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ABSTRACT

The current research chose the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactive justice) and exclusion marketing prowess these are exploring opportunities, exploiting opportunities, and marketing flexibility. The purpose of the research was to test the possibility of organizational justice contributing to achieving marketing prowess. And standing at the level of both organizational justice and marketing prowess, and from here it becomes clear to us its importance. And by searching for the problem through a group of questions centered on whether there is a correlation and influence between the research variables, and in light of this, a hypothetical model was constructed from which the main and sub-research hypotheses emerged. To test the validity of the hypotheses, the data were collected through the questionnaire tool, and it was prepared for this purpose. A sample represented the size of (40) workers in the researched laboratory. The data were analyzed using a set of statistical methods and the results were extracted using the computer program (v.16 SPSS), and in light of the results and analyzes, the research reached a set of conclusions, including the decrease in workers’ sense of fairness of wage distribution procedures. And rewards for workers would cause the worker to lose the performance evaluation criteria, and to separate the goals of the worker from the goals of the organization. Finally, the research presented a set of recommendations, which is the necessity of setting fixed standards for each department in the laboratory to work so that the worker can, through these criteria, evaluate his performance and know his duties and rights. Also, laboratory management must take care to involve all workers in making decisions that affect their work, which contributes to making these decisions more effective.
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INTRODUCTION

The field of organisational behaviour and organisational theory proposed organisational justice in contemporary organisational management as a core principle and organisational experience (Chen et al., 2015). Because of the common attempts not only to request organisational justice for workers but also to preserve it in the organisation, organisational justice has been of high significance in organisational culture (Karkoulian, Assaker, & Hallak, 2016).

This is critical not only for the quality of life of human workers, but for organisations themselves as well. Improving corporate fairness will have a significant and beneficial influence on any organization’s success and sustainability (Karkoulian et al., 2016). In the past, a variety of research findings have tended to support correlation between higher levels of corporate fairness and workplace satisfaction, job participation, positive attitudes and activities at work (Chen et al., 2015,

THE PROBLEM OF THE RESEARCH

The research problem can be formulated through the following main question:

What is the role of organizational justice for top management in achieving employees' marketing prowess?

As for the research sub-questions, they were:

1- What is the reality of organizational justice for senior management in the researched laboratory?

2- What is the relative importance of organizational justice from the viewpoint of the workers in the researched laboratory?

3- What is the role of marketing prowess in the researched lab?

4- What is the form and nature of the relationship between organizational justice and marketing prowess in the researched laboratory?

5- What is the effect of organizational justice (by removing it) on the marketing prowess of the workers in the researched laboratory?

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH:

Organizational justice is an important topic in the administrative fields, as it reduces conflicts within the organization, also reduces work pressures in the organization and highlights the importance of research in two main aspects (yuengo & wong, 2004: 3):

1). Applied importance: the research attempt to measure, test and diagnose the reality of organizational justice and its role in achieving the marketing prowess of workers in the field of work Samawah Cement Factory is a true measure of the health and safety of the upper management in the factory of its workers due to the effect of each of them on human resources and thus the effect on productivity and performance on the organization as a whole.
2). Importance at the level of (Samawah Cement Factory): The importance of research for the researched organization enhances employing organizational justice for senior management in applying appropriate practices and decisions to achieve justice in organizations, building and strengthening trust between management and its workers and clients, and creating an appropriate work environment that contributes to reducing negative phenomena, and unhealthy and psychological situations, and work to prepare workers to be proficient in marketing.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The research seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. Knowing the level of application of the foundations of organizational justice by senior management in the research laboratory.
2. Knowing the suitability of the methods used by the senior management of the researched laboratory in applying organizational justice.
3. Knowing the marketing prowess of the workers in the research laboratory.
5. Presenting a set of recommendations and proposals to senior management to support the perceptions of organizational justice and its potential to achieve marketing excellence in the future.

