

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

## The Effect of Organizational Justice Perception on Employee Motivation in Business Life and a Research

**Salih Güney**

Professor, Department of Management,  
Istanbul Aydın University Istanbul, Turkey

**Büşra Uysal**

Student, Department of Management, Institute of Social Sciences,  
Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul, Turkey

### **Abstract:**

*Organizational justice and motivation are important concepts for organizations to survive in the increasingly competitive work environment and to gain advantage in this competitive environment. Organizations need skilled employees to survive and make a difference. It is among the priorities of the organization to improve the skills of individuals in accordance with the interests of the organization and to increase their motivation by providing a fair work environment. The purpose of this study is to reveal the effect of organizational justice perceptions of aviation sector employees on their motivation. In the study, organizational justice and motivation are discussed within theoretical frameworks and these theories are supported with a research conducted with employees working in the aviation industry. According to the results of the research, it is seen that there is a strong relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational justice and their motivation.*

**Keywords:** Organization, justice, organizational justice, motivation, aviation

### **1. Introduction**

In today's business world, technological developments and globalization makes the effects of the competitive environment felt intensely. Organizations need to take various strategic steps to ensure an advantage in the increasingly competitive environment. Increasing employee satisfaction and productivity make significant contributions to institutions under these competitive conditions. Organizations that wish to have more efficient employees and gain superiority in the competitive environment offer various compensations to their employees. The fairness in the distribution of these compensations is as important as the compensations themselves. In today's circumstances, the perception of justice affects employees both physiologically and psychologically. The perceived justice within the organization affects the quality of work life as well as the motivation of the employees.

### **2. Literature Review**

#### *2.1. Concept, Definition, and Dimensions of Organizational Justice*

The concept of justice has unwritten rules and sanctions that have emerged through traditions, customs, and social behavior throughout human history.

With the spread of humanity and formation of states, laws were put into writing, thus securing the concept of justice. The communication of people with each other and how available resources should be allocated have been discussed in studies on this subject (Arabacı, 2019: 30). Aristotle explains justice in more than one sense and argues that it is necessary to explain justice along with the concept of injustice. According to Aristotle, while justice constitutes the entirety of virtue, injustice constitutes the entirety of evil (Babür, 2012: 5-10).

The concept of justice in organizations encompasses a different understanding than this general understanding of justice. Communities that come together with a common goal create organizations. The expectations of the employees and employers and the work environments in which they will carry out their activities constitute the basis of organizational life. Organizations are the institutions that provide this environment for the employees. Organizations have realized how critical the increasing managerial problems are in their work environments. As a result, in order to understand the attitudes and behaviors of the employees, the justice in the organization has been taken into consideration together with the concept of social justice, but the focus has been on the justice that occurs in the structure of the organization, not on the part that is protected by laws.

The concept that organizations should consider important in order to successfully continue their activities is justice. Organizational justice is defined as the division of the justice within the organization with the individual evaluation

degrees of the employees regarding the outputs and the implementation of the correct stages in the allocation of the outputs by the employers (Masterson, Taylor, Lewis, & Goldman, 2000: 738-748).

In this context, organizational justice is important not only for employers but also for employees and organizations. It is important for employees because it affects their motivation and increases their organizational commitment. Employees who feel safe and valued in an environment embrace the organizations in which they work, and this reflects positively on their attitudes and behaviors within the organization. Considering this, organizational justice is important for managers, because as the exchange of ideas between management and employees increases, this results in an increase in motivation-based performance.

Although the boundaries of the theories about justice are not clear in the literature, it is seen that various types of justice and various theories related to them have been developed. This study examines three dimensions of organizational justice.

Distributive Justice is the fair distribution of all compensations such as promotion, training, wage, reward, punishment by employers and employees' perception of fairness about these distributions. Distributive justice is a form of justice that provides employees with access to certain rewards and guarantees these rewards, provided that they have certain actions and behaviors. It is the way that all kinds of compensations such as reward, punishment, and promotion are perceived as fair by the employees (İşcan and Naktiyok, 2004: 183). How and in what direction the distributions within the organization are made is another important issue. It is possible to apply distributive justice through 3 basic elements in this way. These three basic elements are (Greenberg, 1987: 9-22):

- Equity (Fairness): The compensations should be equivalent to the contribution of the employees.
- Equality: It is when all the employees have an equal opportunity to the compensations.
- Needs: The compensations are rewarded by considering the needs of the employees.

Adams emphasized 6 important elements that can be applied to eliminate the inequality that occurs among employees. These elements can be listed as follows (Moorhead and Griffin, 1989: 137, Arnold and Feldman, 1986: 62-64); Employees can change their own contributions; they can work more or less for their job.

Just as they can change their contributions, they can also set their own expectations such as wages and promotions.

Instead of changing their contributions, they can also change their way of thinking.

They can change their thoughts and perceptions of other employees.

