

PERCEPTIONS OF THE STAFF OF THE GENERAL DIRECTORATE OF SPORTS ABOUT ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Yakup AKYEL¹

Mustafa Yaşar ŞAHİN²

Mehmet GÜNAY³

Abstract

In this study, it was aimed to determine the perceptions of the staff of the general directorate of sports about organizational justice, and to analyse according to some specific variables.

As a survey study, this study included 345 participants which were selected randomly. The data was collected through The Scale of Organizational Justice Perception including 20 items and four sub categories. The data was analysed with SPSS 16.0 applying independent samples t-test and ANOVA.

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that: the participants have medium level justice perception, and the sub category 'Informational Justice' is the leading one. In terms of gender variable, it was concluded that male participants have higher level of perception for the sub category 'procedural justice' and the sub category 'distributive justice' than female participants do. On the other hand, it was found out that female participants have higher level of perception for the sub category 'interpersonal justice' than male participants do. Furthermore, a negative correlation was found between the years of experience and the sub categories 'Procedural, Interpersonal and Informational Justice'. It was determined that the staff graduated from elementary level have higher means level for the sub categories 'Procedural Justice', 'Distributive Justice', 'Informational Justice'. Based on the variable of working place it was reached that the staff of the central organization (SGM) have higher level of perception in terms of 'Procedural justice' and 'Interpersonal justice'.

Introduction

Nowadays, we have experienced significant changes and revolution thanks to technological developments and globalization. In this process, both the state and private organizations have been affected enormously. Today the organizations have a tendency for a new kind of organization which is more flexible, which has horizontal positioning quality, which has increasing communication among the staff, and the controlling mechanism of which is for the staff themselves. In addition, networking is gaining importance for organizations.

¹ Assistant Prof.Dr., IAhı Evran University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Kırşehir, Turkey

² PhD, Gazi University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Ankara, Turkey

³ Prof.Dr., Gazi University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Ankara, Turkey

The rise in environmental and economic changes, the high necessity of flexibility and cooperation, the rise of belief in team and team work, the change of relations with employees and career forms have highlighted the importance of organizational justice. Organizational justice, which is the main element of social capital, is the key bound holding relations together in an organization. It is not possible for an institution to achieve goals and run well without justice. Additionally, justice is one of the important factors of efficient relations. Mutual justice is a vital situation. To be able to benefit from positive results of intra organizational justice it is needed to understand the concept and structure of organizational justice in detail (İşcan and Sayın, 2010). Organizational justice is one of the main sources of trust. Perceptions of employees for their organizations' implementations affect their commitment and trust on their administrators (İşcan and Sayın, 2010).

Recently, because of the fact that the strongest resource for organizational competition is human and that there is a necessary to determine the factors affecting human behaviours in the organizations, there have been an increasing interest for organizational justice (Yeardizx, 2014).

In this perspective, social scientists have accepted the importance of justice for personal pleasure of the staff and for a successful organization (Greenberg, 1990).

When it comes to our country, it can be seen that there is a very limited literature about sports management and it is believed that this study will make important contributions.

The term of Organizational Justice

In general justice is to pay regard to rights and law, and in the using process, to respects the rights of others, to rank everybody as equal and to give them their rights (Gültekin, 1983: 25; Püsküllüoğlu, 1999: 42). In different fields, it can be determined in different ways but justice can be described as showing respect to others' rights, ranking everybody as equal and giving them their rights. At this point, justice is a basis for the relations among the communities and in the communities (Özen, 2002).

Organizational justice can be described as people's want of being treated fairly in terms of management and organizational management. To the equality theory of Adams, equality is the belief of being treated fairly, and inequality is the belief of being treated unfairly (Griffin and Moorhead, 1986).

When the studies about organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007) are analysed, it is found out that organizational justice is described as the justice in the organizations, and it is emphasized that the relationship with the worker perception about the fair or unfair treatment at the work. Organizational justice perception is a personal perception formed as a result of an evaluation of management in terms of ethical and moral situation. To Folger and Cropanzano, organizational justice is the social norms and rules set out for the interpersonal applications and for the practices made in the process of distributive decisions and distributive of the outcomes (Polat and Kazak, 2014).

Aspects of organizational justice

The existence of justice in an organization is possible with trust and citizenship feeling, as for organizational dimension; it becomes possible with high efficiency, favorable workplace environment and strong organizational culture (Altunkurt, 2010). Deficiency of organizational justice results in distrust of employees on other employees and administrators of the organization, and not seeing themselves as a member of the organization.