**The hypothetical scheme of the research: (Hypothetical Model)**

(Hypothetical Model)

![Diagram of Organizational Justice and Marketing Prowess](image1.png)

Figure 1.1

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES:

The research hypotheses were formulated according to the problem, objectives, and outline of the research, as follows:

Ho1: There is no statistically significant effect of distributive justice on marketing prowess.
Ha1: There is a statistically significant effect of distributional justice on marketing prowess.

Ho2: There is no statistically significant effect of procedural fairness on marketing prowess.
Ha2: There is a statistically significant effect of procedural fairness on marketing prowess.

Ho3: Reactive fairness has no statistically significant effect on marketing prowess.
Ha3: There is a statistically significant effect of proactive fairness on marketing prowess.

The theoretical framework

1. Organizational Justice

1.1 The Concept of Organizational Justice

In these days and in a world witnessing high competition, the management of organizations needs employees to perform beyond the traditional job description or official duties as a source of organizational influence, especially the emergence of smart organizations, which increased this competition.

Organizational justice shows the system of social, ethical and religious values among the workers and determines the methods of interaction and moral maturity of the workers in the organization. (Al-Fahdawi & Al-Qatawneh, 2004: 15)

In this regard, (582: Greenberg, 1990) defines organizational justice as a concept that refers to the employees’ perception of the extent to which they are treated fairly in the organization, and how this perception has an impact on organizational results such as commitment and job satisfaction. “(Tatum, 2008, p: 297) defines it as Workers' sense of fair treatment in their jobs and the impact of this on many organizational outcomes.

Through presenting the concept of organizational justice for many points of view, it was revealed that there is near-consensus that this concept means: - Fair treatment received by the worker by the higher management, whether in the form of the distribution of wages and rewards, or in the form of fairness of the procedures applied in the distribution of wages, or fair treatment On the personal level, or the information, or the fairness of evaluating the worker's performance (Al-Zubaidi, 2012: 55).

Brockner has indicated that the importance of organizational justice is due to two reasons:

1. Employees use the perception of current justice in the organization to predict what they will deal with in the future.
2. The workers are trying to realize that they are part of the organization, and the existence of justice is an indicator of the extent of their acceptance and appreciation on the part of the organization's management. (Brockner, 2002: 59)

Organizational justice has an impact on human feelings generated by the injustices that individuals may feel in the organization. Many writers have indicated that the feelings of anger that individuals may feel may be the result of organizational decisions or unfair administrative behaviors. Individuals who face injustice often are violent and hard-tempered, as well as the possibility of creating other feelings such as aggression, revenge, guilt, shame, and withdrawal, as a result of weak dimensions of justice in the organization. (Al-Shakurji, 2008: 38).

2. Dimensions of Organizational Justice

2.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice was developed by Adams in 1965 (2012: 394 Farahbod). Organizational justice is called distributive justice because it works to grant allocations to some or obtain some results without others, and distributive justice is concerned with the fact that not all workers are treated at the same level, and the distinction in the distribution of results in the workplace (Cropanzano, 2007: 37), and that justice The distribution system shows in the organization the reality of the distribution system of salaries and wages, that is, the extent to which the higher management follows a fair system for the distribution of wages and rewards commensurate with the effort and time spent by the worker (Al-Fahdawi & Al-Qatawneh, 15: 2004)

The worker's perception of distributive justice is done by comparing the percentage of what he gets from the inputs that are equal to other teaching inputs and outputs. It determines the employees 'perception of promotion, the wages paid, and similar results. (Hooshmand & Moghimi, 2011: 555).

2.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is an important resource in social exchange, and procedural justice gains importance for workers because it is concerned with making decisions about the distribution of outcomes, which confirms to them the possibility of justice in long-term outcomes, which contributes to their sense of self-worth (paterson, Green & cary, 2002: 401)

It was defined by both (Fahdawi & Qatawneh, 2004: 10) as the degree of feeling generated among workers towards the fairness of the organizational procedures used in determining the organizational outputs.

