

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS,
LEVEL OF SCHOOL AND ADMINISTRATOR
TRUST, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP
BEHAVIORS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
TEACHERS IN TURKEY.

Soner POLAT

Kocaeli University Faculty of Education

Kocaeli University Faculty of Education

Campus of Umuttepe 41380 İzmit/Kocaeli / TURKEY

spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr

(90 262) 3032448

This article Kocaeli University, institute of social sciences, educational sciences, and in October 2007 prepared in Consulting Prof.Dr.Cevat Celebi accepted by the jury based on the doctoral thesis has been prepared.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to display; a) the effect of organizational justice in explaining school trust, administrator trust and organizational citizenship behavior, b) the effect of school trust and administrator trust in explaining organizational citizenship behavior, based on perceptions related with the variables of organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviors of secondary school teachers.

The layout of the research, descriptive in quality, consists of the teachers working at secondary education institutions in the education year of 2006-2007. The survey area consists of 42697 teachers at 1683 secondary schools in randomly chosen 14 cities (two cities from each geographical region) and the sampling consists of 1281 teachers, 721 of 1281 work at general high schools and 560 of 1281 work at vocational schools.

As a result of the research, teachers' perception of distributional justice, procedural justice and interactional justice were found as significant predictors of explaining perceptions of school trust, administrator trust and organizational citizenship behavior. Besides, teachers' perceptions of school trust and administrator trust were also confirmed as significant predictors in explaining perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors in a meaningful way.

Keywords: *secondary education, organizational justice, organizational trust, organizational citizenship behavior.*

Introduction

The variables of organizational justice, organizational trust, and organizational citizenship behavior have lately become one of the topics investigated frequently in researches as organizations has tended to “worker behavior” to increase efficiency.

When literature is observed, it can be concluded that these three variables are affected by various variables and they affect those variables. As justice and trust are indispensable for strong relations of people, workers give importance to how their administrators and organization behave themselves. Workers feel themselves they have to do their bests, by going out of their prespecified roles in environments, where the sense of justice is developed (Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996). When workers are treated fairly in their social working environment, the sense of higher justice and trust was observed as developed. By this way, it was confirmed that workers will of working and their tendency of displaying organizational citizenship behavior increased (Greenberg, 1990a; Moorman, 1991). Therefore organizational justice and trust are the variables that increase the tendency of displaying organizational citizenship behavior (Settoon et al., 1996).

Theoretical Framework

Organizational Justice and Sub-dimensions of It

Organizational justice, generally, is the reflection of justice perception to working environment. In other words, it is the reflection of justice perception related with working environment (Byrne and Cropanzano, 2001; Greenberg, 1990a). The most widely approved approach related with sub-dimensions of organizational justice belongs to Greenberg (1987; 1990b). Greenberg (1990b) discusses organizational justice in three dimensions as; distributional, procedural and interactional justice.

Distributional justice conveys perceptions of workers whether the savings gained at work and rewards are distributed fairly or not. In other words, distributional justice is the

perceptions of workers whether the organizational savings are distributed according to the real evaluation and the performance presented (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Moorman, 1991).

Procedural justice, conveys fair processes used while coming into a decision (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Moorman, 1991). Namely, it is the perception related if true processes are followed while making a decision (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987).

Interactional justice includes normative expectations of workers such as communication at work depends on sincerity and respect in application of work processes (Bies and Shapiro, 1987). Interactional justice points out the fair behaviors of decision maker while acceptance of formative processes and application of those behaviors (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).

The Notion of Organizational Trust and Sub-dimensions of It

With respect to organizations, trust has been examined in two dimensions as: individual to individual in organization (internal) and organization to organization (external) (Huff and Kelley, 2002; Zaheer, McEvily & Perrone, 1998). In an organization, trust develops both in the level of individual and in the level of organization. However, individual trust and trust to organization incorporate and constitute organizational trust (Nyhan and Marlowe, 1997; Tan and Tan, 2000; Zaheer et al., 1998).

Individual trust, expresses expectations of an individual that he never suffer from a relation and even he would get benefit from those relations (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000). According to Fox (1974; Baird and St-Amand, 1995), trust between individuals in an organization develop depending on a horizontal relationship, in equal status, and it can also develop vertically depending on managerial hierarchy between different individuals.

Vertical oriented trust is the one develops depending on managerial hierarchy in an organization. Predictability of supervisors and the belief of workers that they do not suffer

from supervisors develop *trust to supervisors (administrator trust)* and the belief of supervisors that workers fulfill their jobs willingly, independently, and they can share responsibility at work also develop *worker trust (governed trust)* (Grean and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Wang and Clegg, 2002).

Horizontal oriented trust is towards colleagues and team workers. This type of trust, namely colleague trust, includes positive expectations that workers would be interested in each other's benefits, would help each other in need and would be honest and open to each other.

Organizational trust is more oriented in organizations than individuals (Luhmann, 1979; Cited by Neveu, 2004), includes expectations of individuals towards organizational relationships and network of behavior. (Shockeley-Zalabak et al., 2000; Zaheer et al., 1998). In other words, organizational trust is the belief that organization of individual will have positive activities for the individual or at least it is the belief that individuals will have no harm from these activities.(Gambetta, 1988; Cited by Neveu, 2004).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The most widely approved definition for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) belongs to Organ (1988, 1990). According to him OCB are the behaviors which are not directly included in formal rewarding system but they willingly help organizations to fulfill their operations in an efficient way.

Hunt (1999) defines OCB as; positive, natural, open and voluntary behaviors of the workers which are not based on instructions, whereas Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defines OCB, beyond defined role behaviors, as positive social behaviors that are not included in formal role definitions. On the other hand George (1992) makes a definition of OCB as, the

behaviors which have qualifications over the notion of role and do not exist in the formal rewarding system.