When the employees see that there is an inequality between themselves and the other employee with whom they compare themselves for various reasons, they can choose to compare themselves with another employee in order to psychologically relieve themselves.

- Finally, employees can leave their current position and situation.

Procedural Justice focuses on how the distribution is made rather than the distribution itself. In this way, it explains the points that distributive justice cannot explain. Negative perceptions of procedural justice will lead to negative attitudes and behaviors in employees as well, damaging their organizational commitment and decreasing their motivation. For this reason, while making decisions concerning the employees, the procedures and methods applied should be explained to the employees and their opinions should be taken. If we look at the importance of procedural justice for employees and managers in this way, the most important thing about it is that even when the decisions taken are unfair, they cannot be reacted to.

Interactional justice is a type of justice that examines the dimensions of the relationships between the people who manage the processes within the organization and the employees.

During the implementation phase of the procedures, what attitudes and behaviors employees are exposed to by their managers and the role this has in the perception of justice are very important (İyigün, 2012: 59). Interactional justice explains the communication between managers and employees and how this communication should be (Serinkan&Ermiş, 2014: 123). As such, it focuses on the humanitarian aspect of justice. The purpose of interactional justice is to provide justice within the organization. The outline of interactional justice is determined not only through decision-making processes but also through positive communication (Karaeminoğulları, 2006: 19, Taşkıran, 2011: 109, Barling and Phillips, 1993: 649-656). Being respectful and kind to employees, showing that they are valued, and the quality of the established communication are also aspects of this concept of justice. Employees who see that they are treated with tolerance, they are included in the processes, and their personal interests are protected will not have difficulty in embracing the decisions taken by the managers (Karaeminoğulları, 2006: 19).

### 3. Concept, Definition, and Importance of Motivation

Motivation is a process that makes people take action to achieve certain goals. Organizational motivation sets the level of employee performance. Motivation is the energy needed to willingly take action in line with the desire to achieve a certain goal. In its simplest definition, it is directing one's behavior in the desired direction.

From an individual aspect, motivation is a personal process in which the individuals are motivated only by their own drives. From an organizational aspect, motivation can be explained as gaining benefits for both the organization and the employee by establishing a link between the objectives of the employees and the objectives of the organization (Karadağ, Işık, Akbolat, & Çelen, 2015: 313).

In order to increase productivity within the organization, the motivation of the employees needs to be increased by the management. Managers who want to motivate their employees should pay attention to their training and development and take actions that support this (Koçak, 2011: 43, Akbaş, 2007: 14). Motivation is the most important factor that determines the performance of the employees (Semerci, 2005: 9). Managers who want to achieve their goals

need to give importance to their employees' motivation in order to ensure that they work willingly so that this leads to a high level of performance, and therefore, to a high level of output. At this point, managers should follow up with their employees and not depend on a single factor for motivation. The level of employee motivation is important for the organization to achieve its goals.

Organizations that give importance to motivation and work on it achieve success. Employees who perform tasks with high level of motivation will focus on their work since they will already have embraced the goals set by the organization (Manzoor, 2012: 3). If the managers cannot motivate their employees, financial losses will occur due to decrease in efficiency. Another issue that should be given importance at this point is providing an appropriate work environment where the employees can use all their knowledge and experience for the purposes of the organization. Motivation is a process that occurs with a disruption in psychological and physiological balance, takes place within a certain period of time and through certain stages that interact with each other. The process of motivation consists of several stages. The following factors are important in this process (Güney, 2015: 259):

- Needs: These are all the psychological and social factors needed to ensure harmony with the environment.
- Drive: It is the desire to take action in order to meet the needs. As the needs emerge, a desire to take action in order to meet them will occur in the employees. They will begin to have behaviors towards achieving this goal.
- Satisfaction: Satisfaction is the last stage of motivation. Satisfaction occurs when the needs are met at the desired level. Employees whose needs are met will be satisfied and happy. If the needs are not met, the employees who cannot reach satisfaction will be unhappy. The productivity of unhappy employees will decrease.

Employees' personality traits, social and cultural differences have led to an increase in motivational factors in organizations. The motivation techniques applied do not have the same effect on each employee. For this reason, it is seen that more than one motivation technique is applied in organizations. There are some points that need to be considered when applying motivational factors. These can be listed as follows;

- The result desired from motivation should be determined,
- The people to be motivated should be clarified,
- The tools to motivate and how these tools will be implemented should be determined,

### *3.1. Evaluation Should Be Made After the Implementation*

The organizations that are aware of the importance of this conduct analyses in order to increase motivation and use appropriate motivation techniques and tools for their employees. Managers should also consider the needs of employees when choosing motivational tools. Because employees get motivated and make efforts in accordance with their needs. Motivational factors can consist of economic, social, and organizational tools (Sabuncuoğlu and Tuz, 1996: 107-108). Personality traits, expectations, and abilities of employees are different from each other. Therefore, the factors that motivate them will be different from each other. The managers' duty is to identify the characteristics of each employee, determine the appropriate factors, and establish a strong communication.

