The Predictive Value of Teachers' Perception of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction

Cevat ELMA[*]

Abstract

Problem Statement: For individuals and organizations alike there has been a recent upsurge in significance of employees' perceptions toward their work and their job satisfaction. The concept of organizational justice has evolved to include almost all aspects of organizational life, particularly employees' attitudes toward work. While a significant amount of research has been performed on the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, few studies have been conducted in the field of education. In this regard, this study may provide support to close this gap in the education area.

Purpose of the Study: This study aims to determine the organizational justice perceptions of primary school teachers and the predictive value of those perceptions on the teachers' job satisfaction.

Method: This study uses correlational survey to investigate the predictive value of organizational justice on teachers' job satisfaction. The predictive value of primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational justice on their job satisfaction is evaluated by means of two scales designed by the researcher. The population of this study consists of teachers working in public primary schools in the city of Samsun. The number of public primary schools and teachers was taken into account, and the technique of stratified sampling was used in the selection of the sample. "Organizational Justice" and "Job Satisfaction" scales were designed for teachers by the researcher. Bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses were used in the data analysis.

[*] Dr., Ondokuz Mayıs University, College of Education, Turkey, e-mail: cevat.elma@omu.edu.tr

Findings: The correlation analyses suggest a positive and significant relationship between the organizational justice types and job satisfaction dimensions. In overall job satisfaction, the relative order of significance for the organizational justice types was interactional, procedural, and distributive. Interactional justice and procedural justice have significant predictive values on overall job satisfaction whereas distributive justice does not have a significant predictive value.

Discussion and Results: In organizations such as schools, where interaction plays an important role, the principals should be even more sensitive to problems that may have a negative predictive value on the perceptions of justice and, for this reason they should take necessary steps to prevent any such perceptions. As this study concludes, procedural and interactional justice types have a significant predictive value on teachers' job satisfaction. In this context, it is up to the managers to be more careful in the work relations. Forming relations and promoting cooperation and collaboration depend to a large extent on a positive and open school climate. In this sense, the establishment of such climate by the principals will have a positive predictive value on both the teachers' perception of justice and their job satisfaction.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice, Procedural Justice, Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most widely studied issues in organizational behavior and management (Lee, 2000) and can be defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p.1300). Job satisfaction is also defined as a function of work-related rewards and values. Similarly, Mottaz (1988) regards job satisfaction as an effective response resulting from an evaluation of a work situation. Job satisfaction can be described as a general feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various facets of the job (Lee, 2000). A job satisfaction facet can be related to pay, benefits, promotion, work conditions, supervision, organizational practices, and relationships with co-workers (Misener, Haddock, Gleaton, & Ajamieh, 1996). Recently, employees' attitudes toward their work and their job satisfaction have gained significance for individuals and organizations. Research findings suggest that insufficient consideration of human needs in the workplace leads to the intent to leave, absenteeism, slowing down of work, and similar defensive behaviors, which increase economic losses (Balcı, 1985). Therefore, a balance needs to be struck between ensuring job satisfaction for hardworking employees and attaining organizational targets. Striking this balance is viewed as a factor that strengthens the employee's perception of organizational justice; a high perception of justice leads to more job satisfaction (Martin & Bennett, 1996; Tang, & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Osborn, 1991).

Organizational Justice

In recent years, the concept of organizational justice has evolved to include almost all aspects of organizational life, particularly employees' attitudes toward work. Organizational justice is a key issue for understanding organizational behavior (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991; Greenberg, 1987). A survey of studies on organizational justice shows that most studies are based on Adams' (1965, 1963) theory of equality. Additionally, organizational justice reveals individual perceptions on whether organizations behave fairly toward all of their members (Umphress, Labianca, Brass, Kass, & Scholten, 2003; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Moorman, 1991). According to this theory, individuals expect that the amount they invest in and gain from a relationship should be proportional to what another person invests and gains.

Organizational justice refers to employee perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg, 1987). Organizational justice means fairness in sharing economic values as well as in the strategies and policies adopted by the management. It means developing relationships without discrimination among individuals and includes respect for the employee's identity, honor, and cultural values (Cremer, 2005). The studies on organizational justice fall under three main headings: procedural, distributive, and interactional (McCollough, Berry, & Yadav, 2000; Smith, Bolton, & Wagner, 1999; Skarlicki, & Folger, 1997).