Organizational citizenship behavior has been discussed by many writers in various perspectives. But the most widely accepted one belongs to Organ. According to Organ (1997), this notion can be held in five headings as; politeness, casuist, gentlemanliness and civil virtues.

The Aim and Hypotheses of the Research

When the notions of organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behavior are considered from the perspective of Social Change Theory, it is seen that organizational trust is an inter variable in order to maintain the relationship between the organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). Therefore, trust is a vital aspect in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The perception of organizational justice, develops considering the administrator behaviors of the organization, has an important effect on workers to display organizational citizenship behavior by increasing the sense of trust (Farh, Earley and Lin, 1997; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Williams, Pitre and Zainuba, 2002).

The aim of the research is to figure out the relationship between organizational justice, school trust, administrator trust and organizational citizenship behavior by considering the perception levels of the teachers at secondary education towards those variables. In order to achieve this main aim hypothesis based on the information in the literature are set and tested.

Distributional, Procedural and Interactional Justice Relationship between Each Other

In many researches, the relationship between sub-dimensions of organizational justice has been examined and it is found that they all affect each other. Perception of Procedural

Justice is found to be one of the explanatory aspects of distributional justice perceptions. (; Folger and Cropanzono, 1998; Lind and Tyler, 1988; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993). In the result of a meta-analysis carried out by Hauenstein, McGonigle & Flinder (2001) and based on 63 researches examining the relationship between procedural and distributional justice; it is found that there is a high correlation between procedural and distributional justice. Also in Moorman's study (1991), it is confirmed that interactional justice has predicted distributional justice more than procedural justice. Besides, as an individual dimension separated from procedural justice, interactional justice has been confirmed to predict and to be in relation with the procedural justice (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). Within the light of this information, hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4 were set up:

Hypothesis 1 Procedural justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining distributional justice perception in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 2 Interactive justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining procedural justice perception in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 3 Interactive justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining distributional justice perception in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 4 Procedural justice perception of teachers is more effective than interactional justice perception in explaining distributional justice perception.

The Relationship between School Trust and Administrator Trust

Trust among individuals in organizations is seen as mechanisms to increase the organizational trust of workers (Zaheer, et al., 1998). The quality of worker-administrator relationships is significant in determining the level of administrator trust. Considering the administrator-worker interactions and the trust improved based on these interactions, workers make the decision of to trust or not to trust to organization (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). Workers mostly regard the administrator as the representative of the organization and

therefore generalize the administrator trust to organization. Consequently, administrator trust is variable that triggers and supports the organizational trust (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Tan and Tan, 2000). As it is approved, there is a positive relationship between administrator trust and organizational trust (Nyhan and Marlowe, 1997; Tan and Tan, 2000; Wong, et al., 2006). As a result administrator trust is a significant factor in determining the organizational trust and a significant predictor of the organizational trust. Hereby, the 5th hypothesis of the research was set:

Hypothesis 5 Administrator trust perception of teachers is effective in explaining school trust in a meaningful way.

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Trust

Fair behaviors of the administration, gain respect among workers and contribute the development of trust (Folger and Konoysky, 1989). In many research carried out on organizational justice (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2002; Menguc, 2000; Folger and Konoysky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990; Greenberg, 1996; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Konoysky and Pugh 1994; Korsgaard and Roberman, 1995; Korsgaard, Roberman and Rymph, 1998; Korsgaard, Schweiger and Sapienza, 1995; Mayer, Davis and Schoorman, 1995; Pillai et al., 2001; Pillai, Schriesheim, Williams, 1999; Tyler and DeGoey, 1996) organizational justice has been proved to be the pioneer in development of organizational trust and in determining the level of trust.

A positive correlation has been found between distributional justice (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Dailey ve Kirk, 1992) procedural justice (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Tyler and DeGoey, 1996) and interactional justice, as sub-dimensions of organizational justice (Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Kernan & Hanges, 2002) and

administration trust. Hypotheses 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 have been developed according to the results above and the theory of justice:

Hypothesis 6 Distributional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining administrator trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 7 Procedural justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining administrator trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 8 Interactional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining administrator trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 9 Among the perceptions of teachers' interactional justice is the most effective one in explaining administrator trust.

Hypothesis 10 Distributional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining school trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 11 Procedural justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining school trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 12 Interactional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining school trust in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 13 Among the perceptions of teachers' procedural justice is the most effective one in explaining school trust.

The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Throughout many researches, a positive correlation has been found between the level of organizational trust of workers (Brockner, Daly, Tyler & Martin, 1997; Deluga, 1994, 1995; Konoysky and Pugh 1994; Marlowe and Nyhan, 1992; Pillai, Schriesheim, Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990), the level of administrator trust of workers (Brockner, Daly, Tyler and Martin, 1997; Deluga, 1995;) and the tendency of

displaying organizational citizenship behavior. Within the light of this information and results, hypothesis 14, 15 and 16 of the research were set:

Hypothesis 14: School trust perception of teachers is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 15: Administrator trust perception of teachers is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 16: Among the perceptions of teachers', school trust is the most effective one in explaining organizational citizenship behavior.

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

An organizational culture which forces administrators to treat fairly facilitates displaying of organizational citizenship behavior among workers (Organ and Moorman, 1993; Moorman 1991). Throughout many researches a positive correlation has been found between perception of organizational justice and tendency of displaying organizational citizenship behavior. Also, many researchers think in the way that organizational citizenship behavior is a reaction to organizational justice (Organ, 1988, 1990; Moorman, 1993; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983). Within the light of this information and results, hypothesis 17, 18, 19 and 20 of the research were set:

Hypothesis 17: Distributional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 18: Procedural justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 19: Interactional justice perception of teachers is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way.

