

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATION BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION LEVELS AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMICIANS

Pınar KARACAN DOĞAN¹

¹Gazi University, Sports Sciences Faculty, Ankara

Geliş Tarihi: 05.03.2018

Kabul Tarihi: 16.04.2018

Abstract: The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between the organizational justice and organizational identification perceptions of the academicians in terms of some variables. The descriptive review model was used in the study as the method. As the data collection tool, the “Organizational Justice Perception Scale”, which was developed by Colquitt (2001) whose Turkish adaptation was performed by Özmen, Arnak and Özeri (2007), and the “Organizational Identification Scale”, which was developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) whose Turkish adaptation was performed by Polat (2009), were used in the study. The study group consisted of 207 volunteering participants (152 male, 55 female) who worked at Sports Sciences Faculties of universities and who were selected according to the simple random sampling method. The Multilinear Regression Analysis was used to examine the effect of organizational justice scores of the academicians who worked at Sports Sciences Faculties of universities on organizational identification levels. For the purpose of determining the difference between the organizational justice and organizational identification levels of the academicians according to gender and marital status, the Independent Samples t-test was applied; and the One-Way ANOVA test was applied to determine the difference according to service years and the department worked at. The significance level was determined as 0.05.

As a result, it was determined that there is a positive and significant relation between the procedural justice, distributional justice and interpersonal justice levels, which are among the sub-dimensions of organizational justice of academicians who worked at sport sciences faculties, and their organizational identification levels; the organizational identification levels of the participants were high; their organizational justice perceptions were above the medium level, and the service years, which is one of the demographical variables, increased, it had a positive effect on these levels.

Keywords: Organizational justice, Organizational identification

INTRODUCTION

Today’s organizational structures, which have the tendency of being transformed into more flexible ones with horizontal positioning property, having increased communication between employees, with employees being in control of the mechanisms and with intra-organizational network structures, are gaining more importance. In such organizations, interpersonal communication and coordination has gained importance and has even become a requirement. No doubt, the most important element in this new order is “*knowledge*”. For this

reason, the most important factor that may acquire, create, evaluate and use this knowledge is the “*human factor*” (Akyel, 2017). Organizations, which consist of humans coming together to realize their certain goals, must use the human factor, which constitute one of the most important resources, in an efficient way in order to sustain their existence in today’s competitive world. In establishing the balance between the aims or the individual and the organizational aims, in reducing the employee turnover rate, and in ensuring the employee effi-

ciency, one of the most important factors is the organizational identification levels of employees. As the identification levels of employees increase, it becomes easier for them to adopt the aims of the organization, and it is facilitated that they see themselves as identified with their organization, the sacrificing feelings increase, the membership of the organization may be continued in a voluntary manner, and the roles may be realized in an efficient manner (Yazıcıoğlu & Topaloğlu, 2009).

Major-scale changes or transformations experienced in the external conditions of organizations have increased the importance of the psychological relation between employees and organizations. In other words, all organizations expect that employees love their work places, have the feeling of loyalty, and do not have the cease of employment intentions; i.e. they require that employees identify their organizations with their individual identities. Making organizational membership becomes an important part of the identities of employees ensuring that they feel proud when they are defining themselves as one of the members of the organization, have key roles in terms of acquiring long-term successes under the conditions that are now present (İşcan, 2006).

The individuals', who constitute the organization, adopting the aims and values of the organization, integrating themselves with the organization and trying to bring more benefit in this term in the organization, and considering some serious sacrifices for these purposes, being identified with the organization, trying to bring more benefits for the company, feeling trust in their organizations and managers and colleagues; being present in a fair organizational structure, having a sense of belonging and loyalty for the organization cause that they become more efficient and productive (Candan, 2014).

One of the most important factors in ensuring the organizational identification is the beliefs of employees in working in an environment that have justice. The organizational justice, which is one of the concepts that is the subject matter of the present study, and is also one of the fields on which intense studies are conducted in organizational psychology, human resources management, organizational behavior fields, and it was accepted that this was an important field in realizing the functions of an organization (Greenberg, 1990a).

The organizational identification and organizational justice concepts, which are among the important factors in ensuring organizational efficiency and productivity, are among the topics that are emphasized with great importance by fields like organizational behavior and human resources management. Based on this point, analyzing the relation between the organizational justice perceptions and organizational identification levels of academicians and examining this relation in terms of some variables constitute the main aim of the present study.