Lind and Tyler (1988) define procedural justice as the fairness of procedures underlying the distribution of outcomes whereas Moon and Kamdar (2008) and Folger and Konovsky (1989) define it as an individual's ability to participate in the decision-making process and their perceptions of impartiality and objectivity in that process. In other words, procedural justice is the extent to which the methods, procedures, and policies in payment, promotion, financial benefits, work conditions, and performance assessment are fair (Beugre, 2002; Cropanzano & Folger, 1991; Greenberg, 1990). Procedural justice entails consistency, freedom from bias, accuracy, representativeness, correctability, and consistency with ethical standards (Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). According to Thibaut and Walker (1975), procedural justice has two subdimensions. The first is whether employees are invited to voice their opinions, ideas, and views before decisions are made. The second is the way the policies and practices used in the decision-making process are applied by the decision makers. Kim (2005) also examines procedural justice in two subdimensions and stresses that the first relates to the fairness of managers' individual attitudes and behaviors whereas the second focuses on the extent to which the principles and policies adopted by the organization are perceived to be fair by the employees. Research shows that procedural justice is a significant and positive predictor of performance (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Taylor, Moghaddam, Gamble, & Zellerer, 1987). Procedural justice is also found to have an impact on employees' job satisfaction, extra-role behaviors, organizational loyalty, and turnover (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Moorman, 199; Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Interactional justice focuses on individuals' interactions with their superiors and especially the way their superiors treat them in the application of organizational procedures (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice refers to "aspects of interactions between outcome receivers and outcome givers" and "the procedures that do not involve formally imposed

constraints on roles and behavior" (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, p.27). It is also viewed as the 'social aspect of justice' and focuses on the nature of work relations between employees and their superiors (Ambrose, 2002). Interactional justice can be assessed by obtaining information related to respect, propriety, truthfulness, and justification (Kwak, 2006; Tyler & Bies, 1990; Bies & Moag, 1986). When supervisors enact organizational procedures offering adequate justification, with truthfulness, respect, and propriety, and when the information is timely, reasonable, and specific, interactional justice is said to be present (Shapiro, Buttner, & Barry, 1994; Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice also addresses how openly the decision-making processes are shared with employees. Consequently, management attitude is the determining factor in interactional justice.

Adams (1965, 1963) holds that distributive justice involves the perception of justice when an employee compares the amount of work they put in and the pay, benefits, and rewards they receive in return compared with other employees in the same capacity (Beugre, 2002; Jawahar, 2002; Mueller & Tor, 2000; Greenberg, 1990; Leventhal, 1980). Distributive justice can also be defined as fairness perceived by employees in the distribution of organizational resources including pay, promotion, and related benefits (Cohen & Spector, 2001; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Distributive justice directly affects employees' attitudes toward job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust (Colquitt et al., 2001). The study of distributive justice in organizations focuses primarily on employees' perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes (benefits or punishments) they receive, that is, their evaluations of the end state of the allocation process (Lee, 2000).

Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction as part of life satisfaction is based on the evaluation of working conditions as a whole and their partial components. If employees are happy with their jobs, their colleagues, and their superiors, and if they also view the current policies on payment and promotion as fair, then they dedicate themselves to their organization and do not think about quitting (Nayir, 2012; Reed, Stanley, & Robert, 1994). Employees' perception of justice in the workplace is important for job satisfaction and the efficient functioning of the organization. Research shows that organizational justice perceptions strongly affect workers' attitudes and feelings of job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001). Osborn (1991) notes that job satisfaction will be higher for employees who perceive a balance between their contributions and rewards at work.

Researchers underlining the link between organizational justice and job satisfaction (Tansky, 1993; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Alexander & Ruderman, 1987) have recently focused on which type of justice has a greater effect on job satisfaction (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Rifai, 2005; Masterson, Levis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). For instance, Dailey and Kirk (1992), Cropanzano and Ambrose (2001), and Rifai (2005) state that both distributive and procedural justices have a significant effect on workers' job satisfaction. Studies to determine which organizational justice type increases job satisfaction have yielded inconsistent conclusions. For example, Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) and Hartman, Yrle and Galle (1999) conclude that distributive justice has a greater effect on workers' job satisfaction than procedural justice, while Lambert et al. (2007) reach just the opposite conclusion. In another study, Masterson, Levis, Goldman and Taylor (2000) conclude that both types of

justice are relevant to job satisfaction but procedural justice is more influential than interactional justice.

While a significant amount of research has been performed on the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, Hoy and Tarter (2004) noted few studies have been conducted in the field of education. Organizational justice is one of the key factors with a positive or negative impact on attitudes toward work in individuals employed in educational organizations, just as it is in other organizations. In this context, this study aims to determine the organizational justice perceptions of primary school teachers and the predictive value of those perceptions on teachers' job satisfaction.

Method

This study uses correlational research to investigate the predictive value of organizational justice on teachers' job satisfaction. Correlational studies are useful for initial exploration of relationships, particularly when there are a large number of variables. Like other types of quantitative research, the goal of correlational studies is to generalize their results to a larger population. There are two types of correlational studies: relationship and predictive studies. Relationship studies seek to determine if a relationship exists between two or more variables, whereas the purpose of predictive studies is to identify one or more variables that predict the results of participants on another variable (Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Anderson, 1998). The predictive value of primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational justice on their job satisfaction was evaluated by means of two scales designed by the researcher.

