The Predictors of Work-Related Stress: Organizational Justice and Fatalism

Özgür ÖNEN[1]

[1]*Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Faculty of Education, Burdur, Turkey* (iD) 0000-0002-3715-7488

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The purpose of the current study is to understand the relationship between organizational justice and the effect of the fatalism on work related stress. Although, organizational justice has been found to be a significant predictor of the work related stress in previous studies, fatalism which can be related with work related stress and organizational justice as well, has not been studied before together. In this correlational study, organizational justice, four dimensions of fatalism and job type were considered as predictors and work-related stress was the criterion variable. In total, 100 academics and 66 support staff have participated to this study. Multiple regression analysis with backward elimination was conducted. Results indicated that organizational justice, job type and luck were significant predictors of the work-related stress. While an increase on organizational justice perceptions lowers the work-related stress, luck and work-related stress seem increasing together. Additionally, academic personnel have higher stress levels than support staff. However, superstition, personal control, and predetermination dimensions of the fatalism were not found to be significantly associated with work related stress. Policy improvements were offered in line with the findings and recommendations for future studies were prescribed in discussion.

1. Introduction

The rate of change in every field in the twenty-first century, where people work more and spent longer hours to live a more comfortable and prosperous life than in previous, is also reflected in the change in individuals' expectations. As people's expectations increase, so does the expectations for them in business life. Some of these expectations were met but some of them not even people try harder. Individuals give some physiological and psychological reactions in challenging situations in which they cannot fully utilize their current potentials, cannot cope with the situations, and therefore their expectations are not met. These reactions are generally referred to as stress (Morey, Boggero, Scott, & Segerstrom, 2015).

Work related stress is one of the most important and rapidly growing factors affecting ones' health. According to "Stress in America: The State of Our Nation Report 2017" (APA, 2017) the increase on the percentage of Americans experiencing at least one symptom of stress (i.e. feeling nervous, anger, fatigue) in the past month reached to 75 which was 71 in 2016. Similarly, Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (2017) reports, that stress, depression or anxiety accounts for the 40 percent of the total work-related ill health cases in Britain. According to APA (2017), money and work are the top stressors among Americans, by considering the results of surveys being conducted more than a decade. There are numerous studies all over the world suggesting similar results too. For example, Leka, Griffiths and Cox (2003) indicates that work related stress can cause psychological (such as; depression, anxiety, illogical thinking and decision making and so on) and physical problems (such as; headache, muscle-skeleton disorders, high blood pressure and even in extreme cases heart attack). In fact,

---

work related stress affects people negatively in any way (Kotteeswari & Sharief, 2014). For that reason, increasing our insights on work stress can be beneficial for coping the negative effects of stress.

When work-related stressors examined, job reorganization (change) and job insecurity, workload, being subject to unacceptable behaviors, lack of supervisory support, work-family conflict, mobbing, discrimination, interpersonal relations arise as common stressors (Pan-European opinion poll on occupational safety and health report [EU-OSHA], 2013; HSE, 2017; International Labour Organization [ILO], 2016; Leka, Griffiths, & Cox, 2003). As some of these factors related with justice, it is not surprising that researcher has empirically exhibited the relationship between organizational justice perceptions of employees and work related stress (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Judge, & Colquitt, 2004; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007). However, there can be a factor which may be related with both justice perceptions of individuals and stress; fatalism which is not adequately examined enough in organizational behavior literature. Since, justice understanding of the individuals may be related with their fate understanding too (Elder, 1966). Jacobson (1999), for example, found that justice perception and fatalism are correlated with each other. Hunt (2004), also, argues that beliefs about wealth and poverty are generally examined by the view of individualist and structuralist point of views, but, fatalistic view is another source which in turn may affect the work related stress because of the relation between just distribution and work related stress. However, fatalism which is described as beliefs on non-personal forces for the things happens in the life (Wheaton, 1983), generally examined in theology (Kaya & Bozkur, 2015) and health behavior (Shen, Condit & Wright, 2009).