Although there are many different aspects in the literature, plenty of researchers have described the organizational justice as distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Especially Greenberg (1987) analysed the term in three aspects as being fair of outcomes (distributive justice), of processes (procedural justice) and of interpersonal relations (interactional justice) (Greenberg, 1987).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice indicates the perception of all kinds of outcomes like money reward, fine and promotion as fair by the staff. Distributive justice is to guarantee that if every staff accomplishes specific tasks, he/she will be rewarded in the same way (Isan ve Naktiyok, 2004). Distributive justice is a term which deals with sharing all kinds of outcomes such as tasks, products, services, opportunities, fines/rewards, roles, status, fees, promotions in both social and organizational contexts (Cohen, 1987). Distributive justice describes employees' perceptions against whether acquisitions and rewards are distributed justly. In other words, distributive justice is perceptions about whether acquisitions of employees are evaluated properly and truly in terms of their performance (Polat ve Celep, 2008).

Distributive justice can develop when the results of justice and equality are consistent and coherent. The outcomes are regarded as a kind of reaction to their effort, and it is believed that appreciation, rewards and fees should be distributed equally (İçerli, 2009).

Procedural justice

As mentioned above, distributive justice deals only with the way of distribution of outcomes but it doesn't deal with the processes that affect these outcomes. These processes can affect the justice perception about distribution. Even in some situations these processes can be much more important than the outcomes. So there appears to be procedural justice focusing on this process and procedures (Greenberg, 1987).

Procedural justice is not related to the outcomes but being fair of decision making process determining the outcomes. That somebody perceives the procedures, methods, politics and practices –which are being applied in the process of evaluation and rewarding of the staff– as being fair is related to procedural justice. It includes objectivity in decision making process, using suitable and true data, right to speak of the staff, convenience of evaluation criteria (Cropanzano et al. 2002). In other words, procedural justice is a kind of perceived justice of the tools used in determining the outcomes (Çetinkaya and Çimenci, 2014).

Interactional justice

Interactional justice is expressing processes of making decisions about distribution and practices and decisions about the staff in the management department in a kind, sincere, honest way.

Folger and Cropanzano mention (about) two different types of interactional justice: legalization and interpersonal behaviours. To them, expressions related to the decisions will provide accurate legalization of the processes. Moreover Greenberg indicates that explaining the reasons for the decisions and having a sincere and honest communication affect the perceptions about justice in a positive way (İşbaşı, 2000:53).

Interactional justice points out the qualifications of behaviours and attitudes the staff have when they practice organizational activities (Liao and Tai, 2006).

Method

This study is a descriptive study which aims to determine opinions of the staff of the central and the country agents of the general directorate of sports. In this study, the scores of

the staff on the scale of organizational justice were compared and contrasted in terms of the gender, the marital status, age, experience year and their organizations.

Universe and Sample

The universe of the study is about 10 thousand staff working in the central and the country agents of the general directorate of sports. The sample is 370 staff selected by randomly. In this selection process, 5% was accepted as error rate, and the confidence interval was determined as 95%. But, because 345 out of 370 staff provided feedback for the study, the confidence interval was then determined as 94 %.

The data collection tool

In order to collect data, Personal Data Form and Scale of Organizational Justice Perception which was developed by Colquitt (2001) and translated by Arnak and Özeri (2007) into Turkish were applied. Based on the reliability analysis of the scale including twenty items and four sub categories, Cronbach Alpha was determined as the following: .94 for the subcategory of distributive justice; .86 for the subcategory of procedural justice and .88 for the subcategory of interactional justice (Özmen et al., 2007).

Similarly, according to the reliability analysis applied in the study of Yelboga (2012), internal consistency reliability rate namely Cronbach Alpha for the whole test was determined as 0.84. Based on these statistical results, it was concluded that the test is reliable and valid (Yelboga, 2012).

FINDINGS

Table 1- The Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of The Staff For Organizational Justice Perception

	N	Minimum	Maximum	\bar{X}	S
Procedural justice	345	1,00	5,00	3,42	,87
Distributive justice	345	1,00	5,00	3,21	1,03
Interpersonal justice	345	1,00	5,00	3,52	,73
Informational justice	345	1,00	5,00	3,59	,94

When the Table 1 is analysed, it can be seen that the Scores of The Staff For Organizational Justice Perception were determined as $\bar{X}=3,42$ for the subcategory procedural justice, as $\bar{X}=3,21$ for the subcategory distributive justice, as $\bar{X}=3,52$, for the subcategory interpersonal justice, and as $\bar{X}=3,59$ for the subcategory informational justice. The lowest score was for distributive justices while the highest score was for informational justice.