(Dolan et al., 2004: 3) believes that it is the fairness of the procedures followed in determining the distribution of results or allocations. It explains procedural justice to equality in the formal procedures that underpin the decisions of the organization in terms of their relevance to workers (2008: 230 et al Asgari). Studies show that unfair decision-making processes are associated with many negative behavioral outcomes, such as low performance of the organization as a whole, lack of job satisfaction, and low organizational affiliation (Awad, 2003: 22).

2.3 Interactional Justice
Reactive justice is the third dimension of organizational justice, and it means the employees' sense of the fairness of the treatment they receive when formal procedures are applied to them (Al-Sukkar, 2013: 413).

There is a direct link to interactive justice with the human aspect of organizational practices, while distributive and procedural justice is concerned with the work of the organization. Interactive justice focuses on the behavior of individuals and personal contact with them by the higher management of the organization in contrast to distributive and procedural justice (Johnson, 2007: 30). Reactive justice is the personal treatment that the worker receives from the direct official. Reactive justice is defined as the way the administration treats the recipient of justice related to the human character and organizational practices (Hooshmand & Moghimi, 2011: 555). Whereas, (Robert & Angelo, 2001: 302) sees it as the degree to which the worker feels fairness in the human treatment he gets when applying the procedures.

Both (Hooshmand & Moghimi, 2011: 555) explained that reactive justice includes two main aspects:

1- Fair treatment of employees by higher management.
2- Provide employees with an adequate explanation of the decisions they are affected by.

The precedents of fair treatment are summarized by relying on four rules that control fair treatment:

1- Truthfulness: Management must be open, honest and upfront when implementing decision-making procedures.
2- Justification: Management must provide appropriate explanations for the results of the decision process.
3- Propriety: Staying away from inappropriate words and phrases.
4- Respect: The administration must treat individuals with respect and dignity (Al-Shakurji, 2008: 51).

3. Marketing Prowess

3.1. The Concept of Marketing Prowess

The origin of the word “Ambidexterity” linguistically goes back to the Middle Ages and in the Latin language in particular, as it was explained to several concepts, including the use of both hands in a dual or dual-mode, or it is an unusual skill, or a state of fluctuation and multiplicity (Tempelaur, 2010: 1). According to the Oxford dictionary, this word means the ability of people to do actions with both hands with equal ease (Oxford, 1980). As for Al-Mawred Modern Dictionary (Al-Baalbaki 2008: 51), it means, the ability to work with both hands with equal ease, deceptive, and two-sided, He is exceptionally skilled and has shown (Simsek, 2009: 597) that organizations need to be exceptionally ingenious to achieve a balance between the two processes of exploring opportunities and optimizing their exploitation simultaneously, as they search for new possibilities to be compatible with the dynamic business environment, and at the same time Employing all its capabilities for the purpose of achieving efficiency. Prange & Bruyaka (2016:
316) indicated that business acumen refers to the degree of achieving balance and compatibility between competitors' points of view to achieve a specific goal, between the internal and external orientation that determines the nature and types of important and necessary strategies to achieve external competition.

4. Banish Marketing Prowess:

4.1. Explore Marketing Opportunities

It is interested in creating new market opportunities and working to develop them in order to create value for the customer through developing new products or expanding existing production lines (Nwokha & Cndukwu, 2009: 2012). Rahey (2007: 5) emphasized that identifying potential marketing opportunities makes the organization open in its current and future strategy. Looym et.al. (2005: 5) indicated that the activities of searching for new marketing opportunities aim at developing new products, as well as creating innovative products. (Pai, 2007: 24-25) believes that an organization that resorts to exploring new marketing opportunities and moves towards them quickly and adapts to volatile markets acquires new markets and customers, and then establishes new distribution channels.

