

Organisational support and its relationship with job involvement among Sonatrach employees.

Djamel Lakhdari¹, Hachemi MOKRANI²

¹University centre of Barika (Algeria).

²University of Algiers 2 (Algeria).

The Author's E-mail: djamel.lakhdari@cu-barika.dz¹,
hachemimokrani@gmail.com²

Received: 07/08/2023 Published: 17/02/2024

Abstract:

The aim of this research is to identify the determinants of organisational support and its relationship with job commitment among Sonatrach employees. The researcher followed a descriptive analytical approach, as it is appropriate to the research topic, which is based on studying the reality or phenomenon as it exists in reality, and focuses on describing it accurately to obtain information that answers the research questions without interference from the researcher.

The current research found a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level of significance between the determinants of organisational support and job commitment among Sonatrach employees with variables such as gender, educational level and years of experience.

The study recommends that Sonatrach adopt concepts that reflect dimensions of organisational justice, which would be reflected in the behaviour of understanding performance levels among its members. This can be achieved by promoting concepts of transparency and fairness and linking them to duties through open meetings that facilitate the dissemination of direct and positive relationships and provide employees with the opportunity to participate in decision-making, especially those related to their work. This would make them more accepting and responsive to these decisions, which in turn would be reflected in their performance of their duties. The study also emphasises the importance of neutrality and integrity in all administrative procedures and decisions, which requires distancing from personal or narrow partisan interests.

Keywords: Organisational support, job commitment, Sonatrach employees.

1- Introduction:

Organisational support refers to the degree to which individuals perceive that the organisation values and appreciates their efforts, contributions and well-being. The theory of organisational support assumes a reciprocal and participatory relationship between the organisation and its employees. It is important for the organisation to recognise and respond to the beliefs and contributions of its employees and to care for their well-being, both in material and personal terms¹.

Job involvement, as one of the key dimensions of organisational commitment, plays a significant role in making individuals effectively engaged in their jobs, dedicated to performing their duties with enthusiasm and immersion, and demonstrating organisational commitment, loyalty and a desire to develop and improve organisational processes. Increased job involvement increases the effectiveness of employees in achieving satisfaction, thereby contributing to improved performance. Conversely, reduced job involvement can lead to feelings of job burnout. Therefore, considerable attention has been paid to job involvement in order to achieve high performance and reduce the phenomenon of job burnout².

Based on the above mentioned interrelationship, the researcher hypothesised the existence of a relationship between organisational support and job involvement. Therefore, the researcher chose the topic of organisational support to study its determinants and their impact on the development of job involvement and individual integration in the tasks assigned by the organisation. This positive integration has a positive impact on individual productivity and on the interests of the organisation, thus achieving the objectives of organisational support.

2- Research problem:

Recent developments in the business environment have raised numerous research questions about employee behaviour in today's organisations, especially with increased competition, job losses, the drive for innovation and creativity,

¹ El-Shanti, Mahmoud Abdel Rahman. (2015). The role of organisational support as a mediating variable in the relationship between job stress and job performance. *Open University Journal of Research*, p. 124.

² Bahri, Yamina & Hafsi, Um El Khair. (2020). Job involvement and its relationship with the level of job burnout. Unpublished Master's thesis, Kasdi Merbah Ouargla University: Algeria.

and rapid advances in communication methods. These challenges have created an urgent need for organisations to focus on human resources, as the human element is the main pillar of organisational success and goal achievement. Therefore, it is essential to pay more attention and work on the effective use and improvement of employee satisfaction, where organisations meet the needs and desires of their employees and improve their performance. This means that organisations should adopt a philosophy of supporting their human resources, known as organisational support.

Organisations use a variety of means and allocate significant resources to train and develop their employees, and offer them many benefits and incentives to achieve high levels of job engagement. They also rely on modern methods and research to implement effective organisational support strategies. However, while some organisations succeed in achieving job involvement through organisational support methods, others fail despite using the same methods. This discrepancy can be attributed to differences in the nature of the organisation, its location and the time in which it operates. Therefore, each organisation needs to choose the appropriate support tools for its specific circumstances.

The aim of this study is therefore to identify the effective organisational support methods used to increase the job involvement of Sonatrach employees in the Boumerdes branch in the province of Batna.