Fatalism can be described as "everything has been determined before, and one cannot change what will happen" (Kaya & Bozkur, 2015, p. 942). In literature, there is no consensus on the dimensionality of fatalism (Shen et al., 2009). As can be seen in Powe and Finnie's study (2003), scales measuring the fatalism generally regarded as only one dimensional. Shen et al. (2009), on the other hand, criticize that view and suggest a multi-dimensional solution which has predetermination, luck, and pessimism dimensions. Elder (1966), on the other hand, suggest theological and empirical fatalism dimensions for participants in India. Contrary, Hunt (1996), consider fatalism as one dimensional and also handles together with luck. In this study, as conducted in Turkish context where most of the people label themselves as Muslim, Kaya and Bozkur's (2015) study results are followed in which four dimensional factor solution is suggested, namely; predetermination, luck, personal control and superstitiousness. One of the interesting promises of their study is the addition of superstitiousness, which can be described as believing in protection power of some objects, being punished just after doing something by the power of undefined things cannot be explained by just luck or predetermination.

Hunt (2004; 1996) reports that, in American sample, people tend to believe that poverty and wealth are consequences of individual attributions which is followed by structuralist views, and least favorable of the beliefs are fatalistic views (God's will and Good Luck) however results also suggest that 25 percent of the participants think that fatalistic reasons (such as, luck) are important especially among disadvantaged groups. Ehsani and Hosseini (2015) also indicate that low income is significantly related with fatalism. Similarly, Aslantekin, Erdem, Aslan and Göktaş's study (2005) support that finding, and they add that fatalism level of the participants significantly differ according to educational level where higher levels of education indicate lower fatalism. Similarly, Beckert and Lutter (2013) report that spending money for lottery is significantly and positively predicted by low income and high fatalism which can be considered as a way of copping the poverty. Kaya and Bozkur (2015) even states that there are thoughts that fatalism used as a way to manage the low income people. For those reasons, poverty or wealth which can be considered as a consequence of distribution may also be related with organizational justice perception and in turn related with stress. By considering the previous studies, it can be said that less educated and disadvantaged or low income groups (Aslantekin et al., 2005; Beckert & Lutter, 2013; Ehsani &Hosseini, 2015; Hunt, 2004; 2002; 1996; Powe, Daniels, & Finnie, 2005; Straughan & Seow, 1998) may be more fatalistic. So employees who are paid lower, in this study the support staff, may show more work related stress due to being paid less, but at the same time, they may show higher levels of fatalism as well. However, fatalism can be a way for them to cope with this situation and may result a decrease in stress levels as well.

In health behavior studies, effect of fatalism is examined, especially, on cancer cases (e.g. De Los Monteros & Gallo, 2011; Miles, Voorwinden, Chapman, & Wardle, 2008; Powe et al., 2005; Powe & Finnie, 2003). In common, fatalism found to be a significant factor affecting the cancer screening behaviors in a negative way.

Fatalism also considered as a predictor of depression but can be thought as a way of coping strategy too (Aranda, Castaneda, Lee, & Sobel, 2001). Similarly, Egede and Bonadonna (2003), consider fatalism and other religious views as a coping strategy on diabetes cases. Park, Edmondson and Mills (2010), on the other hand, argue that stress and religiosity, which consist of the fatalism believes, have a recursive relation. So, it can be said that, lack of control on the things happening around us may cause stress, however blaming the external forces may also be a good tool for coping with the stress as a result of undesirable happenings. As in the case of undesirable consequences of unjust distribution happens to people, like in poverty situation, then, the people who have higher levels of fatalism should be living less stress. On the other hand, if fatalism is response to stressors, then mutual / reciprocal increase should be expected on both stress levels and fatalism scores.

While studying the relationship of fatalism and stress, it is also important to include justice perception to models, as they may be sharing some variance together. Studies regarding to justice on organizational level, suggest that satisfaction of the justice perceptions is very important to keep the employees together (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Employees evaluate the consequences of each decision taken in the organization and judge their fairness (Colquitt, 2001). However, these judgements are based on employees' subjective perceptions of fairness rather than the exact fairness (Cropanzano et al., 2007). So the employees' satisfaction about fairness is indeed how it's perceived by employees. In this context, justice and fairness are the concepts about the perceptions of the decisions and their consequences in organizational settings (Judge & Colquitt, 2004).

