

Editor-in-Chief

Frank Tian Xie, Ph.D.
School of Business Administration
University of South Carolina Aiken
United States

Editorial Board

Alistair R Anderson, Editor of Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, Director of the centre for Entrepreneurship, Aberdeen Business School, Robert Gordon University, United Kingdom.

Anthony Goerzen, PhD, Associate Professor, Strategy & International Business, Director of UVic Business PhD Program, University of Victoria, Canada.

A/P Jochen Wirtz, PhD, Academic Director of UCLA-NUS EMBA, National University of Singapore.

Basel Saleh, PhD, Assistant Professor of Economics, Radford University, USA.

Charles R. B. Stowe, PhD, Dean, College of Business and Public Affairs, Lander University, USA.

Dr. Alexandros G. Psychogios, Academic Research Coordinator, International faculty of the University of Sheffield, University of Sheffield, Greece.

Dr. Antonios Siganos, Department of Accounting and Finance, Glasgow University, United Kingdom.

Dr. Eric A. Landis, Assistant Professor, Cumberland University, USA.

Dr. Ruth Kiraka, Dean, Institute of continuing Education & Director, Strathmore Enterprise Development Centre, Strathmore University, Kenya.

Dr. Shahed Imam, Associate Professor of Accounting, Warwick Business School, The University of Warwick, USA.

Dr. Sara Maioli, Department of Business Administration, Newcastle University, United Kingdom.

Dr. Sule L. Aker, Associate Professor, Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus.

Dr. Qin Xiao, University of Aberdeen Business Schoo, United Kingdom.

Dr. Xenia Anastassiou-Hadjicharalambous, CPsychol, Assistant Professor of Child Psychopathology, Department of Psychology, University of Nicosia, Cyprus.

Eric S. Burgess, PhD, Department of Business and Economics, Lincoln University, USA.

Geoff Turner, PhD, CMA, Associate Professor of accounting, University of Nicosia, Cyprus.

Lars Kolvereid, Professor, Bodo Graduate School of Business, Norway.

Khaleda Yasmin, Director of Centre for Promoting Ideas (CPI), Bangladesh. Executive Editor, International Journal of Business and Social Science.

Manzoor E. Chowdhury, PhD, Professor, Department of Business and Economics.

Lincoln University of Missouri, USA.

Meijun Qian, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance, National University of Singapore.

Mohammad Reza Noruzi, Instructor, Department of Management and Economics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Nicole Bissessar, Assistant Professor of Economics, Kent State University, USA.

Paul C. Stumb, PhD, Professor, Labry School of Business and Technology, Cumberland University, USA.

Vivien A Beattie, Professor of Accounting, Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom.

Wallace Chigona, Associate Professor, Department of Information Systems, University of Cape Town. South Africa.

Derginin Tarandığı Index: Derginin ana sayfasında (http://www.ijbssnet.com/) INDEX kısmında aşağıdaki linkleri verilerek derginin tarandığı INDEXSLER bu şekilde belirtilmiştir.

To read more, please visit http://www.indexcopernicus.com

To read more, please visit http://journalseek.net

To read more, please visit http://www.indexcopernicus.com

The Australian Research Council (ARC)

Organizational Justice, Organizational Trust and Organizational Identification Perceptions of Physical Education Teachers

Yeliz ŞİRİN
Kahramanmaras Sutcu Imam University,
School of Physical Education and Sports,
Kahramanmaraş/Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the association between organizational justice, trust and identification perceived by physical education teachers working at secondary schools and to examine these in terms of some socio-demographic features.This study, significant difference was found between the procedural and interactional justice perceptions of teachers in terms of their organizational justice and, significance difference was found between the justice, trust and identification of physical education teachers in terms of the variables of marital status and social activity. A moderately significant association was found between distributive justice-a sub dimension of organizational justice perceptions- and trust and identification of the research group while a highly significant association was found between interactional, procedural justice and organizational trust. It was concluded that procedural and interactional justice and identification had a significant influence on the teachers' trust perceptions.

Keywords: Physical Education teacher, Justice, Trust, Organizational Identification

1. Introduction

Educational organizations have been founded to meet the educational needs of the society and today they are one of the leading principles followed by modern societies. The function of education is to educate qualified manpower against the influences of changing and developing technology on society. The success of education system depends on the qualifications of teachers. Educational organizations are environmentally-conscious, value-substantive organizations with an emphasis on its human side (Alıç, 1987). School administrators should make sure that every dynamic at school is used effectively. Justice practices demonstrated by administrators while administering the schools are perceived and valued by school workers. These values take their predecessors from culture and leave their outputs to other variables. The most important of these variables are organizational trust and organizational identification. Organizational trust and organizational identification, which are outputs of the concept of justice, are influenced by the perception of justice within school culture.