3- Importance of the study:

The main importance of this study, both for the researcher and for the Sonatrach organisation in the Boumerdes branch, Batna province, is as follows:

For the researcher: The study provides a direct insight into how organisational support is used in the professional life of employees to increase work engagement and professional flourishing.

For the Sonatrach organisation: The study helps decision makers in the organisation to identify effective organisational support methods to increase the level of job involvement of their employees.

It helps the organisation to understand different organisational support methods used in different Western and Arab countries that have proven successful in

increasing job involvement, as well as methods that have shown no impact on job involvement.

There is a lack of research and studies analysing the factors influencing job involvement in the Arab environment in general and in Algeria in particular.

4- Conceptualisation of the study:

Organisational support: According to Yavas et al. (2010), it refers to "a set of policies, procedures and ongoing tools that help service providers achieve their goals at work and motivate them to develop themselves"³.

According to Al-Rashidi, it is defined as "the organisation's ability to support employees and create a suitable work environment that reflects their level of performance"⁴.

The researcher defines it operationally as "the degree to which an employee perceives that the organisation to which he or she belongs has shown interest in him or her by valuing his or her efforts and contributions and taking care of him or her in all areas".

The determinants of organisational support include:

- **Organisational justice:** It represents a phenomenon where employees feel a sense of fairness within the organisation, which leads to increased trust in the organisation and increases their level of organisational performance. Organisational justice refers to "the way in which individuals judge the fairness of the treatment they receive from their supervisors, in terms of both job-related and people-related aspects"⁵.
- **Supervisor support behaviour:** This refers to employees' perceptions of job satisfaction due to the presence of supportive leadership. This can be perceived through the manager's efforts in setting the path for subordinates, providing assistance in completing various tasks, offering incentives and exerting positive influence. This in turn leads to commitment from subordinates who reciprocate

³ - W. Yavas, U., & Babakus, E. (2010). Relationships between organisational support, customer orientation and work outcomes: A study of frontline bank employees. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 28(3).

⁴ - Al-Rashidi, Ali. (2019). Organizational support and its relationship with organizational justice and organizational commitment - an applied study on doctors working in some government hospitals in Riyadh city. *Arab Journal of Management*, 39(3).

⁵ - Nada, Samia. (2007). Analysis of the relationship between some personal variables and leadership styles with organisational commitment and organisational justice - a field study on Palestinian ministries in the Gaza Strip. Unpublished Master's thesis, Islamic University: Gaza.

by investing time and effort to fulfil the leader's instructions and achieve organisational goals⁶.

Job Involvement: The origin of the word "involvement" in the Arabic language is derived from the verb "istagharaq" (meaning to immerse oneself in something and to go beyond the limit). Job Involvement is a relatively modern concept that has attracted the attention of researchers in recent decades and has found its way into the academic literature. The first contributions to job involvement were made by William Kahn, who is considered the father of job involvement. He defined it as "the use of a person's physical, emotional and cognitive energies in the performance of a role". He also defined it as "the psychological connection between the individual and his or her job, in which the job plays a central and pivotal role in the individual's life and self-evaluation"⁷.

Ahmed defines it as "a significant behavioural state that indicates the extent to which individuals are attached to their job, which is a central and pivotal part of their relationship with the work environment and the work itself, and is reflected in their personal characteristics"⁸.

The researcher defines it operationally as "the degree of alignment between the employee and their job, where they are fully engaged and proficient in it, leading to the achievement of desired goals".

5- Previous studies:

- Erat and Erdil (2012) conducted a study to examine the impact of organisational support and justice on job satisfaction and turnover rates among academics in Turkish government universities. The study found that distributive justice has a positive impact on affective and normative commitment, and a negative impact on turnover rates. However, it has no positive effect on continuance commitment. Procedural justice has a positive

⁶- El Maghrabi, Abdel Hamid. (2003). The effect of the determinants of perceived organisational support on individual performance motivation: Applied to public sector industrial companies in Dakahlia Governorate. *Scientific Journal of Commerce and Finance*, Faculty of Commerce, Tanta University, Second Supplement, Issue (2), p. 6.

⁷- El Maghrabi, Abdel Hamid Abdel Fattah. (2012). The effect of organisational culture on job satisfaction: Applied to Saudi government agencies. *Egyptian Journal of Commercial Studies*, Faculty of Commerce, Mansoura University, Issue 3.