Organizational justice, although there are different views on its dimensionality, has three basic dimensions which are related with each other (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Neuman, 2004). Distributive justice, as one of the first defined dimension of the organizational justice is about the balance between the output of the employee and what is obtained as a result of it (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Procedural justice, on the other hand, is about the role definition of the employees while having decision (Cropanzano et al., 2007), that is about the perception on how fair is the process while the decision is taken and implemented (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Tyler, 1988; Gilliland, 1993) and is derived from the law terminology (Greenberg, 1987). The last important component of the organizational justice is interactional justice, which is about treating employees with respect and dignity (Bies, 2005; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) in other words it refers the quality of the interpersonal interaction in work settings (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002).

Organizational justice literature presents that justice perception of employees are related with some organizational and individual factors. For example, Efeoğlu and İplik (2011) have found that organizational justice perceptions of the employees are related with cynicism. Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009) found that distributive justice and procedural justice are significant predictors of organization commitment while distributive justice significantly predicts the job satisfaction. DeConinck and Stilwell (2004) also found significant relation between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Elovainio, Kivimäki, and Vahtera (2002) even indicated that organizational justice has an impact on the health conditions of the employees. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) also suggested that pay satisfaction and job satisfaction can be predicted by distributive justice whereas procedural justice is a significant predictor of organizational commitment and employees' evaluation of managers.

As stated before, organizational justice is, additionally, a significant predictor of work-related stress (Fox et al., 2001; Francis & Barling, 2005; Judge & Colquitt, 2004; Lambert et al., 2007). If an employee thinks that s/he is not treated justly, and the employee has not got the power to change the situation, then employee may start to show stress symptoms. In this study, as already supported by the literature, organizational justice is considered as a significant predictor of work-related stress along with fatalism.

It is very important for university personnel who have a critical role in the development of science-producing and future-generating individuals to work in a healthy environment. The purpose of the current study is to understand the relationship between work related stress, organizational justice, job type and the possible effect of the fatalism on university personnel. Since employees faces many stressors which occur from injustice behaviors of the supervisors or unequal distribution of resources, fatalism as it is also considered as a source of distribution in society by some people, may be related with work stress. Additionally, employees having diverse positions in an organization may be payed and treated differently, so job type is also considered to be

related with work related stress. In this context the research question of this study is "Do organizational justice perceptions and fatalism level of university personnel predict their work-related stress perceptions?"

2. Method

2.1. Design

In this study, correlational study design is followed (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). For testing the hypothesis multiple regressions analysis was conducted. In this study, p value of .05 and below was accepted as the significance level. Total score of three dimensions of organizational justice, four dimensions of fatalism and job type are threaded as predictors of the work-related stress.

2.2. Participants and data collection procedure

Participants are chosen from the academics and support staff from the university of the researchers, as it is difficult to reach other work settings and universities for this kind of study where there are questions which may be considered as sensitive, since their fatalistic understanding may also reveal their religious understandings. Before conducting the study, permissions were gathered from ethic committee of the university. In order to warrant anonymity, participants informed that any questions that may yield their identity can be omitted, additionally questionnaires are collected in manner that no one can distinguish one from another. As a result, some of the participants did not indicate their title, responsibility, faculty or department. For that reason, it was impossible to give detailed information about participants, and include some demographics into the model. In total, 100 academics and 66 support staff have participated in the study, where the 85 of the participants were male and 70 of them were female. When the ages of the participants who have filled that information vary between 20 to 56.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Organizational justice scale. In order to measure the organizational justice perceptions of the participants, organizational justice scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım (2007) is used. The scale has three dimensions, Distributional Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice. Cronbach alpha values of each dimension, in Turkish form, are .81, .89, and .95 respectively as reported by Yıldırım (2007).