Hypothesis 20: Among the justice perceptions of teachers' Interactional justice is the most effective one in explaining organizational citizenship behavior.

Method

The Layout of the Research

As this research is towards figuring out the relationship between school trust, administrator trust, perceptions of teachers about their schools and organizational citizenship behaviors, it is in descriptive relationship scanning modal.

The Scope and Sampling of the Research

This research covers all teachers at secondary education in Turkey in the education year of 2006-07. According to 2006-2007 statistics of Ministry of Education, 184582 teachers at 7399 secondary school compose the coverage of the research.

The survey area of the research was composed by 42697 teachers at 1683 secondary schools in randomly chosen 14 cities (two cities from each geographical region). In determining the extent of the sampling, the formula $n = N \cdot t^2 \cdot p \cdot q / d^2 (N-1) + t^2 \cdot p \cdot q$ (Baş, 2001) was used and the extent of sampling was calculated as 1281 people. The extent of sampling was divided into the extent of research area, so group weight was calculated. (Group weight = $1281 / 42697 = 0,03$). Thus, the extents of sampling, 1281 people were distributed into groups in a balanced way. 3 % of the number of the teachers, working at general high schools and vocational schools, represents the research area. 721 of 1281 teachers in sampling works at general schools and 560 teachers work at vocational schools.

All teachers at 4 schools, randomly chosen 2 general high schools and 2 vocational schools by the city directorship of education, were taken in the sampling group. When deciding which schools to choose, the city directorship of education considered some qualifications such as; being a secondary school, the number of teachers at schools, being in the city centrum.

Data Collection

Four different measuring scales were used in data collection. The items in Likert scale were graded as: “(1) *Completely disagree*, and (5) *Completely agree*”.

a) Organizational Justice Perception Scale of Secondary School Teachers:

Organizational justice perceptions of teachers related to their schools were measured by “organizational justice scale” developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). In factor analysis carried out after the application of the scale, the elements are classified in three-dimensional as they are in the original scale. As each elements factor weight was calculated over 0.45 all elements were taken into consideration. 8th, 9th, 10th and 12th elements, related to agreeing on a decision, took place in interactional justice in the original scale, but in this research these elements were considered in procedural justice (Appendix 1). Bureaucratic structure of Turkish public organizations and schools might be influential in taking place of elements in procedural justice during the process of agreeing a decision. As a result of the factor analysis, 6 elements of 3 factor scale measure distributional justice, 9 elements measure procedural justice and 4 of them interactional justice.

After reliability analysis carried out in organizational justice scale, reliability Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was calculated as .96 for the whole scale. Reliability coefficients for subdimensions of organizational justice were as follows; distributional justice .89, procedural justice .95 and interactional justice .90.

b) Trust Perception Scale of Secondary School Teachers to their Administrators:

Trust perception of teachers was measured with “trust scale of colleagues at schools” developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003). In reliability analysis carried out in organizational justice scale, reliability Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for the whole scale was calculated .96. In factor analysis, all the elements in the scale were got together in one unique dimension.

c) Trust Perception Scale of Secondary School Teachers to their Schools:

School trust was measured with Daboval, Comish and Swindle and Gaster's (1994) "organizational trust scale". In reliability analysis, reliability coefficient of school trust scale was calculated as .96. In factor analysis, all 21 elements in school trust scale were got together in one factor and as factors weights were above .45, all the elements were taken into consideration.

d) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Perception Scale of Secondary School Teachers:

Organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers were measured with "organizational citizenship behavior scale" which was prepared by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989), based on Organ's(1988) five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, and later on, developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) and Moorman (1991).

In factors analysis the scale was collected into four dimensions, in fact it has originally five dimensions.

In the original scale, elements of mutual aid (1, 5, 7 and 8) and courtesy (2, 3, 4 and 6) were got together in one dimension. (Appendix 4). Both mutual aid and courtesy behaviors were highly emphasized and they were said to contribute to each other in the literature. (Organ,1988).

Therefore, gathering these two dimensions in one is an acceptable result. On this occasion, as the elements of mutual aid and courtesy in this research stand for aiding others, it is named as "mutual aid". In reliability analysis, reliability Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as .96.

Distribution and Collection of Data Collection Organs

Since the research was supported by Ministry of Education Directorship of Research and Development, distribution and collection of research scale were carried out by related directorship. 881 scale out of 1281(% 69), sent to schools in sampling through the

directorship, returned. 30 scales of 881 were not taken into consideration with various reasons and 851 of them were taken for analyses.

Analysis of the Data

One of the most appropriate ways of testing models including variables such as predictor, semi-predictor, and predicted is applying multi-regression analyses.(Judd and Kenny, 1981; Baron and Kenny, 1986; Demircan, 2003). Thus, regression models were developed for testing the research hypotheses and regression analyses were carried out in order to test how the variable affect each other.

Findings and Comments

Interdependent Effects of Organizational Justice Sub-dimensions

The regression analysis, developed for testing H1, H2, H3 and H4, was found meaningful (Table 1). Procedural justice ($\beta=0,794$) and interactional justice ($\beta=0,691$), are effective in explaining distributional justice. This result supports the accuracy of H1 and H3. Besides, interactional justice ($\beta=0,749$) was found to be effective in explaining procedural justice. This result also confirms H2.

Table 1 Results of regression analysis related with the effect of organizational justice sub-dimensions on explaining each other

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
1	Distributional justice	Procedural justice	.794*	,794*	,631*	,631*	1451,845*
2	Procedural justice	Interactional justice	.749*	,749*	,561*	,560*	1083,870*
3	Distributional justice	Interactional justice	.691*	,691*	,477*	,476*	773,708*
4	Distributional justice	Procedural justice	,631*				
		Interactional justice	,218*	,807*	,652*	,651*	793,829*

* $p < .01$

Procedural justice ($\beta=0,631$) is much more effective than interactional justice ($\beta=0,218$) in explaining distributional justice (Table 1). This result confirms H4.

