

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN UNIVERSITIES- A COMPARISON IN TURKEY¹

Dr. Gökhan KOCA²

Nursel KARADAĞ YILMAZ³

ABSTRACT

As the world becomes more and more globalized, rapid changes in technology and evolving structure of today's workforce have forced organizations to create more practical solutions to the issue of low productivity (Wright and Lund, 2001:10). When focusing on the overall performance picture of any organization, it is seen that work motivation and organizational justice practices arise as one of the most serious issues in the current business environment. That's why today's competitive organizations have urged their managerial-level experts to find out more effective motivation tools and organizational justice practices to increase their productivity level and meet the evolving needs of their workforce (Allen and White, 2002:18).

Finding factors that affect organizational justice is generally considered as a essential stage to reaching success in organizations and mainly in universities. This study purposes to find and compare factors affecting the organizational justice level of faculty members who are hired by Aksaray University (a new university in Turkey) and Çukurova University (an older University in Turkey). This is the first study comparing two Turkish universities in terms of their faculty members' organizational justice levels. A survey was performed on 179 people from Aksaray University and 189 people from Çukurova University in the month's March and April 2013. In both universities, varied organizational justice forms diversing according to age, sex, position, marital status, work length and hometown have been disclosed. According to results there is a significant differences between sex and procedural justice in both universities; age and procedural justice in Aksaray University and age and interactional justice in Cukurova University; Marital status and procedural/interactional justice in Aksaray University, marital status and distributive/interactional justice in Cukurova University; Working years and distributive/procedural justice in Aksaray University, working years and distributive/interactional justice in Cukurova University. Further studies can handle commitment profiles or with the relationship between the attitudes and behaviors of the teaching staff.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Aksaray University, Cukurova University

Jel Codes: D23, Z10, Z18

INTRODUCTION

¹ This paper was presented in 8th International EMI Entrepreneurship&Social Science Congress

²Dr. Gökhan KOCA, gkoca68@hotmail.com, (ORCID: 0000-0003-2643-4053)

³Nursel KARADAĞ YILMAZ, nkyilmaz2@gmail.com

As the world becomes more and more globalized, rapid changes in technology and evolving structure of today's workforce have forced organizations to create more practical solutions to the issue of low productivity (Wright and Lund, 2001:10). Additionally, as an inevitable result of some contemporary phenomena such as workforce diversity, postmodernist administration style, and feminism, today's workforce environment has been forced to focus on the urgency of understanding the motivation and productivity perspectives (Wright, 2004:36).

When focusing on the overall performance picture of any organization, it is seen that work motivation and organizational justice practices arise as one of the most serious issues of the current business environment. That's why today's competitive organizations have urged their managerial-level experts to find out more effective motivation tools and organizational justice practices to increase their productivity level and meet the evolving needs of their workforce (Allen and White, 2002:52). Scholars believe that the more employers manage to motivate their employees, the more organizations achieve their defined goals (Ambrose and Kulik, 1999:18).

For years and years, by reviewing the root of organizational development, scholars have tried to diagnose the ingredients of organizational justice and workforce motivation. Since the beginning of the 1980s, numerous motivational theories have been formulated to understand the type of human behavior and bridge the gap between an individual's desire and organizational preferences (Wright, 2004:38). Rainey and Steinbauer (1999:12) claim that the overall achievement of any organization depends on its managerial skill and capability to motivate employees. According to Rainey and Steinbauer (1999:13), in order to hold a better perspective on motivation, it is essential to advance the efficiency and effectiveness of organizational activities.

The purpose of the study

Does money lonely draw a satisfactory desirability to please workers' entire wants? There's no hesitation that cash may attraction workers' courtesy up to the front door, nevertheless, owners' requirement to produce some other motivations to inspire their workers to do their best contributions (Wright, 2004:8). It is well known that University faculty members frequently change their universities and institutes, transferring the intellectual assets of that institute consequently. Therefore, universities may have difficulty operating effectively if they are weak in maintaining the organizational justice of their teaching staff. Logically, determining factors that affect organizational justice of them should be recognized as a fundamental step toward building an effectual University. In view of this rationale, this paper aims to find and compare the issues affecting the organizational justice of faculty members at Aksaray University (new university) and Çukurova University (old University). Though, there are many studies on the subject of organizational justice; this study is expected to be the first comparing two universities in terms of faculties' organizational justice levels. Additionally, this study is to become the

first investigation conducted in these universities on such a theme. Thus, this study is distinctive and opportune for preparing and determining the appropriate local policies. These policies can be spotted by analyzing the reasons underlying faculties' preference to work in old or new universities.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The definition and content of motivation are varied among scholars. Shafritz and Russell (2003) define motivation as a combination of all of the factors in one's working environment that can enhance productivity level. Similarly, Buhler (2003:11) reflects motivation as some quantity of energy that a worker participates in a given mission. Additionally, Kreitner (1998:7) also made a definition of motivation as a psychological exercise of providing drive and way for social conduct. According to Greenberg and Baron (2003), motivation is the continuing process that arouses, directs, and keep up workers' perception to achieve defined goals. In the same vein, Pinder (1998:6) describes motivation as a set of interior and exterior forces that pledge work-related behavior, and control its form, way, concentration, and period.

In general, motivational theories are classified by dividing into two core classes. These are content (acognitive) theories and process (cognitive) theories of motivation. Whereas content theories of motivation consider motivation as a consequence of an individual's internal attributes (intrinsic motivation), process theories focus on motivation as an integration of external and internal forces (extrinsic motivation) (Wooldridge, 2006:2).

Content theories of motivation explain the encouraging factors that steer human behavior. It focuses on intrinsic motivation in order to understand what kind of forces enables the organization to reshape and motivate its workforce (Nigro and Nigro, 2000:14). They also help managers to create a healthier way of understanding employees' needs and show a way of motivating employees' behaviors (Buhler, 2003). These content theories of motivation are *Classic Organizational Theory (Scientific Management)*, *Human Relations Approach*, *Organizational Humanism Theory (Needs Theories)*, and *Contingency Theory of Motivation*.

The second approach is the cognitive processes used in determining motivation (Wooldridge, 2006:2). Process theories of motivation attempt to find out the right methods of directing motivation to create the highest level of efficiency in the organization. According to Netz and Shulamith (2004:5), an individual's motivation process can be evaluated with three basic assumptions that are self-efficacy, result opportunities, and self-evaluated fulfilment (dissatisfaction). These development theories of motivation (*Equity Theory*, *Goal Setting Theory*, and *Expectancy/Valency Theory*) help employers to diagnose the best way of exerting efforts in order to reach the ultimate goals for the organizations.