⁸- Ahmed, Shahinaz Fadel.(2016).Employees' job commitment and its impact on the crystallisation of organisational conformity:Analytical research on a sample of employees in the Iraqi Middle East Investment Bank. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, Issue 91: 276.

effect on normative commitment and a negative effect on turnover, but it has no positive effect on affective and normative commitment and a negative effect on turnover.

- El-Sawy et al. (2022) conducted a study to evaluate the effectiveness of training from the perspective of hotel employees and to measure its impact on job involvement directly and indirectly, considering the fit between individual skills and job requirements. The study sample consisted of 235 employees from five-star hotels in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS and Smart PLS software.

- Jadidi et al. (2021) aimed to investigate the impact of psychological empowerment dimensions (meaning, competence, autonomy and impact) on job involvement among employees of urban and semi-urban transport institutions in the province of Tebessa, Algeria. The study used a sample of 75 questionnaires and statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS and AMOS software.

- Shahrazad (2018) conducted a study to explore the contribution of organizational climate in enhancing and supporting work engagement among employees in the Directorate of Planning, Architecture and Construction in the province of El Oued, Algeria. The organisation is a public institution responsible for managing local development programmes that directly affect citizens. The study used a descriptive approach to analyse the results and field data, which included a research sample of 64 employees and semi-structured interviews with 15 supervisors as auxiliary techniques.

- Bouguerra Saad's study (2022): The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between job involvement and psychological stress. To this end, a descriptive analytical approach was used, in which both the Job Involvement Scale and the Psychological Stress Scale were applied to a sample of 80 secondary school teachers selected by simple random sampling. The results of the study also indicated that there were no significant differences in the study variables attributed to professional experience. With regard to the main question, the study showed the existence of a relationship, but it did not reach statistical significance. This can be attributed to a number of factors, including the need to revise the Algerian pension law and the sector's recurrent need to

improve social and professional conditions. Nevertheless, the results are contrary to expectations.

6– Methodological approach

6–1 Research method:

To determine the relationship between organisational support and job involvement, the study used a descriptive analytical method, which describes the state of workers' job involvement after organisational support, such as the impact of organisational support on job involvement in the national institution.

6–2 Fields of study:

The study is searchable according to three dimensions: spatial dimension, temporal dimension and human dimension. These dimensions represent the fields of study, which are defined as follows:

A. Spatial dimension: It refers to the place where the field study was carried out. We conducted our study on the employees of the Sonatrach Corporation in Algeria.

B. Temporal dimension: It represents the "observation units" through which the study passed. Our study took place from November 2022 and went through three stages:

– The first stage: The exploratory stage, which lasted approximately six days, consisted of conducting an exploratory interview with a sample of employees working in the institution, in order to understand the relationship between organisational support and job involvement among employees in the Sonatrach Corporation.

– The second stage: in this stage, the questionnaire was developed, which took about four weeks, taking into account the guidance of the supervisor and making the necessary modifications. Then, the pilot questionnaire was randomly administered to workers and we received feedback from a group of reviewers and made the necessary final corrections.

– The third stage: The final version of the questionnaire was administered to obtain the required information and data, which were then collected, organised into tables and analysed.

c. Human dimension (comprehensive survey): The study covered the entire population of employees in Algerian institutions, i.e. 445 employees.

6-3 Questionnaire:

The questionnaire has been adopted as the tool to collect the necessary data for the study. It is considered to be one of the most appropriate scientific research tools for answering the study's questions and achieving its objectives by obtaining information and facts related to a specific reality. The accuracy and effectiveness of any research depends to a great extent on the choice of appropriate methodological tools, which are adapted to the nature of the subject and to the researcher's ability to obtain the data and information that serve the objectives of the study. The questionnaire is one of the necessary tools on which the researcher relies in order to obtain satisfactory results according to a scientific methodological plan. Any researcher who relies on a specific methodology must use appropriate tools to obtain the necessary information that will allow him to explore the field of study⁹.

The first section: It consists of personal and professional data (gender, age, educational level, years of service (experience), department in which the employee works, job position).

The second section: It contains the axes of the study and consists of 67 items divided into two axes:

Axis 1: Organisational Support Indicators, consisting of 36 items divided into four domains: Organisational Justice, Leaders' Behaviour in Supporting Subordinates, Participation in Decision Making, and Employees' Self-Affirmation and Support.