As it can be observed from Table 1, while procedural justice is effective in the explanation of interactional justice, distributional justice is effective in explaining both procedural justice and interactional justice. But procedural justice is much more effective than interactional justice in explaining distributional justice. So, H1, H3, H3 and H4 of the research were accepted. This result displays coherence with theoretical knowledge and the other results of the research.

The Effect of Administrator Trust on School Trust

Simple regression model, developed for testing H5, seems to be meaningful (Table 2). Administrator trust ($\beta=0,870$) is an important predictor of school trust. This result confirms H4.

Table 2 Simple Results of Regression Analysis Related with Administrator Trust’s Prediction of School Trust

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
5	School Trust	Administrator Trust	.870*	,870*	,757*	,756*	2638,264*

* p<.01

The Effect of Organizational Justice’s Sub-dimensions on Administrator Trust

As one can infer from Table 3, the models 6, 7, 8 and 9, developed for confirming the effects of distributional justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on administrator trust are meaningful. Sub-dimensions of justice; distributional justice ($\beta=0,749$), procedural justice ($\beta=0,757$) and interactional justice ($\beta=0,701$) were found effective in explaining of administrator trust. These results confirm the accuracy of H6, H7, and H8.

The multi-regression model, developed for testing which dimension of organizational justice is more effective in explaining administrator trust, is meaningful ($R=0,809$, $R^2=0,654$, $p<.01$). The importance rank of justice’s sub-dimensions in explaining organizational trust is; distributional justice ($\beta=0,340$), procedural justice ($\beta=0,313$) and interactional justice ($\beta=0,232$). This result rejects H9 (Table 3).

Table 3 Results of Regression Analysis Related with the Effect of Organizational Justice's Sub-dimensions on Explaining of Administrator Trust

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
6	Administrator Trust	Distributional Justice	,749*	,561*	,560*	,749*	1083,157*
7	Administrator Trust	Procedural Justice	,757*	,757*	,573*	,572*	1137,793*
8	Administrator Trust	Interactional Justice	,701*	,701*	,492*	,491*	821,000*
9	Administration Trust	Distributional Justice	,340*				
		Procedural Justice	,313*				
		Interactional Justice	,232*				

* p<.01

The Effect of Organizational Justice Sub-dimensions on School Trust

As one can infer from Table 4, the models 10, 11, 12 and 13, developed for confirming the effects of distributional justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on school trust are meaningful. These sub-dimensions of justice; distributional justice ($\beta=0,749$), procedural justice ($\beta=0,801$) and interactional justice ($\beta=0,732$) were found effective in explaining of school trust. These results confirm the accuracy of H10, H11, and H12.

Table 4 Results of Regression Analysis Related with Organizational Justice's Sub-dimensions on Prediction of School Trust

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
10	School Trust	Distributional Justice	,749*	,749*	,561*	,561*	1086,700*
11	School Trust	procedural justice	,801*	,801*	,641*	,641*	1515,597*
12	School Trust	Interactional justice	,732*	,732*	,535*	,535*	978,507*
13	School Trust	Distributional Justice	,243*				
		Procedural justice	,422*				
		Interactional justice	,248*				

* p<.01

According to the results of the multi-regression model, developed for testing which dimension of organizational justice is more effective in explaining school trust, the importance rank of justice's sub-dimensions in explaining school trust is; procedural justice ($\beta=0,422$), interactional justice ($\beta=0,248$), and distributional justice ($\beta=0,243$). This result confirms the accuracy of H13.

The Effect of Organizational Trust on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The regression model, developed for testing H14, H15 and H16, seems meaningful (Table 5). School trust ($\beta=0,483$) and administrator trust ($\beta=0,412$), predict the organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way. These results confirm H14 and H15.

Table 5 Regression Analysis Results of Organizational Justice's Sub-dimensions on Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
14	OCB	School trust	,483*	,483*	,233*	,233*	258,604*
15	OCB	Administrator trust	,412*	,412*	,170*	,169*	173,320*
16	OCB	Administrator trust	-0,035	,484*	,234*	,232*	129,366*
		School trust	0,514*				

* $p < .01$

Considering the results of regression analysis, developed to test H16 and to test which trust predicts organizational citizenship behavior better (school or administrator), one can infer that school trust ($\beta=0,514$) has a significant effect on explaining organizational citizenship behavior than administrator trust (Table 5).

While administrator trust is effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior by itself with a correlation of ($\beta=0,412$; $p < .05$), it can be inferred that it loses its predictor strength when it is considered with school trust variable ($\beta=-0,035$; $p > .05$). Therefore, school trust is a mid-predictive variable between administrator trust and organizational citizenship behavior. Administrator trust is indirectly effective in explaining the organizational

citizenship behavior. The reason of this stems from the correlation between administrator trust and organizational trust. In literature there is information about transaction of administrator trust into organizational trust in the course of time. Thus, H16 was accepted.

The Effect of Organizational Justice Sub-dimensions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Simple regression models, developed for testing H17, H18, H19 and H20, seem meaningful. Distributional ($\beta=0,369$; $P<.01$), procedural ($\beta=0,396$; $P<.01$) and interactional justice ($\beta=0,442$; $P<.01$) are effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior (Table 6). These results confirm H17, H18 and H19.