The concept of organizational justice is rules and social norms about how to administer and distribute rewards and punishments (Aydın and Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2008). How justice is perceived influences the behaviors of workers towards their organizations. The perceptions of workers about whether their organizations are fair or not influencing their working behaviors is one of the aspects which increase the importance of the subject of organizational justice (İşcan, 2005). There are three types of justice in general. Greenberg (1990) examined organizational justice in three dimensions as distributive, procedural and interactional. *Distributive justice*, is the perceptions of workers on whether gains are assessed accurately and realistically in terms of performance (Justice in the distribution of resources), *Procedural justice*, is a concept which explains how and according to what the rewards given to workers as a result of their performances are determined and the perceptions of workers on how fair the decision making processes (justice in procedure processes) used in the distribution of rewards are (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

Interactional justice is in what ways and how clearly (justice in interpersonal interactions) the decision making processes in the work place are told to individuals. For organizations, basic values are very important since they are the determiners of the organization's rules and procedures. Justice is one of these basic values (Konovsky, 2000).

Organizational trust can be defined as "a process in which values such as truth, faith, devotion and sincerity are formed in the interactions of organization members within the organizational structure and during which these values become concrete through these values for specific purposes" (Arslan, 2009). In organizations which lack organizational trust, it is not possible to talk about healthy organizational communication, information sharing, organizational performance and organizational activity between the organization members and between administrators and workers (Callaway, 2006). Özen (2003) and Hoy and Tarter (2004) consider the role of organizational justice in organizational trust as the key. A great number of studies on organizational justice (Hoy and Tarter, 2004; Polat, Ceep, 2008; İşcan, 2005; Baş, Şentürk, 2011; Özgan, 2011.) have stated that perceived organizational justice has a leading role in the formation of organizational trust and the determination of its level (Cüce et al., 2013). According to Greenberg (1990) and Moorman (1991), when workers were treated fairly in their organizations, their feelings of justice increased, their feelings of trust developed and increased (Polat and Celep, 2008).

Mael and Ashforth (1992) defined organizational identification as "a worker's feeling of belonging with an organization, perceiving the success or failure of the organization as his own success or failure and integrating the purposes of the individual and the organization in an increasing way". The workers who identify with the organization tend to see themselves as the representatives of the organization in their interactions with the people outside the organization. Thus, it can be said that increasing the organizational identification levels of the workers can be the predecessor of many factors. One of the factors bringing about identification within an organization is a fair administration. This is because a positive understanding of justice within an organization is interpreted by the workers as being valued and respected. There are researchers in literature who suggest that a fair administration within an organization increases identification (De Cremer, Blader, 2006; Hakonen, Lipponen, 2008).

This study is important since it presents the inputs and outputs of organizational justice, trust and identification based on concepts and researches and examines and emphasizes these concepts in educational organizations in terms of physical education teachers who shape the development and sports and athletes. It is also important to find out how associated these three conceptually associated concepts are in educational organizations in terms of directing the outputs of physical education teachers.

2. Research Methodology and Data Collection

This descriptive study is a "general review model" research. Organizational justice, trust and identification perceptions of the physical education teachers who participated in the study were compared in terms of demographic features.

2.1. Research group

The universe of the study consists of a total of 316 physical education teachers, 252 men and 64 women working in secondary schools of five cities in the Mediterranean region of Turkey, who participated in the study voluntarily.

2.2. Data collection tools

Questionnaires were used in the study as data collection tools. These questionnaires were "Organizational Justice Scale", "Organizational Trust Scale" and "Organizational Identification Scale" and in addition, variables such as gender, marital status and social activity were used to determine the socio-demographic features of the participants.

2.2.1. Organizational Justice Scale

Organizational justice perceptions of the physical education teachers were found by using Organizational Justice Scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Organizational Justice Scale consists of three sub dimensions as Distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ). The scale was translated into Turkish and checked for validity and reliability by Yıldırım (2002) and internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for each sub-dimension were as follows: (DJ).81, (PJ).89, (IJ).95. The scale consists of a total of 20 items and it is 5-Likert type.