- Organisational justice consists of 23 items divided into three sub-domains:

- a. Distributive justice, consisting of 7 items.
- b. Procedural justice, consisting of 8 items.
- c. Interactional justice, consisting of 8 items.

- Leaders' behaviour in supporting subordinates, consisting of 12 items.

Axis 2: Work Involvement, consisting of 13 items.

6-3-1 Questionnaire validity: Questionnaire validity refers to the extent to which the questionnaire measures what it is intended to measure. The

⁹ - Alian, Yahya Mustafa.(2000).Methods and techniques of scientific research between theory and practice, p. 8, Dar Al-Safa: Oman

researcher ensured the validity of the questionnaire through two methods: expert validity (face validity) and scale validity.

6-4-2 Questionnaire reliability: Questionnaire reliability refers to the consistency of the questionnaire in giving the same results when it is administered several times under the same conditions and circumstances. In other words, questionnaire reliability means the stability of the results of the questionnaire and its lack of significant changes when it is redistributed to the sample individuals several times within certain time periods. The researcher checked the reliability of the questionnaire in the study using Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

6-5-3 Statistical analysis used in the study: The questionnaire was transcribed and analysed using statistical analysis software (SPSS).

Normality test:

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used to test whether the data followed a normal distribution or not. The results are shown in table (4.9).

Table (1): Shows the results of the normality test

M	Domain	Probability Value
1	Organization Justice	0.230
2	Leadership behavior to support subordinates	0.293
5	Organizational support	0.234
6	Job engagement	0.243

The results presented in the previous table show that the p-value (sig) for all study variables was greater than the significance level (0.05). Therefore, the data distribution for these variables follows a normal distribution. Consequently, parametric tests will be used to answer the study hypotheses related to these variables.

7- Hypotheses data presentation and analysis:

First, the descriptive statistics of the study sample:

Table (2): Characteristics of the study sample

Variable	Status	Count	Percentage
Gender	Male	110	76%

	Female	45	24%
Education	Secondary or Less	41	28%
	Diploma	46	32%
	Bachelor's or Higher	58	40%
	Experience		
First	Less than 5 years	35	24%
	5–10 years	47	32.5%
	More than 10	63	43.5%
Total		145	100%

Axis 1: Organisational Support Indicators:

Domain 1: Analysis of organisational justice items:

Analysis of Distributive Justice Items: The t-test was used to determine whether the average response score of the sample reached a neutral level (mean score of 3) or not. Table (3) illustrates this:

Table (3): Analysis of Distributive Justice Items

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
	: Distributive Justice	3.66	73.2	6.37	0.001	
01	The average working hours suit my personal circumstances.	3.44	68.8	3.46	0.001	7
02	I think my monthly salary is fair.	3.86	72.8	8.2	0.001	1
03	I consider my workload to be appropriate.	3.64	72.8	4.87	0.001	4
04	The financial incentives I receive are generally appropriate.	3.86	77.2	8.02	0.001	3

05	I feel my job responsibilities and duties are appropriate.	3.64	72.8	4.87	0.001	6
06	My salary is commensurate with my qualifications.	3.77	75.4	7.3	0.001	5
07	Each employee receives a fair share of the benefits provided by the organisation.	3.8	76	7.45	0.001	2

According to the previous table, the p-value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all the items are statistically significant at a level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the average response score for these items is above the neutral average score of 3. This means that there is agreement among the sample participants on these items.

The item 'I think my monthly salary is appropriate' ranked first with a mean score of 3.86 and a percentage of 77.2%. The item 'The working hours are suitable for my personal circumstances' ranked last with a mean score of 3.44 and a percentage of 68.8%.

Analysis of the procedural justice items:

The t-test was used to determine whether the average response score of the sample reached a neutral level (mean score of 3) or not. Table (4) illustrates this:

Table (4): Analysis of procedural justice items

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
	Second: Procedural justice	3.71	74.2	7.17	0.001	
01	The manager makes work decisions in an unbiased manner.	3.79	75.8	7.8	0.001	3
02	The manager makes sure that each	3.55	71	4.32	0.001	6

	employee has his or her say before making job-related decisions.					
03	The manager gathers accurate and complete information before making work decisions.	3.74	74.8	7.26	0.001	5
04	The manager explains decisions and provides additional details to employees when they inquire about these decisions.	3.55	71	5.9	0.001	7
05	All management decisions are applied to all employees without exception.	3.5	70	3.9	0.001	8
06	Employees have the right to appeal decisions made by the manager.	3.9	78	8.9	0.001	1
07	The institution deals fairly with all employees.	3.7	74	5.67	0.001	5
08	Reward procedures are open to everyone.	3.85	77	8.22	0.001	2

According to the previous table, the p-value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all the items are statistically significant at a level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the average response score for these items has exceeded the neutral average score of 3. This means that there is agreement among the sample participants regarding these items.