## **4. Research**

### *4.1. Objective and Importance of the Study*

In today's business world, technological developments and globalization makes the effects of the competitive environment felt intensely. Organizations need to take various strategic steps to ensure an advantage in the increasingly competitive environment. Increasing employee satisfaction and productivity make significant contributions to institutions under these competitive conditions. Organizations offer various compensations in order to ensure higher efficiency from their employees. The fairness of the distribution of these compensations is important. The sense of justice perceived within the organization directly affects the motivation of the employees. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of justice perception on employee motivation in organizations that wish to obtain high efficiency from employees and want to gain superiority in the competitive environment.

### *4.2. Population and Sample of the Study*

The sample of the research consists of 208 individuals who were reached through random sampling method from those who work in the aviation industry. Although the aim was to reach 400 participants, feedback could only be received from 208 people to participate in the research due to the current worldwide pandemic and time constraints. The fact that 208 people who participated in the study work in various departments indicates that the results have the potential to represent the entire population. In order to achieve this diversity, opinions of a high number of managers and employees have been evaluated.

### *4.3. Data Collection Method*

In this study, survey method has been used as data collection tool. The survey consists of three sections. In the first section, there are personal information questions in order to reach data regarding the demographic characteristics of the aviation sector employees. In the second section, the organizational justice perception scale has been used to measure the organizational justice perception levels of the employees. In the third section, motivation scale has been used to identify its effect on employee motivation.

#### 4.4. Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the research are given below.

- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by gender.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by gender.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by gender.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by gender.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by gender.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by marital status.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by marital status.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by marital status.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by marital status.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by marital status.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by age.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by age.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by age.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by age.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by age.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by title.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by title.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by title.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by title.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by title.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by income.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by income.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by income.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by income.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by income.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the institution.

- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by time spent in the institution.

#### 4.5. Data Analysis

In the selection of the analysis methods to be used, the results of the normality analysis were taken as a basis. According to the Shapiro-Wilk W test applied in the study, the hypothesis 'H1: the distribution of the variable is not normal' was accepted and non-parametric tests were applied. In the research, Correlation Test and Regression Analysis have been used. In addition, Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.938 for organizational justice and 0.973 for motivation as a result of reliability analysis. In the survey, 7 questions were asked to the participants in order to identify their demographic characteristics. The analysis table regarding the answers is given below.

		n	%
Gender	Female	112	53.8
	Male	96	46.2
Marital Status	Single	101	48.6
	Married	107	51.4
Age	25 or below	25	12
	26-30	77	37
	31-35	51	24.5
	36-40	17	8.2
	41-45	14	6.7
	46 or above	24	11.5
Title	Official	58	27.9
	Engineer	36	17.3
	Chief	36	17.3
	Technician	14	6.7
	Specialist	64	30.8
Income Status	2500-3500	42	20.2
	3501-5500	82	39.4
	5501-7500	49	23.6
	7501-9500	16	7.7
	9501 or above	19	9.1
Total time in the occupation	1-3 years	48	23.1
	4-7 years	77	37
	8-11 years	29	13.9
	12-15 years	18	8.7
	16 years or above	36	17.3
Total time in the institution	1-3 years	78	37.5
	4-7 years	75	36.1
	8-11 years	24	11.5
	12-15 years	11	5.3
	16 years or above	20	9.6

Table 1: Analyses of Demographic Information

When the analysis is examined in general, it is seen that the majority of the participants are women, they are between the ages of 26-30, married, specialists, have an income of 3501-5500, spent 4-7 years in the occupation, and 1-3 years at the institution.

#### 4.6. Analysis of Hypotheses Related to Demographic Variables

'Normality Test' was used to decide on parametric or nonparametric tests for the analysis of the hypotheses related to demographic variables. For this test, hypotheses are established as H0: With 95% confidence level, the data is not normally distributed and H1: With 95% confidence, the data is normally distributed. Whether the established hypotheses have normal distribution is examined according to the results of 'Kolmogorov-Smirnov' and 'Shapiro-Wilk' tests.

It is seen that there are two different tests in Table 2. One of them is 'Kolmogorov Smirnov,' the other is 'Shapiro-Wilk' test. Although making a decision based on the results of the 'Shapiro-Wilk' test, which is one of the normality tests, is considered more reliable, it is acceptable based on the results of both tests. If the results of the tests are different, it is possible to apply both parametric and non-parametric tests.

#### 4.7. Analyses Regarding the Gender Variable

The results of the normality test for the gender variable are given in Table 2.