Organizational Identification

Organizational identification is defined as the perception of being unified with the organization in which the individuals define themselves in the scope of the organization to which they belong, the success or failure of the organization with which they integrate themselves and is said to be a special form of social identification (Mael & Ashfort, 1992). Organizational identification may also be defined as the harmonization of individuals with the targets of the organization they belong to (Edwards, 2005). Dutton et al. (1994) defined the identification as the overlapping point between the "cognitive bond between one's individuality and the definition of his/her organization" and the "cognitive image" constructed by the organization and the identity of the member of the organization or a member's using the same statements s/he uses to define himself/herself for defining his/her organization. When organization members classify themselves in a social group (organization) that is different and centralist, and that has permanent qualities, organizational identification is strengthened.

Lee (1971) dealt with organizational identification over three basic phenomena, belonging, loyalty and showing common characteristics. As a sense of belonging, identification refers to a phenomenon that comes from common targets that are shared with others in the organization. As loyalty and identification is discussed around the attitudes and behaviors that support the organization. These attitudes and behaviors include adopting and supporting organizational aims, being proud of the success of the organization, and defending the organization to outsiders. Identification, as common characteristics, on the other hand, refers to the similarities between employees. These similarities

may be demographic characteristics, attitudinal characteristics, educational level, experience, gender, race, age, success, job level, job type and some other similar aspects (Cited by İçkes & Yılmaz, 2017).

Another way of defining the organizational identification is the Social Identification Theory (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Social Identification Theory assumes that individuals acquire social identities and therefore individual identities through organizational membership. This viewpoint is based on two main assumptions. The first one claims that employees are motivated in order to strengthen their self-respect, and the other one claims that people use categories and comparisons to create their own environment and define a place for themselves in this environment. social identification theory-based identification, which explains organizational identification, is based on the feeling that the organizational belonging and membership to the organization will strengthen the self-respect (Turunç & Çelik, 2010).

According to Hall et al. (1970), identification mainly consists of three elements. The main element of identification is that individual believes in organizational aims and values, and accept them. In this way, identification may be seen as the integration process of organizational and individual aims. The second element of identification is that the individual does the activities that constitute his/her organizational role in a willing manner. For an individual who adopts the aims of the organization as if they were his/her own aims, working to realize them is a source of satisfaction. In other words, the levels of the satisfaction of the work done is proportional to the level of the organizational identification level. The side of one's personality shows a great development after s/he joins the organization when compared with other sides. An individual who loves competitions is inclined to identify himself/herself with a job that may bring profit, an individual who has the need for bonding is inclined to identify himself/herself with an organization generally in the field of service sector. The third element of identification is that individuals must be willing to sustain their membership to the organization. Although those who identify themselves with the organization find better conditions in terms of salary, promotion and respectfulness, they may not leave their organizations (Cited by Polat & Meydan, 2010).

The organizational identification level of an individual shows how much his/her self-identity is devoted to the organization. If the organizational membership has gained a place in the self-identity of an employee, if it has gained an important position that is more important than the membership in other social groups, this individual has identified himself/herself with the organization at a high level (Karabey & İşcan, 2007). In previous studies, it was reported that identification caused positive outcomes in the attitudes and behaviors, and in this respect, it affected the motivation, job performance and satisfaction, individual decision-making and employee Interactional (Cheney, 1983; Scott et al., 1988).

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is explained with the procedures used in distributing the acquisitions and in making decisions and with the rules and social norms that are required by the Interactional among individuals (Folger & Konovsky 1989; Greenberg, 1990b). Organizational justice may be defined as the positive perception of the decisions and practices of the managers by employees. In other words, organizational justice is the way in which employees perceive how the salaries, rewards, fines and promotions in the organization are distributed, how these decisions are taken, or how these decisions are told to employees (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2012; Cropanzano, et al., 2002).

The historical development of organizational justice is based on the "Adams' Equity Theory" of Adams (1963), and still keeps its importance in our present day. According to this theory, an individual makes an accountancy of inputs and outputs in his/her job. In other words, this theory consists of the balance between the sacrifices of an individual made for his/her job (input) and the values s/he acquires as a result (output). The inputs are the things given by the individual to the organization (mastership, effort, training received, experience, etc.); the outcomes are the things given to the individual by the organization (reputation, salary, appreciation, promotion in profession, etc.). In other words, the basis of the Equity Hypothesis of Adams (1963) is the desires of the people for being treated in a fair manner. According to the hypothesis, equity means that the individual believes that s/he is treated in a fair manner compared with

other people in work place; inequity means that the individual believes that s/he is not treated in a fair manner when compared with other people in work place. In the Equity Theory of Adams, the individual reaches satisfaction in case the input-output rate is balanced. The Equity Theory directed the attention of organizational scientists to conduct studies on justice concept (Mowday, 1987).