The item 'Employees have the right to object to decisions made by the manager' comes first with a mean score of 3.9 and a percentage of 78%. The item 'All administrative decisions are applied to all employees without exception' ranked last with a mean score of 3.5 and a percentage of 70%.

Analysis of the procedural justice items: The t-test was used to determine whether the average response score of the sample reached a neutral level (mean score of 3) or not. Table (5) illustrates this:

Table (5): Analysis of procedural justice items

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
	Third: Interpersonal justice	3.68	77	7.26	0.001	
01	When the manager makes a decision relating to my work, he treats me with kindness and care.	3.6	72	7.1	0.001	5
02	When the manager makes a decision about my job, he discusses it openly with me.	3.75	5.77	5.77	0.001001	3
03	When making a decision about my job, the manager takes my personal requirements into account.	3.92	78.4	8.6	0.001	1
04	When making a decision about my job, the manager shows an interest in my welfare as an	3.82	7.9	7.9	0.001	2

	employee.					
05	The manager explains to me the reasons for decisions that affect my job.	3.59	71.8	4.6	0.001	7
06	When my line manager makes a decision that affects my job, he or she explains the logical reasons that led him or her to make that decision.	3.68	73.6	6.67	0.001	4
07	The manager clearly explains to me any decisions made regarding my job.	3.49	69.8	5.3	0.001	8
08	I feel that disputes between employees are resolved fairly.	3.6	72	5.2	0.001	5

According to the previous table, the p-value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all the items are statistically significant at a level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the average response score for these items is above the neutral average score of 3. This means that there is agreement among the sample participants on these items.

The item 'When the manager makes a decision relating to my work, he takes my personal requirements into account' is in first place with a mean score of 3.92 and a percentage of 78.4%. The item 'The manager clearly explains any decision he makes regarding my job' ranked last with a mean score of 3.49 and a percentage of 69.8%.

Area 2: Analysis of managerial behaviour in support of subordinates:

The t-test was used to determine whether or not the average response score of the sample reached a neutral level (mean score of 3). Table (6) illustrates this:

Table (6): Analysis of leader behaviour in supporting subordinates Items

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
	Leaders' Behaviour in Support of Subordinates	3.788	75.76%	7.63	0.001	
01	The leader allows subordinates to use their personal skills in solving work problems.	3.55	71	4.29	0.001	11
02	The leader encourages innovation among subordinates and discusses their ideas.	3.99	79.8	9.48	0.001	1
03	The manager allows subordinates to carry out their tasks as they see fit.	3.8	76	6.06	0.001	6
04	The manager allows subordinates to determine the form and characteristics of work in future stages.	3.9	78	8.71	0.001	4
05	The manager implements and follows up on subordinates' suggestions.	3.6	72	7.14	0.001	10
06	The subordinates feel that the manager is	3.7	74	5.77	0.001	8

	their friend because he cares about their comfort and happiness.					
07	The leader shares benefits with subordinates.	3.95	79	9.09	0.001	3
08	The manager informs subordinates of any changes that may affect them.	3.84	76.8	8.32	0.001	5
09	When the leader speaks, subordinates feel that the leader believes what he or she is saying.	3.68	73.6	5.92	0.001	6
10	The manager has the ability to inspire others and gain their support.	3.55	71	4.29	0.001	12
11	The manager is a strong advocate of justice and convinces others of his point of view.	3.99	79.8	9.84	0.001	2
12	The manager has excellent debate and dialogue skills.	3.8	76	6.066	0.001	7

The previous table shows that the probability value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all paragraphs are considered to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This indicates that the average response score for these paragraphs has increased compared to the neutral score of 3. This means that there is agreement among the sample individuals regarding these paragraphs. The paragraph "The manager encourages initiative from subordinates and discusses their ideas" is in first place

with an average of 3.99 and a percentage of 79.8%. The paragraph "The manager has the ability to inspire enthusiasm in others and gain their support" ranked last with an average of 3.55 and a percentage of 71%.