Workforce motivation largely bases on organizational justice assumptions that try to explain how employee motivation and performance can be influenced by organizational justice practices. **Organizational justice** mentions to procedures that are used to assign results between workers to explain that apparent undesirable injustice that makes them mad and an encouraging injustice leads them sense of responsibility (Greenberg and Baron, 2003:11). In general, organizational justice theories advise that commons' insight of equality within the organization concerning how and what choices are made around the delivery of results affects motivation. These theories are significant for organizations that have been forced to lay off people. The results of fairness insights can have an financial effect on organizations, and they can affect job attitudes such as satisfaction and turnover intention (Koh & Boo, 2004:13). Organizational Justice Theory attentions on insights of equality in organizations, by classifying workers' opinions and feelings about their action and others with organizations. There are three types of organizational justice approaches called distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Greenberg & Baron, 2003:10).

2. DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE: EQUITY THEORY

Staffs need to identify the present delivery of their organization's properties by questioning several queries to managers connected to internal equity and justice practices (Culyer, 2001:12). In different point of view, staffs need to guarantee the presence of organizational justice which mentions to workers' insight of justice in terms of the delivery of results, measures to regulate them, and personal relations (Greenberg and Baron, 2003:15).

Although there is no single perfect definition, it is widely agreed that equity implies equality (Culyer, 2001:13). According to Huseman and Hatfield (1990:8), equity is a subjective comparison process in which employees match up their pay rates to the pay rates of other employees. This comparison process leads each employee to create his/her own perceptions of equity.

Distributive justice states to approaches that are used to assign results between staffs by presumptuous that apparent undesirable injustice makes staffs feel annoyed and a optimistic injustice crops a sense of fault (Greenberg and Baron, 2003:9). Equity occurs when employees observe that the proportion of inputs to outputs is the same for them as it is for others whom they compare themselves. On the other hand, inequity occurs when employees observe that the proportion of inputs to outputs is unlike for them than it is for others whom they comparison themselves. Williams (1999:9) highlights that these two moods produce dissimilar results. On one hand, the sensation of annoyance inspires staffs to be less fruitful and less pleased under underpayment circumstances. On the other hand, the stress consequential from the fault will inspire staffs to be more creative, but still less pleased under overpayment circumstances.

Since distributive justice focuses on outcome fairness, J. Stacy Adam's equity theory has been generally used as the source for distributive justice (Robbins, Summers, and Miller, 2000:11). The term equity theory of motivation was first presented by J. S. Adams in 1963. Adams's Equity theory is based on perceived fairness. Its basic idea emphasizes the employees' desire for comparisons with others to reach an agreement on what is fair and reasonable in an exchange (Allen and White, 2002:18). Equity theory suggests that apparent injustice is a motivational power. When an employee accepts that she or he has been unevenly preserved in assessment to others, she or he will try to eliminate the inequity. Individuals are supposed to assess justice by a proportion of inputs to outputs (Ramlal, 2004:11). Inputs to a job contain work experience, education, exertion, and capability. Results from a job contain pay, gratitude, promotions, superiority, and paybacks (Wooldridge, 2006:4).

According to distributive justice, staffs are inspired to decrease apparent injustice. They may try to decrease injustice in different ways. An employee may alteration his or her level of input; he or she who feels underpayment is probably to work less hard. Another thing is to change the behavior, possibly by inspiring that person to put forth more exertion. An employee who feels inequity may comparison him or herself to a dissimilar individual to evaluate justice. For organizations and managers, distributive justice highlights the position of a prize system that is apparent as fair by staffs. In addition to the above-mentioned reactions, the employee can withdraw from the situation completely. He or she can quit the job and look for employment elsewhere (Greenberg and Baron, 2003:5).

2.1. Procedural Justice

Insights of justice in organizations are not only fanatical by results as it happens in distributive justice. They are also affected by the justice of the procedure that is used to spread results. Procedural justice is worried with making and applying choices rendering to reasonable procedures. Procedural justice claims that people who feel fairly treated are more eager to admit decisions even if these decisions are undesirable (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003:7).

Greenberg and Baron (2003:7) describe **procedural justice** as workers' sympathetic of the routine procedure which is used to select results. The procedural justice method receives that having the chance to operate the choice process can affect insights of justice (Williams, 1999). Employees show a high concern about organizational justice. On one hand, they imagine the equal delivery of the results they obtain; on the other hand, they want fairness in the decision-making processes practical to control the way of assigning plunders (Williams, 1999:12).

Studies suggest that people have complex models of procedural justice. There is an emphasis on the consistency of rules and policies. Reasonable procedures should assurance that cases are preserved similar. Also, procedures must be independent and unbiased. In other words, decisions should be made an unbiased manner. Balanced decision-makers must perform the actions to reach a reasonable and exact

assumption. If people believe the third party, they are more probable to opinion the decision-making process as reasonable. In addition to that, staffs who are straight pretentious by the choices should have a “voice” and picture in the decision-making procedure. Having picture confirms the position of group members and takes trust to the decision-making scheme. Finally, decisions should not be secret and deceptive and there should be appealed opportunities for incorrect decisions.

2.2. Interactional Justice

The most recent measurement of organizational justice is interactional justice. Along with the conventional result and the application process, relational action is also among the significant mechanisms of organizational justice. The **interactional justice** viewpoint studies the way of procedural justice’s method toward the responses of staffs to each other’s. It helps to progress insights of reasonable action and stretches a great deal of care to the fineness of the relational acts of staffs with others (Williams, 1999:6).

Saunders and Thornhill (2003:5) state that, since it has been evaluated as making the same kind of perceptual results as procedural justice, Greenberg approaches interactional justice as a side of procedural justice rather than as a distinct factor of organizational justice. Chan (2000:9) also supports this idea and mentions that interactional justice was primary presented as an independent justice variable, and it is currently considered to be a procedural justice component with questions raised by some researchers. According to Chan (2000:9) regardless of how interactional justice is viewed either as an independent or as part of procedural justice, it consists of two components called interpersonal sensitivity and explanations or social accounts. Greenberg and Baron (2003) name these two items “informational justification” and “social sensitivity.” Information justification refers to “the care of information received about a choice” while communal compassion mentions to “ the quantity of self-respect and admiration established in the course of presenting an unwanted result, such as a pay cut or the loss of a job” (p.205). In interactional justice, the most important thing is interpersonal communication. It considers whether people feel they were told the truth and treated respectfully. An employee may not like or support an idea, but if it is presented fairly, they are more likely to accept it.

2.3. Relevant Previous Studies On Organizational Justice

Ohbuckhi, Sugawara, Teshigara and Imazai (2005:8) conducted an interview survey with Japanese plaintiffs of civil court-martials and examined the relationship between their perception of results and procedure of trials, answers to trials, and assessment of the judicial system. They found that the favorability of trial results and bureaucratic fairness of trials enhanced gratification with the trial results and assessment of the judicial system. According to the survey findings, satisfaction was mostly strongminded by apparent favorability, while the assessment of the judicial system was strongminded by hypothetical procedural justice. The study designated constancy with procedural justice theories.