Tests of Normality							
	Gender:	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Procedural Justice	Female	.074	112	.168	.980	112	.100
	Male	.102	96	.016	.969	96	.021
Distributive Justice	Female	.159	112	.000	.937	112	.000
	Male	.124	96	.001	.947	96	.001
Interactional Justice	Female	.134	112	.000	.932	112	.000
	Male	.137	96	.000	.942	96	.000
Justice in General	Female	.075	112	.150	.972	112	.019
	Male	.100	96	.020	.972	96	.037
Relationships with Managers	Female	.167	112	.000	.928	112	.000
	Male	.175	96	.000	.921	96	.000
Wage System	Female	.160	112	.000	.921	112	.000
	Male	.088	96	.064	.959	96	.004
Decision Making Process	Female	.087	112	.038	.962	112	.003
	Male	.142	96	.000	.951	96	.001
Incentive and Evaluation System	Female	.091	112	.025	.958	112	.001
	Male	.116	96	.003	.956	96	.003
Motivation in General	Female	.064	112	.200*	.987	112	.357
	Male	.102	96	.015	.966	96	.013
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 2: Tests of Normality for Gender Variable

When The Table Is Examined, It Is Seen That the Perceived Organizational Justice, Motivation and Subdimension Scores Do Not Have Normal Distribution by Gender ( $P < .05$ )

#### 4.8. Comparison of Scores According to the Gender Variable

Comparison of scores according to the gender variable is given in Table 3.

Subdimension	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	U	sig
Procedural Justice	Female	3.27	0.89	3.14	1.00	5.00	105.15	5303.5	0.867
	Male	3.21	0.97	3.29	1.00	5.00	103.74		
Distributive Justice	Female	3.15	1.22	3.13	1.00	5.00	100.66	4945.5	0.317
	Male	3.33	1.13	3.50	1.00	5.00	108.98		
Interactional Justice	Female	3.44	0.77	3.67	1.00	5.00	100.41	4918	0.289
	Male	3.50	0.89	3.67	1.00	5.00	109.27		
Organizational Justice	Female	3.32	0.78	3.35	1.20	4.90	102.87	5193	0.672
	Male	3.37	0.79	3.53	1.00	5.00	106.41		
Relationships with Managers	Female	3.37	0.81	3.67	1.00	5.00	98.08	4657.5	0.096
	Male	3.48	1.03	3.89	1.00	5.00	111.98		
Wage System	Female	2.34	1.08	2.00	1.00	5.00	98.42	4695	0.114
	Male	2.56	1.06	2.60	1.00	5.00	111.59		
Decision Making Process	Female	3.14	0.96	3.22	1.00	5.00	98.97	4756.5	0.152
	Male	3.34	0.91	3.44	1.00	5.00	110.95		
Incentive and Evaluation System	Female	2.75	1.08	2.86	1.00	5.00	104.51	5375	0.998
	Male	2.75	1.04	2.71	1.00	5.00	104.49		
Motivation	Female	2.98	0.86	3.02	1.00	5.00	99.34	4798.5	0.182
	Male	3.12	0.87	3.28	1.00	5.00	110.52		

Table 3: Comparison of Scores According to the Gender Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not significantly differ by gender ( $p > .05$ ). The perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores of women and men are similar to each other. According to this result, it can be said that there is no gender discrimination within the organization.

#### 4.9. Analyses Regarding the Marital Status

The results of the normality test for the marital status variable are given in Table 4.

Marital Status:		Tests of Normality					
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Procedural Justice	Single	0.109	101	0.005	0.966	101	0.01
	Married	0.174	107	0	0.938	107	0
Distributive Justice	Single	0.114	101	0.002	0.954	101	0.001
	Married	0.166	107	0	0.927	107	0
Interactional Justice	Single	0.107	101	0.006	0.953	101	0.001
	Married	0.157	107	0	0.935	107	0
Organizational Justice	Single	0.103	101	0.01	0.979	101	0.114
	Married	0.136	107	0	0.939	107	0
Relationships with Managers	Single	0.121	101	0.001	0.961	101	0.005
	Married	0.209	107	0	0.863	107	0
Wage System	Single	0.14	101	0	0.94	101	0

	Married	0.117	107	0.001	0.935	107	0
Decision Making Process	Single	0.094	101	0.028	0.964	101	0.008
	Married	0.143	107	0	0.939	107	0
Incentive and Evaluation System	Single	0.095	101	0.026	0.963	101	0.006
	Married	0.09	107	0.034	0.947	107	0
Motivation	Single	0.074	101	0.197	0.984	101	0.274
	Married	0.102	107	0.008	0.962	107	0.004
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 4: Tests of Normality for Marital Status Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by marital status ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.10. Comparison of Scores According to the Marital Status Variable

Comparison of scores according to the marital status variable is given in Table 5.