2.3.2. Fatalism scale. In this study, for measuring the fatalistic understandings of the participants, Fatalism Tendency scale developed by Kaya and Bozkur (2015) is used. This scale has 24 items for measuring, four dimensions: predetermination, luck, personal control and superstitiousness. Internal validity test results of the scale can be considered satisfactory, as Cronbach alpha value for the whole scale estimated as .86, while .86 for predetermination, .71 for luck, .78 for personal control, and .78 for superstitiousness.

2.3.3. Job stress scale. For measuring the work-related stress, Job Stress Scale developed by House and Rizzo (1972) and adapted to Turkish by Efeoğlu (2006) is used. This scale is unidimensional and has seven items. Results regarding to internal validity show Cronbach alpha values between .71 and .89 in previous studies (e.g. Grandey & Cropanzano, 1998; Güler, 2013).

2.4. Limitations

One of the main limitations of this study was the impossibility of gathering detailed information from participants for anonymity reasons. Some little information, for example knowing one's age and department may easily reveal the participant's identity. For that reason, although participants asked to give information about these demographics, they were also informed that they can omit these questions. Many participants, in turn, did not respond these questions. So, it was impossible to compare the stress levels, or fatalism levels of participants on different levels of their academic career.

3. Findings

Before conducting regression analysis, a parametric statistical procedure, assumptions were checked. Results indicated nearly normal distribution for continuous variables, as controlled by skewness and kurtosis values and they were between -.565 and .625 values, additionally histogram graphs were on acceptable shape. As the control of z-scores of the variables indicated two outliers they have been removed from the data set, in total 164 participants' data were used in analysis. Additionally, residual plots were almost normally distributed

and there was no heteroscedasticity problem as the visual check of the P-P plots and scatter plots indicates. Multi-collinearity, another assumption of the regression analysis, was checked via Pearson correlations, VIF values and Tolerance values. Among organizational justice sub scales there were higher levels of correlation, between .49 and .79, detected. For that reason, total score gathered from the sub scales were used in this study. All other correlations after computing total scores for organizational justice, were below .41 (Table 1). Additionally, all the VIF values were below two on the last regression model and tolerance values were above .10. Auto correlation on the other hand controlled by Durbin Watson value and found to be around acceptable range (DW= 1.98). By considering all, regression analysis was conducted.

Table 1. *Correlations Among Dependent and Independents Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	sd	Cronbach Alpha
1 Work related stress	-						16.60	5.84	.88
2 Justice	-.403**	-					3.34	15.34	.95
3 Luck	.222**	-.116	-				10.62	2.81	.63
4 Superstition	.046	.063	.410**	-			12.37	4.33	.76
5 Personal control	.003	.007	-.062	-.238**	-		22.61	3.59	.69
6 Predetermination	.072	.077	.223**	.338**	-.128	-	24.91	7.38	.68

*** Correlation is significant at the .01 level*

In this study regression analysis preferred, by backward elimination method, where all the variables are included at the first run and deletion of the most insignificant predictors in each run. Results revealed four models (Table 2). First model in which all the variables entered, explains 24 percent of the variance on work related stress significantly [F(6,163)=8.31, p<.05]. As personal control found least significant variable in the model, it is removed. In the second model in which 24 percent of the variance on work related stress can be explained significantly [F (5, 163) =10.03, p<.05]. In the second model, superstition was the least significant variable has a p value greater than .05 and removed from the analysis. In the third model, again, 24 percent of the variance significantly explained by justice, luck, predetermination, job-type [F (4, 163) =12.60, p<.05]. However, predetermination dimension has a p value greater than .05, and removed from the analysis as well. On the last run, all the variables entered to model, organizational justice, luck and job-type explained the almost 23 percent of the variance on work related stress significantly [F (3, 163) =15.78, p<.05]. When the standardized β values were checked on the final model, organizational justice (β = -.384, t=-5.488, p<0.001), luck (β =.200, t=2.842, p<0.05) and job-type (β = .187, t=2.679, p<0.05) were found to be significant predictors of the work related stress.