Justice perceptions in management field are examined in four dimensions, which are Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Informational Justice and Interpersonal Justice. At first, the researchers intensified on "Distributive Justice" dimension, which included mostly the decision-making processes (Colquitt, 2001; Deutsch, 1975; Homans, 1961, Leventhal, 1976). As scientific studies on organizational justice increased, it was revealed that the distributive justice, which only involved the decision-making processes, were not adequate alone; and different researchers started to investigate new dimensions that included organizational justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1987; Leventhal, 1980; Moorman, 1991). Although debates are still ongoing on the dimensions of organizational justice, the model which was proposed by Colquitt (2001) and which included 4 dimensions mentioned in his study in which he reported meta-analytic findings, was the most-preferred method in the literature.

Distributive justice is related with the righteousness of the administrative decisions on the situation of some acquisitions of employees like salary and promotion (Dailey & Kirk, 1992). In other words, the distributive justice seeks the answer to the question "Do employees perceive the salary, rewards and promotions they receive as being fair?". Until recently, the distributive justice on the distributive of the acquisitions was considered as the sole dimension of organizational justice perceptions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In another definition, distributive justice was defined as "the equity evaluation of employees on the rewards given for their own inputs" of employees (Mueller et al., 1999). Distributive justice requires that individuals are behaved on a basis that is defined as ethical and objective. According to these principle, the individuals who are similar in terms of related aspects must be treated similarly; however, different individuals must be treated differently at a rate of their differences (Foley et al., 2002). *Procedural Justice* is defined as the justice perception on the methods and processes used in

determining the acquisitions (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991). Konovsky (2000) stated that procedural justice is related with how distributional decisions are made, and with objective and subjective situations. Bies and Moag (1986) pointed out to the importance of the quality of interpersonal behaviors when the proceedings are performed and called this "*Interactional Justice*". In this respect, Greenberg (1993) claimed that *Interactional justice* should be examined under two dimensions which are interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interactional Justice includes some behaviors like caring for employees, being respectful, and announcing a decision that is defined as a social value to employees. *Informational justice*, on the other hand, may be defined as providing information on the realization of proceedings, distributional of acquisitions, and explaining these to employees (Colquitt et al., 2001). Colquitt (2001) defined interpersonal justice with the level of courtesy, value and respect shown by authorities (managers) who participate in the realization of acquisitions to employees.

METHOD

The Model of the Study

The study is a descriptive research designed as a relational survey method. The aim of this model is to determine the existence and level of the covariance among more than one variables (Karasar, 2005).

The Study Group

The study group consisted of a total of 207 volunteering participants (152 male and 55 female) who were selected according to the "Simple Random Sampling Method" from among academicians who worked at Sports Sciences Faculties of different universities.

The Data Collection Tool

For the purpose of determining the data of the academicians who participated in the study according to their gender, marital status, service years, and their departments at their work places, a Personal Information Form was created. Before the other scales, the Personal Information Form was applied to the participants.

The “Organizational Justice Perception Scale”, which was developed by Colquitt (2001), and which was adopted into Turkish by Özmen, Arnak and Özeri (2007), was used as the data collection tool. The scale, which is designed according to the 5-Point Likert Type, consisted of 20 items and 4 sub-dimensions (Procedural Justice, Distributional Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice). According to the reliability analysis conducted, the Cronbach Alpha value for Distributional Justice Perception Dimension was .91; for Procedural Justice perception dimension .91; for Interactional Justice perception dimension .85; for Informational Justice sub-dimension .95.

Again, in the study, another measurement tool, the “Organizational Identification Scale”, which was developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992), and which was adopted into Turkish by Polat (2009), was used. As a result of the analyses, the reliability coefficient of the scale, which was leveled in the form of 5-Point Likert Style and which consisted of single dimension, was found to be .91.

The Analysis of the Data

In the present study, the Multilinear Regression Analysis was used to examine the effect of organizational justice scores of the academicians who worked at Sport Sciences Faculties of universities on their organizational identification levels. The Independent Samples t-test was used to determine the difference between the organizational justice

and organizational identification levels of the academicians according to gender and marital status; and the One-Way ANOVA test was used to determine the difference according to service years and the department worked. The significance level was determined to be 0.05.

FINDINGS

One of the most important assumptions in regression analysis is the multicollinearity problem. The multicollinearity problem shows that there are high-level relations between independent variables ($r > 0.90$) (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010). Many methods were suggested to test the multicollinearity problem, which appears depending on high correlation between independent variables. One of these methods is the examination of the correlation between the independent variables (Büyüköztürk, 2011; Çokluk et al., 2010). As a result of the correlation analysis which was performed to determine the level of the relation between independent variables it was determined that the highest relation level was 0.738. This finding may be stated as there is no multicollinearity problem between the independent variables.