2.2.2. Organizational Trust Scale for Schools (OTSS)

Organizational Trust Scale for Schools (OTSS) is a scale developed by Daboval et al. (1994) to find out the organizational trust level according to the views of teachers and it was adapted to Turkish by Kamer (2001). The scale consists of a total of 40 items and it is 5-Likert type. Yılmaz (2005) readapted the scale for schools and checked the scale for validity and reliability.

2.2.3. Organizational Identification Scale

Identification Scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) was used to find out the power of organizational identification. The scale consists of a total of 6 items and it is 5-Likert type (1=Totally disagree, 5=Totally agree). Mael and Ashforth (1992) found the reliability coefficient of the scale as .87. In his study, Tüzün (2006) reported the reliability coefficient of the scale as .78. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was found that the scale had a one factor structure and the factor loads differed between .45 and .82. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as .792.

2.3. Data Analysis

The data obtained from the study was analyzed by using SPSS 15.0 program. Frequencies and percentages were calculated to find out the distribution of socio-demographic variables. T-test was used in paired comparisons to find out the differentiation level of independent variables while Pearson correlation was used for the level of association between variables and linear regression test was used to find out the levels of interaction between variables. Alpha (α) significance level was accepted as $p<0.001$ and $p<0.05$.

3. Findings

Demographic information obtained from the research group and the analysis results of the data are presented in tables.

Table1: Descriptive information of the research groups

Scales	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Distributive Justice	Men	252	16.55	4.95	-1.884	.062
	Women	64	17.75	4.41		
Procedural Justice	Men	252	19.06	5.68	-2.023	.044*
	Women	64	20.68	5.92		
Interactional Justice	Men	252	31.58	8.02	-2.672	.008*
	Women	64	34.62	8.48		
Organizational Identification	Men	252	3.84	.75	-.068	.945
	Women	64	3.85	.94		
Organizational Trust	Men	252	160.55	46.39	-.105	.916
	Women	64	161.25	49.76		

79.7% of the research group consists of men, while 20.3% consists of women, 78.5% are married while 21.5% are single, 65.5% were found to participate in social activities while 34.5% were found not to participate in social activities.

Table 2: Analysis results of the research group in terms of the variable of gender

Scales	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Distributive Justice	Men	252	16.55	4.95	-1.884	.062
	Women	64	17.75	4.41		
Procedural Justice	Men	252	19.06	5.68	-2.023	.044*
	Women	64	20.68	5.92		
Interactional Justice	Men	252	31.58	8.02	-2.672	.008*
	Women	64	34.62	8.48		
Organizational Identification	Men	252	3.84	.75	-.068	.945
	Women	64	3.85	.94		
Organizational Trust	Men	252	160.55	46.39	-.105	.916
	Women	64	161.25	49.76		

p<0.05

Table 2 shows a statistically significant difference in favor of women in the procedural and interactional justice perceptions in terms of the variable of gender ($p<0.05$). Gender was not found to create a significant difference in Distributive justice perception. Organizational trust and identification perceptions also did not create a significant difference in terms of gender ($p>0.05$).

Table 3: Analysis results of the research group in terms of the variable of marital status

Scales	Marital Status	N	Mean	Ss	t	p
Distributive Justice	Married	248	17.09	4.63	2.100	.036*
	Single	68	15.70	5.52		
Procedural Justice	Married	248	19.43	5.61	.253	.800
	Single	68	19.23	6.30		
Interactional Justice	Married	248	31.80	8.20	-1.644	.101
	Single	68	33.64	8.07		
Organizational Identification	Married	248	3.78	.78	-2.614	.009*
	Single	68	4.06	.79		
Organizational Trust	Married	248	160.32	47.40	-.269	.788
	Single	68	162.05	45.91		

p<0.05

Statistically significant difference was found in the distributive justice (p<0.05) and organizational identification perceptions (p<0.05) in terms of the analysis conducted based on the marital status variable of the research group.