Because, the perception of procedural justice was augmented by the sense of control and assessment of relative factors, despite each being pretentious by favorability.

In a study, Robbins, Summers, and Miller (2000:11) tried to find the relationships between distributive and procedural justice, justice factor and organizational commitment, and justice mechanisms and interactive purposes. The findings showed that procedural justice decisions probably affect insights of distributive justice. In addition to that, distributive justice and procedural justice have relationships with obligation and income drives. The study suggests managers, worried with perceptions of justice on the job, should focus not only on objective predictors of such perceptions but also on formerly held attitudes and intentions. More importantly, this study indicates that people are more probably to act against injustice if they believe this type of injustice is probably to go on in the future.

Erdogan, Kraimer, and, Liden`s (2001:11) performance evaluation study conducted in Turkey showed that the validity of performance standards, knowledge of performance standards, and organizational level of employees were connected to procedural justice, whereas perceived performance and reasonable hearing were each definitely connected to later procedural justice. Another result was that people made basis ascriptions when making judgments about procedural justice. According to the researchers, these attributions may deliver the relation between worker perceptions of justice and their future behaviors.

The study conducted by Staley, Dastoor, Magner and Stolp (2003:9) examined the influence of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice in Federal budget decision-making to Federal managers' obligation to the Federal government as an paying organization. The study reinforced only chief effect relationships among procedural justice and interactional justice and the manager's organizational commitment. There was no provision for a chief result relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment. The authors feel that the findings of the study advise that Federal managers can be inspired mainly by psychological results of budget choices. They also think that the absence of interface between interactional justice and distributive justice may be equally based. Federal managers may attention on social connections because the attendance of some social connections meets social standards, and this may lead to confident psychological results like self-esteem and self-identity.

The study conducted on foreign workers and local employees indicated the rank of concentrating on the labor position and service relationships of foreign labors. Outcomes indicated that even after regulatory for cultural and demographic changes, foreign workers had lower insights of distributive justice than local staffs and managers regarded the presentation and organizational citizenship behavior of foreign labors lower than those of local staffs (Ang, Dyne, and Begley, 2003:13).

McFarlin and Sweeney (1992:15) measured procedural justice and distributive justice. In addition, they evaluated insights of two personal results including pay and job fulfilment, and two

organizational results including organizational commitment and junior's assessment of manager. According to their findings, distributive and procedural justice were significant forecasters of work results. They also discovered that distributive justice was a sturdier forecaster of personal consequences than procedural consequences, but for organizational results, the result was the opposite. According to these results, the authors feel that if they see actions as reasonable, staffs may assessment the organization positively, even if they are disgruntled with such personal results as low pay increase. Another finding was that distributive and procedural justice had an communicating effect on organizational results, juniors' assessment of manager and organizational commitment.

Williams, Pitre, and Zainuba (2002:16) examined whether the insight of interactional justice would affect organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) intention. The result indicated that there was a relationship with each other. Although distributive and interactional justice was related to OCB, only the perceptions of interactional justice prejudiced an worker's meaning to perform citizenship behaviors.

2.4. Demographic Factors

Iskan and Sayin (2010:8) conducted a survey for their study. 190 workers from EAE company joined their survey. According to results, they found statistically differences between sex and organizational justice. Females have higher procedural justice scores than males. Sanlimeshur (2015:3) conducted a survey for their study. 85 people who work for government agencies joined her survey. According to results, she found statistically significant differences between sex and organizational justice. Females have higher procedural justice scores than males. Jepson and Rodwell (2012:4) research females and organizational justice. According to their findings, there are statistically significant differences between distributive/procedural justice and sex. Ramamoorthy and Flood (2004:3) studied about sex and organizational justice. To their findings, there is a statistically significant difference between interaction justice and sex. According to findings, distributive and procedural justice affects females in the organization. Basar (2011:3) conducted a survey for his study 487 elementary school teachers in Ankara joined his survey. According to his results, he couldn't find any differences between organizational commitment and sex.

Aizzad Mohd (2011:4) conducted a survey for his study about organizational justice. 136 people who work in the telecommunication industry in Malaysia joined the survey. According to results, he found statistical differences between age and procedural justice. Dundar and Tabancali (2012:2) conducted a survey for their study. 314 primary school teachers joined their survey. As result, they found statistical differences between age and interaction justice. According to Sanlimeshur's study(2015:15), there are no statistically differences between age and organizational justice.

Imazai and Ohbuchi (2002:3) research solutions to conflict and procedural justice. Their findings showed that, there are statistically significant among between procedural/interactional justice and status.

Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002:5) research organizational justice and work outcomes. To their findings, there are statistically significant differences between distributive/interactional justice and status.

Ohbuckhi et.al. (2005:3) conducted an interview survey with Japanese plaintiffs of civil trials and inspected the relationship between their perception of results and procedure of trials, answers to trials, and assessment of the judicial system. They found that there are statistically differences between procedural/interactional justice and marital status. The study conducted by Staley et.al. (2003:2) examined the influence of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice in Federal budget decision-making to Federal directors' obligation to the Federal government as an employing organization. To their findings, there are statistically differences between distributive/interactional justice and marital status. According to Iscan and Sayın's (2010:11) study, there are no differences between marital status and Organizational Justice. Also in Dundar and Tabancali's (2012:13) study, there are also no differences between marital status and organizational justice.

McFarlin and Sweeney (1992:13) measured procedural justice and distributive justice. In addition, they evaluated perceptions of two individual results including pay and job fulfilment, and two organizational results including organizational commitment and junior's assessment of supervisor. They found that there was a statistically significant difference between distributive/procedural justice and working years. Williams et.al. (2002:14) examined whether the perception of interactional justice would affect organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) intention. The result showed that there were statically significant differences between distributive/interactional justice and working years. Ang et.al. (2003) run a study on foreign workers and local employees indicating the importance of concentrating on the labor position and employment relationships of foreign workers. According to their findings, there were statistically differences between distributive/interactional justice and working years. Roch and Shanock (2006:13) conducted a survey for their study about organizational justice. 401 part-time and 272 full-time staffs joined the survey. According to the results, they found statistically differences among distributive/interactional justice and working years. Elevanto, van den Bos, Linna, Kivimaki, Ala-Mursula, Pentti and Vahtera (2005:14) conducted survey for their study about organizational justice. 7083 males and 24,317 females Finnish public-sector employees joined the survey. According to results, they found statistically differences between distributive/procedural justice and working years.

There has been no study comparing the two universities in regard to organizational justice in the relevant literature until now. This is the first study comparing faculty members of two universities in terms of organizational justice level.

3. METHODS

A survey method is used in this study, and the survey was conducted between March and April 2013. 179 people from Aksaray University and 189 people from Çukurova University joined this survey. Before starting the study, consent was taken from the university authorities and the participants. This study is exploratory in nature because this study aims to analyze the demographic factors, which affect the organizational justice levels in two different universities. The SPSS program was used for statistical analyses.