According Table 2, a positive, medium-level and significant relation was determined between the Procedural Justice, Distributional Justice and Interpersonal Justice sub-dimensions and Organizational Identification levels ($R = .514$, $R^2 = .264$,

Table 1. Correlation Between Independent Variables

Variables		Procedural Justice	Distributional Justice	Interpersonal Justice	Informational Justice
Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	,633**	,725**	,616**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000
	N	207	207	207	207
Distributional Justice	Pearson Correlation	,633**	1	,513**	,558**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000
	N	207	207	207	207
Interpersonal Justice	Pearson Correlation	,725**	,513**	1	,738**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000
	N	207	207	207	207
Informational Justice	Pearson Correlation	,616**	,558**	,738**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
	N	207	207	207	207

$p < .000$). In other words, as the scores of the academicians who worked at universities in procedural justice, Distributational Justice, and Interpersonal Justice increase, so do the Organizational Identification scores.

According to the data obtained in the study, the Organizational Identification of the academicians is at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3,8$), and there are no significant differences in terms of the gender variable. It was also determined that the perceptions of the academicians in Organizational Justice sub-dimensions (Procedural Justice: $\bar{X} = 3,2$; Distributational Justice: $\bar{X} = 3,4$; Interpersonal Justice: $\bar{X} = 3,5$; Informational Justice: $\bar{X} = 3,19$) are above medium level, and the personal justice dimension is more dominant. On the other hand, only the scores in Informational Justice sub-dimension differed in favor of the female academicians according to the gender variable ($t_{205} = 2,366$; $p = 0,019$).

When Table 4 is considered, it is seen that the Organizational Identification, Procedural Justice, Distributational Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice scores of the academicians do not differ according to marital status.

According to Table 5, it was determined that the Organizational Identification and Informational Justice sub-dimension scores of the academicians differ according to service years at their work places. According to the Organizational Identification sub-dimension of the academicians who had service years over 18 years and between 6 and 11 years, it was determined that there was a significant difference in favor of the academicians who had 18 years and over service years ($F_{(3,203)} = 3,004$; $p < 0,05$). Similarly, it was determined that there is a significant difference in favor of the academicians who had service years between 12-17, when those who had 6-11 service years and 6-11 were compared according to informational justice dimension ($F_{(3,203)} = 3,425$; $p < 0,05$).

In Table 6, it is seen that it was determined that the Organizational Identification, procedural justice, Distributational Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice sub-dimension scores of the academicians did not differ according to the department at which they worked.

Table 2. Regression Analysis for Organizational Identification Scale

	B	SH	Beta	t	p	Partial	Part
(Invariant)	11,158	1,452		7,683	,000		
Procedural Justice	,267	,096	,324	2,777	,006	,192	,168
Distributational Justice	,289	,118	,193	2,454	,015	,170	,148
Interpersonal Justice	,261	,128	,192	2,029	,044	,141	,122
Informational Justice	-,130	,107	-,137	-1,219	,224	-,085	-,074

Table 3. Independent Samples t-test Results Regarding Organizational Identification and Organizational Justice Scales According to Gender

	Gender	N	\bar{x}	Ss	df	t	p
Organizational Identification	Male	152	22,80	5,354	205	,010	,992
	Female	55	22,81	6,388			
Procedural Justice	Male	152	22,24	6,850	205	1,298	,196
	Female	55	23,63	6,731			
Distributational Justice	Male	152	13,47	3,633	205	,858	,392
	Female	55	13,98	4,102			
Interpersonal Justice	Male	152	14,05	4,237	205	,700	,488
	Female	55	14,50	3,881			
Informational Justice	Male	152	14,88	6,003	205	2,366	,019
	Female	55	17,07	5,466			

Table 4. Independent Samples *t*-Test Results Regarding Organizational Identification and Organizational Justice Scales According to Marital Status

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Ss	df	t	p
Organizational Identification	Married	168	22,87	5,690	205	,335	,738
	Single	39	22,53	5,433			
Procedural Justice	Married	168	22,41	7,077	205	,860	,391
	Single	39	23,46	5,646			
Distributinal Justice	Married	168	13,53	3,795	205	,579	,564
	Single	39	13,92	3,637			
Interpersonal Justice	Married	168	14,11	4,229	205	,395	,693
	Single	39	14,41	3,781			
Informational Justice	Married	168	15,17	6,040	205	1,494	,137
	Single	39	16,74	5,324			

Table 5. One Way ANOVA Test Results Regarding Organizational Identification and Organizational Justice Scales According to Working Year