Second axis: commitment to the job:

The T-test was used to determine whether the average response score of the sample individuals reached the neutral score of 3, indicating moderate engagement. Table 7 illustrates this:

Table 7: Job Engagement Domains

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
	Job commitment	3.61	72.2	6.26	0.001	
01	My work gives me the greatest satisfaction in my life.	3.48	69.6	3.74	0.001	11
02	My interest and commitment to my work are among the most important things I prioritise.	3.64	72.8	4.95	0.001	6
03	Most of the important events in my life are in some way related to my current job.	3.8	76	7.6	0.001	1
04	I often find myself thinking about my job after hours.	3.77	75.4	7.4	0.001	3
05	Most of my interests revolve around my job.	3.51	70.2	6.09	0.001	9
06	I have very strong attachments to my job, which I find very difficult to break.	3.6	72	4.67	0.001	7

07	Most of my personal goals in life are related to and focused on my job.	3.79	75.8	7.59	0.001	2
08	I have a strong commitment to accuracy in my work.	3.7	74	6.97	0.001	4
09	I enjoy spending most of my time immersed in my work.	3.46	69.2	3.66	0.001	13
10	I genuinely enjoy my work.	3.65	73	6.43	0.001	5
11	Each working day in my job seems to end quickly.	3.47	69.4	5.15	0.001	12
12	I feel psychologically stable in my relationship with my manager.	3.52	3.52	70.4	4.06	8
13	I feel that I invest most of my academic skills and work experience in my job.	3.51	70.2	4.46	0.001	9

The previous table shows that the p-value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all items are considered statistically significant at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the mean response score for these items is above the neutral mean score of 3, indicating agreement among the sample participants on these items.

The item 'Most important things that happen to me fit into my current job in one way or another' ranked first with a mean score of 3.8 and a percentage of 76%. The item 'I enjoy the fact that my job takes up most of my time' came last with a mean score of 3.46 and a percentage of 69.2%.

Analysis of the main areas of the survey responses:

Table (8) presents the analysis of the main domains of the survey responses.

M	Paragraph	Mean	Percentage	Test Value	Sig	Rank
Axis 1:	Organizational Support	3.72	74.4	7.48	0.001	-
First:	Organizational Justice	3.686	73.72	7.24	0.001	3
01	Distributive Justice	3.66	73.2	6.37	0.001	3
02	Procedural Justice	3.71	74.2	7.17	0.001	1
03	Interpersonal Justice	3.68	77	7.26	0.001	2
Second:	Leaders' Supportive Behavior	3.788	75.76%	7.63	0.001	1
Axis 2:	Job Engagement	3.61	72.2	6.26	0.001	-

The previous table shows that the p-value (sig) is 0.001. Therefore, all items are considered statistically significant at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the average response score for these items has exceeded the neutral average score of 3, indicating agreement among the sample participants on these items.

The domain 'Leader Behaviour in Support of Subordinates' ranked first with a mean score of 3.78 and a percentage of 75.76%. The domain "Support and Affirmation of followers" ranked last with a mean score of 3.68 and a percentage of 73.6%.

Hypothesis testing regarding the relationship between the variables in the study: Pearson's correlation test was used to test the hypotheses regarding the relationship between the variables in the study.

Null hypothesis (H0): There is no statistically significant relationship between the variables in the study.

Alternative hypothesis (H1): There is a statistically significant relationship between the variables in the study.

If Sig is greater than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, indicating that there is no statistically significant relationship between

the variables in the study. However, if Sig is less than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the variables in the study.

The first main hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between the determinants of organisational support in its different dimensions (organisational justice, leader behaviour in supporting subordinates, participation in decision making, support and affirmation among employees) and job involvement among SONATRACH employees. Table (9) shows the results:

Table (9): Shows the relationship between organisational support and job involvement.

The hypothesis	Pearson correlation coefficient	Probability value (sig)
There is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between organizational support variables and job engagement among Sonatrach employees.	0.960	0.000

*Statistical correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The previous table shows that the correlation coefficient is 0.960 and the p-value (sig) is 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between the determinants of organisational support in its different dimensions (organisational justice, leader behaviour in supporting subordinates, participation in decision making, support and affirmation among employees) and job involvement.