Research Population and Sample

The research population of this study consists of teachers working in public primary schools in the city of Samsun, Turkey. The number of public primary schools and teachers was taken into account, and the technique of stratified sampling was used in the selection of the sample. The research population was divided into four sublayers district-wide, and the teachers were divided into two sublayers as subject and classroom teachers. Primary schools were selected from each of the four districts. Approximately 20% of the 3,427 teachers were targeted and the scales were sent out to 686 classroom teachers; 514 of these 686 scales were returned, for a return rate of 75%. Of the participants, 62% were female (319), 38% were male (195), 86% were married (442), 14% were single (72), 48% were classroom teachers (249), and 52% were subject teachers (265).

Development of the Data Collection Instruments

The research data were collected using organizational justice and job satisfaction scales. The scales used as the data collection instruments are described below.

Organizational justice scale

Following an extensive literature review regarding an organizational justice scale (Hoy and Tarter, 2004; Colquitt et al., 2001; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Moorman, 1991), the researcher designed a scale for teachers. Following an analysis of a pilot study, an 'Organizational Justice Scale' of 19 items was developed. In the factor analysis for structural validity, the scale was put together under three factors by using principal components analysis with varimax rotation and the load of

factors varied between .41 and .77. The three-factor scale explained almost 76% of total variance. A five-step Likert scale was used to evaluate teachers' perceptions of organizational justice. On the scale, the lowest value corresponds to 'never' and the highest value corresponds to 'always'.

The interactional justice scale consists of seven items: The Cronbach α internal consistency factor was found to be .94 and the factor analysis revealed that the load of factors of the statements varied between .41 and .76. The procedural justice scale consists of six items. The Cronbach α internal consistency factor was found to be .92 and the factor analysis revealed that the load of factors of the statements varied between .48 and .75. The distributive justice scale consists of six items. The Cronbach α internal consistency factor was found to be .91 and the factor analysis revealed that the load of factors of the statements varied between .67 and .77. The organizational justice subscales' factor loadings and item-total correlations are given in Table 1.

Table 1.
Organizational Justice Subscales' Factor Loadings and Item-Total Correlations

Sub-scale	Items	Factor Loadings	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
Interactional Justice	The principal takes my views into account when making a decision.	.72	.72
	The principal hears me out when making a decision.	.41	.75
	The principal respects my rights as a teacher.	.67	.82
	I believe the principal would do his/her best for me.	.70	.77
	The principal clearly states the reasons for his/her decisions.	.78	.87
	The principal is polite to me.	.75	.85
	The principal trusts me.	.74	.80
Procedural Justice	The principal keeps his/her prejudices out of his/her judgments.	.60	.76
	The principal briefs us on the processing of the school.	.62	.81
	The principal is fair when assessing my performance.	.48	.81
	The principal treats all of us the same way.	.75	.77
	I can easily announce my views to the principal on decisions affecting the processing of the school.	.63	.72
	The principal enforces the regulations equally to all of us.	.70	.74
Distributive Justice	The principal designs class schedules fairly.	.67	.73
	The principal is fair in sharing out extracurricular activities.	.67	.79
	The principal grants leaves fairly.	.72	.78
	The principal provides equal opportunities for all for professional development.	.77	.70
	The principal distributes course sections fairly.	.76	.71
	The principal designs our weekly schedules fairly.	.65	.78

Job satisfaction scale

Following a comprehensive literature review, a job satisfaction scale was designed for teachers. Although the literature covers sub-dimensions such as job satisfaction, remuneration, opportunities for promotion, working conditions, and organizational practices, this study focuses instead on the job itself and relations with management and colleagues, as school principals have no say in their teachers' salaries or promotion in the Turkish educational system. In this context, the factors affecting job and relations have been focused on, ignoring those falling outside the realm of school principals, in the establishment of organizational justice in the school. Following an analysis of the pilot study, a 'Job Satisfaction Scale' of 17 items was designed. The Cronbach α internal consistency factor was found to be .94. In the factor analysis for structural validity, the scale was put together under three factors and the load of factors varied between .41 and .89. The three-factor scale (job itself, relations with principal, relations with colleagues) explained almost 73% of total variance. A five-step Likert scale was used to evaluate teachers' job satisfaction. On the scale, the lowest value corresponds to 'I strongly disagree' and the highest value corresponds to 'I strongly agree'. The job satisfaction subscales' factor loadings and item-total correlations are given in Table 2.

Table 2.

Job Satisfaction Subscales' Factor Loadings and Item-Total Correlations

Sub-scale	Items	Factor Loadings	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
Job itself	I find my job suitable to my knowledge and skills.	.85	.53
	If I found a new job, I would get the same job that I do now.	.89	.52
	I find my job meaningful.	.70	.64
	Teaching is the best job for me.	.66	.63
Relations with principal	My principal acts sensitively to my problems.	.64	.72
	I can pass over all my opinions and recommendations to my principal very easily.	.75	.71
	I think my principal is successful regarding management skills.	.84	.64
	I can easily communicate with the principal.	.64	.73
	The principal always supports me in my endeavors.	.86	.63
	Teachers are valued in my school.	.72	.74
	My principal evaluates teachers fairly and objectively.	.68	.81
Relations with colleagues	Communication between teachers in this school is friendly and openly.	.86	.67
	My colleagues consider my opinions.	.77	.76
	We are like a team with my colleagues.	.87	.74
	My colleagues have a big influence on why I am staying in this school	.82	.60
	I feel myself as an indispensable member of my school.	.67	.63
	Our relationship with my colleagues is based on trust.	.81	.73

Data Analysis

The SPSS 16.0 statistical package program was used in the analysis of the research data. Bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses were used in the data analysis.