Subdimension	Marital Status	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	U	sig
Procedural Justice	Single	3.25	0.94	3.29	1.00	5.00	104.34	5387.5	0.971
	Married	3.23	0.91	3.43	1.29	4.71	104.65		
Distributive Justice	Single	3.07	1.17	3.00	1.00	5.00	95.64	4508.5	0.038
	Married	3.39	1.18	3.75	1.00	5.00	112.86		
Interactional Justice	Single	3.54	0.81	3.67	1.00	5.00	109.23	4926	0.27
	Married	3.40	0.84	3.67	1.00	5.00	100.04		
Organizational Justice	Single	3.35	0.78	3.35	1.00	5.00	103.27	5279	0.774
	Married	3.34	0.79	3.45	1.20	4.90	105.66		
Relationships with Managers	Single	3.44	0.96	3.67	1.00	5.00	103.98	5350.5	0.902
	Married	3.40	0.88	3.78	1.00	4.78	105.00		
Wage System	Single	2.44	1.10	2.20	1.00	5.00	103.24	5276.5	0.769
	Married	2.45	1.05	2.20	1.00	4.80	105.69		
Decision Making Process	Single	3.28	0.97	3.33	1.00	5.00	106.37	5214.5	0.663
	Married	3.19	0.91	3.44	1.00	4.89	102.73		
Incentive and Evaluation System	Single	2.82	1.06	2.86	1.00	5.00	108.27	5022.5	0.378
	Married	2.69	1.06	2.71	1.00	5.00	100.94		
Motivation	Single	3.08	0.89	3.20	1.00	5.00	106.04	5248	0.72
	Married	3.01	0.84	3.07	1.00	4.53	103.05		

Table 5: Comparison of Scores According to the Marital Status Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference only in the perceived distributive justice ( $p < .05$ ). The perceived distributive justice median of the married participants was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the single ones. For all other dimensions there is no difference by marital status. It can be said that the married people attach more importance to the fairness of their compensations in return for their efforts, since they have more responsibilities.

#### 4.11. Analyses Regarding the Age Variable

The results of the normality test for the age variable are given in Table 6.



Tests of Normality							
	Age:	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Procedural Justice	25 or below	.135	25	.200*	.954	25	.304
	26-30	.121	77	.007	.963	77	.025
	31-35	.108	51	.189	.964	51	.124
	36-40	.170	17	.200*	.915	17	.123
	41-45	.212	14	.089	.927	14	.273
	46 or above	.150	24	.172	.969	24	.649
Distributive Justice	25 or below	.164	25	.080	.949	25	.232
	26-30	.126	77	.004	.928	77	.000
	31-35	.205	51	.000	.922	51	.003
	36-40	.188	17	.113	.880	17	.032
	41-45	.191	14	.177	.945	14	.490
	46 or above	.106	24	.200*	.965	24	.556
Interactional Justice	25 or below	.148	25	.162	.947	25	.216
	26-30	.160	77	.000	.933	77	.001
	31-35	.200	51	.000	.915	51	.001
	36-40	.182	17	.136	.901	17	.071
	41-45	.174	14	.200*	.950	14	.559
	46 or above	.154	24	.144	.952	24	.297
Organizational Justice	25 or below	.129	25	.200*	.947	25	.215
	26-30	.085	77	.200*	.968	77	.051
	31-35	.141	51	.013	.945	51	.020
	36-40	.177	17	.160	.901	17	.069
	41-45	.171	14	.200*	.962	14	.757
	46 or above	.132	24	.200*	.970	24	.677
Relationships with Managers	25 or below	.176	25	.045	.926	25	.072
	26-30	.145	77	.000	.951	77	.005
	31-35	.216	51	.000	.877	51	.000
	36-40	.203	17	.060	.843	17	.009
	41-45	.298	14	.001	.817	14	.008
	46 or above	.147	24	.195	.914	24	.044
Wage System	25 or below	.205	25	.008	.882	25	.008
	26-30	.115	77	.014	.937	77	.001
	31-35	.135	51	.022	.904	51	.001
	36-40	.130	17	.200*	.924	17	.173
	41-45	.173	14	.200*	.905	14	.135
	46 or above	.189	24	.026	.944	24	.197
Decision Making Process	25 or below	.164	25	.079	.931	25	.091
	26-30	.092	77	.172	.962	77	.022
	31-35	.114	51	.093	.943	51	.016
	36-40	.149	17	.200*	.894	17	.054
	41-45	.165	14	.200*	.934	14	.352

	46 or above	.171	24	.067	.936	24	.132
Incentive and Evaluation System	25 or below	.159	25	.101	.942	25	.163
	26-30	.104	77	.039	.969	77	.056
	31-35	.125	51	.044	.910	51	.001
	36-40	.141	17	.200*	.907	17	.088
	41-45	.193	14	.168	.884	14	.067
	46 or above	.122	24	.200*	.937	24	.142
Motivation	25 or below	.135	25	.200*	.983	25	.936
	26-30	.076	77	.200*	.982	77	.328
	31-35	.082	51	.200*	.959	51	.076
	36-40	.159	17	.200*	.872	17	.024
	41-45	.126	14	.200*	.952	14	.585
	46 or above	.162	24	.101	.949	24	.253
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

*Table 6: Tests of Normality for Age Variable*

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by age groups ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.12. Comparison of Scores According to the Age Variable

Comparison of scores according to the age variable is given in Table 7.