Table 6 Regression Analysis Results of Organizational Justice’s Sub-dimensions on Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model	Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F
17	OCB	Distributional justice	,369*	,369*	,136*	,135*	134,176*
18	OCB	Procedural justice	,396*	,396*	,157*	,156*	157,868*
19	OCB	Interactional justice	,442*	,442*	,196*	,195*	206,681*
20	OCB	Distributional justice	,066	,455*	,207*	,204*	73,618*
		Procedural justice	,105				
		Interactional justice	,318*				

* $p<.01$

According to the results of the multi-regression model, developed towards testing which sub-dimension of organizational justice is more effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior, it can be inferred that only interactional justice ($\beta=0,318$; $P<.01$) explains organizational citizenship behavior in a meaningful way (Table 6). Thus, H20 was accepted.

Results and Discussion

Among organization justice types, distributional justice is the closest to organizational output. Teachers’ perception of distributional justice comes into through being affected by perceptions of procedural and interactional justice. In many researches, have been carried out on this topic, the relationship between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice have been

investigated and it is found that they affect each other. Perceptions of procedural justice (Lind and Taylor, 1988; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993; Folger and Cropanzono, 1998) and interactional justice (Moorman, 1991) were found to be explanatory parts of distributional justice perception. The most explanatory type of justice which explains distributional justice is procedural justice. In the study of Moorman (1991), it was confirmed that interactional justice predicts distributional justice more than procedural justice. Besides, interactional justice, developing by separating from procedural justice, has a significant effect on the consistence of procedural justice perception. Like in the study of Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997), is also confirmed that interactional justice predicts procedural justice.

Teachers' perception of administrator trust is an important predictor of school trust perception. While determining teachers' level of school trust, it is confirmed that the perception of administrator trust plays an important role. This result is supported by the results of other researches in literature (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Nyhan and Marlowe, 1997; Zaheer et al., 1998; Tan and Tan, 2000; Wong et al., 2006).

All dimensions of organizational justice are found to be effective in explaining administrator trust. Among dimensions of justice, distributional justice is the one that best predicts the administrator trust. This finding is followed by procedural and interactional justice. On the other hand, in the studies of Menguc (2000) and Demircan (2003), procedural justice was found to be the most effective dimension that affects administrator trust.

The reason for distributional justice to have greater effect on administrator trust than other dimensions might be the fact that the perceptions of procedural and interactional justice increased the effect of distributional justice by occurring earlier (Cropanzano and Folger, 1989; Folger, 1987).

Researchers claim that, the fair administration of operations leads to the perception that administration is interested in workers (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994) and gives the impression that they respect workers' rights (Menguc, 2000).

These messages cause workers to anticipate that they will be treated well and this situation provides workers to develop positive attitudes to organization and administrators, and it provides workers to develop administrator trust (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Menguc, 2000).

Many research findings show that the perceptions of distributional and procedural justice are related with administrator trust (Ambrose and Schminke, 2003; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2002; Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Menguc, 2000; Pillai et al., 2001; Hubbell and Chory-Assad, 2005). Unlike the previous findings in some researches (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Günaydın, 2001; Ruder, 2003) distributional justice was not seen as a predictor of administrator trust, but procedural justice was found as an important predictor of administration trust. A similar situation faces even the interactional justice as it was seen as a predictor of administrator trust in some researches examining the correlation between interactional justice and administration trust (Aryee et al., 2002; Wong et al., 2006), and in some others, interactional justice was not seen as a predictor of administration trust (Hubbell and Chory-Assad, 2005;).

In summary, findings of the research are in a supportive quality with respect to the findings of researches in Turkey and in World. On the other hand the question of "Which one of the justice types is more effective in explaining administration trust?" can still have different answers. The reason of this might be both the structure of the education organizations and the differentiation of country and organization culture.

Apart from the reasons above, depending on the Turkey's economical condition, having problems arising from distribution of the topics such as extra courses and similar

topics (circulating capital, determining which teachers to take exercise fee etc.) seems effective in explaining administrator trust.

The most important factor for developing administrator trust is the fact that whether the administrators behave fairly or not while they are giving rewards and punishments. Another type of justice which is important in developing administrator trust is procedural justice. Fair behaviors of administrators while both in carrying out the office work and in giving rewards or punishments to all teachers increase the administrator trust.

All three sub-dimensions of justice seem effective in organization trust of teachers'. This result displays coherence with results of other researches in literature. Perceptions of distributional and procedural justice (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Tyler and DeGoey, 1996) and interactional justice (Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001) are found related with trust towards organization.

But in a study carried out in China (Wong et al., 2006), only distributional and procedural justice seemed effective in explaining organizational trust, whereas only procedural justice was found effective in the study of Hubbell and Chory-Assad (2005).

Among sub-dimensions of justice, procedural justice is the one which predicts school trust most in a dominant way. This is followed almost in the same level by interactional and distributional justice. This result is coherent with the results of some researches (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Aryee, Budhwar and Chen, 2002; Demircan, 2003; Gopinath and Becker, 2000; Konvosky and Cropanzano, 1991;).

School rules being fair and fair implementations of them, equal implementations of processes at school among teachers, equal expectations of administrators from teachers while working increase school trust. Interactional justice and distributional justice have a great effect on development of school trust, but the effect of procedural justice is greater.

The possible reason might be the fact that processes belong to school but distribution and interaction are based on the relationship between administrator-teacher.

Brockner and Siegel (1996), specified that processes will give clues about the behaviors on ongoing process in group value model and in the theory of personal interest. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) claimed that procedural justice perception is related with organizational trust because fair processes show fair behaviors of the organization. So, they are entitled as reliable. Thus, due to fair behavior of an organization even once a time, that organization is believed to be reliable and to show fair behaviors in long term. (Brockner and Siegel, 1996; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994).

Despite the fact that all three sub-dimensions of justice affect trust, the question of which justice perception affects which type of trust depends to the type of trust.