Table 2. *Multiple Regression Analysis Results*

	Model	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F	F Change
1	Justice, luck, superstition, personal control, predetermination, job-type	.491	.241	.241	8.310**	8.310
2	Justice, luck, superstition, predetermination, job-type	.491	.241	.000	10.034**	.007
3	Justice, luck, predetermination, job-type	.491	.241	.000	12.601**	.062
4	Justice, luck, job-type	.478	.228	-.012	15.777**	2.602

Note: Backward elimination method was used

4. Results and Discussion

Findings of the current study suggest that organizational justice perceptions of the participants is a significant negative predictor of work related stress, which means increase on the justice perceptions of the participants lower the work related stress levels of the university personnel. This finding is similar with the previous studies (e.g. Fox et al., 2001; Francis & Barling, 2005; Judge & Colquitt, 2004; Lambert et al., 2007).

In this study, among the fatalism dimensions, only luck is found to be a significant predictor of the work-related stress. Indicating that increase in the luck belief associated with the increase on work related stress. This may be due to the fact that, participants who experiences more work-related stress may try to explain undesired outcomes in work settings by luck. This may help them cope with the stress faced in work settings, as Kuşat (2000) and Foster and Kokko (2009) suggest. Similarly, West, Griffin and Gardner (2007) suggest that luck and similar beliefs increase when there is ambiguity and help people to find causal explanations for the

outcomes. This finding can, also, be considered as a support for the Hunt's (2004) study in which participants, coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, consider unjust distribution occurs from fatalistic forces. Academic personnel found to be experiencing higher levels of stress in this study too. This may be due to higher amount of workload in Turkish university settings (Sarvan & Karakaş, 2001). Additionally, promotion expectations of the academic personnel may lead higher levels of stress as well, especially for assistant professors (Göksel & Tomruk, 2016). However, support staff, in general, do not rush for promotion, since they have limited opportunity to get promotion in organizational structure of the universities in Turkey, at the same time finding a fatalistic explanation may be reducing their stress level too. Additionally, academics are also responsible from teaching in universities, which is generally thought as one of the most stressful occupation (Johnson et al., 2005).

Surprisingly, procedural and interactional justice were not found as significant predictors of work-related stress. This may be due to facts that, as a bureaucratic public university where most of the personnel and managers are well educated, stuffs behave each other kindly and procedures are executed in similar manner for all. Moreover, superstition, personal control and predetermination dimensions were not found significant predictors of work-related stress.

By considering all, it can be recommended that there is a need for some improvements on role definitions, salaries, promotions, and work conditions of academics in Turkey. As some of the academics work without job security, and promotion conditions are considered very strict. While some academics who have finished their doctorate, studies work as research assistants, some of them have assistant professor degree, which differs their earnings and rights significantly. However, work conditions and academic culture vary among universities dramatically. Additionally, regional cultures also differ from one province to another. For that reason, similar studies can be conducted before setting an understanding on the possible effect of fatalism. It should be noted that, this study has been conducted in university setting where most of the participants have higher levels of education. Academics, some of the participants of this study, conduct scientific research. In other organizations, where employees are not familiar with scientific methods, other dimensions of the fatalism may also be related with job stress. Conducting similar studies in different work settings is recommended for understanding possible effect of fatalism on organizational issues.

5. References

APA, (2017). Stress in America: The State of Our Nation. American Psychological Association Report. https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/ stress/2017/ state-nation.pdf

Aranda, M. P., Castaneda, I., Lee, P. J., & Sobel, E. (2001). Stress, social support, and coping as predictors of depressive symptoms: Gender differences among Mexican Americans. *Social Work Research, 25*(1), 37-48. https://doi.org/10.1300/J191v01n03_04

Aslantekin, F., Erdem, R., Aslan, G., & Göktaş, B. (2005). Hastane çalışanlarının toplumsal kültürel özellikleri. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi, 8*(2), 149-164. http://dergipark.gov.tr/hacettepesid/issue/7557/99341

Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International journal of Business and Management, 4*(9), 145. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Arti_Bakhshi2/publication/41891478_Organizational_Justice_Perceptions_as_Predictor_of_Job_Satisfaction_and_Organizational_Commitment/links/575c599108aed884621339d2.pdf