Subdimension	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	Chi-square	sig	Difference
Procedural Justice	< 25	3.32	0.77	3.14	1.57	5.00	105.44	11.77	0.038	26-30 >46 or above
	26-30	3.40	0.98	3.43	1.00	5.00	115.69			
	31-35	3.29	0.91	3.29	1.29	5.00	108.24			
	36-40	2.93	1.02	3.14	1.29	4.29	87.41			
	41-45	3.23	0.98	3.36	1.71	4.71	106.04			
	>46	2.78	0.70	2.71	1.57	4.29	70.88			
Distributive Justice	< 25	3.06	0.98	3.00	1.25	4.75	93.66	7.39	0.193	
	26-30	3.31	1.25	3.50	1.00	5.00	108.73			
	31-35	3.29	1.13	3.75	1.00	5.00	107.57			
	36-40	3.15	1.48	3.25	1.00	5.00	103.68			
	41-45	3.75	0.82	4.00	2.25	5.00	129.86			
	>46	2.80	1.12	2.75	1.00	5.00	81.48			
Interactional Justice	< 25	3.54	0.84	3.67	1.22	5.00	110.86	6.15	0.292	
	26-30	3.57	0.80	3.78	1.00	5.00	111.70			
	31-35	3.46	0.70	3.67	1.44	4.56	100.58			
	36-40	3.07	1.06	3.22	1.00	4.44	83.88			
	41-45	3.66	0.89	3.94	2.00	5.00	119.79			
	>46	3.27	0.88	3.50	1.56	4.78	88.79			
Organizational Justice	< 25	3.37	0.69	3.35	1.50	4.50	104.40	9.46	0:092	
	26-30	3.46	0.77	3.50	1.00	5.00	112.86			
	31-35	3.36	0.73	3.40	1.75	4.75	106.26			

	36-40	3.04	1.08	3.45	1.20	4.40	93.35			
	41-45	3.53	0.79	3.60	1.95	4.90	119.43			
	>46	3.00	0.67	2.85	1.90	4.40	73.23			
Relationships with Managers	< 25	3.61	0.79	3.78	1.44	5.00	111.14	4.91	0.426	
	26-30	3.50	0.96	3.78	1.00	5.00	110.06			
	31-35	3.37	0.85	3.78	1.11	4.56	101.05			
	36-40	3.07	1.11	3.33	1.00	4.22	86.74			
	41-45	3.64	0.78	3.89	2.11	4.56	120.29			
	>46	3.19	0.93	3.39	1.22	4.44	90.44			
Wage System	< 25	2.35	0.93	2.80	1.00	3.60	100.70	1.74	0.884	
	26-30	2.52	1.16	2.40	1.00	5.00	107.55			
	31-35	2.43	1.17	2.20	1.00	4.60	103.08			
	36-40	2.26	0.99	2.20	1.00	4.00	95.56			
	41-45	2.70	1.06	2.60	1.00	4.00	119.32			
	>46	2.31	0.82	2.00	1.00	4.00	99.40			
Decision Making Process	< 25	3.18	0.89	3.33	1.78	5.00	98.88	8.10	0.151	
	26-30	3.38	0.93	3.44	1.00	5.00	113.05			
	31-35	3.21	0.94	3.44	1.44	5.00	103.09			
	36-40	3.11	1.23	3.22	1.00	4.67	102.97			
	41-45	3.55	0.36	3.56	2.89	4.00	121.96			
	>46	2.79	0.94	3.06	1.00	4.11	76.81			
Incentive and Evaluation System	< 25	3.06	1.11	3.14	1.00	5.00	122.40	8.04	0.154	
	26-30	2.83	1.05	2.57	1.00	5.00	106.89			
	31-35	2.61	1.11	2.57	1.00	4.29	98.13			
	36-40	2.68	1.12	3.00	1.00	4.14	103.00			
	41-45	3.10	0.77	3.00	1.86	4.00	124.25			
	>46	2.35	0.94	2.36	1.00	4.00	81.27			
Motivation	< 25	3.14	0.79	3.23	1.37	4.73	108.98	6.54	0.257	
	26-30	3.14	0.89	3.30	1.00	5.00	110.92			
	31-35	2.98	0.87	3.07	1.37	4.63	100.52			
	36-40	2.85	1.04	3.20	1.00	4.07	98.41			
	41-45	3.33	0.50	3.32	2.47	4.07	123.64			
	>46	2.73	0.78	2.85	1.37	4.10	80.83			

Table 7: Comparison of Scores According to the Age Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference only in perceived procedural justice ( $p < .05$ ). The median of procedural justice perception of employees in the 26-30 age group was found to be statistically and significantly higher than compared to those aged 46 or above. There is no difference by age groups in any other dimensions. The fact that young employees are open to innovations and can take risks more easily than older employees greatly affect their commitment to work. It increases the motivation of young employees, who are highly motivated when they start working, to improve their justice perception and promotion opportunities within the organization. Employees aged 46 or above have come to a certain age and attach importance to wage increases and other compensations within the organization as a result of their experience, as most of their expectations have come true compared to young employees in the 26-30 age group. Employee satisfaction decreases in those who cannot achieve the expected compensations and those who are older, feel that they are not treated fairly, and they do not have a voice in the processes compared to the employees who are newly recruited with the same status.