		Ss	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Organizational Identification	Inter Group	277,739	3	92,580	3,004	,031	18 years and over with 6-11 years
	In-Group	6255,913	203	30,817			
	Total	6533,652	206				
Procedural Justice	Inter Group	227,144	3	75,715	1,638	,182	
	In-Group	9383,938	203	46,226			
	Total	9611,082	206				
Distributinal Justice	Inter Group	100,756	3	33,585	2,424	,067	
	In-Group	2812,548	203	13,855			
	Total	2913,304	206				
Interpersonal Justice	Inter Group	23,951	3	7,984	,462	,709	
	In-Group	3509,788	203	17,290			
	Total	3533,739	206				
Informational Justice	Inter Group	349,281	3	116,427	3,425	,018	12-17 yıl ile 6-11 yıl
	In-Group	6900,265	203	33,991			
	Total	7249,546	206				

Table 6. One way ANOVA Test Results Regarding Organizational Identification and Organizational Justice Scales According to the Department in the Institution

		Ss	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organizational Identification	Inter Group	213,545	3	71,182	2,243	,085
	In-Group	6251,978	197	31,736		
	Total	6465,522	200			
Procedural Justice	Inter Group	137,158	3	45,719	,969	,408
	In-Group	9296,524	197	47,190		
	Total	9433,682	200			
Distributinal Justice	Inter Group	27,238	3	9,079	,654	,581
	In-Group	2736,026	197	13,888		
	Total	2763,264	200			
Interpersonal Justice	Inter Group	20,517	3	6,839	,394	,758
	In-Group	3421,851	197	17,370		
	Total	3442,368	200			
Informational Justice	Inter Group	69,318	3	23,106	,656	,580
	In-Group	6938,483	197	35,221		
	Total	7007,801	200			

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

When the results of the regression analyses between the scale which were used as a data collection tool were considered (Table 2), it was determined that there is a positive, medium-level and significant difference between the Organizational Identification levels and Procedural Justice, Distributional Justice and Interpersonal Justice sub-dimension of the Organizational Justice Scale ($R=.514$, $R^2=.264$, $p<.000$). In other words, it is possible to claim that as the Procedural Justice, Distributional Justice and Interpersonal Justice sub-dimension scores of the academicians who worked at universities increase, so do the Organizational Identification scores. Greenberg (1990a) claimed that in the long run, justice was a basic requirement for the identification of employees with the organization and for the functioning of the organization. Because justice perception shapes the thinking styles, feelings and the activities of individuals (Özdemir, 2010). It is considered that Organizational Justice perception strengthens the bond between the employees and their work places (Thompkins & Cheney, 1985). When employees evaluate the organization practices and the acquisitions they will have in a fair manner, they will think that their organization cares about them and behaves respectfully. This attitude, predisposition or behavior that appear in the employee will ensure that the employee bonds to the organization in an affective way, and identifies with it as a result of positive, volunteering and cooperative behaviors.

The relevant literature points out that one of the most important organizational factors is the Organizational Justice Perception (Cremer, 2005; Brewer & Kramer, 1986; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). The findings of the present study support these findings. In addition, in similar studies, it was also concluded that there is a positive relation between Organizational Justice sub-dimension and Organizational Identification level, which is parallel to the findings of the present study (Turunç, 2011; Cheung & Law, 2008; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Çetinkaya & Çimenci, 2014). According to Lipponen, Wisse and Perala (2001), as the procedural justice increases, the tendency also increases in employees to identify themselves with their organizations. When the results of the present study are analyzed, it is possible to claim that the inclinations of the employees increase when they believe that the procedures used during organiza-

tional processes, equity principles, and interpersonal relations are fair. Employees, who think that interpersonal relations, practices, information sharing in the organization and the acquisitions they have are fair, believe that they are cared and respected for by their organizations. Feeling that one is respected and cared for in an organization increases the self-respect of him/her, and s/he will try to identify himself/herself with the organization to protect their self-respect and to identify themselves (Tyler & Blader, 2003). In this respect, it is possible that employees respond to the care and sensitivity of their organizations in treating employees in a fair way by caring for their organizations, defending it and seeing it as the part of their identities, in brief, by identifying themselves with their organizations.