Results

The research model examines the predictive value of perceived organizational justice on teachers' job satisfaction. The Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses were used to study the relationships between the variables in the model. In the analyses, the job satisfaction dimensions were taken as the dependent variable and perceived organizational justice types as the independent variable.

The relationship between the organizational justice types and teachers' job satisfaction dimensions was studied through the Pearson correlation analysis.

Table 3.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Procedural Justice	24.7393	4.92459							
2. Interactional Justice	28.2646	5.77013	.710**						
3. Distributive Justice	24.9163	4.45847	.772**	.744**					
4. Relations with Colleagues	22.4650	5.20194	.364**	.390**	.341**				
5. Relations with Principal	26.6459	6.01615	.749**	.765**	.702**	.506**			
6. Job Itself	16.5117	3.33930	.374**	.332**	.328**	.387**	.483**		
7. Overall Job Satisfaction	73.2004	12.50453	.635**	.642**	.588**	.789**	.845**	.691**	-

Note: $p < 0.01$

As observed in Table 1, a positive and statistically significant relationship exists between the organizational justice types and teachers' job satisfaction dimensions. Positive and significant relationships are observed between procedural justice and relations with colleagues (r=.364), relations with principals (r=.749), the job itself (r=.374), and overall job satisfaction (r=.635). Relations with principals and overall job satisfaction have a particularly strong relationship with procedural justice compared to other job satisfaction dimensions. Positive and significant relationships are observed between interactional justice and relations with colleagues (r=.390), relations with principals (r=.765), the job itself (r=.332), and overall job satisfaction

(r=.642). Relations with principals and overall job satisfaction have a particularly strong relationship with interactional justice compared to other job satisfaction dimensions. Positive and significant relationships are observed between distributive justice and relations with colleagues (r=.341), relations with principals (r=.702), the job itself (r=.328), and overall job satisfaction (r=.588). Relations with principals have a particularly strong relationship with procedural justice compared to other job satisfaction dimensions.

In order to detect any problems in terms of collinearity and multicollinearity in the study, the values for simple correlation, variance inflation factor (VIF), and tolerance value (TV) were looked at, and no such problems were found as the existing data had simple correlation values lower than .90, VIFs lower than .10, and TVs higher than .10. In order to test the multi-variable normality and linearity, the scatter plot matrix of each group was examined and the diagrams formed by variable couples were found to be almost elliptical in shape. This suggests that no problems exist in terms of normality or linearity in the study (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010; Field, 2005).

The results of the multiple regression analyses for the predictive values of the organizational justice types on teachers' job satisfaction dimensions are shown in Table 4.

Tablo 4. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Relations with Colleagues			Relations with Principal			Job Itself			Overall Job Satisfaction		
	B	SE(B)	β	B	SE(B)	β	B	SE(B)	β	B	SE(B)	β
Interactional Justice	.28	.09	.31*	.48	.07	.48**	-.07	.06	-.13	.69	.17	.34*
Procedural justice	.03	.12	.02	.34	.09	.28*	.34	.08	.49**	.72	.22	.29*
Distributive justice	.08	.10	.07	.08	.07	.06	.02	.06	.03	.20	.18	.07
R			.40			.80			.40			.69
R²			.16*			.64**			.17*			.48**
Adjusted R²			.15*			.63**			.16*			.47**

Note: B represents the unstandardized regression coefficient. SE (B) represents the estimated standard error, and β represents the standardized regression coefficient.

$*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01$.

Interactional, procedural, and distributive justice types were found to have a low-level relationship with teachers' relations with their colleagues (R²=.16, Adjusted R²=.15, p<0.05), a mid-level relationship with relations with principals (R²=.64, Adjusted R²=.63, p<0.01), a low-level relationship with the job itself (R²=.17, Adjusted R²=.16, p<0.05), and finally a mid-level relationship with overall job satisfaction (R²=.48, Adjusted R²=.47, p<0.01). Organizational justice types account for

approximately 15% of the total variance in relations with colleagues, 63% in relations with principals, 14% in the job itself, and 47% in overall job satisfaction.

In relations with colleagues, the relative order of significance for the organizational justice types was interactional, procedural, and distributive. The significance of regression factors shows that only interactional justice has a significant predictive value on relations with colleagues (β=.31, p<0.05) whereas procedural and distributive justice types do not have a significant predictive value.

In relations with principals, the relative order of significance for the organizational justice types was interactional, procedural, and distributive. The significance of regression factors shows that both interactional justice (β=.48, p<0.01) and procedural justice (β=.28, p<0.05) have significant predictive values on relations with principals whereas distributive justice does not have a significant predictive value.