#### 4.13. Analyses Regarding the Title Variable

The results of the normality test for the title variable are given in Table 8.

Tests of Normality							
	Title:	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Procedural Justice	Official	.121	58	.034	.965	58	.045
	Engineer	.136	36	.092	.955	36	.150
	Chief	.091	36	.200*	.959	36	.206
	Technician	.163	14	.200*	.951	14	.583
	Specialist	.074	64	.200*	.984	64	.570
Distributive Justice	Official	.151	58	.002	.934	58	.004
	Engineer	.196	36	.001	.919	36	.012
	Chief	.110	36	.200*	.949	36	.100
	Technician	.177	14	.200*	.892	14	.087
	Specialist	.181	64	.000	.930	64	.001
Interactional Justice	Official	.149	58	.003	.947	58	.014
	Engineer	.152	36	.034	.939	36	.049
	Chief	.146	36	.049	.923	36	.015
	Technician	.198	14	.141	.864	14	.034
	Specialist	.129	64	.010	.948	64	.009
Organizational Justice	Official	.111	58	.071	.937	58	.005
	Engineer	.111	36	.200*	.956	36	.157
	Chief	.121	36	.200*	.948	36	.092
	Technician	.145	14	.200*	.939	14	.409
	Specialist	.062	64	.200*	.990	64	.877
Relationships with Managers	Official	.174	58	.000	.913	58	.000
	Engineer	.124	36	.181	.947	36	.083
	Chief	.190	36	.002	.901	36	.004
	Technician	.220	14	.065	.813	14	.007
	Specialist	.146	64	.002	.946	64	.007
Wage System	Official	.172	58	.000	.901	58	.000
	Engineer	.177	36	.006	.888	36	.002
	Chief	.116	36	.200*	.943	36	.061
	Technician	.250	14	.018	.836	14	.014
	Specialist	.102	64	.093	.960	64	.036
Decision Making Process	Official	.154	58	.001	.919	58	.001
	Engineer	.121	36	.200*	.964	36	.276
	Chief	.126	36	.160	.948	36	.088
	Technician	.215	14	.079	.836	14	.014
	Specialist	.093	64	.200*	.971	64	.131
Incentive and Evaluation System	Official	.106	58	.167	.956	58	.033
	Engineer	.129	36	.138	.929	36	.024
	Chief	.118	36	.200*	.957	36	.167

Motivation	Technician	.141	14	.200*	.926	14	.271
	Specialist	.133	64	.006	.943	64	.005
	Official	.105	58	.173	.977	58	.330
	Engineer	.156	36	.028	.926	36	.018
	Chief	.086	36	.200*	.961	36	.227
	Technician	.265	14	.008	.842	14	.017
	Specialist	.097	64	.200*	.978	64	.297
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 8: Tests of Normality for Title Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by title ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.14. Comparison of Scores According to the Title Variable

Comparison of scores according to the title variable is given in Table 9.

Subdimension	Title	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	Chi-square	sig	Difference
Procedural Justice	Official	3.28	0.88	3.43	1.00	5.00	106.39	13.74	0.008	Specialist>Technician
	Engineer	2.91	0.98	3.00	1.29	4.71	83.82			
	Chief	3.34	0.98	3.43	1.29	5.00	111.92			
	Technician	2.60	0.94	2.71	1.00	4.00	67.07			
	Specialist	3.48	0.79	3.43	1.57	5.00	118.44			
Distributive Justice	Official	3.59	1.05	3.88	1.00	5.00	122.78	19.61	0.001	Specialist>Engineer Official>Engineer
	Engineer	2.61	1.19	2.13	1.00	5.00	73.99			
	Chief	3.15	1.12	3.00	1.00	5.00	98.96			
	Technician	2.68	1.38	2.38	1.00	5.00	77.32			
	Specialist	3.43	1.12	3.75	1.00	5.00	114.16			
Interactional Justice	Official	3.46	0.83	3.67	1.00	5.00	104.10	9.07	0.059	
	Engineer	3.30	0.90	3.44	1.22	4.56	93.43			
	Chief	3.39	0.94	3.44	1.00	5.00	99.47			
	Technician	3.11	0.80	3.33	1.56	3.89	75.68			
	Specialist	3.69	0.67	3.78	1.67	5.00	120.22			
Organizational Justice	Official	3.43	0.72	3.53	1.00	4.40	112.03	14.95	0.005	Specialist>Technician Specialist>Engineer
	Engineer	3.03	0.84	3.00	1.50	4.40	82.28			
	Chief	3.32	0.89	3.35	1.20	4.90	104.79			
	Technician	2.85	0.75	2.95	1.65	4.10	66.11			
	Specialist	3.56	0.65	3.60	2.05	5.00	118.41			
Relationships with Managers	Official	3.57	0.79	3.78	1.00	5.00	113.15	11.16	0.055	
	Engineer	3.14	1.02	2.94	1.44	5.00	83.89			
	Chief	3.16	1.03	3.61	1.00	4.56	91.79			
	Technician	3.00	1.23	3.56	1.00	4.11	91.14			
	Specialist	3.69	0.71	3.78	1.22	5.00	118.33			
Wage System	Official	2.16	0.92	2.00	1.00	4.00	89.84	17.63	0.001	Specialist>Engineer
	Engineer	2.10	1.05	2.00	1.00	4.60	84.79			