Research Question 1- What are the factor differences that affect the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University?

3.1 Hypothesis

H₁: Organizational justice level is different among the male and female faculties at Aksaray University and Cukurova University.

H₂: Age has an effect on the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

H₃: Status has an effect on the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

H₄: Marital Status has an effect on the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

H₅: Seniority has an effect on the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

H₆: Hometown of the faculty members has an effect on the faculty members' organizational justice level at Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

3.2 Variables

- Gender (Male and female)
- Age (People's genetic ages when they filled out the survey were divided into five different groups, 25 years old and below, 26-35 years old, 36-45 years old, 46-55 years old and 55 and above.)
- Status (This variable is analyzed into six different categories; research assistant, lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor.
- Marital Status (This variable operationalized in three groups; married, single and divorced/separated)
- Working period
- Hometown (operationalized as people from the hometown in which the respective University is located [yes] and others [no])

- Organizational Justice (organizational justice was measured in three ways as distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. In distributive justice, researchers used Price and Mueller's (1986) Distributive Justice Index contained six items that question the degree of justice for the distribution of organizational centers by as employee responsibilities, schooling, skills, and performance. Price and Mueller's distributive justice measure has been exposed to some reliability tests to verify the tool's reliability and validity. For example, its coefficient alpha values were noticed as .98 by Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff (1998) and .74 by Niehoff and Moorman (1993).

Procedural justice, researchers used Sweeney and McFarlin's (1997) 13-item measurement scale deliberate to regulator to what degree the respondent believes that the organization receives procedural justice with respect to the justice of organizational resources. The coefficient alpha values was noticed as .85 by Moorman et.al. (1998) and .84 by Sweeney and McFarlin (1997).

Finally, to measure interactional justice, researchers used Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) 9-item scale that stresses on the degree of workers' perception regarding whether their opinions and wants are measured in making job decisions. The procedural justice measurement scale's coefficient alpha values were noticed as .92 by Niehoff and Moorman, (1993) and .98 by Moorman et.al. (1998). In general, the reliability and validity test results of organizational justice types settle that equally the validity and reliability levels of the items are acceptable.

This survey contains total of 28 questions with Likert scale 1- Totally not agree.....5- Totally Agree

3.3 Reliability of Measurement

To the testing reliability of measurement, Cronbach Alfa scores were used in this study. As seen in Table 1, Cronbach Alpha Scores are bigger than 0,60.

Table 1. Reliability of Measurement

| Measurement | University | Number | Cronbachalfa score |
|---------------|------------|--------|--------------------|
| Distributive | Aksaray | | 0.90 |
| Justice | Cukurova | 6 | 0.94 |
| Procedural | Aksaray | | 0.88 |
| Justice | Cukurova | 13 | 0.92 |
| Interactional | Aksaray | | 0.92 |
| Justice | Cukurova | 9 | 0.94 |

Variables also were checked for the absence of multicollinearity. The data was track a collinearity diagnostic, which was available in SPSS linear regression analysis. Data were also tested for (multivariate) outliers. A Mahalanobis distance of 15.0 and above can be accepted a multivariate outlier.

3.4 Research Design

This study used a cross-sectional research design. The cross-sectional research design is the one that is most applied in the social sciences. It allows the identification of gathered data measured at a single point in time on all proper variables. It also allows the researcher to identify relationships and correlations among numerous variables and it is also appropriate for studies on large groups of subjects (Nachimas & Nachimas, 2008). These strengths made a cross-sectional design suitable for this study. This study employed quantitative data collection and analysis methods.

3.5 Sampling

Although the survey aimed to collect data from all faculty members, researchers could reach 179 people at Aksaray University and 189 people at Çukurova University. Aksaray University was chosen for this study as a new university because it is the newest university in the territory. Çukurova University was chosen as an old university for this study because it is the oldest one in the territory except for the Universities in Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir. Therefore, these two universities were chosen for this study in order to make a good comparison.

Sampling size which represents the main population was calculated to the level of $e=0.05$ and $\alpha=0.05$ (%95 confidence level $Z=1.65$). Standard deviation and variance are not known therefore $P \times Q$ level is accepted as $0,5 \times 0,5$ and the formula of sampling size was defined as $n = \frac{P \times Q}{(e/Z)^2}$ [54]. To this formula for Aksaray University $n = 68$ and the main population is bigger than %10, therefore, $68/549 \geq 0.1$, for Çukurova University $n=68$ and the main population is smaller than %10 therefore $68/1900 < 0.1$, therefore, a correction factor wasn't added. (Kurtulus, 1998:52).

Accordingly sampling size for Aksaray University was calculated based on correction factor $549 - 68/549 - 1 = 0.88$; $n = 0.88 \times 68 = 60$, for Çukurova University $n=68$.

3.6 Reliability

Reliability means that the results are reliable time after time and that this can be explained by variables. The required data were obtained from the survey filled out by faculty members of two universities voluntarily. Surveys were mailed or handed out to all faculty members and only filled out by faculty members willing to join this study.

3.7 Validity

External validity refers to whether this study is applicable to other groups. This study has external validity to a certain extent. The findings of the study can be applied to Aksaray and Çukurova

Universities but it cannot be applied to the other organizations as each organization has different dynamics and characteristics. The lack of randomization was also a threat to the validity of the data collected. The information given in survey was provided on a snapshot basis.

Empirical validity means that the relationship and the implementation of the variables measured should be the identical in the real world. To enhance empirical validity, in this study a wide series of linked variables was selected to increase the validity and compare the results. As researchers studied the literature and observed at many sizes of the study, it was

understood that this study has content validity.

3.8 Limitations

This study is to be used only for the comparison of Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

3.9 Findings

Descriptive of the study

According to data 64 females (35.8%) and 115 males (64.8%) joined this survey from Aksaray University and 78 females (41.3%) and 111 males (58.7%) joined this survey from Çukurova University. Additionally, 33 (18.4%) research assistants, 49 (27.4%) lecturers, 7 (3.9%) instructors, 73 (40.8%) assistant professors, 12 (6.7%) associate professors and 5 (2.8%) full professors from Aksaray University and 90 (47.6%) research assistants, 17 (9%) lecturers, (2.1%) instructors, 21 (11.1%) assistant professors, 25 (13.2%) associate professors and 32 (16.9%) full professors from Çukurova University joined this study. Among those people, 133 (74.3%) of them were married, while 46 (25.7%) of them were single at Aksaray University and at Çukurova University, 111(58.7%) of the respondents were married, 73 (38.6%) of them were single and 5 (2.6%) of them were divorced/separated (Table 2).