Beckert, J., & Lutter, M. (2013). Why the poor play the lottery: Sociological approaches to explaining class-based lottery play. *Sociology, 47*(6), 1152-1170. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0038038512457854

Bies, R. J. (2005). Are Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice Conceptually Distinct? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 85-112). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(3), 324-351. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1059601102027003002

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(4), 34-48. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.27895338

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400. https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2001-06715-002

DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research, 57*(3), 225-231. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00289-8

De Los Monteros, K. E., & Gallo, L. C. (2011). The relevance of fatalism in the study of Latinas' cancer screening behavior: A systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 18*(4), 310-318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-010-9119-4

Egede, L. E., & Bonadonna, R. J. (2003). Diabetes self-management in African Americans: an exploration of the role of fatalism. *The Diabetes Educator, 29*(1), 105-115. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F014572170302900115

Efeoğlu, İ. E., & İplik, E. (2011). Algılanan örgütsel adaletin örgütsel sinizm üzerindeki etkilerini belirlemeye yönelik ilaç sektöründe bir uygulama. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 20*(3), 343-360. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/50721

Efeoğlu, İ. F., (2006). *İş-aile yaşam catışmasının iş stresi, iş doyumu ve örgütselbağlılık üzerindeki etkileri: İlaç sektöründe bir araştrma* [Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi]. Çukurova Üniversitesi.

Ehsani, K., & Hosseini, S. M. N. (2015). Investigating the relationship of economic, social and cultural capitals with fatalism in Isfahan. *Journal of Sociological Research, 6*(2), 68-83. Doi:10.5296/ jsr.v6i2.8145

Elder, J. W. (1966). Fatalism in India: A comparison between Hindus and Muslims. *Anthropological Quarterly, 39*(3), 227-243. https://doi.org/10.2307/3316807

Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. American *Journal of Public Health, 92*(1), 105-108. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.92.1.105

EU-OSHA (2013). *European opinion poll on occupational safety and health. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://osha.europa.eu/en/surveys-and-statistics-osh/european-opinion-polls-safety-and-health-work/european-opinion-poll-occupational-safety-and-health-2013

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management journal, 32*(1), 115-130. https://doi.org/10.5465/256422

Foster, K., R. & Kokko, H. (2009). The evolution of superstitious and superstition-like behavior. *Proc. R. Soc. B., 276*, 31-37. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0981

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Organizational injustice and psychological strain. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement, 37*(4), 250. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0087260

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*(3), 291-309. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 694-734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.9402210155

Göksel, A. & Tomruk, Z. (2016). Akademisyenlerde stress kaynakları ile stresle başa çıkmada ve stress durumunda gösterilen davranışların ilişkisi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 315-343. http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=b02dc7ab-7db5-4675-bc16-8f7af546e9d5%40sdc-v-sessmgr01

Grandey, A.A. ve Cropanzano, R. (1998), The conversation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 350–370. http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/a/a/aag6/Grandey&CropanzanoJVB.pdf

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

Güler, A. (2013). *Örgütsel stres ve sağlık çalışanlarında örgütsel stresle başa çıkma yolları* [Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Beykent Üniversitesi.

Health & Safety Executive (report). (2017). http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/

Hunt, M. O. (2004). Race/ethnicity and beliefs about wealth and poverty. *Social Science Quarterly, 85*(3), 827-853. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.00247.x

Hunt, M. O. (2002). Religion, race/ethnicity, and beliefs about poverty. *Social Science Quarterly, 83*(3), 810-831. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6237.00116

Hunt, M. O. (1996). The individual, society, or both? A comparison of Black, Latino, and White beliefs about the causes of poverty. *Social Forces, 75*(1), 293-322. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/75.1.293

ILO, (2016). *Workplace stress: A collective challenge.* Turin: International Training Centre of the ILO. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_466547.pdf

Jacobson, C. K. (1999). Denominational and racial and ethnic differences in fatalism. *Review of Religious Research*, 9-20. https://doi.org/10.2307/3512424

Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., Donald, I., Taylor, P., & Millet, C. (2005). The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(2), 178-187. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510579803

Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: the mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 395. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.395