In the job itself, the relative order of significance for the organizational justice types was procedural, interactional, and distributive. The significance of regression factors shows that only procedural justice has a significant predictive value on the job itself (β=.49, p<0.01) whereas interactional and distributive justice types do not have a significant predictive value.

In overall job satisfaction, the relative order of significance for the organizational justice types was interactional, procedural, and distributive. The significance of regression factors shows that both interactional justice (β=.34, p<0.05) and procedural justice (β=.29, p<0.05) have significant predictive values on overall job satisfaction whereas distributive justice does not have a significant predictive value.

Discussion and Conclusion

The objective of this study was to determine the predictive value of teachers' perceptions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) on their job satisfaction. The correlation analyses suggest a positive and significant link between the organizational justice types and job satisfaction dimensions. This finding is also corroborated by many other studies in the literature (Altınkurt & Yılmaz, 2012; Yelboğa, 2012; Al-Zubi, 2010; İşcan & Sayın, 2010; Yıldırım, 2007; Rifai, 2005; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Yelboğa (2012) concludes that the perception of organizational justice is one of the factors affecting job satisfaction. The present study has found that, while distributive justice and interactional justice have an impact on job satisfaction, procedural and informational justice perceptions have no such impact. Altınkurt & Yılmaz (2012) and Al-Zubi (2010), for instance, stress that organizational justice is one of the key predictors of job satisfaction. In studies on the link between organizational justice and job satisfaction, Yıldırım (2007) concludes that job satisfaction rises in line with distributive justice. Likewise, Rifai (2005) underlines the strong, positive relationship between procedural and distributive justice and employees' job satisfaction. Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) conclude that when employees perceive a work environment to be unfair, they adopt a

negative attitude toward their jobs and obtain little satisfaction from them. The findings of the present study reveal that relations with principals and overall job satisfaction have a stronger relationship with all three organizational justice types than relations with colleagues or the job itself. The lowest link is between the satisfaction one gets from the job itself and the organizational justice types.

To determine which justice type has a greater predictive value on specific dimensions of job satisfaction, multiple regression analyses were conducted. According to the results, interactional justice has predictive values on relations with colleagues, procedural justice on the job itself, and interactional and procedural justice on relations with principals and overall job satisfaction. Teachers' perceptions of their principals' or colleagues' attitudes as fair or unfair do have a predictive value on their job satisfaction. Another study on teachers concludes that interactional justice, or interactional relations, has the greatest predictive value on job satisfaction (Karademir, 2010). Similarly, Schappe (1998) and Yıldırım (2007) also conclude that interactional justice affects job satisfaction more than the other types of justice. This is also supported by the findings of the present study. This study further reveals that procedural justice has predictive values on the job itself, relations with principals, and overall job satisfaction. This, too, is corroborated by other studies in the literature. Masterson et al. (2000), for instance, conclude that while both procedural and interactional justice affect job satisfaction, the former has a greater predictive value than the latter. Tyler (1989) and Lambert et al. (2007), on the other hand, reveal that procedural justice has a stronger predictive value on job satisfaction than distributive justice. Lee (2000), however, holds that both procedural and distributive justices have direct, positive effects on job satisfaction. As for the present study, the findings point toward distributive justice having an insignificant predictive value on job satisfaction dimensions. However, the literature also contains studies that conclude otherwise (Yelboğa, 2012; Tsai & Bellino, 2010; Clay-Warner, Reynolds, & Roman, 2005; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; McCain, Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Where such studies are carried out, and on whom, undoubtedly affects the findings they yield.

Organizational justice is a significant factor in employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness in schools (Aydın & Kepenekçi, 2008). The perception of justice by schoolteachers is important from both the organizational and individual points of view. Low organizational justice perceptions might cause problems in adding value for teachers who are supposed to imbue future generations with values such as justice, honesty, sincerity, and equality (Yılmaz, 2010). Unfair practices have been found to have negative effects on teachers also when reaching organizational targets is concerned (Özgan and Bozbayındır, 2011). This perception is influenced by many factors including the sharing of the resources, the distribution of rewards and sanctions, interaction among people, enforcement of the regulations, and remuneration corresponding to the work done. If individuals perceive injustice in their organizations, this will affect their behaviors and attitudes to work, of which, in this context, job satisfaction is one. Undoubtedly, the perception of justice is not the sole factor affecting job satisfaction but it is a significant one, as has been revealed by