The following hypotheses can be derived from this hypothesis:

First, there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level of significance between organisational justice and job involvement among SONATRACH employees. Table (10) shows the results:

Table (10): Shows the relationship between organisational justice and job involvement.

The hypothesis	Pearson correlation coefficient	Probability value (sig)
There is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between organisational justice and job commitment among Sonatrach employees.	0.959	0.000

*Statistical correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The previous table shows that the correlation coefficient is 0.959 and the p-value (sig) is 0.000, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level of significance between organisational justice and job involvement among SONATRACH employees.

Secondly, there is a statistically significant relationship at the significance level of 0.05 between leader behaviour in supporting subordinates and job involvement among SONATRACH employees. Table (11) shows the results:

Table (11): Illustrates the relationship between job involvement and leader behaviour in supporting subordinates.

The hypothesis	Pearson correlation coefficient	Probability value (sig)
There is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between leaders' supportive behaviour and Sonatrach employees' work	0.907	0.000

engagement.		
-------------	--	--

*Statistical correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The previous table shows that the correlation coefficient is 0.907 and the p-value (sig) is 0.000, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level of significance between leader behaviour in supporting subordinates and job involvement among SONATRACH employees.

Third, there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level between participation in decision making and job involvement among SONATRACH employees.

Hypothesis testing:

"There are no statistically significant differences attributed to the following variables: gender, experience, age".

The results refer to the gender variable: The null hypothesis was formulated as follows: There are no statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the mean scores of the sample respondents attributed to the gender variable.

To test the validity of the hypothesis, the means and standard deviations of the sample respondents' responses to the study instrument were calculated. The t-test was used to examine the differences between the means as shown in the following table:

Table (12): Results of t-test for differences based on gender variable.

Field	Variable	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Statistical Significance
Organizational Justice	Male	110	3.7	1.18	1.06	0.29
	Female	45	3.5	1.02		
Leaders' Supportive Behavior	Male	110	3.7	1.24	0.487	0.62
	Female	45	3.8	1.28		
Participation in Decision Making	Male	110	3.73	1.16	0.144	0.88
	Female	45	3.76	1.21		

Self-affirmation among Workers	Male	110	3.74	1.23	1.09	0.278
	Female	45	3.49	1.1		
Organizational Support	Male	110	3.7	1.2	1.99	*0.048
	Female	45	3.2	1.07		
Job Engagement	Male	110	3.74	1.19	0.80	0.425
	Female	45	3.56	1.05		
Overall Questionnaire	Male	110	3.7	1.19	0.69	0.487
	Female	45	3.58	1.07		

In the previous table it can be seen that the p-value (Sig.) corresponding to the "independent samples t-test" is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences in the mean estimates of the study sample attributed to the gender variable, except in the area of support, where there are differences attributed to the gender variable in favour of men.

Concerning the results related to the variable of years of experience

The null hypothesis was formulated as follows: There are no statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) attributed to the variable of years of experience. In order to test the validity of the hypothesis, the means and standard deviations of the responses of the sample respondents to the study instrument were calculated. The one-way ANOVA test was used to examine the differences between the means, as shown in the following table:

Table (13): Results of the One-Way ANOVA test for examining differences based on the variable of years of experience.

Field	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Value	Significance Level	Significance
Organizational Justice	Between	74.39	2	37.19	45.54	0.001	Statistical function

	Groups						
	Within Groups	115.96	142	0.817			
	Total	190.35	144				
Leaders' Supportive Behavior	Between Groups	67.5	2	33.753	40.36	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	118.7	142	0.836			
	Total	186.254	144				
Organizational Support	Between Groups	78.85	2	39.427	43.4	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	128.95	142	0.908			
	Total	207.805	144				
Job Engagement	Between Groups	81.01	2	40.5	47.35	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	121.45	142	0.855			
	Total	202.47	144				

According to the results presented in the previous table, the p-value (Sig.) corresponding to the One-Way ANOVA test is less than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant

differences in the mean estimates of the study sample due to the variable of years of experience. In order to determine the differences in favour of which years of experience, the researcher used the Chi-square test, and the following table shows it:

Table (14): Results of the Chi-square test for comparing the means of the categories of years of experience.