Most of the scientists claim that only procedural justice perception affects organizational trust and only distributional justice affects administrator trust (Ambrose and Schminke, 2003; Bies and Moag, 1986; Brockner and Siegel, 1996; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2002; Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Masterson et al., 2000). Therefore, it can be obviously seen that the results of this research display coherence with the results of other researches in the literature. While distributional justice is more effective than other types of justice in explaining administrator trust; procedural justice is more effective in explaining school trust.

As administrative trust is towards an individual, an individual might be subject to affection from a type of justice which is under supervision (Flaherty and Pappas, 2000). This includes the interaction between administrators and individual so, it can be named as interactional justice. On the contrary, processes, namely procedural justice is checked by organizational system; in other words, administrators, even if they want to, may not behave without considering the evaluation criteria of the organization (Hubbell and Chory-Assad,

2005). This situation makes us feel that process of giving rewards and punishments to teachers has not been implemented fairly and administrators display arbitrary behaviors in Turkey.

In this research both administrator trust and school trust were found to be significant variables in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. Both organizational trust and administrator trust were found effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior in a study carried out by Kamer (2001). A similar result was found in a research done in China (Wong et al., 2006). Administrator trust was found effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior meaningfully in Konovsky's and Pugh's (1994) research which investigated only the relationship between administrator trust and organizational citizenship behavior. A similar result was also found in a research of Kalleberg and et al. (2004)

In literature there are findings on the fact that both administrator trust and organizational trust explain organizational citizenship behavior. As it can be inferred from various studies, the affecting shape the sub-dimensions of organizational trust differs in various countries and structures of organizations. The reason for this fact might be the differentiation of both country and organization cultures.

When each of organizational justice type is considered one by one, they are found effective in explaining organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. This result displays coherence with the results of Atalay's research (2005) on primary schools. But in a study carried out by Dilek (2005) in military organizations, only distributional justice found effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, procedural justice was confirmed as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the research of Walumbwa and et al. Besides, both distributional and procedural justices were not found to explain organizational citizenship behavior in the research of Moorman (1991). In another research of

Niehoff and Moorman (1993) distributional justice was found not to be effective in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. As it can be observed, among the studies both in and out of the country, the answers of the questions; “Which type of justice is more effective in explaining organizational citizenship behavior?” and “Which type of justice is the strongest in explaining organizational citizenship behavior?” can vary. The answer may vary depending on the country or the organization. Thus, the fact that national culture, organizational culture and characteristics of the organization have a significant effect on determining the perceptions of workers can be observed.

Consequently, if teachers are required to perform better, their tendency of displaying organizational citizenship behavior should be increased. This research shows that teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice and organizational trust are significant predictors of their tendency to display organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, by increasing their perceptions of organizational justice and organizational trust, their tendency to display organizational citizenship behavior can also be increased. So, teachers will work more efficiently and schools will reach their aims in an easy way.

Bibliography

- Alexander, S., Ruderman, M, (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior, *Social Justice Research*, 1,177-198.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 295–305.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. and Chen, Z. X. (2002) Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 267-285

- Atalay, İ. (2005). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel adalet* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Afyon, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Baird, A.& R. St-Amand (1995) “*La confiance au sein des organisation*” http://www.psc-cfp.gc.ca/publications/monogra/mono2_f.htm Erişim tarihi:2.5.2006.
- Baş, T. (2001). *Anket: Anket nasıl hazırlanır, nasıl uygulanır, nasıl değerlendirilir*. Ankara: Seçkin yayıncılık.
- Bies, J.B., Shapiro, D.L., (1987), Interactional fairness judgments: the influence of causal accounts, *Social Justice Research*, 1, 199-218.
- Bies, R. J., Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice, communication criteria for fairness. In, M. H. Bazerman, R. Sheppard, & B. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research in negotiations in organizations*. 1, 43-55.
- Brief, A.P. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1986) "Prosocial organizational behaviors" *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725
- Brockner, J., P. Siegel, J. Daly, T. Tyler, C. Martin. (1997). When trust matters: The moderating effect of outcome favorability. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 42, 558–583.
- Brockner, J., Siegel, P., (1996), *Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive justice: The Role of Trust, Trust In Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, der. R.M. Kramer ve T.R. Tyler, s.390-414. Sage Publications, London.
- Byrne, Z. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). The history of organizational justice: The founder speak. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen-Charash Y, Spector PE.(2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta analysis. *Organizational Behavior Human Decis Process*. 86(2),278–321.

- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management*, 27, 324-351.
- Cropanzano R, Greenberg J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice, tunneling through the maze. In *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 317-372), Cooper C, Robertson IT (eds). John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Cropanzano, R., Folger, R. (1989). Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy, Beyond equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 293-300.
- Daboval, J., Comish, R., Swindle, B & Caster, W. (1994) A trust inventory for small businesses. *Small Businesses Symposium*, <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/docs/proceedings/94swi031.txt>
- Dailey, RC. & D.J. Kirk. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45 (3), 305-317.
- Deluga, R.J. (1994) 'Supervisor Trust building, leader/member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 67, 315-326.
- Deluga, R.J., (1995), The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior, *Military Psychology*, 7, 1-16.
- Demircan, N. (2003). *örgütsel güvenin bir ara değişken olarak örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: Eğitim sektöründe bir uygulama*. (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi) Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

- Dilek, H. (2005). *Liderlik tarzlarının ve adalet algısının; örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerine etkilerine yönelik bir araştırma*. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi) Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Fahr, J-L., Earley, P.C., Lin, S.C. (1997), "Impetus for action: a cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42,421-44.
- Flaherty, K. E., & Pappas, J. M. (2000). The role of trust in salesperson–sales manager relationships. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 20, 271–278.
- Folger, R., (1987), Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace, *Social Justice Research*, 1,143-159.
- Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., (1998), *Organizational justice and human resource management*, London: Sage Publications.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M.A., (1989), Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions, *Academy of Management Journal*, 32 ,115-130.
- George, J. M. (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Management*, 18, 185-213.
- Gopinath, C., & Becker, T. E. (2000). Communication, procedural justice, and employee attitudes: Relationships under conditions of divestiture. *Journal of Management*, 26, 63–83.
- Green & Uhl-Bien (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) Theory of leadership over 25 Years: Applying A Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- Greenberg, J. (1987), A taxonomy of organizational justice theories, *Academy of Management Review*, 12,9-22.