this study. In organizations like schools, where interaction plays an important role, the principals should be even more sensitive to problems that may have a negative effect on the perceptions of justice and, for this reason; they should take steps necessary to prevent any such perceptions. As pointed out by Polat and Celep (2008), principals must behave ethically and observe the regulations of the educational system and the school. Promoting justice in all school-related matters will lead to a better functioning of the educational processes. Principals should treat the teachers equally and fairly in the distribution of extra teaching hours, classroom sizes, duties, rewards, and sanctions. Teachers also need to feel respect, love, trust, self-esteem, and appreciation. The principals should also be fair in their interaction with all of their subordinates and avoid favoring any particular individuals. Management should be sensitive to the teachers' problems, listen to them, and allow them to express their views freely. Participation should be promoted, the teachers should be informed of the functioning of the school, and their taking part in the decision-making processes should be encouraged. An unprejudiced, all-inclusive, and ethical management method should be adopted. As this study concludes, procedural and interactional justice types have a significant predictive value on teachers' job satisfaction. In this context, it is up to the managers to be more careful in the work relations. Forming relations based on mutual trust and promoting cooperation and collaboration depends to a large extent on a positive and open school climate. In this sense, the creation of such a climate by the principals has a positive effect on both the teachers' perception of justice and their job satisfaction. Teachers obtaining satisfaction from their jobs will have a positive attitude toward their colleagues, principals, and others, and will surely be more dedicated to their work.

Studies on the link between organizational justice in education and job satisfaction are in general, quantitative in nature and based on the theoretical framework set by the researchers. Besides these approaches, the demonstration is expected to make a significant contribution to the field through qualitative methods of how these facts are defined in the work environment and precisely on what it is that teachers base their own perspectives.

References

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology:* 267-299. New York: Academic Press.

Alexander, S., & Ruderman M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 177-198.

Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Ortaöğretim okullarında değerlerle yönetim, örgütsel adalet ve iş doyumu arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between management by values, organizational justice and job satisfaction in secondary schools]. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*(2), 65-78.

Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(6), 102-109.

Ambrose, M. L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior and Human, 89*, 803-812.

Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd Edition). London: The Falmer Press.

Aydın, İ. & Kepenekçi, Y. K. (2008). Principals' opinions of organisational justice in elementary schools in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(4), 497-513.

Balcı, A. (1985). *Eğitim yöneticisinin iş doyumu [Educational administrators' job satisfaction].* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Beugre, C. D. (2002). Understanding organizational justice and its impact on managing employees: An African perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(7), 1091-1104.

Bies, R. J., & Moag J. F. (1986). International justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.). *Research on negotiations in organizations,* vol. I: 43-55. Qreenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds J., & Roman P. (2005). Organizational justice and job satisfaction: A test of three competing models. *Social Justice Research, 18*(4), 391- 409.

Cohen, Y. C., & Spector P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278-321.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. O., Wesson M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng. K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445.

Cremer, D. D. (2005). Procedurel and distributive justice effects moderateed by organizational indentification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(1), 4-13.

Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. (1991). Procedural justice and worker motivation. In R. Steers and L. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior:*131-143. New York: McGraw–Hill.

Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (2001). Procedural and distributive justice are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice:* 119-151. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik. SPSS ve Lisrel uygulamaları [Multivariate statistics in the social sciences: SPSS and Lisrel applications].* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job satisfaction and intent to turnover, *Human Relations, 45,* 305 - 317.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decision. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(2), 115–130.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 9-22.

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

Hartman, S. J., Yrle, A. C. & Galle, W. P. (1999). Procedural and distributive justice: Examining equity in a university setting. *Journal of Business Ethics, 20*(4), 337-351.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management, 18,* 250-259.

İşcan, Ö. F. & Sayın, U. (2010). Örgütsel adalet, iş tatmini ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between organizational justice, trust and job satisfaction]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 24* (4), 195-216.

Jawahar, I. M. (2002). A model of organizational justice and workplace aggression. *Journal of Management, 28*(6), 811-834.

Karademir, K. (2010). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları ve iş doyum düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of job satisfaction levels and organizational justice perceptions of physical education teachers]. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 5*(2), 88-103.

Kim, H. S. (2005). *Organizational structure and internal communication as antecedents of employee organization relationships in the context of organizational justice: A multilevel analysis.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Maryland.

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,* 698–707.

Kwak, A. (2006). *The relationships of organizational injustice with employee burnout and counterproductive work behaviors: Equity sensitivity as a moderator.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Central Michigan University.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Griffin, M. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35,* 644-656.

Lee, H. R. (2000). *An empirical study of organizational justice as a mediator of the relationships among leader-member exchange and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions in the lodging industry.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done in equity theory. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg & R. H. Willis, (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research:* 27-55. New York: Plenum.

Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction:* 167-218. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. (1988). *The social psychology of justice.* New York: Plenum.

Lodico, M.G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K.H. (2006). *Methods in educational research : From theory to practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology:* 1297–1349. Rand McNally: Chicago.

Martin, C. L., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Management, 21,* 84–104.

Masterson, S. S., Levis, 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,* 738-748.

McCain, S. C., Tsai, H., & Bellino, N. (2010). Organizational justice, employees' ethical behavior and job satisfaction in the casino industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 22*(7), 992-1009.

McCollough, M. A., Berry, L. L., & Yadav, M. S. (2000). An empirical investigation of customer satisfaction after service failure and recovery. *Journal of Service Research, 3,* 121-137.

McFarlin D., & Sweeney, P. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 626-637.