Field	Number of Years of Service	Means	Standard deviation	F	Significance level
Organizational Justice	Less than 5 years	2.68	0.76	45.54	0.001
	5-10 years	3.45	1.03		
	10 years or more	4.45	0.86		
Leaders' Supportive Behavior	Less than 5 years	2.69	0.73	40.36	0.001
	5-10 years	3.52	1.09		
	10 years or more	4.3	0.84		
	5_10 years	3.66	1.18		
	10 years or more	4.4	0.84		
Organizational Support	Less than 5 years	2.68	0.79	43.417	0.001
	5-10 years	3.4	1.09		
	10 years or more	4.48	0.918		
Job	Less than	2.65	0.76	47.35	0.001

Engagement	5 years				
	5-10 years	3.2	1.07		
	10 years or more	4.44	0.88		
	5-10 years	3.5	1.07		
	10 years or more	4.46	0.8		

According to the previous table, there are statistically significant differences in the mean estimates of the study sample attributed to the variable of years of experience, in favour of 10 or more years of experience.

Regarding the results related to the variable of educational qualification:

The null hypothesis was formulated as follows: There are no statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) attributed to the variable of educational qualification. In order to test the validity of the hypothesis, the means and standard deviations of the responses of the sample respondents to the study instrument were calculated. The one-way ANOVA test was used to examine the differences between the means, as shown in the following table:

Table (15): Results of the One-Way ANOVA test to examine differences based on the variable of educational attainment.

Field	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Value	Significance Level	Significance
Organizational Justice	Between Groups	105.102	2	52.55	87.53	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	85.25	142	0.600			Statistical function
	Total	190.35	144				Statistical function
Leaders'	Between Groups	111.10	2	57.23	73.14	0.001	Statistical function

Supportive Behavior	Within Groups	6	142	0.782			Statistical function
	Total	225.57	144				Statistical function
Organizational Support	Between Groups	106.66	2	53.33	84.78	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	89.322	142	0.629			Statistical function
	Total	195.98	144				Statistical function
Job Engagement	Between Groups	111.759	2	55.87	87.47	0.001	Statistical function
	Within Groups	90.7	142	0.639			
	Total	202.47	144				

According to the results presented in the previous table, the p-value (Sig.) corresponding to the One-Way ANOVA test is less than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant differences in the mean estimates of the sample attributed to the variable of educational qualification. In order to determine the differences in favour of which educational qualifications, the researcher used the Chi-square test, and the following table shows that

7- References:

1. Al-Shanti, Mahmoud Abdelrahman. (2015). The role of organisational support as a mediating variable in the relationship between job demands and job performance. *Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Research*, 124.
2. Bahri, Yamina and Hafsi, Oum El Khir. (2020). Job involvement and its relationship with the level of job burnout. Unpublished Master's thesis, Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla: Algeria.
3. Al-Rashidi, Ali. (2019). Organizational support and its relationship with organizational justice and organizational commitment – an applied study on

doctors working in some government hospitals in Riyadh city. *Arab Journal of Administration*, 39(3).

4. Abu Nada, Samia. (2007). Analysis of the relationship between some personal variables, leadership styles, organisational commitment and perceived organisational justice – a field study on Palestinian ministries in the Gaza Strip. Unpublished Master's thesis, Islamic University: Gaza.

5. Al-Maghribi, Abdulhamid. (2003). The effect of the determinants of perceived organisational support on individual performance motivation: An application to public sector industrial companies in Al-Dakhiliyah Governorate. *Scientific Journal of Commerce and Finance*, Faculty of Commerce, Tanta University, Second Supplement, Issue 2.

6. Al-Maghribi, Abdulhamid Abdel Fattah. (2012). The effect of organisational culture on job satisfaction: An application to Saudi government agencies. *Egyptian Journal of Business Studies*, Faculty of Commerce, Mansoura University, Issue 3.

7. Ahmed, Shahinaz Fadel. (2016). Employee engagement and its impact on organisational symmetry: An analytical study of the views of a sample of employees in the Middle East Investment Bank. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, Issue 91: 276.

8. Alian, Yahya Mustafa. (2000). Research methods and scientific research between theory and application. Dar Al-Safa: Amman.

9. Yavas, U., & Babakus, E. (2010). Relationships between organisational support, customer orientation and work outcomes: A study of frontline bank employees. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 28(3).