Table 2 - The results of Independent-Sample T-Test about the differences of perception levels on Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on gender of the staff

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	t	sd	p
Procedural justice	Female	128	3,38	,88	-,73	343	,469
	Male	217	3,45	,86			
Distributive justice	Female	128	3,11	1,04	-1,36	343	,175
	Male	217	3,26	1,03			

Interpersonal justice	Female	128	3,54	,69	,31	343	,760
	Male	217	3,51	,75			
Informational justice	Female	128	3,58	,90	-,06	343	,949
	Male	217	3,59	,97			

In order to determine whether there are significant differences on organizational justice perception of the staff participating in this study based on their gender or not, Independent-Sample T-Test was applied. It was concluded that male participants had higher level of perception for the sub category 'procedural justice' and the sub category 'distributive justice' than female participants did and for the sub category 'interpersonal justice', the female participants had higher level of perception than the males did.

Table 3-The results of Independent-Sample T-Test about the differences of perception levels on Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on marital status of the staff

	Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	S	t	sd	p
Proceduraljustice	Married	227	3,40	,89	-,66	343	,513
	Single	118	3,46	,83			
Distributivejustice	Married	227	3,19	1,07	-,50	343	,616
	Single	118	3,24	,95			
Interpersonaljustice	Married	227	3,51	,74	-,51	343	,614
	Single	118	3,55	,71			
Informationaljustice	Married	227	3,58	,93	-,10	343	,921
	Single	118	3,59	,96			

In the table 3, when the differences of perception levels on the Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on the marital status of the general directorate of sports, it was concluded that the single participants had higher levels of perception for all of the sub categories, but there weren't any significant differences among the results.

Table 4 The results of Independent-Sample T-Test about the differences of perception levels on Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on working place of the staff

	WorkingPlace	N	\bar{X}	S	t	sd	P
Procedural justice	SGM (Central Organization)	225	3,49	,83	2,13	343	,034*
	RuralOrganization	120	3,28	,92			
Distributive justice	SGM (Central Organization)	225	3,20	1,03	-,18	343	,856
	RuralOrganization	120	3,22	1,04			
Interpersonal justice	SGM (Central Organization)	225	3,58	,69	2,01	343	,046*
	RuralOrganization	120	3,42	,78			
Informational justice	SGM (Central Organization)	225	3,60	,92	,43	343	,666
	RuralOrganization	120	3,56	,99			

When the Table 4 is analysed, it can be summarized that the perception levels of the staff working in the central organization for the sub category ‘Procedural Justice’ is ($\bar{X}=3,49$) and for the staff working in the rural organizations is ($\bar{X}=3,28$), which causes significant differences according to $t_{(343)}=2,13$, $p<,05$. These significant differences were brought about by the fact that the staff of the central organization (SGM) have higher level of perception in terms of ‘Procedural justice’ and ‘Interpersonal justice’.

There is significant difference according to $t_{(343)}=2,01$, $p<,05$ ’e in terms of the sub category ‘interpersonal justice’ for the staff of the central organization (SGM).

When it comes to other sub categories, it can be concluded that the staff of the rural organizations have higher level of perception for the sub category ‘Distributive Justice’, and the staff of the central organization have higher level of perception for the sub category ‘Informational justice’. But there aren’t any significant differences between these two sub categories according to the working place variable.

Table 5 The results of One-Way Anova about the differences of perception levels on Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on experience years of the staff

		N	\bar{X}	S	F	p	Post Hoc (Tukey)
Procedural justice	0-2 year	95	3,58	,84	1,86	,137	
	3-8 year	79	3,37	,96			
	9-14 year	49	3,25	,73			
	15 above	122	3,39	,86			
Distributive justice	0-2 year	95	3,40	,96	3,76	,011*	0-2 year > 3-8 year 0-2 year > 9-14 year
	3-8 year	79	2,98	1,07			
	9-14 year	49	2,95	1,02			
	15 above	122	3,30	1,03			
Interpersonal justice	0-2 year	95	3,58	,72	1,20	,311	
	3-8 year	79	3,61	,74			
	9-14 year	49	3,40	,63			
	15 above	122	3,48	,76			
Informational justice	0-2 year	95	3,72	,94	2,14	,095	
	3-8 year	79	3,50	,87			
	9-14 year	49	3,34	,87			
	15 above	122	3,64	1,00			

As seen in the Table 5, it can be pointed out that there aren’t any significant differences based on the significance level of 0,05 for the sub categories ‘Procedural Justice’, ‘interpersonal Justice’, ‘Informational justice’, and the levels of perception of the staff with 0-2 years of experience are the highest one.