According to the data obtained in the present study, it was determined that the organizational identification levels of the academicians were at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3,8$). Academicians, who are the most important value for universities, spend their efforts by using their knowledge, skills and attitudes for their organizations. In this respect, the existence of academicians who have high identification levels may increase the productivity of universities. Because the performance criteria of academicians who work at universities like the number and quality of publications affect directly the world ranking of universities. The results of the study show that the participants experience the Organizational Identification feeling at a very high level, they see themselves as a part of their organizations, and their scores in identification themselves with their organizations are high. It is possible to claim that these high scores stem from the fact that academicians see their work not only as a profession but also as a life style (Tolukan et al., 2016). In this respect, according to the study findings, the high identification levels of academicians with their organizations may stem from the fact that they trust their colleagues, they believe that they are in a fair organizations structure, they feel a sense of belonging and loyalty for their organizations, they establish affective bonds with their organizations by integrating their organization and profession with their personal values, they have high interpersonal communication levels, and they adopt and love their professions with the enlightening effect of science. The level of one's identification of himself/herself with his/her organization reflects the bonding level of him/her with his/her

organization. The self-entity of an individual who has a strong identification with his/her organization integrate the discriminative, central and permanent features felt for the organization with the discriminative, central and permanent features of one's own. In this respect, if the identity of an employee as a member of the organization attracts more attention than the other identities, and if an employee uses the concepts s/he uses to define the organization to define himself/herself, it is accepted that this individual has identified himself/herself with his/her organization in a strong level (Dutton et al., 1994).

According to the study results, it was determined that the Distributional Justice, Procedural Justice and Informational Justice perceptions of academicians are generally at a medium level, and interpersonal justice dimension is at a high level (4,4). According to Sarikoyuncu and Ağca (2018), when employees working at an organization form their perception and attitudes towards their organization, they are affected by the Organizational Justice applied by the organization at a great deal. The Organizational Justice applied to employees ensures that organization members satisfy the psychological and social needs of organization members, they integrate with their organizations, adopt the aims of the organizations, their devotion to organizations increases, in other words, they adopt their organizations, and therefore, it also ensures that employees work in a more efficient and productive way. In this context, the Organizational Justice perception level of academicians being determined as over medium level is a positive situation for sport sciences faculties. Educators' being successful and efficient is one of the most important indicators in reaching success for educational organizations. Because high Organizational Justice perceptions of employees about the practices in educational faculties appear before us as factors effecting the productivity of organizations and employees (Aytaç, 2018). It was also determined in the present study that the academicians were inclined more towards the Interpersonal Justice dimension. The negative reaction of an employee to a behavior that s/he sees to be improper is associated with Interpersonal Justice. In this respect, it is possible to claim that academicians' level in considering the respect, sensitivity and caring in a behavior done to him/her is interpreted as an important criterion by the academicians in

Organizational Justice perception (Bies & Moag, 1986).

In the analysis made between the gender variable of the academicians and the sub-dimension of Organizational Justice Scale, it was determined that female participants had higher average scores in all dimensions, and there is a significant difference in Informational Justice sub-dimension. Parallel to the study results, Çakar (2015) determined in his study that the expectations of female academicians were more than those of male academicians in all justice perceptions, and explained this situation as the gender being one of the factors that affect working conditions of employees in an organization. As the reason for similar identification levels of academicians according to the gender variable, we may show the fact that social gender roles associated with males and females are not effective at universities, and in general, academicians are talked about as scientists. Parallel to the results of the present study, Başar (2011) conducted a study on teachers and reported that the identification levels did not vary at a significant level according to gender and marital status variables. In addition, Lovelace and Rosen (1996) stated that the results of the analyses of many studies in the literature conducted on the identification of individuals with their organizations and on the individual-organization agreement did not vary according to race and gender variables. However, Nartgün and Kalay (2014) conducted a study in educational field, and reported that the identification status of teachers with their organizations they work differed at a significant level in terms of the gender variable in favor of the male participants. The results of this study differ from the results of the present study of ours.

While no significant differences were detected in the analysis made in the sub-dimensions of Organizational Justice Scale about the marital status variable of the academicians, it was determined that the perception levels of married and female participants were similar. Different from the results of the present study, Akduman et al. (2015) examined the differences in Organizational Justice according to marital status. As a result of the analyses, it was determined that the Organizational Justice perceptions of the single participants were higher than those of the married participants. The difference between the two studies might stem from the fact that academicians have different careers and titles in the society as professional perception and in

personal terms and the identities of academicians are over the social gender perception.

According to the data of the present study, it was determined that there were significant differences in the Organizational Identification sub-dimension according to the service years between those with 18 years and above service years and those with 6-11 years in favor of those with 18 years and above; and in the informational justice dimension, between those with 12-17 years and 6-11 years in favor of those with 12-17 service years. Mael and Ashforth (1992) reported that the seniority of employees, the existence of role models in the organization, and the opportunities provided by the organization for its employees increased the identification levels. The seniority and sense of belonging, which are among individual factors, affect the identification in a direct way (Cüce et al., 2013). In this respect, it is possible to claim that as for the professional characteristics of the academicians, the changes in the titles that come parallel to the service years, and as a result, increasing economic and social opportunities are consistent with the literature. In his study, Korkut (1990) explained this situation as the elongation of the service years in the organization strengthening the identification of the employee with his/her organization.