- Greenberg, J. (1990a), Looking Fair versus being fair: managing impressions of organizational justice, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12 (1) 11-157.
- Greenberg, J. (1990b), Organizational justice: yesterday, today, tomorrow, *Journal of Management*, 16,399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job, essays and experiments*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Günaydın, S.C.(2001). *İşletmelerde örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven değişkenlerinin politik davranış algısı ve işbirliği yapma eğilimine etkisini inceleyen bir çalışma*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Hauenstein, N. M., McGonigle, T.&Flinder, S.W.(2001). "A meta-analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and distributive justice: Implications for justice research." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 39-56.
- Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). "The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-Scale." In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel, Theory and Research in Educational Administration. Information Age Publishing: Greenwich: CT
- Hubbell, A. P. & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and their relationships with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies*, 56, 47-70.
- Huff A L Kelley L., (2002) Is Collectivism a liability? The impact of culture on organizational trust and customer orientation, a seven-nation study; *Journal Of Business Research*. 5836
- Hunt, C.(1999). "Candlesticks and faces: Aspects of lifelong learning." *Studies in the Education of Adults* 31 (2), 197-209.

- Kalleberg, A.L., Appelbaum, E., Sleigh, S. & Schmitt, J. (2004). "For better or worse: Union and company trust and citizenship behaviors," *Paper prepared for the Industrial Relations Research Association meetings*, San Diego, CA, January 2-5, 2004.
- Kamer, M. (2001). *örgütsel güven, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkileri*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi) Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü .
- Kernan, M. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2002). Survivor reactions to reorganization: Antecedents and consequences of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 916–928.
- Konovsky, M. A., Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived Fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 698 - 707.
- Konovsky, M. A., Pugh, S. D. 1994. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation, The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in', performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management*, 21, 657-669.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Roberson, L., & Rymph, R. D. (1998). What motivates fairness? The role of subordinate assertive behavior on managers interactional fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 731-744.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 60 - 84.
- Lind, E. A., Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, Plenum Press.

- Marlowe, H. A., Nyhan, R. C. (1992). *Development and psychometric properties of the organizational trust inventory*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange, The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., ve Schoorman, F. D. (1995). "An integrative model of organizational trust." *The Academy Of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- MEB (2006). *Türkiye eğitim istatistikleri (2005/2006)*. Ankara: MEB Yayınlar Dairesi Başkanlığı.
- Menguc, B. (2000). An empirical investigation of a social exchange model of organizational citizenship behaviors across two sales situations: A Turkish case. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 20, 205–214.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Moorman, R.H., (1993), The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior, *Human Relations*, 46,759-775.
- Neveu V. (2004), "La confiance organisationnelle: définition et mesure", *Actes du XVème Congrès de l'AGRH*, Montréal, 1^{er} 1– 4 septembre 2004
- Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36 (3), 527-556.
- Nyhan R., Marlowe H.A., (1997), "Development and Psychometric Properties Of The Organizational Trust Inventory," *Evaluation Review*, 21(5), October

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior, the good soldier syndrome*.
Lexington, MA, Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W., (1990), The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavioral*, s.43-72.
- Organ, D.W., (1997), Organizational citizenship behavior: ifs construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Organ, D.W., Moorman, R.H., (1993). Fairness and organizational citizenship behavior: What are the connections, *Social Justice Research*, 6, 5-18.
- Pillai R, Schriesheim CB.Williams ES. (1999). "Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership, a two-sample study." *Journal of Management*. 25,897-933.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 1989. *A second generation measure of organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1 (2), 107-142.
- Ruder, G.J. (2003). "*The relationship among organizational justice, trust, and role breadth self-efficacy*." Ph.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. 1996. Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
- Shockley-Zalabak P, Ellis K, Winograd G.(2000) "Organizational tust, what it means, why it matters." *Organizational Development Journal*, 18,35-48.
- Smith, C.A, Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *journal of applied psychology*, 68 (4), 653-663.

- Sweeney, P. D., McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the ends and the means, An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- Tan, H. H., Tan, C. S. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and Psychology Monographs*, 126(2), 241-260.
- Tyler, T. R., & DeGoey, P. (1996). *Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attributions in willingness to accept decisions*. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 331-356). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Walumbwa, F. O, Wu, C., & Orwa, B (2006). Leadership, procedural justice climate, work attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, Organizational Behavior Division.
- Wang, K. Y. & Clegg, S (2002) Trust and decision making: Are managers different in the people's Republic of China and in Australia. *Cross Cultural Management*. 9 (1) 30 –45.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., & Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 33-44.
- Wong Y.T., Ngo, H.Y. & Wong C.S. (2006). Perceived organizational justice, trust, and OCB: A study of Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprises. *Journal of World Business* 41,344–355.
- Zaheer A McEvily B., Perrone V., (1998), Does trust matter? Exploring the effects interorganizational and interpersonal trust. *On Performance Organization Science*, 9, 141-159.