Table 4: Analysis results of the research group in terms of the variable of social activity

Scales	Social Activity	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Distributive Justice	Yes	207	17.00	4.99	1.020	.308
	No	109	16.41	4.60		
Procedural Justice	Yes	207	20.26	5.76	3.769	.000*
	No	109	17.74	5.39		
Interactional Justice	Yes	207	33.25	7.55	3.025	.003*
	No	109	30.20	9.00		
Organizational Identification	Yes	207	3.93	.66	2.438	.016*
	No	109	3.68	.97		
Organizational Trust	Yes	207	170.24	45.19	5.172	.000*
	No	109	142.56	45.22		

p<0.05

Statistically significant difference was found in the procedural justice (p<0.01), interactional justice (p<0.05), organizational trust (p<0.05) and organizational identification (p<0.05) perceptions in terms of the analysis conducted on the social activity variable

Table 5: Correlation results of the data obtained from the research group

Scales		(DJ)	(PJ)	(IJ)	(OI)	(OT)
Distributive Justice (DJ)	r	1				
	p					
Procedural Justice (PJ)	r	.735*	1			
	p	.000				
Interactional Justice (IJ)	r	.707*	.847*	1		
	p	.000	.000			
Organizational Identification (OI)	r	.351*	.357*	.484*	1	
	p	.000	.000	.000		
Organizational Trust (OT)	r	.626*	.796*	.809*	.478*	1
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

***p<.01*

According to the Table, a moderately significant association was found between organizational trust and distributive justice r=.626 (p<0.01) and organizational identification r=.478 (p<0.01) and a high significant association was found between procedural justice r=.796 (p<0.01) and interactional justice r=.809 (p<0.01)

Table 6: Model summary table

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error
1	.845(a)	.714	.710	25.30

a: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Organizational Identification

Table 7: Regression results of the data obtained from the research group

Model	Scales	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-9.034	7.636		-1.183	.238
	Distributive Justice	-.106	.446	-.011	-.238	.812
	Procedural Justice	3.461	.503	.424	6.875	.000
	Interactional Justice	2.231	.358	.389	6.225	.000
	Organizational Identification	8.460	2.073	.143	4.080	.000

Dependent Variable: organizational trust

It can be seen that of the values in the R^2 column of the model summary table, independent variables "Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Organizational Identification" explain the variance of the variable "organizational trust" with a rate of 71%. According to the table, it can be seen that in the assessment which was made by taking the dimensions of organizational justice and organizational identification into consideration together, distributive justice did not influence organizational trust statistically; however, it made 71% contribution to organizational trust together with other dimensions. This contribution can be seen the most in organizational identification, followed by procedural justice and interactional justice.

4. Result and Discussion

According to the results of the study which was conducted to determine the organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational identification perceptions of physical education teachers in terms of some socio-demographic features and to find out the associations between these variables, significant difference was found in procedural justice and interactional justice perceptions in terms of the variable of gender, which was in favor of women. Women teachers stated that the administrators in their schools conducted more procedural justice and interactional justice practices. In their studies, Polat (2007), Polat and Celep (2008) concluded that organizational justice differed in terms of the variable of gender. These results are in parallel with our study. However, in their studies, Baş and Şentürk (2011), Yılmaz (2010), Yazıcıoğlu and Topaloğlu (2009) and Yılmaz and Taşdan (2009) stated that the justice perceptions of teachers did not differ in terms of the variable of gender, which is not in parallel with the results of this study. In this study, it was concluded that the organizational trust perceptions of teachers did not differ in terms of the variable of gender. This result is in parallel with the results of Polat (2007), Çokluk-Bökeoğlu and Yılmaz (2009) that teachers' organizational trust perceptions do not differ in terms of the variable of gender. It can be stated that these results are in parallel with the results of this study.

Significant difference was found in organizational justice and identification perceptions in terms of the variable of marital status. Distributive justice perceptions of married teachers were found to be higher while organizational identification perceptions of single teachers were found to be higher. Married physical education teachers think that gains such as service, opportunity, punishment and reward, roles, status, payment and promotion are distributed fairly among teachers while single teachers think that they are not.

The reason why organizational identification perceptions of single teachers were higher can be because they are devoted to their schools and students since they do not have big responsibilities such as a family. Physical education teachers are different from other teachers in terms of branch. In addition to their lesson programs in the curriculum, they also have responsibilities such as leading the students to extracurricular sport activities, training students at the weekends, leading skilled students to sports clubs and monitoring these students. It is thought that these responsibilities cause them to be more devoted to their occupation and schools. Thus, it can be thought that physical education teachers will have different expectations from the school administration in terms of distributive justice practices when compared with the teachers of other branches.

As a result, it can be concluded that they have lower distributive justice perceptions but higher identification perceptions when compared with married teachers.