For the sub category ‘Distributive Justice’, significant differences can be seen about the ‘Distributive Justice’ based on the years of experience according to $F=3,76$, $p<,05$. These significant differences are like ($\bar{X}=3,40$) for the staff with “0-2 years of experience”, ($\bar{X}=2,98$) for the staff with “3-8 years of experience”, and ($\bar{X}=2,95$) for the staff with “9-14 years of experience”.

Table 5 The results of One-Way Anova about the differences of perception levels on Scale of Organizational Justice Perception based on educational background of the staff

		N	\bar{X}	S	F	p
Procedural justice	Primary School	38	3,56	,74	,78	,503
	High School	93	3,32	,90		
	AssociateDegree	45	3,46	,91		
	Undergraduate&GraduateDegree	169	3,43	,87		
Distributive justice	Primary School	38	3,48	1,02	1,59	,192
	High School	93	3,25	,98		
	AssociateDegree	45	3,26	1,16		
	Undergraduate&GraduateDegree	169	3,10	1,02		
Interpersonal justice	Primary School	38	3,53	,72	,75	,523
	High School	93	3,46	,77		
	AssociateDegree	45	3,66	,54		
	Undergraduate&GraduateDegree	169	3,52	,75		
Informational justice	Primary School	38	3,82	,93	1,07	,363
	High School	93	3,56	1,00		
	AssociateDegree	45	3,64	,80		
	Undergraduate&GraduateDegree	169	3,53	,94		

According to the Table 6, there aren't any significant differences based on the significance level of 0,05 related to educational background variable. It was determined that as the education level of the staff is increases, there becomes a decrease in procedural justice perception. In other words, the staffs with lowest level of educational background have the highest level of perception. For the sub category 'interpersonal justice' as the education level of the staff increases, there becomes an increase in perception.

RESULTS

As a result of the analysis, it can be said that the justice perception of the staff at work is above the medium level via the mean score ($\bar{X}=3,40$) of the scale which is formed as '1' indicates "never" and '5' indicates "always". When the justice perception of the staff was analysed in terms of sub categories, it can be concluded that the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=3,21$) is for the subcategory 'distributive justice' related to providing of the organizational justice. The mean score ($\bar{X}=3,42$) for the subcategory 'procedural justice' related to be fair of methods used to make organizational decisions is a bit high. However, the mean score is ($\bar{X}=3,52$) for the sub category 'interpersonal justice' related to managers' honest and open behaviours towards their staff and the mean score is ($\bar{X}=3,59$) for the sub category 'informational justice' related to informing the staff by the administrators.

As a result of these facts, it can be concluded that there is good communication between the staff and the managers, the managers are care about informing their staff in terms of social and personal rights, and the managers are careful and sensitive to respect their staff and their

rights. However, it can be indicated that the staff have negative impression about organization outcomes like appreciation, reward, social rights and promotion.

There aren't any significant differences on organizational justice perception of the staff of the general directorate of sports participating in this study based on their gender. It was also concluded that male participants had higher level of perception for the sub category 'procedural justice' and the sub category 'distributive justice' than female participants did, and for the sub category 'interpersonal justice', the female participants had higher level of perception than males did.

In this study, it was found that there weren't any significant differences for organizational justice and the four sub categories based on the staff's marital status of the general directorate of sports. It was also concluded that the single participants had higher levels of perception for all of the sub categories.

In the literature there are various studies that support our findings or contrast with our findings. For instance, Tetik (2010) doesn't find any significant differences between the sub categories of organizational justice and marital status (Tetik, 2010). Demirkıran, Yordan and Yorulmaz (2013) find significant differences between the single and the married staff in terms of distributive justice ($3,54 \pm 1,07$; $3,05 \pm 0,93$) (Tekfur et al., 2013).