APPENDIX 1. Factor Analysis Results of Teachers at Secondary Schools in Organizational Justice Perception Scale

ITEMS	DJ	PJ	IA
1 I think our school administrators design our course schedules fairly.	.761		
2 Our school administrators distribute the courses to colleagues in the same branch fairly.	.750		
3 I think the works apart from the courses are distributed fairly among teachers.	.724		
4 I think our school administrators give equal responsibility to teachers.	.631		
5 Our school administrators give the decisions about our profession in an objective manner.	.616		
6 I think the rewards are distributed fairly at school.	.552		
7 Our school administrators tell each decision about our profession to each teacher one by one in a logical way.		.795	
8 Our school administrators discuss the decisions about our profession with each of us on how they will result before implementation.		.767	
9 Our school administrators explain all the decisions about the school to everyone without hiding anything.		.764	
10 Our school administrators present the information on decisions, if any of teachers want, without any discrimination.		.736	
11 Our school administrators collect adequate and accurate information from teachers before coming to a decision about the school.		.726	
12 Our school administrators explain the decisions to all teachers; and they explain the requirements of this decision if teachers want to.		.717	
13 Our school administrators permit any teacher to enquire any decision without discrimination.		.696	
14 Our school administrators try to consider all of the ideas of the teachers without any discrimination on related issues.		.606	
15 Our school administrators apply all the laws, regulations, guidelines, notices and etc. to teachers in an objective and coherent manner.		.491	
16 Our school administrators behave gently to all teachers.			.825
17 Our school administrators behave any of teachers at school respectfully and proudly.			.806
18 Our school administrators consider our legal remedies when they come into a decision about us.			.704
19 Our school administrators behave sensible to all teachers` personal needs at school.			.667

DJ: Distributional Justice **PA:** Procedural Justice **IA:** Interactional Justice

APPENDIX 2. Factor Analysis Results of Teachers at Secondary Schools in Administrator Trust Perception Scale

ITEMS		Factor Strength
1	I believe that our school administrators are good at their jobs.	,854
2	Administrators of this school are talented in their jobs.	,835
3	Administrators of this school can tell their life out of school easily.	,834
4	Administrators of this school are sensible to the problems of teachers.	,828
5	Teachers at this school think that administrators are behave in a coherent manner.	,818
6	Administrators of this school give great importance to do their jobs well.	,814
7	Behaviors of our school administrators are not subject to any suspicion.	,807
8	All teachers at this school believe the honesty of administrators.	,805
9	Teachers at this school believe the declarations of administrators.	,802
10	Teachers at this school know that they get support from administrators when needed.	,794
11	Our school administrators finish the work they begin.	,787
12	Our school administrators consider the benefits of teachers.	,783
13	Our school administrators share their personal information with teachers evidently.	,783
14	Teachers at this school never suspect about administrators.	,753
15	Our administrators keep the words they said on profession.	,705

APPENDIX 3. Factor Analysis Results of Teachers at Secondary Schools in School Trust Perception Scale

ITEMS		Factor Strength
1	All the decisions given at his school are applied in equity to everyone.	,858
2	All the decisions given at his school are applied fairly to teachers.	,839
3	The rules applied at his school are decided by considering the ideas of the teachers.	,826
4	All the necessary information is told completely and accurately to all teachers.	,816
5	Our school gives support and maintains the safety of its personnel.	,811
6	The decisions given are updated after an observation when needed.	,805
7	Our school is open to new modernity and change in the directions of teachers` suggestions and their needs.	,805
8	Everything is applied apparently in our school, there are no hidden applications.	,803
9	There is a great communication environment between teachers and administrators in our school.	,792
10	This school behaves according to the previously given decisions.	,789
11	The communication channels between teachers and administrators are always open in our school.	,789
12	The information related to teachers are transferred in time in our school.	,783
13	Our school supports their teachers` wills on self-development and promotion.	,773
14	The expectations and responsibilities in this school are designed	,767

	considering the fulfillment of schools objectives and happiness and health care of workers.	
15	The disciplinary applications in our school are only applied in legal and needed situations.	,730
16	Our school provides necessary education opportunities to its personnel.	,721
17	A new personnel is given adequate information about school.	,714
18	My relationships at school are positive and joyous.	,709
19	The working hours and programs in school permit workers both to fulfill their works at job and to allocate enough time for their families.	,671
20	In our school teachers can communicate each other in an easy way.	,624
21	I never abstain from making suggestions and expressing my feelings on a decision about school.	,607

APPENDIX 4. Factor Analysis Results of Teachers at Secondary Schools in Organizational Citizenship Behavior Perception Scale

		MA	G	C	CV
1	I voluntarily allocate time to help my colleagues when they are in trouble.	,748			
2	I give great care on conserving my colleagues' rights.	,733			
3	Before giving a decision about my school, I consider ideas of my friends that can be affected by the decision.	,713			
4	I take precautions for probable problems between my colleagues and me.	,700			
5	I help my colleagues who are overloaded at work.	,617			
6	I acknowledge my administrators before taking a new step in my job.	,615			
7	I help newly promoted teachers even they don't ask for help.	,607			
8	I give lecture of an absent or late colleague If I have time.	,578			
9	I spent most of my time at school complaining the applications and works at school.		,842		
10	I can have a little finger ache at school.		,841		
11	I constantly say that I want to quit teaching to people around me.		,827		
12	I focus on negative sides of school rather than positive sides.		,649		
13	I never lengthen the breaks.			,836	
14	I don't interrupt my work apart from breaks.			,831	
15	I obey the rules, regulations and processes of school even no one inspects.			,786	
16	I come to school on time.			,784	
17	I actively participate in the debates by attending all the meetings related with school.				,796
18	I voluntarily attend the activities which contributes the strengthening of school image.				,759
19	I follow the changes at school and take active role for my friends approval of the changes.				,698
20	I try to cope up with the changes at school.				,492

MA: Mutual Aid **G:** Gentlemanliness **C:** Conscientious **CV:** Civil Virtue