As a result of the analysis based on the variable of social activity, significant difference was found in organizational justice, identification and organizational trust. It can be thought that these kinds of perceptions will increase as teachers spend time outside school. Through these activities, they can share and compare with each other whether rules are applied equally to everybody, and how fairly interpersonal communication is conducted.
A moderate association was found between the distributive justice and organizational trust and organizational identification of the research group, while a significantly high association was found between the interactional justice and procedural justice and organizational trust of the research group. In literature, some researchers have stated that distributive justice is about a specific decision or specific results and it does not influence the general attitude and behaviors towards the administration (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Beugre, 2002). In addition to this result, Arslantaş and Dursun (2008) concluded that interactional justice highly affected the trust felt for the administrator. In their study, Ambrose and Schminke (2003) found a significantly high association between procedural and interactional justice and trust for administrators. In their studies, Polat and Celep (2008), Baş and Şentürk (2011), Özgan (2011) found a significant association between organizational justice and organizational trust.

According to the results of the regression analysis conducted at the end of the study, it was seen that distributive justice dimension did not influence organizational trust statistically; however, it contributed to organizational trust with a rate of 71% together with the other dimensions. When the association between the dimensions of justice and organizational identification was examined, it was concluded that only the dimensions of procedural and interactional justice dimensions affected organizational identification positively. Blader (2003) stated that of the justice dimensions, only procedural justice had a key role in identification. Tyler and Blader (2003) concluded that distributive justice had a lower influence than procedural justice on organizational identification. Tüzün (2006), Cüce and Haşim (2013), Ertürk (2010) concluded that organizational trust had positive impact on organizational identification. These results are in parallel with our results. Based on these results, we can conclude that physical education teachers' organizational trust levels will increase as their organizational justice levels increase. According to Özer et al. (2006) and Baş (2010), it is important for school administrators, teachers, students and parents to develop a relationship based on mutual trust and organizational justice in terms of the quality of education. Fair procedures within a school will positively affect teachers' perceptions of trust and it will cause teachers to develop organizational justice perceptions, to adopt the school and to identify with it.

The purpose of this study is to determine the organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational identification of physical education teachers in terms of some socio-demographic features and to determine the associations between these. According to the results of the study, organizational justice perceptions of female physical education teachers were found to be higher. At the same time, it was concluded that married physical education teachers were found to have higher distributive justice perceptions than single physical education teachers while single physical education teachers were found to have higher organizational identification perceptions. Significant differences were found in justice trust and identification dimensions as teachers participated more in social activities outside the school.

As a result of the study, organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational identification perceptions of physical education teachers were found to be associated with each other. Thus, practices such as school administrators' increasing teachers' justice and equality perceptions by treating them fairly, helping them with occupational resources, making necessary and enough explanations about the decisions taken and attaching importance to cooperation and sharing will increase teachers' levels of organizational trust and identification. It is thought that school administrators' being fair in giving rewards and punishments, complying with the rules of procedural and interactional justice will increase organizational trust and identification.

Recommendations

This study is limited to secondary schools and physical education teachers. It is recommended to conduct the same study in high schools and with teachers of other branches or as a study which comprises all the branches in general. Thus, such studies will contribute both to the literature and to the subject of organizational trust and organizational identification in schools. These kinds of studies are thought to contribute a lot to make educational organizations more effective and more qualified and to overcome the deficiencies.

References

Alıç M (1987). Management and Leadership. *Eskişehir Anadolu University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 2 (1), 141-149.

Ambrose M & Schminke M(2003). Organization Structure as a Moderator of The Relationship Between Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Perceived Organizational Support, And Supervisory Trust. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 88 (2), 295-305.

Arslan MM 2009. Organizational Trust Perceptions of the teachers of Technical and Industrial Vocational High School. *Journal of Method and Practice in Education,* 5(2), 274-288.

Arslantaş C, Dursun M (2008). The Indirect Role of Interactional Justice on the Effect of Ethical Leadership Behavior on Trust and Psychological Reinforcement to the Manager. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1), 111-128.

Aydın İ, Karaman-Kepenekçi Y 2008. Principals Opinions Of Organisational Justice İn Elementary Schools İn Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(4), 497-513.

Baş G, Şentürk C (2011). Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship and Organizational Trust Perceptions of Primary School Teachers. *Education Management in Method and Practice*, 17(1), 29-62.

Beugre CD (2002). Understanding Organizational Justice and Its Impact on Managing Employees: An African Perspective, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(7), 1091-1104.