Table 2. Descriptive Of The Data

| | | Aksaray University | | Cukurova University | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| Demographic Information | | Number | % | Number | % |
| Sex | Female | 64 | 35,8 | 78 | 41,3 |
| | Male | 115 | 64,2 | 111 | 58,7 |
| Status | Research Assistant | 33 | 18,4 | 90 | 47,6 |
| | Lecturer | 49 | 27,4 | 17 | 9 |
| | Instructor | 7 | 3,9 | 4 | 2,1 |
| | Assistant Professor | 73 | 40,8 | 21 | 11,1 |
| | Associate Professor | 12 | 6,7 | 25 | 13,2 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----|------|-----|------|
| | Professor | 5 | 2,8 | 32 | 16,9 |
| Age | 25 and below 25 | 8 | 4,5 | 17 | 9 |
| | 26-35 | 74 | 41,3 | 99 | 52,4 |
| | 36-45 | 80 | 44,7 | 40 | 21,2 |
| | 46-55 | 14 | 7,8 | 26 | 13,8 |
| | 55 and above 55 | 3 | 1,7 | 7 | 3,7 |
| Marital Status | Married | 133 | 74,3 | 111 | 58,7 |
| | Single | 46 | 25,7 | 73 | 38,6 |
| | Divorced/Separated | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2,6 |
| Working Years | Below 5 years | 117 | 65,4 | 84 | 44,4 |
| | 6-10 | 20 | 11,2 | 25 | 13,2 |
| | 11-15 | 23 | 12,8 | 37 | 19,6 |
| | 16-20 | 10 | 5,6 | 21 | 11,1 |
| | 21-25 | 9 | 5 | 22 | 11,6 |
| Hometown | Yes | 46 | 25,7 | 97 | 51,3 |
| | No | 133 | 74,3 | 92 | 48,7 |

Table 3. Comparison Between Distributive, Procedural, Interaction Justice, and Sex

| Organizational Justice Types | University | Sex | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | T | P |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------|-------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Distributive Justice | Aksaray | Female | 64 | 3,0833 | 1,16874 | 1,089 | 0,353 |
| | | Male | 115 | 2,8899 | 1,08325 | | |
| | Çukurova | Female | 78 | 2,9936 | 1,00878 | 1,759 | 0,516 |
| | | Male | 111 | 2,7282 | 1,03766 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Aksaray | Female | 64 | 3,2933 | 0,52188 | 1,134 | 0,049 |
| | | Male | 115 | 3,1786 | 0,82840 | | |
| | Çukurova | Female | 78 | 3,1696 | 0,35810 | 2,317 | 0,030 |
| | | Male | 111 | 3,0340 | 0,44501 | | |
| Interaction Justice | Aksaray | Female | 64 | 3,4809 | 1,15046 | 1,606 | 0,645 |
| | | Male | 115 | 3,1981 | 1,09013 | | |
| | Çukurova | Female | 78 | 3,6111 | 0,79192 | 2,452 | 0,230 |
| | | Male | 111 | 3,3033 | 0,92538 | | |

In Table 3, while distributive and interaction justice weren't found to vary statistically with the gender in Aksaray University but a statistically significant difference was found between procedural justice and gender and it is ($t=-1.134$, $p=0.049<0.05$). The same difference was also found to exist among Çukurova University' faculty members ($t=-2.317$, $p=0.030<0.05$). As seen in Table 3, females have higher procedural justice scores than males in both universities. According to these results, female faculty members feel that all levels in the university have been identified in procedures.

Table 4. Comparison Between Distributive, Procedural, Interaction Justice, and Age

| Organizational Justice Types | University | Age | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | F | p |
|------------------------------|------------|----------|----|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| Distributive Justice | Aksaray | Below 25 | 8 | 3,1875 | 1,16645 | 11,430 | 00,226 |
| | | 26-35 | 74 | 3,1577 | 1,15401 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 80 | 2,7563 | 1,03963 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 14 | 2,8690 | 1,13073 | | |
| | | 55 and + | 3 | 3,2778 | 1,66944 | | |
| | Çukurova | Below 25 | 17 | 3,2157 | 0,92189 | 22,011 | 00,095 |
| | | 26-35 | 99 | 2,9310 | 0,98054 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 40 | 2,6375 | 1,09966 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 26 | 2,7244 | 1,08520 | | |
| | | 55 and + | 7 | 2,1667 | 1,09713 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Aksaray | Below 25 | 8 | 3,3077 | 0,97648 | 33,688 | 00,007 |
| | | 26-35 | 74 | 3,1590 | 0,70344 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 80 | 3,1519 | 0,42680 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 14 | 3,9121 | 1,54315 | | |
| | | 55 and + | 3 | 3,0513 | 0,37945 | | |
| | Çukurova | Below 25 | 17 | 3,0905 | 0,34103 | 00,213 | 0,931 |
| | | 26-35 | 99 | 3,0870 | 0,42378 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 40 | 3,0577 | 0,41616 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 26 | 3,1213 | 0,41463 | | |
| | | 55 and + | 7 | 3,1978 | 0,55976 | | |
| Interactional | Aksaray | Below 25 | 8 | 4,1111 | 1,03382 | 22,104 | 00,082 |
| | | 26-35 | 74 | 3,4429 | 1,17797 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 80 | 3,1083 | 1,03343 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 14 | 3,2540 | 0,90647 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------|----|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| Justice | | 55 and + | 3 | 2,8889 | 2,00924 | | |
| | Çukurova | Below 25 | 17 | 3,4908 | 0,76364 | 22,554 | 00,040 |
| | | 26-35 | 99 | 3,5073 | 0,93720 | | |
| | | 36-45 | 40 | 3,0972 | 0,85594 | | |
| | | 46-55 | 26 | 3,3547 | 0,68495 | | |
| | | 55 and + | 7 | 3,6508 | 0,75203 | | |

As seen in Table 4, a new variable was created with an age variable and an ANOVA test was employed. According to the findings, there is a statistically significant difference between age and procedural justice ($F=3.688$, $p=0.007<0.05$) at Aksaray University. According to TUKEY test results, faculty members, whose ages are between 46 and 55, scored higher in procedural justice than others at Aksaray University. But there was no difference between distributive justice, interaction justice and age at Aksaray University.

A statistically significant difference was found between interaction justice and age ($F=2.554$, $p=0.040<0.05$), but no difference was found between distributive and procedural justice and age among faculty members of Çukurova University. Especially TUKEY test results displayed a high procedural justice score for faculty members who are older than 55.

