the workplace. This is largely attributed to the implementation of transparent distribution criteria, standardized organizational procedures, and unified administrative policies, which collectively foster a general sense of fairness across the institution. It is advisable to focus on enhancing internal communication channels and increasing employee participation in decision-making processes to ensure a stronger perception of organizational justice.

**•Analysis of the Second Hypothesis as a Whole: The Impact of Demographic Variables on the Perception of Organizational Justice:**

The results of the statistical analysis indicated that employees' perception of the dimensions of organizational justice does not differ significantly based on demographic variables such as nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income. This outcome reflects the overall homogeneity in the perception of justice among employees within the CNFPCL centers, regardless of their functional or financial characteristics. The researcher attributed this finding to a set of fundamental factors characterized by clarity, unity, and stability—most notably, the policies governing resource and reward distribution, the standardized wage and allowance system, an organizational culture that remains unaffected by individual differences, and a structured administrative framework that applies consistent standards across all job categories. These elements contribute to a stable perception of justice within the centers under study.

These results align with organizational justice theory, which asserts that the general perception of justice primarily depends on institutional policies and evaluation criteria, rather than on the individual characteristics of employees. When policies are transparent and consistently applied, the influence of personal variables—such as the nature of work or years of experience—tends to diminish. Studies by Moorman (1991) and Greenberg (1990) have shown that organizational justice tends to be higher in institutions with unified policies, clear organizational structures, and fixed standards, as these reduce the emphasis on individual differences. This trend explains the absence of statistically significant differences in the current study, as the consistent implementation of administrative policies helps ensure a uniform perception of justice among all employees.

Based on the analysis, several recommendations can be proposed to ensure the continued perception of fairness within the institution:

- Conduct regular reviews of administrative policies to ensure their alignment with the needs of all job categories and to maintain transparency in their implementation.
- Strengthen internal communication channels to clarify organizational procedures and the criteria for resource distribution.
- Organize workshops and awareness sessions to promote understanding of organizational justice concepts among employees.
- Involve employees in decision-making processes to enhance their sense of participation and transparency.
- Carry out periodic assessments of perceived organizational justice to gauge employee satisfaction with existing policies and identify areas for improvement.

Finally, it can be concluded that the nature of work, professional experience, and monthly income do not significantly influence employees' perceptions of organizational justice within the centers. This outcome is attributed to the presence of unified administrative policies and a clear organizational structure, which ensure the fair and consistent application of procedures across all employee groups. Therefore, future efforts should focus on enhancing transparency, strengthening internal communication, and regularly reviewing administrative evaluation mechanisms to maintain a sustainable sense of justice within the workplace.

#### **IV- Critique of the Study:**

Although many studies have addressed the topic of organizational justice in terms of its importance and dimensions, most have focused on the perception of justice in general contexts, particularly within the Algerian environment where numerous employee complaints are still raised through informal communication channels. This raises several important research questions:

- Is the "moderate" perception of organizational justice linked to the institution's internal policies or to external factors such as general work culture or prevailing social norms?
- Does the absence of statistical differences among employees based on personal variables challenge the hypothesis that unified policies lead to equal perceptions of justice?
- What are the real underlying reasons for the low perception of justice among employees within organizations?

Based on these questions, it can be said that this study represents a step toward a more detailed analysis of the relationship between organizational perception and personal factors. However, there is a need for further empirical research and comparisons between different individual variables to gain a deeper understanding of the dynamics of organizational justice.

To ensure a fair work environment and promote the principles of organizational justice, it is recommended, in addition to the above, to take the following measures:

- Establish formal channels for submitting complaints and objections to ensure that justice-related concerns are addressed objectively and systematically.
- Monitor behaviors that reflect a sense of injustice and develop strategies to address them proactively before they impact overall institutional performance.
- Organizational justice is not merely about the distribution of rewards, but rather about fostering a general sense of fairness and balance in the workplace, where employees are able to assess their efforts and compensation transparently and clearly.

## References

### Books

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. Braziller.

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 negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Dorra, O. M. (2008). *Organizational justice and its relationship with some contemporary administrative trends* (العدالة التنظيمية وعلاقتها ببعض الاتجاهات الإدارية المعاصرة). Dar Al-Radwan.

Ezz, A. F. (2008). *Introduction to descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS* (مقدمة في الإحصاء الوصفي والاستدلالي باستخدام SPSS). Khawarizm Al-Elmeyah.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. Wiley.

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). Springer.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. McGraw-Hill.

### Journal Articles

Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102–109.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & 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.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34–48.

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115–130.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.

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.

### Legal Documents

Executive Decree No. 95-59, February 18, 1995, concerning the establishment of the National Centers for the Formation of Local Authority Personnel and the improvement of their levels and renewal of their information.

Joint Ministerial Decision No. 6559, December 24, 1997, defining the administrative organization of the National Centers for the Formation of Local Authority Personnel and the improvement of their levels and renewal of their information.