When the study findings given in Table 6 are interpreted, it is seen that it was determined in the present study that the Organizational Identification, procedural justice, Distributive Justice, Interpersonal Justice and informational justice sub-dimension scores of the academicians do not differ at a significant level according to the departments they work in their organizations. The lack of significant difference might stem from the value and position given to the academician in the society, the attraction of being an academician.

When we interpret the Organizational Identification concept by considering the groups in an organization, we see that the most important focal point of the identification between the employees and their organizations occurs at the point when the employees identify themselves with their own careers and with their own professions (Başar, 2011). Similarly, Bamber and Iyer (2002) reported that identification with profession, identification with organization had a significant effect on Organizational Identification, which supports the findings of the present study in this context.

As a result, in the present study it was concluded that there is a positive relation between the procedural justice, Distributional Justice and Interpersonal Justice, which are sub-dimensions of Organizational Justice, and the Organizational Identification levels of the academicians working at sport sciences faculties; the Organizational Identification levels of the participants were at a high level; the Organizational Justice perceptions are above the medium level; and the increase of service years, which is one of the demographical variables, has a positive impact on these levels.

REFERENCES

1. Adams JS (1963): Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422.
2. Akduman G, Hatipoğlu Z, Yüksekbilgili Z (2015): Medeni durumuna göre örgütsel adalet algısı. *Uluslararası Akademik Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-13.
3. Akyel Y (2017): Yönetim bağlamında adalet ve güven. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
4. Alexander S, Ruderman M (1987): The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1: 177-98.
5. Ambrose ML, Schminke M (2009): The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 491–500.
6. Aytaç KY (2017): Investigating the working life quality and organizational commitment behaviors of academicians carrying on duties in faculties of sports science. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(11), 603-628.
7. Bamber EM, Iyer VM (2002): Big 5 auditors' professional and organizational identification: Consistency or conflict? *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 21(2), 21-38.
8. Başar U (2011): Örgütsel adalet algısı, örgütsel özdeşleşme ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişkilere yönelik görgül bir araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
9. Biçkes DM, Yılmaz C (2017): Çalışanların örgütsel güven algılamalarının özdeşleşme düzeyleri üzerindeki etkisi: amprik bir çalışma. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(2), 301-322.
10. Bies RJ, Moag JF (1986): Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations*, 1, 43-55, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
11. Brewer MB, Kramer RM (1986): Choice behavior in social dilemmas: effects of social identity, group

- size and decision framing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 543-549.
12. Büyüköztürk Ş (2011): Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
 13. Candan H (2014): Çalışanların örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven algılamalarının örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi: bir kamu kurumu üzerinde araştırma. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(4):889-917.
 14. Cheney G (1983): On the various changing meanings of organization membership: A field study of organizational identification, *Communication Monographs*, 50, 342-362.
 15. Chernyak-Hai L, Tziner A (2012): Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBS): Socio- psychological antecedents and consequences. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 25(3/4), 53-92.
 16. Cheung MF, Law MC (2008). Relationships of organizational justice and organizational identification: The mediating effects of perceived organizational support in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 14(2), 213-231.
 17. Cohen-Charash Y, Spector PE (2001): The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2): 278-321.
 18. Colquitt JA (2001): On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
 19. Colquitt JA, Conlon DE, Wesson MJ, Porter CO, Ng KY (2001): Justice at the millenium: A meta analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
 20. Cremer D (2005): Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(1), 4-13.
 21. Cropanzano R, Folger R (1991): "Procedural justice and worker motivation" in R. Steers & L. Porter (Ed.), *Motivation and Work Behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 131-143.
 22. Cropanzano R, Prehar CA, Chen PY (2002): Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management*, 27, 324-351.
 23. Cüce H, Güney S, Tayfur Ö (2013): Örgütsel adalet algılarının örgütsel özdeşleşme üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1): 1-30.
 24. Çakar ND (2015): Toplumsal cinsiyet temelinde örgütsel adalet algısı: etik iklimin rolü. *KADEM Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 79-94.
 25. Çetinkaya M, Çimenci S (2014): Örgütsel adalet algısının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi ve örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü: Yapısal eşitlik modeli çalışması. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(23), 237-278.
 26. Çokluk Ö, Şekercioğlu G, Büyüköztürk Ş (2010): Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve Lisrel uygulamaları. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
 27. Dailey RC, Kirk DJ (1992): Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45(3): 305-317.
 28. Deutsch M (1975): Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-149.
 29. Dutton JE, Dukerich JM, Harquail CV (1994): Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 239-263.
 30. Edwards MR (2005): Organizational identification: A conceptual and operational review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(4), 207-230.
 31. Foley S, Kidder DL, Powell GN (2002): The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: An investigation of hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 471-496.
 32. Folger R, Konovsky MA (1989): Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions, *Academic Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-30.
 33. Greenberg J (1987): A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 1987, 9-22.
 34. Greenberg J (1990a): Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
 35. Greenberg J (1990b): Looking fair us being fair: Managing impressions of organizational justice. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12(1), 111-157.
 36. Greenberg J (1993): "The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice" Cropanzano (eds.) *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, Hillsale, NJ Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 37. Homans GC (1961): *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
 38. İşcan ÖF (2006): Dönüştürücü/etkileşimci liderlik algısı ve örgütsel özdeşleşme ilişkisinde bireysel farklılıkların rolü. *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 11(6), 160-177.
 39. Karabey CN, İşcan ÖF (2007): Örgütsel özdeşleşme, örgütsel imaj ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisi: bir uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(2), 231-241.
 40. Karasar N (2005): *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın & Dağıtım.
 41. Konovsky, MA (2000): Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 489-511.
 42. Korkut H (1990): Üniversitelerde akademik olmayan personelin iş doyumunu ve örgütle özdeşleşmesi. Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu Matbaası.