Kaya, A. & Bozkur, B. (2015). Kadercilik eğilimi ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*(3). DOI: 10.17860/efd.55137

Kaya, A. & Bozkur, B. (2017). Kadercilik eğilimi ile öz-yeterlik inancı ve savunma mekanizmaları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 18*(1), 124-145. https://app.trdizin.gov.tr/publication/paper/detail/TWpNeE5ESXlNZz09

Kuşat, A. (2000). Psikolojik bir olgu olarak kendini aldatma ve dini inançla ilişkisi. *Dini Araştırmalar, 3*(8), 97-116. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/51643

Kotteeswari, M., & Sharief, S. T. (2014). Job stress and its impact on employee's performance a study with reference to employees working in Bpos. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review, 2*(4), 18-25. https://www.academia.edu/download/53437142/3.pdf

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*(6), 644-656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.09.001

Leka, S., Griffiths, A., & Cox, T. (2004). *Work organization and stress*. World Health Organization

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 626-637. https://doi.org/10.5465/256489

Miles, A., Voorwinden, S., Chapman, S., & Wardle, J. (2008). Psychologic predictors of cancer information avoidance among older adults: the role of cancer fear and fatalism. *Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 17*(8), 1872-1879. DOI: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-08-0074

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(3), 351-357. https://doi.org/10.5465/256913

Morey, J. N., Boggero, I. A., Scott, A. B., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2015). Current directions in stress and human immune function. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 5,* 13-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.03.007

Neuman, J. H. (2004). Injustice, stress, and aggression in organizations. In Griffin, R. W. and O'Leary Kelly, A. M. (Eds), *The dark side of organizational behavior*. Jossey-Bass.

Park, C. L., Edmondson, D., & Mills, M. A. (2010). Religious worldviews and stressful encounters: Reciprocal influence from a meaning-making perspective. In *Handbook of stressful transitions across the lifespan* (pp. 485-501). Springer.

Powe, B. D., Daniels, E. C., & Finnie, R. (2005). Comparing perceptions of cancer fatalism among African American patients and their providers. *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, 17*(8), 318-324. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7599.2005.0049.x

Powe, B. D., & Finnie, R. (2003). Cancer fatalism: The state of the science. *Cancer Nursing, 26*(6), 454-467. https://journals.lww.com/cancernursingonline/fulltext/2003/12000/cancer_fatalism__the_state_of_the_science.5.aspx?casa_token=WgJ1XNFlcDsAAAAA:icIfgoVsdaNiLypWXMwa8INXJdLGMnLq7y-oCkYEgBWP2MdsAO9ILdOj7I0LOBiuA7MMGOBGtFV3aYw

Sarvan, F. & Karakaş, K. (2001). An approach to the emotional as-pects of professional growth in academic organizations, *Akdeniz İİBF Dergisi, 1*(1). http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=4a15d828-b380-4ce0-852f-8325828ef8b7%40sessionmgr4006

Shen, L., Condit, C. M., & Wright, L. (2009). The psychometric property and validation of a fatalism scale. *Psychology and Health, 24*(5), 597-613. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440801902535

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.434

Straughan, P. T., & Seow, A. (1998). Fatalism reconceptualized: A concept to predict health screening behavior. *Journal of Gender, Culture and Health, 3*(2), 85-100. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023278230797

Tyler, T. R. (1988). What is procedural justice? Criteria used by citizens to assess the fairness of legal procedures. *Law and Society Review, 22*(1), 103-135. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/lwsocrw22&div=9&id=&page=

Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş doyumu ile örgütsel adalet ilişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 62*(01), 253-278. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fatma_Yildirim3/publication/27568690_IS_DOYUMU_ILE_ORGUTSEL_ADALET_ILISKISI/links/544e28130cf2bca5ce8eef74.pdf

West, S. A., Griffin, A. S., & Gardner, A. (2007). Social semantics: Altruism, cooperation, mutualism, strong reciprocity and group selection. *J. Evol. Biol. 20,* 415–432. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01258.x

Wheaton, B. (1983). Stress, personal coping resources, and psychiatric symptoms: An investigation of interactive models. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(3), 208-229. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136572