4.2. Exploiting Marketing Opportunities

Exploitation of marketing opportunities refers to application, production and efficiency, as units of opportunity exploitation are more centralized, processes and cultures associated with the organization, as opportunities are exploited through continuous change and the achievement of maximum efficiency, as well as control of ideal sites (Huang, 2010: 10). And (David & Nigal, 2006: 23) that the exploitation of opportunities are the events that can happen now or in the future in the markets, which the organization can invest to achieve its goals through the adoption of an effective marketing plan, and in most cases, it is measured in monetary return or market share)

4.3. Marketing Flexibility

The term marketing flexibility refers to the ability of the organization to adapt or shift from one situation to another, which enables it to take the necessary actions and measures to respond to environmental changes (Kourpalatis, et.al., 2012: 1393). As for (Gylling et.al., 2012: 1284), it was expressed in the ability of the organization to respond quickly to the changes that occur in the marketing environment and to adapt to it to reduce the negative effects, as well as the extent of the response to the changes that occur in the external environment that may affect the tastes. Customers constantly statistical analysis

Description Sample

The research sample was intentionally chosen, to seek the opinion of those involved in the relationship and workers in the administrative work sector in the Iraqi education, specifically in the Samawah Cement Factory, forty-four questionnaire forms were distributed to the specialists, four forms were excluded for their incompleteness, and thus the research sample becomes (40) individuals.

Analyzing Results of Questionnaire
The results of the questionnaire that was conducted were unpacked, in the form of frequencies and percentages in the statistical program (SPSS). Reliability and dispersion indicators (Std.) will be extracted for the results of the questionnaire, as follows:

Reliability

After extracting the coefficient of stability (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the data, it became clear that the measuring instrument has a good degree of reliability.

**Table 1: Reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient of the Research Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Distributive justice</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Procedural justice</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Reactive justice</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Explore opportunities</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Exploiting opportunities</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Marketing flexibility</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean & Std. Deviation**

**Table No. (2) Measuring the dispersion of the research variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>1.00766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>0.90441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x3</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
<td>0.97534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x4</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3250</td>
<td>1.02250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>1.13652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x6</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.9750</td>
<td>1.02501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y1</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.8750</td>
<td>1.09046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y2</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.9750</td>
<td>0.97369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y3</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>0.93883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y4</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>0.92681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y5</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.9500</td>
<td>0.81492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3250</td>
<td>0.94428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>1.14774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.9750</td>
<td>1.16548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>1.13228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4250</td>
<td>0.98417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4750</td>
<td>1.03744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k1</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1750</td>
<td>1.19588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k2</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6750</td>
<td>0.99711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k3</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>1.26466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k4</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>6.28307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k5</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.5750</td>
<td>1.25856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k6</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>1.21291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k7</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
<td>0.87119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k8</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.13228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k9</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.4750</td>
<td>1.21924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5750</td>
<td>0.90263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0250</td>
<td>0.69752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m3</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2750</td>
<td>0.75064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical tests

The First Hypothesis:

Ho1: There is no statistically significant effect of distributive justice on marketing prowess.

Ha1: There is a statistically significant effect of distributional justice on marketing prowess.

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.400&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.26782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), XXX

### ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.602</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.602</td>
<td>7.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup>
It was found from the tables above that the value of the double-correlation coefficient was (0.400), and the coefficient of determination was (0.160), which means that (16%) approximately of the change in marketing prowess is due to the change in distributive justice, and since the calculated value of (F) is equal to (7.218) which is greater than its tabular value, and since the significance level is equal to (0.011) which is less than (0.05) the approved level of significance, so we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant effect of distributonal justice on marketing prowess.

The Second Hypothesis:

Ho2: There is no statistically significant effect of procedural fairness on marketing prowess.