43. Leventhal GS (1976): The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 9, 91-131, New York: Academic Press.
44. Leventhal, GS (1980): What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research*, 27-55, New York: Plenum Press.
45. Lipponen J, Wisse B, Perala J (2011): Perceived justice and group identification: The moderating role of previous identification. *Journal of personnel psychology*, 10(1), 13.
46. Lovelace K, Rosen B (1996): Differences in achieving person-organization fit among diverse groups of managers. *Journal of Management*, 22, 703-722.
47. Mael F, Ashforth BE (1992): Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 103-123.
48. Moorman, RH (1991): Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
49. Mowday RT (1987): Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations, in Steers M.R. Porter, L.W. (Ed), *Motivation and Work Behavior* (4. Ed), New York: McGraw-Hill, 89-110.
50. Mueller CW, Iverson RD, Jo DG (1999): Justice evaluations in two cultural contexts: A comparison of the US and South Korea. *Human Relations*, 52, 869-893.
51. Nartgün ŞS, Kalay M (2014): Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek, örgütsel özdeşleşme ile örgütsel sinizm düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri, *Turkish Studies*, 2014; 9(2): 1361-1376.
52. Olkkonen ME, Lipponen J (2006): Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100(2), 202-215.
53. Özdemir A (2010): Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin algılanan örgütsel destek, cinsiyet ve kıdem değişkenlerine göre incelenmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 14(1), 237-250.
54. Özmen ÖN, Arbak Y, Özer Süral P (2007): Adalet verilen değerler adalet algıları üzerindeki etkisinin sorgulanmasına ilişkin bir araştırma. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 7(1), 17-33.
55. Polat M (2009): Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin öncülleri ve ardılları üzerine bir saha araştırması, *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa.
56. Polat M, Meydan CH (2010): Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin sinizm ve işten ayrılma niyeti ile ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(1), 145-172.
57. Sarıkoyuncu EŞ, Ağca A (2018): Örgütsel adaletin muhasebecilerin iş memnuniyeti üzerine etkisi: Kültür örneği. *Muhasebe ve Finans Dergisi*, 77, 27-44.
58. Scott C, Corman S, Cheney G (1988): Development of a structural model of identification in the organization", *Communication Theory*, 8(3), 298-336.
59. Tolukan E, Şahin MY, Koç M (2016): Cimnastik antrenörlerinin örgütsel özdeşleşme düzeyleri ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi, *Turkish Studies*, 11(8): 377-398.
60. Tompkins PK, Cheney G (1985): Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions*, 13, 179-210.
61. Turunç Ö (2011): Örgütsel adaletin çalışanların örgütsel özdeşleşme ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi: örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü. "İş, güç" *Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 13(1), 143-166.
62. Turunç Ö, Çelik M (2010): Çalışanların algıladıkları örgütsel destek ve iş stresinin örgütsel özdeşleşme ve iş performansına etkisi. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 183-206.
63. Tyler TR, Blader SL (2003): The group engagement model: procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 349-361.
64. Yazıcıoğlu İ, Topaloğlu IG (2009): Örgütsel adalet ve bağlılık ilişkisi: konaklama işletmelerinde bir uygulama. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 1(1): 3-16.