Misener, T. R., Haddock, K. S., Gleaton, J. U., & Ajamieh. A. R. (1996). Toward an international measure of job satisfaction. *Nursing Research, 45,* 87-91.

Moon, H., & D. Kamdar. (2008). Me or we? The role of personality and justice as other- centered antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviors within organizations. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 84-94.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), 845-855.

Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Work satisfaction among hospital nurses. *Hospital and Health Services Administration, 33*(1), 57-74.

Mueller, C. W., & Tor, W. (2000). The degree to which justice is valued in the workplace. *Social Justice Research, 13*(1), 1-24.

Nayir, F. (2012). The relationship between perceived organizational support and teachers' organizational commitment. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 48,* 97-116.

Osborn, S. H. (1991). *Managing organizational behavior.* San Francisco: John Willey&Sons.

Özgan, H., & Bozbayındır, F. (2011). Okullarda adil olmayan uygulamalar ve etkileri [Unfair applications and their effects in schools]. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 66*(16), 66-85.

Polat, S.ve Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları [Perceptions of secondary school teachers on organizational justice, organizational trust, organizational citizenship behaviors]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 54*, 307-331.

Reed, S. A., Stanley, H. K., & H. S. Robert. (1994). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions of United States accountants: The impact of locus of control and gender. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 7*, 31-58.

Rifai, H. A. (2005). A test of the relationships among perceptions of justice, job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business, 7*(2), 131-154.

Schappe, S. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Psychology, 132*(3), 227-290.

Shapiro, D. L., Buttner, E. H., & Barry, B. (1994). Explanations: What factors enhance their perceived adequacy? *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Processes, 58*, 346-368.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 434-443.

Smith, A. K., Bolton, R. N., & Wagner, J. (1999). A model of customer satisfaction with service encounters involving failure and recovery. *Journal of Marketing Research, 36*, 356-373.

Sweeney P., & McFarlin, D. (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.

Tang, T. L. P., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *Advanced Management Journal, 61*(3), 25-32.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 195-207.

Taylor, D. M., Moghaddam, F. M., Gamble, I., & Zellerer, E. (1987). Disadvantaged group responses to perceived inequality: From passive acceptance to collective action. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*, 259−272.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In J. Carroll (Ed.), *Advances in applied social psychology: Business settings:* 77-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler. T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 830-838.

Umphress, E. E., Labianca, G. J., Brass, D.J., Kass, E.E., & Scholten, L. (2003). The role of instrumental and expressive social ties in employees' perceptions of organizational justice. *Organization Science, 14*(6), 738–753.

Yelboğa, A (2012). Örgütsel adalet ile iş doyumu ilişkisi: Ampirik bir çalışma [The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction: An empirical study]. *Ege Akademik Bakış, 12*(2), 171-182.

Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş doyumu ile örgütsel adalet ilişkisi [The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction]. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 62*(1), 354–279.

Yılmaz, K. (2010). Devlet ortaöğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları [Secondary public school teachers' perceptions about organizational justice]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 10* (1), 579–616.

Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumlarının Yordayıcısı Olarak Örgütsel Adalet Algısı

Atıf:

(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Günümüzde çalışanın işine karşı tutumu ve işinden doyum sağlaması hem bireysel açıdan hem de örgütsel açıdan önem verilen konular arasında yer almaktadır. Örgütsel adalet kavramı ise son yıllarda başta çalışanların işe yönelik tutumları olmak üzere örgütsel yaşamın neredeyse tüm boyutlarıyla ilişkili bir kavram haline gelmiştir. Örgütsel adalet ve iş doyumu arasındaki ilişkiye yönelik pek çok çalışma yapılmış olmasına rağmen uzun yıllardır bu çalışmaların eğitim alanında göz ardı edildiği görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın eğitim alanındaki bu eksikliği gidermesine katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın amacı ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algılarının iş doyumlarına etkisini belirlemektir.

Yöntem

Örgütsel adaletin öğretmenlerin iş doyumlarına etkisinin belirlenmesi amacıyla yapılan bu araştırma, tarama modeli niteliğindedir. Bu çalışmada ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algılarının iş doyumlarına etkisi araştırmacının geliştirdiği iki ölçek aracılığıyla belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu araştırmanın evreni Türkiye'nin Samsun ilinin resmi ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerden oluşmaktadır. Örneklem seçiminde resmi ilköğretim okul sayıları ile öğretmen sayıları göz önünde bulundurulmuştur. Örneklem seçiminde "tabakalı örnekleme" tekniği kullanılmıştır. Buna göre araştırma evreni ilk olarak ilçe düzeyinde 4 alt tabakaya ve öğretmenler branş ve sınıf öğretmeni olmak üzere iki alt tabakaya ayrılmıştır. Örneklem belirlenme sürecinde sözü edilen 4 ilçenin tamamından ilköğretim okullarının seçilmesine dikkat edilmiştir. 3427 olan öğretmen sayısının yaklaşık %20'sine ulaşılması hedeflenmiş ve toplam 686 sınıf ve branş öğretmenine ölçekler ulaştırılmıştır. Araştırmacı tarafından öğretmenlere ulaştırılan 686 ölçekten 514'ü geri dönmüş ve dönüş oranı yaklaşık % 75 olmuştur. Örgütsel adalet ve iş doyumu ile ilgili yapılan kapsamlı bir yazın taramasından sonra öğretmenlere yönelik "Örgütsel Adalet" ve "İş Doyum" ölçekleri geliştirilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde bivariate korelasyon katsayısı ve çoklu regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular

Yapılan korelasyon analizi sonucunda örgütsel adalet türleriyle iş doyum boyutları arasında anlamlı ve pozitif yönde bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir. Örgütsel adalet türlerinin toplam iş doyumu boyutu üzerindeki göreli önem sırasının; etkileşim, prosedür ve dağıtım adaleti olduğu görülmektedir. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelendiğinde ise hem etkileşim adaletinin hem de prosedür adaletinin toplam iş doyumu boyutu üzerinde önemli yordayıcıları olduğu görülmektedir. Dağıtım adaletinin ise bu anlamda önemli bir etkiye sahip olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Bu çalışma sonuçları, yöneticiyle ilişkiler ve toplam iş doyumunun diğer boyutlara (meslektaşlarla ilişkiler ve işin kendisi) göre her üç örgütsel adalet türüyle daha yüksek bir ilişki içinde olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. En düşük ilişkinin ise işin kendisinden elde edilen doyum ile örgütsel adalet türleri arasında olduğu saptanmıştır.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Bir örgütte çalışanların adalet algısı hem örgütsel hem de bireysel açıdan oldukça önemlidir. Çalışanların örgütteki adalet algılamasını, kaynakların paylaşımı, ödül ve cezanın dağıtımı, kişiler arası etkileşim, kuralların uygulanması, yapılan iş karşılığı alınan ücret gibi pek çok faktör etkilemektedir. Bireyler, eğer örgütlerinde adaletsizlikler yapıldığını algılarlarsa, bu onların işe yönelik tutumlarını ve davranışlarını da etkileyecektir. Bu bağlamda etkilenen tutumlardan biri de iş doyumudur. Şüphesiz iş doyumunu etkileyen tek neden çalışanların algıladıkları adalet değildir, ancak önemli bir faktör olduğu bu araştırma ile ortaya koyulmuştur. Okul gibi etkileşimin önemli olduğu örgütlerde yöneticiler adalet algısını olumsuz etkileyebilecek sorunlara daha duyarlı olmalıdırlar. Bu nedenle yöneticiler okuldaki

her türlü adaletsizlik algılamalarının önüne geçmelidir. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algılarını artırmak için yöneticilerin etik davranması, eğitim sistemi ve okulla ilgili kurallara sadık kalarak keyfi uygulamalardan kaçınmaları gerekir. Okuldaki tüm işlerde adaletin gözetilmesi, okuldaki süreçlerin daha sağlıklı işlemesine yol açacaktır. Okul yöneticileri ek ders, şube, nöbet, ödül ve ceza gibi işlerin dağıtılmasında öğretmenler arasında ayrım yapmadan eşit ve adil davranmalıdırlar. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin okulda saygı görme, sevilme, güvenilme, kendini değerli hissetme ve taktir edilme ihtiyaçları vardır. Okul yöneticileri çalışanlarıyla etkileşimlerinde de adil olmalı; birileri kendisine yakın olduğu için özel imkânlara kavuşmamalıdır. Okul yöneticisi, öğretmenlerin sorunlarına duyarlı olmalı, onları dinlemeli ve görüşlerini rahatça ifade etmelerine olanak sağlamalıdır. Katılımcı bir yönetim anlayışını uygulamak suretiyle öğretmenleri okulun işleyişi ile ilgili konularda bilgilendirmeli ve özellikle öğretmenleri doğrudan ilgilendiren kararlara onların katılımlarını sağlamalıdır. Okul yöneticisi kararlarında ön yargıdan uzak, okuldaki herkesi dikkate alan ve etik kurallara uygun bir yöntem benimsemelidir. Bu çalışmada da ortaya konulduğu gibi özellikle prosedür ve etkileşim adaletinin öğretmenlerin iş doyumu üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu bağlamda yöneticiye düşen görev, okuldaki işlemler ve öğretmenlerle kurulan ilişkiler açısından daha özenli davranmaktır. Öğretmenler arasında güvene dayalı ilişkilerin kurulması, dayanışma ve işbirliğinin arzu edilen düzeye ulaştırılması büyük ölçüde olumlu ve açık bir okul ikliminin oluşturulmasına bağlıdır. Bu anlamda okul yöneticisi olumlu bir okul iklimi yaratabilirse öğretmenlerin hem adalet algısını hem de iş doyumunu pozitif yönde etkileyecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Örgütsel Adalet, Dağıtımsal Adalet, Etkileşimsel Adalet, Prosedür Adaleti, İş Doyumu