Table 5. Comparison Between Faculty Members' Organizational Justice Types And Status

| Organizational Justice Types | University | Status | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | F | p |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| Distributive Justice | Aksaray | Research Assistant | 33 | 2,7626 | 1,06314 | 11,928 | 00,092 |
| | | Lecturer | 49 | 3,1633 | 1,00144 | | |
| | | Instructor | 7 | 3,9524 | 1,26825 | | |
| | | Assistant Professor | 73 | 2,8626 | 1,11491 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 12 | 2,7361 | 1,39526 | | |
| | | Professor | 5 | 2,7333 | 1,09761 | | |
| | Çukurova | Research Assistant | 90 | 3,0741 | 0,97890 | 44,759 | 00,000 |
| | | Lecturer | 17 | 2,0490 | 0,75886 | | |
| | | Instructor | 4 | 1,5000 | 0,66667 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| | | Assistant Professor | 21 | 2,8571 | 1,13442 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 25 | 2,7400 | 0,87939 | | |
| | | Professor | 32 | 2,8229 | 1,09080 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Aksaray | Research Assistant | 33 | 2,9674 | 0,72391 | 22,935 | 00,014 |
| | | Lecturer | 49 | 3,2323 | 0,53305 | | |
| | | Instructor | 7 | 3,8791 | 0,76131 | | |
| | | Assistant Professor | 73 | 2,3298 | 0,83771 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 12 | 0,9692 | 0,56320 | | |
| | | Professor | 5 | 3,2196 | 0,36325 | | |
| | Çukurova | Research Assistant | 90 | 3,0795 | 0,39703 | 00,611 | 00,692 |
| | | Lecturer | 17 | 2,9955 | 0,22504 | | |
| | | Instructor | 4 | 3,1731 | 0,26923 | | |
| | | Assistant Professor | 21 | 3,1941 | 0,42386 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 25 | 3,1415 | 0,51203 | | |
| | | Professor | 32 | 3,0505 | 0,47604 | | |
| Interactional Justice | Aksaray | Research Assistant | 33 | 3,1145 | 1,22804 | 22,794 | 00,019 |
| | | Lecturer | 49 | 3,4286 | 1,18178 | | |
| | | Instructor | 7 | 4,4286 | 0,99469 | | |
| | | Assistant Professor | 73 | 3,3196 | 0,94225 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 12 | 2,6574 | 1,04173 | | |
| | | Professor | 5 | 2,9111 | 1,11715 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|----|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Çukurova | Research Assistant | 90 | 3,6531 | 0,90418 | 66,264 | 00,000 |
| | | Lecturer | 17 | 2,5882 | 0,78838 | | |
| | | Instructor | 4 | 2,5556 | 0,44444 | | |
| | | Assistant Professor | 21 | 3,2222 | 0,75359 | | |
| | | Associate Professor | 25 | 3,6089 | 0,80195 | | |
| | | Professor | 32 | 3,3576 | 0,70201 | | |

As seen in Table 5; there was a statistically significant difference between procedural justice ($F=2.935$, $p=0.014<0.05$), interaction justice ($F=2.794$, $p=0.019<0.05$) and status in Aksaray University. According to TUKEY test results demonstrated the highest procedural justice and interactional justice scores for instructors. But there was no difference between distributive justice and status.

As seen in Table 5; there was a statistically significant difference between distributive justice ($F=4.759$, $p=0.00<0.05$), interactive justice ($F=6.264$, $p=0.000<0.05$) and status in Çukurova University. TUKEY test results demonstrated the highest distributive justice scores for Research Assistants and interactional justice scores for associated professors. But there was no difference between procedural justice and status.

Table 6. Comparison Between Organizational Justice Types and Marital Status Among Faculty Members of Aksaray University

| Organizational Justice Types | Marital Status | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | T | P |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Distributive Justice | Married | 133 | 2,9561 | 1,11273 | 0,003 | 0,953 |
| | Single | 46 | 2,9674 | 1,13454 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Married | 133 | 3,3048 | 0,72237 | 7,215 | 0,008 |
| | Single | 46 | 2,9732 | 0,71945 | | |
| Interactional Justice | Married | 133 | 3,4010 | 1,01163 | 4,380 | 0,038 |
| | Single | 46 | 3,0048 | 1,34745 | | |

As seen in Table 6; There is no difference between distributive justice and marital status but there was a statistically significant difference between procedural justice ($t=7.215$, $p=0.008<0.05$), interaction justice ($t=4.380$, $p=0.038<0.05$) and marital status in Aksaray University. According to

TUKEY test results, married faculty members have more procedural/interactional justice scores than single ones, therefore, the difference exists.

Table 7. Comparison Between Organizational Justice Types and Marital Status Among Faculty Members of Çukurova University

| Organizational Justice Types | Marital Status | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | F | P |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| Distributive Justice | Married | 111 | 2,5721 | 0,99459 | 99,772 | 00,000 |
| | Single | 73 | 3,2215 | 0,98290 | | |
| | Divorced/Separated | 5 | 3,1333 | 0,81138 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Married | 111 | 3,0603 | 0,42201 | 00,833 | 00,436 |
| | Single | 73 | 3,1254 | 0,40206 | | |
| | Divorced/Separated | 5 | 3,2308 | 0,49554 | | |
| Interactional Justice | Married | 111 | 3,2242 | 0,83013 | 88,318 | 00,000 |
| | Single | 73 | 3,7002 | 0,87874 | | |
| | Divorced/Separated | 5 | 4,0667 | 0,91826 | | |

As seen in Table 7; there is a significant difference between distributive justice ($F=9.772$, $p=0.000<0.05$), interaction justice ($F=8.318$, $p=0.000<0.05$) and marital status in Çukurova University. According to TUKEY test results, single faculty members have more distributive justice scores and divorce/separated faculty members have more interactional justice scores than the others, therefore, the difference exists.

Table 8. Comparison Between Organizational Justice Types And Working Years

| Organizational Justice Types | University | Working Years | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | F | P |
|------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-----|--------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| | Aksaray | Less than 5 years | 117 | 2,9929 | 1,16140 | 2,825 | 0,026 |
| | | 6-10 | 20 | 2,9250 | 1,14896 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 23 | 2,7899 | 0,94042 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 10 | 2,2167 | 0,76598 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| Distributive Justice | | 21-25 | 9 | 3,8519 | 0,44444 | | |
| | Cukurova | Less than 5 years | 84 | 3,1329 | 0,95437 | 4,524 | 0,002 |
| | | 6-10 | 25 | 2,7200 | 0,96071 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 37 | 2,3739 | 0,85383 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 21 | 2,9365 | 1,15768 | | |
| | | 21-25 | 22 | 2,5303 | 1,22111 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Aksaray | Less than 5 years | 117 | 3,1460 | 0,62992 | 13,885 | 0,000 |
| | | 6-10 | 20 | 3,0192 | 0,50773 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 23 | 3,2174 | 0,39473 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 10 | 3,0923 | 0,49561 | | |
| | | 21-25 | 9 | 4,7692 | 1,42100 | | |
| | Cukurova | Less than 5 years | 84 | 3,0925 | 0,35418 | 0,989 | 0,415 |
| | | 6-10 | 25 | 3,1108 | 0,54260 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 37 | 2,9875 | 0,44982 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 21 | 3,2015 | 0,28103 | | |
| | | 21-25 | 22 | 3,1224 | 0,51061 | | |
| Interactional Justice | Aksaray | Less than 5 years | 117 | 3,3153 | 1,19010 | 1,818 | 0,127 |
| | | 6-10 | 20 | 3,0000 | 1,11578 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 23 | 3,5314 | 0,80956 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 10 | 2,7111 | 0,93139 | | |
| | | 21-25 | 9 | 3,8148 | 0,61864 | | |
| | Cukurova | Less than 5 years | 84 | 3,6918 | 0,85152 | 4,538 | 0,002 |
| | | 6-10 | 25 | 3,3022 | 1,06888 | | |
| | | 11-15 | 37 | 3,0210 | 0,77815 | | |
| | | 16-20 | 21 | 3,2328 | 0,65159 | | |
| | | 21-25 | 22 | 3,4545 | 0,86605 | | |