When the differences among their perception levels of the staff of the general directorate of sports based on the 'The Scale of Organizational Justice Perception' are examined, significant differences can be seen for the sub categories 'Procedural justice' and 'Interpersonal justice' in favour of the staff working in the central organization ($t_{(343)}=2,01$, $p<,05$). From the study findings, it can be mentioned that the managers working in the rural organizations should be fairer in terms of method, procedures and politics which determine organizational outcomes.

In the study, it was found that the highest level of justice perception belongs to the staff starting work recently. Moreover, significant differences can be seen about the 'Distributive Justice' based on the years of experience according to $F=3,76$, $p<,05$. These significant differences are caused by the fact that 'Distributive Justice' perception of the staff with "0-2 years of experience" ($\bar{X}=3,40$), and what of the staff "3-8 years of experience" ($\bar{X}=2,98$) are higher than the perception levels of the staff with "9-14 years of experience" ($\bar{X}=2,95$). In other words, as the number of experience years increases, the levels of justice perception of organizational justice decrease.

The study carried out by Yavuz (2010) has a contrastive point for our study; there aren't any significant differences about organizational justice perception based on their experience years of the staff working in private and state organizations while it has a supporting point for our study which is that the ones with 0-1 year of experience have the highest level of justice perception ($\bar{X}=3,36$), which is similar to our finding that the ones with 2-5 years of experience have the highest level of justice perception ($\bar{X}=2,99$) (Yavuz, 2010).

Based on the educational background variable, the highest level of justice perception for the sub category 'Procedural Justice' belongs to the primary school graduates ($\bar{X}=3,56$); the highest level of justice perception for the sub category 'Distributive Justice' belongs to the primary school graduates ($\bar{X}=3,48$); the highest level of justice perception for the sub category 'Interpersonal Justice' belongs to the associate degree graduates ($\bar{X}=3,53$); the highest level of justice perception for the sub category 'Informational Justice' belongs to the primary school graduates ($\bar{X}=3,82$).

The situation can be clarified with the fact that the staffs with lower level of educational background have higher levels of organizational justice perception, the staffs with higher level of educational background have much more outcomes than the others do, and these facts cause much more expectations.

Consequently, it can be summarized that the practices related to organizational justice in the general directorate of sports are perceived as being fair. But, when the results of the scale of justice perception are examined, it is seen that the level of the perception is medium not high. So, the practices related to organizational justice should be reconstructed, which is very important for the sake of organizational power. The study results show that the perception level of distributive justice is low. For this reason, especially the senior managers should try to have an organization atmosphere which includes organizational ethic and justice system.

Furthermore, it is found out via the scale that the male staff have the highest level of perception for the subcategories 'Procedural and Distributive Justice', and the single staff has have the highest level of perception for all of the subcategories. There is a negative correlation among the years of experience and 'Procedural, Interpersonal and informational justice'. The primary school graduate staffs have the highest level of perception for the subcategories 'Procedural, Distributive and Informational Justice'.

According to the working place variable, it is seen that there are significant differences for the sub categories 'Procedural justice' and 'Interpersonal justice' in favour of the staff working in the central organization (SGM). These results show that the managers working in the rural organizations should have open and honest relations, and a more active communication.

REFERENCES

- Altinkurt, Y. (2010). Örgütsel Adalet. Memduhoğlu, H. B. & Yılmaz, K. (Eds.). Yönetimde Yeni Yaklaşımlar. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Cohen, R.L., Distributive Justice: theory and research, *Social Justice Research*, 1987;1: 19-40.
- Cropanzano R., Prehar C. A., ve Chen P. Y. Using socialexchange theory to distinguishprocedural from interactionaljustice. *Group&Organization Management*, 2002; 27 (3): 324-351.
- Çetinkaya M, Çimenci S. Örgütsel Adalet Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisi ve Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Aracılık Rolü: Yapısal Eşitlik Modeli Çalışması. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2014; 12(23): 237-278.
- Greenberg, J. Organizationaljustice: yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 1990, 16(2): 389-412.
- Greenberg, J.A taxonomy of organizationaljusticetheories, *The Academy of Management Review*, 1987;12 (1): 9-22.
- Griffin, R., Moorhead, G. Organizationalbehavior. HoughtonMifflinCompany, 1986.
- Gültekin, V. (1983). Hayat Ansiklopedisi. İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınevi.
- İçerli, L. Örgüt yapısı ve örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkiler, (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi) İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2009.
- İşbaşı, J. Ö. (2000) Çalışanların Yöneticilerine Duydukları Güvenin ve Örgütsel Adaletle İlişkin Algılamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışının Oluşumundaki Rolü, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.