Ha2: There is a statistically significant effect of a statistically significant effect of procedural justice on marketing prowess.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>d. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.207a</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>1.35305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), YYY

ANOVA

It was found from the tables above that the value of the double correlation coefficient (0.207), and the coefficient of determination was (0.043), which means that (4%) approximately of the change in marketing prowess is due to the change in procedural justice and since the calculated value of (F) is equal to (1.701) which is smaller than its tabular value, and since the significance level is equal to (0.200) which is greater than (0.05) the approved level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant effect of procedural justice on marketing prowess.

**The Third Hypothesis:**

Ho3: Interaction fairness has no statistically significant effect on marketing prowess.

Ha3: There is a statistically significant effect of a statistically significant effect of reactive fairness on marketing prowess.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.194&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>0.038</th>
<th>0.012</th>
<th>1.35676</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant), EEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>69.950</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72.683</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), EEE

b. Dependent Variable: KMB

### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.778</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-1.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: KMB

It was shown from the above tables that the value of the double correlation coefficient was (0.194), and the coefficient of determination was (0.038), which means that (3.8%) approximately of the change in marketing prowess is due to the change in reactive fairness, and since the calculated value of (F) is equal to (1.484) which is smaller than its tabular value, and since the level of significance is equal to (0.231) which is greater than (0.05) the approved level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant effect of reactive justice on marketing prowess.

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXX</th>
<th>YYY</th>
<th>EEE</th>
<th>KKK</th>
<th>MMM</th>
<th>BBB</th>
<th>KMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.442**</td>
<td>0.484**</td>
<td>-0.429**</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>-0.352'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XXX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.442**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.376*</td>
<td>-0.269-</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-0.197-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YYY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.484**</td>
<td>0.376*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.282-</td>
<td>0.530**</td>
<td>-0.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.429**</td>
<td>-0.269-</td>
<td>-0.282-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.282-</td>
<td>0.461**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KKK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.530**</td>
<td>-0.282-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.507**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.352'</td>
<td>-0.197-</td>
<td>-0.443**</td>
<td>0.461**</td>
<td>-0.507**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BBB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.400*</td>
<td>-0.207-</td>
<td>-0.194-</td>
<td>0.887**</td>
<td>-0.008-</td>
<td>0.618**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KMB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

1- The factory management deals with a moderate degree of fairness, as it negatively affects the level of marketing prowess felt by its employees. The interactive justice dimension came first.

2 - The factory administration is interested in the fairness of wage distribution, financial benefits, and rewards for workers and this arises many negative phenomena that affect the efficiency of work performance, accordingly the procedural justice dimension came in second order.

3- The employees’ feeling of fairness in the procedures for distributing wages and bonuses for workers will cause the worker to lose the performance evaluation criteria, and for the worker’s goals to be separated from the organization’s own goals. The distributional justice dimension came in the third order.

4- The factory management neglects those who are distinguished in their performance and this is a dangerous indicator that the factory management uses, because that would kill the spirit of creativity and innovation.

5- The senior management neglects the researched laboratory by not involving them in the decision-making and implementation process without having any participation or expressing an opinion.

6- There is an inverse relationship between organizational justice in its three dimensions and marketing prowess, where the greater the degree of organizational justice, the less the marketing prowess.

Recommendations: (Recommendations)

1. The laboratory should follow up on fair treatment and ensure that all employees are treated with fairness and respect.

2 - The necessity of reconsideration by the administration of the research laboratory in the systems, rules and instructions followed in the allocation and distribution of their financial resources, by setting up a mechanism for the distribution of financial and moral incentives.

3- The factory management has the main role in cultivating the spirit of one team, and cooperation in work, which reduces the isolation that workers suffer from.

4- The necessity of setting fixed standards for each department in the laboratory to work so that the worker can, through these criteria, evaluate his performance and know his duties and rights.

5- The factory management must be concerned with involving all workers in making decisions that affect their work, which contributes to making these decisions more effective.

6- The necessity of placing the right person in the right place, as the more the administration is able to provide suitable cadres with the necessary capabilities and capabilities, the higher the degree of marketing prowess.
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