A new variable was created by dividing the working years variable into 5 groups. there is a significant difference among distributive justice ($F=2.825$, $p=0.026<0.05$), procedural justice ($F=13.885$

$p=0.000<0.05$) and working years in Aksaray University faculty members. According to TUKEY test results, the higher scores existed for less than 5 working years in distributive justice. And also the higher scores existed for 6-11 working years in procedural justice. But there are no significant differences between interaction justice and working years at Aksaray University. There is a statistically significant difference among distributive justice ($F=4.525$, $p=0.002<0.05$), interaction justice ($F=4.538$, $p=0.002<0.05$) and working years among Çukurova University faculty members. According to TUKEY test results, the difference existed for less than 5 working years in distributive/interactional justice. Less than 5 working years had bigger distributive/interactional justice scores, but there was no difference with procedural justice.

Table 9. Comparison Between Organizational Justice Types And Hometown

| Organizational Justice Types | University | Hometown | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | T | p |
|------------------------------|------------|----------|-----|--------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Distributive Justice | Aksaray | Yes | 46 | 3,1884 | 1,22303 | 2,643 | 0,106 |
| | | No | 133 | 2,8797 | 1,06883 | | |
| | Cukurova | Yes | 97 | 2,8368 | 1,03049 | 0,000 | 0,989 |
| | | No | 92 | 2,8388 | 1,03818 | | |
| Procedural Justice | Aksaray | Yes | 46 | 3,2692 | 0,83509 | 0,282 | 0,596 |
| | | No | 133 | 3,2024 | 0,69846 | | |
| | Cukurova | Yes | 97 | 3,0531 | 0,41071 | 1,567 | 0,212 |
| | | No | 92 | 3,1288 | 0,41980 | | |
| Interactional Justice | Aksaray | Yes | 46 | 3,4420 | 1,13879 | 1,012 | 0,316 |
| | | No | 133 | 3,2498 | 1,10963 | | |
| | Cukurova | Yes | 97 | 3,4341 | 0,89647 | 0,004 | 0,952 |
| | | No | 92 | 3,4263 | 0,87447 | | |

As seen in Table 9; among the Aksaray University faculty members, there was no difference among any organizational commitment level and hometown. Among the Çukurova University's faculty members there was no difference in any organizational commitment level and hometown.

CONCLUSION

In order to be efficient, organizations have to find some methods to improve their members' motivations and organizational justice. This paper examines the faculty members' organizational (distributive, procedural and interaction) justice level differences regarding their demographic

characteristics of them for Aksaray University and Çukurova University. A statistically significant difference between age and procedural justice existed whereas there was no difference between distributive and interactional justices and age at Aksaray University. These findings support Aizzad Mohd's (2011:14) study. There was a statistically significant difference between interactional justice and age, while there was no difference between distributive and procedural justice and age for the faculty members of Çukurova University. These results also support Dundar and Tabancali's (2012) findings. Especially faculty members, whose ages are between 46 and 55, scored higher in procedural justice than others at Aksaray University. Exclusively, faculty members older than 55 scored highest, in terms of procedural/interactional justice at Çukurova University.

The employees' age rise, their chances of finding an alternative job diminish and they also don't have a chance to get extra education opportunities. And also they have gained retirement rights so they can speak freely. Therefore, their organizational justice scores increase. According to the results, there are significant differences between procedural/interactional justice and age, but there is no difference between distributive justice and age.

There are no differences between distributive, interactional justice and sex among Aksaray University' faculty members but there is a difference between procedural justice and sex, and it is statistically significant. The same difference also exists among the faculty members of Çukurova University. Females appear to have higher procedural justice scores than males in both universities. This result supports Iscan and Uyar (2010:11) and Sanlimeshur (2015:15) findings.

There is a statistically significant difference between procedural justice, interactional justice and status, but no difference was found between distributive justice and status at Aksaray University. While instructors' scores emerge as the highest, the lowest scores belong to Associate Professors. These results support Imazai and Omuichi's (2002:14) study. As seen in Table 5, there is also a statically significant difference between distributive justice, interaction justice and status among faculty members of Çukurova University. These results support Aryee, Budhwar and Chen's (2002:11) study. Research assistants have the highest distributive justice scores in contrast to instructors. Associated professors have the highest interactional scores, on the other hand, instructors have the lowest interactional justice scores. High costs of quitting, seeking alternative job opportunities and career expectations for research assistants and instructors can be viewed for these results. Associated professors have more life and job experiences, therefore their interaction scores can be high.

In view of marital status, a statistically significant difference was found for procedural/interactional justice, but no difference for distributive justice was detected at Aksaray University. The highest procedural/interactional scores were from married faculties. These results support Ohbuchi et.al's (2005:13) study. There were statistically significant differences between

distributive/interactional justice and marital status at Çukurova University. These results support Staley et.al.'s (2003:14) findings. Because of their economic responsibilities, procedural/interactional justice scores of married personnel can be high. Because of the career expectations, distributive/interactional justice scores of divorced/separated personnel can be high.

In view of working years, a statistically significant difference was found for distributive justice and procedural justice, but no difference for interaction justice was detected at Aksaray University. These results support McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) and Eleano et.al.'s (2005:10) study. On the other hand, there are statistically significant differences between distributive justice and interaction justice detected at Cukurova University. This result also supports the findings of Williams et.al. (2002:13), Ang et.al. (2003:12) and Roch and Shanock's (2006:13) studies. Because of career expectations, finding an alternative job diminish and they also don't have a chance to get extra education opportunities, these results can be found.

According to findings, the most effective sources of organizational justice level of faculty members are observed as life/job experiences, future worries, career expectations and family. Generally, academicians from new universities prefer to work in big cities because of their abilities, on the other hand, the ones in an old university try to change their university on account of career expectations. Identifying factors that affect faculties' organizational justice level is particularly important for devising resourceful policy directions and practices. Additionally, this study helps further new studies on this particular subject. This study compared the organizational justice level of faculty members in old and new universities, and it is supposed that these findings are to be deemed valuable by newly established universities.