- İşcan, Ö.F.and Naktiyok, A.(2004). Çalışanların örgütsel bağdaşımalarının belirleyicileri olarak örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel adalet algıları, Ankara üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 59 (1): 182-201.
- İşcan, Ö.F. and Sayın, U. (2010). “Örgütsel Adalet, İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Güven Arasındaki İlişki”. Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 24(4); 195-216.
- Liao, W.,Wei-Tao, T. OrganizationalJustice, Motivation to Learn, and Training Outcomes” SocialBehavior and Personality, 2006; 34 (5): 545-556.
- Özen, J. Adalet kuramlarının gelişimi ve örgütsel adalet türleri. Hukuk Felsefesi ve Sosyolojisi Arşivi, 2002, Haziran (5): 107-117.
- Özmen Ö. N. T, Arbak Y, Özer P.S. Adalet Verilen Değerin Adalet Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Sorgulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma. Ege AcademicReview, 2007; 7 (1): 17-33.
- Polat, S. and Celep C. (2008). “Ortaöğretim Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Adalet, Örgütsel Güven, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına İlişkin Algıları”. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, (54): 307-331.
- Polat, S., Kazak, E. Okul Yöneticilerinin Kayırmacı Tutum ve Davranışları ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Algıları Arasındaki İlişki [doi: 10.14527/kuey. 2014.004]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 2014; 20(1): 71-92.
- Püsküllüoğlu, A. (1999). Türkçe Sözlük. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.
- Tetik S. Kamu işletmelerinde çalışanların örgütsel adalet algılarının bazı demografik özellikler açısından incelenmesi. Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2010; 4(1); 239-249.
- Teyfur M, Beytekin OF, Yalçınkaya M. İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik özellikleri ile okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin incelenmesi (İzmir il örneği). Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2013; 21: 84-106.
- Yavuz E. Kamu ve özel sektör çalışanlarının örgütsel adalet algılamaları üzerine bir karşılaştırma çalışması. Doğu Üniversitesi Dergisi, 2010; 11(2): 302-312.
- Yelboğa A. Örgütsel adalet ile iş doyumu ilişkisi: ampirik bir çalışma. Ege Akademik Bakış, 2012; 12(2): 171-182.
- Yıldız S. Örgütsel Adaletin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisinde İş Tatmininin Aracı Rolü. Ege Akademik Bakış, 2014; 14(2): 199-210.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Nowadays, we have experienced significant changes and revolution thanks to technological developments and globalization. In this process, both the state and private organizations have been affected enormously. Today the organizations have a tendency for a new kind of organization which is more flexible, which has horizontal positioning quality, which has increasing communication among the staff, and the controlling mechanism of which is for the staff themselves. In addition, networking is gaining importance for organizations. The rise in environmental and economic changes, the high necessity of flexibility and cooperation, the

rise of belief in team and team work, the change of relations with employees and career forms have highlighted the importance of organizational justice. Organizational justice, which is the main element of social capital, is the key bound holding relations together in an organization. It is not possible for an institution to achieve goals and run well without justice.

In this study, it was aimed to determine the perceptions of the staff of the general directorate of sports about organizational justice, and to analyse according to some specific variables. As a survey study, this study included 345 participants which were selected randomly. The data was collected through The Scale of Organizational Justice Perception including 20 items and four sub categories. The data was analysed with SPSS 16.0 applying independent samples t-test and ANOVA.

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that: the participants have medium level justice perception, and the sub category 'Informational Justice' is the leading one. In terms of gender variable, it was concluded that male participants have higher level of perception for the sub category 'procedural justice' and the sub category 'distributive justice' than female participants do. On the other hand, it was found out that female participants have higher level of perception for the sub category 'interpersonal justice' than male participants do. Furthermore, a negative correlation was found between the years of experience and the sub categories 'Procedural, Interpersonal and Informational Justice'. It was determined that the staff graduated from elementary level have higher means level for the sub categories 'Procedural Justice', 'Distributive Justice', 'Informational Justice'. Based on the variable of working place it was reached that the staff of the central organization (SGM) have higher level of perception in terms of 'Procedural justice' and 'Interpersonal justice'.