Blader SL, Tyler TR (2009). Testing and Extending the Group Engagement Model: Linkages between Social Identity, Procedural Justice, Economic Outcomes, and Extrarole Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 445-464.

Callaway PL (2006). The relationship between organizational trust and job satisfaction. Doctoral thesis. Capella University Graduate School, Florida.

Cüce H, Güney S, Tayfur Ö (2013). A Research to Find out the Effect of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Organizational Identification. *H.Ü. Journal of Faculty of Economy and Administrative Sciences*, 31(1), 1-30.

Çokluk-Bökeoğlu Ö & Yılmaz K. (2009). Teacher's views on Organizational Trust in Primary Schools. *Education Management in Method and Practice*, 54: 211-233.

Daboval J, Comish R, Swindle B &Gaster W 1994. A Trust İnventory for Small Businesses, Small Bisinesses Symposium;htp:/wwww.sbaer.uca..edu/docs/proceedings/94sw031.txt (16.09.2015).

De Cremer D, Dijke MV, Bos AER (2006). Leader's procedural justice affecting identification and trust Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27 (7), 554 – 565.

De Cremer D, Blader SL (2006). Why Do People Care About Procedural Fairness? The Importance of Belongingness in Responding and Attending to Procedures. *European Journal of Psychology*, 36: 211-228.

Ertürk A (2010). Exploring Predictors of Organizational Identification: Moderating Role of Trust on the Associations Between Empowerment, Organizational Support, and Identification. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(4), 409-441.

Folger R, Cropanzano R (1998). Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management, London: Sage Publications.

Folger R, Konovsky MA (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: (1), 111-130.

Greenberg J (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16: 399-432.

Hakonen M, Lipponen J (2008). Procedural Justice and Identification with Virtual Teams: The Moderating Role of Face-to-Face Meetings and Geographical Dispersion. *Social Justice Research*, 21: 164-168.

Hoy WK, Tarter CJ (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250-259.

İşcan ÖF (2005). Organizations and the Effect of Organizational Politics on Organizational Justice Perception as a Metaphor of Political Arena. *Ankara University Journal of Political Sciences*, 60(1), 149-171.

Kamer M (2001). The Effects of Organizational Trust, Organizational Committment and Organizational Citizenship, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Konovsky MA (2000). Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3),489-511.

Mael F, Ashforth BE (1992). Alumni and their Alma Matter: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103-123,

Moorman, RH (1991). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 845-855.

Niehoff BP, Moorman RH (1993). Justice As A mediator of the relationship between Methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship Behavior. *Academy of management Journal*, 36: 527-556.

Özen J (2003). Organiational Justice as the Key Element of Trust felt for the Organization. Trust in Social Sciences. Ankara: Vadi Publications.

Özer N, Demirtaş H, Üstüner M & Cömert M (2006). Organizational Trust of Secondary School Teachers. *Ege Journal of Education*, 7(1), 103-124.

Özhan H (2011). The Relationship Between Organizational Justice, Confidence, Commitment, and Evaluating The Manager and The Perceptions of Conflict Management at The Context of Organizational Behavior. *Educational Sciences in Method and Practice*, 11(1), 241-247.

Polat S (2007). The Association between Organizational Justice Perceptions, Organizational Trust Levels and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Secondary School Teachers. Doctorate thesis. Kocaeli University Institute of Social Sciences, Kocaeli.

Polat S, Celep C (2008). Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers on Organizational Justice, organizational Trust and Organizational Behaviors, Educational Management on Method and Practice, 54: 307-331.

Tüzün İK (2006). Association between Organizational Trust, Organizational Identity and Organizational Identification: An Applied Study, Gazi University Institute of Social Sciences, Doctorate Thesis, Ankara.

Yazıcıoğlu İ, Topaloğlu IG (2009). Association between Organizational Justice and Committment: An Application in Accomodation Enterprises. *Journal of Business Researches*,1(1), 3-16.

Yıldırım F (2002). Association between Organizational Committment and Organizational Justice. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. Ankara Unviersity, Institute of Social Sciences.

Yılmaz E (2005). Validity and reliability Study of Organizational Trust Scale in Schools. *Selçuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, 14: 567-580.

Yılmaz K (2010). Organizational Justice Perceptions of Students working at State Secondary Schools. *Educational Sciences in Method and Practice*, 10(1), 579-616.

Yılmaz K & Taşdan M (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 108-126.