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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.
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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.
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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 (Balci, 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 (Umpfress, 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 (McCullough, 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, & Zellner, 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). Interational 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 underline 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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Procedural Justice</td>
<td>24.7393</td>
<td>4.92459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interactional Justice</td>
<td>28.2646</td>
<td>5.77013</td>
<td>.710&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distributive Justice</td>
<td>24.9163</td>
<td>4.45847</td>
<td>.772&quot;</td>
<td>.744&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relations with Colleagues</td>
<td>22.4650</td>
<td>5.20194</td>
<td>.364&quot;</td>
<td>.390&quot;</td>
<td>.341&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relations with Principal</td>
<td>26.6459</td>
<td>6.01615</td>
<td>.749&quot;</td>
<td>.765&quot;</td>
<td>.702&quot;</td>
<td>.506&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>73.2004</td>
<td>12.50453</td>
<td>.635&quot;</td>
<td>.642&quot;</td>
<td>.588&quot;</td>
<td>.789&quot;</td>
<td>.845&quot;</td>
<td>.691&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Şekerioğlu & 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Relations with Colleagues</th>
<th>Relations with Principal</th>
<th>Job Itself</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01.

Interational, 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 ($\beta=.31$, $p<0.05$) 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 ($\beta=.48$, $p<0.01$) and procedural justice ($\beta=.28$, $p<0.05$) 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 ($\beta=.49$, $p<0.01$) 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 ($\beta=.34$, $p<0.05$) and procedural justice ($\beta=.29$, $p<0.05$) 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; İçcan & 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 (Özgân and Bozyaydın, 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.
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**Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumlarının Yordayıcısı Olarak Örgütsel Adalet Algısı**

**Atif:**


**(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


Bulgular

Yapılan korelasyon analizi sonucunda örgütsel adalet türleriyile iş doyum boylarını arasında anlamlı ve pozitif yönde bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir. Örgütsel adalet türlerinin toplam iş doyumu boyutu üzerindeki göreli önem oranını; etkileşim, prosedür ve değiştirme adaleti olduğu görülmektedir. Regresyon katsaylarının anlamlığına ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelemiştir ise hem etkileşim adaletinin hem de prosedür adaletinin toplam iş doyumu boyutu üzerinde önemli yöndecileri olduğu görülmektedir. Dağıtım adaletinin ise bu anlamda önemli bir etkiye sahip olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Bu çalışma sonuçları, yöneticiyile ilişkiler ve toplam iş doyumuunun diğer boyutlara (meslektâşlarla ilişkiler ve işin kendisi) göre her üç örgütsel adalet türüyle daha yüksek bir ilişki içinde olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. En düşük ilişki nin ise işin kendisinden elde edilen doyum ile örgütsel adalet türleri arasında olduğu saptanmıştır.
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