REFERENCES

- Aizzad Mohd, N. (2011). Organizational Justice, Age, And Performance Connection In Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, Vol. 21 Issue: 3, pp.273-290
- Allen, R. S., & White C. S. (2002). Equity Sensitivity Theory: A Test Of Responses To Two Types Of Under-Reward Situations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 14, 435-452
- Ambrose, M. L., Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old Friends, New Faces: Motivation Research In The 1990s. (Yearly Review of Management). *Journal of Management*, 25, 231-237
- Ang, S., Dyne, L.V., Begley, T.M. (2003). The Employment Relationship Of Foreign Workers Versus Local Employee: A Field Study Of Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, Performance, And OCB. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 561- 583. Retrieved March 14, 2013, from ProQuest database.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S., Chen, Z.X. (2002). Trust As A Mediator Of The Relationship Between Organizational Justice And Work Outcomes: Test Of A Social Exchange Model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Volume 23, Issue, 3, p. 267-285

Basar, U. (2011). *Örgütsel Adalet Algisi, Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Ve İş Tatmini Arasındaki İlişkilere Yönelik Görgül Bir Araştırma*. Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü Savunma Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Buhler, P. M. (2003). Managing In The New Millennium: Understanding The Manager's Motivational Tool Bag. *Supervision*, 64, 20-23

Chan, M. (2000). Organizational Justice Theories And Landmark Cases. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8, 68-88. Retrieved March 17, 2013, from ProQuest database.

Culyer, A. J. (2001). Equity: Some Theory And Its Policy Implications. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 27, 275

Dundar, T. Tabancali, E. (2012). The Relationship Between Organizational Justice Perceptions And Job Satisfaction Levels. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 46, 2012, Pages 5777-5781

Elevano, M., van den Bos, K., Linna, A., Kivimaki, M., Ala-Mursula, L., Pentti, J. Vahtera, J. (2005). Combined Effects Of Uncertainty And Organizational Justice On Employee Health: Testing The Uncertainty Management Model Of Fairness Judgments Among Finnish Public Sector Employees. *Social Science & Medicine* Volume 61, Issue p. 2501–2512

Erdogan, B., Kraimer, M.L., Liden, R.C. (2001). Procedural Justice As A Two-Dimensional Construct: An Examination In The Performance Appraisal Context. *The Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 37, 205-222.

Greenberg, J., Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing The Human Side Of Work*. (8th edition). Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi (2005)

Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D. (1990). Equity Theory And The Managerial Matrix. *Training & Development Journal*, 44, 98-103

Imazai, K. Ohbuchu K. (2002). Conflict Resolution and Procedural Fairness in Japanese Work Organizations. *Japanese Psychological Association. Published by Blackwell Publishers*. Volume 44, No.2.

Iscan, O.F., Sayin, U., (2010). Örgütsel Adalet, İş Tatmini Ve Örgütsel Güven Arasındaki İlişki. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt: 24, Sayı: 4, 2010

Jepson, D. M. Rodwell, J. (2012). Female Perceptions of Organizational Justice. *Department of Business, Faculty of Business and Economics, Macquarie University. Blackwell Publishing* Vol.19 No.6

Koh, H.C., & Boo, E.H. (2004). Organizational Ethics And Employee Satisfaction And Commitment. *Management Decision*, 42, 677-693.

Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A. (1998). *Organizational Behavior* (5th edition). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill

Kurtuluş, K. (1998), *Pazarlama Araştırmaları*, İ. Ü. İşletme Fakültesi No: 274, İ. Ü. İşletme İktisadı Enstitüsü No: 406, 6. Baskı, İstanbul.

McFarlin, D.B., Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive And Procedural Justice As Predictor Of Satisfaction With Personal And Organizational Outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637

Nachimas, D. & Frankfort-Nachimas, C. (2008). *Research Methods In The Social Sciences*. (6th edition). Worth Publishers, New York, United States

Netz, Y., Shulamith, R. (2004). Age Differences In Motivational Orientation Toward Physical Activity: An Application Of Social-Cognitive Theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138, 35-49

Nigro, L. G. & Nigro, F. A. (2000). *The New Public Personal Administration*. (5th edition). Thomson Wadsworth Group, Belmont CA

Ohbuchi, K., Sugawara, I., Teshigara, K., Imazai, K. (2005). Procedural Justice And The Assessment Of Civil Justice In Japan. *Law & Society Review*, 39, 875-891

O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. R. & Berner, M. (2003). *Research Methods For Public Administrators*, (4th edition). Longman, United States

Perry, L. S. (1993). Effects Of Inequity On Job Satisfaction And Self-Evaluation In A National Sample Of African American Workers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 565-574

Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work Motivation In Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Rainey, H. G., Steinbaner, P. (1999). Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements Of A Theory Of Effective Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9, 1-32

Ramoorthy, N. Flood, P. C. (2004). Gender and Employee Attitudes: The Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions. *British Journal of Management*. Vol.15, 247-258.

Ramlall, S. (2004). A Review Of Employee Motivation Theories And Their Implications For Employee Retention Within Organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 52- 63.

Robbins, T., Summers, T., Miller, J. (2000). Intra-And Inter-Justice Relationships: Assessing The Direction. *Human Relations*, 53, 1329-1335.

Roch, S.G., Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organizational Justice In An Exchange Framework: Clarifying Organizational Justice Distinctions. *Journal of Management*, Vol.32, Issue, 2, p.299-322

Sanlimeshur, O. (2015). *Organizasyonlarda Algılanan Örgütsel Adalet ile Çatışma İlişkisi Ve Bir Araştırma*. İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Saunders, M.N., & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organizational Justice, Trust And The Management Of Change: An Exploration. *Personnel Review*, 32, 360-375.

Shafritz, J. M. & Russell, E. W. (2002). *Introducing Public Administration*. (3rd edition). Longman, United States

Staley, A.B., Dastoor, B., Magner, N.R., Stolp, C. (2003). The Contribution Of Organizational Justice in Budget Decision Making To Federal Managers' Organizational Commitment. *Accounting & Financial Management*, 15, 505-524. Retrieved March 15, 2013, from ProQuest database.

Williams, S. (1999). The Effects Of Distributive And Procedural Justice On Performance. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133, 183

Williams, S., Pitre, R., Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice And Organizational Citizenship Behavior Intentions: Fair Rewards Versus Fair Treatment. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 33-44. Retrieved March 17, 2013, from EBSCOhost database.

Wooldridge, B. (2006). Cognitive Theories Of Motivation & Organizations. Handouts.

Wright, B. E. (2004). The Role Of Work Context In Work Motivation: A Public Sector Application Of Goal And Social Cognitive Theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14, 59-79

Wright, C., Lund, J. (2001). State Regulation And The New Taylorism: The CASE of Australian Grocery Warehousing. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, 56, 747-770