	Chief	2.65	1.08	2.60	1.00	4.60	117.11			Specialist> Official
	Technician	2.14	0.97	2.40	1.00	3.40	88.54			
	Specialist	2.85	1.10	2.80	1.00	5.00	125.27			
Decision Making Process	Official	3.37	0.89	3.56	1.00	5.00	115.81	14.20	0.057	
	Engineer	2.87	1.05	2.78	1.00	4.89	83.47			
	Chief	3.20	0.98	3.22	1.00	5.00	100.03			
	Technician	2.63	1.01	3.06	1.00	3.67	68.57			
	Specialist	3.46	0.78	3.39	1.33	5.00	116.45			
Incentive and Evaluation System	Official	2.81	1.01	2.86	1.00	5.00	108.27	13.78	0.008	Specialist> Engineer
	Engineer	2.33	1.07	2.14	1.00	5.00	81.36			
	Chief	2.73	1.13	2.71	1.00	5.00	101.06			
	Technician	2.29	0.91	2.43	1.00	3.57	77.96			
	Specialist	3.05	1.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	121.84			
Motivation	Official	3.10	0.76	3.20	1.00	4.73	107.66	13.49	0.009	Specialist> Engineer
	Engineer	2.70	0.91	2.57	1.37	4.37	82.17			
	Chief	2.99	0.97	3.13	1.00	4.63	101.21			
	Technician	2.58	0.96	3.10	1.17	3.67	77.32			
	Specialist	3.33	0.74	3.28	1.67	5.00	122.00			

Table 9: Comparison of Scores According to the Title Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational justice, wage system, incentive and evaluation system and motivation scores differ significantly by title ( $p < .05$ ). The median of procedural justice of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as technician. The median of distributive justice of those working as specialist and official were found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The median of organizational justice of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as technician and engineer. The median of the wage system perception of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as official and engineer. The incentive and evaluation medians of those working as specialist were found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The motivation median of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The duties and responsibilities of employees who are specialists are less than those working as technicians and engineers. The expectations of engineers and technicians are higher due to the higher responsibilities and workloads brought about by their titles compared to the employees working as officials and specialists. When they compare their earnings with employees with lower titles, they start to think that distributions and processes are not fair. This shows us the difference by title in the perception of justice.

#### 4.15. Analyses Regarding the Income Variable

The results of the normality test for the income variable are given in Table 10.

Tests of Normality							
	Income Status:	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Procedural Justice	2500-3500	.082	42	.200*	.981	42	.715
	3501-5500	.105	82	.025	.983	82	.363
	5501-7500	.093	49	.200*	.958	49	.042
	7501-9500	.140	16	.200*	.941	16	.364
	9501 or above	.094	19	.200*	.972	19	.807
Distributive Justice	2500-3500	.149	42	.020	.961	42	.165
	3501-5500	.162	82	.000	.920	82	.000
	5501-7500	.114	49	.135	.942	49	.018

	7501-9500	.177	16	.196	.890	16	.056
	9501 or above	.155	19	.200*	.906	19	.064
Interactional Justice	2500-3500	.131	42	.069	.914	42	.004
	3501-5500	.134	82	.001	.939	82	.001
	5501-7500	.168	49	.001	.901	49	.001
	7501-9500	.133	16	.200*	.936	16	.301
	9501 or above	.192	19	.063	.936	19	.221
	2500-3500	.126	42	.089	.952	42	.078
Organizational Justice	3501-5500	.105	82	.025	.975	82	.106
	5501-7500	.107	49	.200*	.939	49	.013
	7501-9500	.144	16	.200*	.941	16	.365
	9501 or above	.122	19	.200*	.955	19	.475
	2500-3500	.176	42	.002	.946	42	.046
Relationships with Managers	3501-5500	.156	82	.000	.939	82	.001
	5501-7500	.255	49	.000	.802	49	.000
	7501-9500	.146	16	.200*	.967	16	.792
	9501 or above	.146	19	.200*	.945	19	.323
	2500-3500	.189	42	.001	.834	42	.000
Wage System	3501-5500	.129	82	.002	.941	82	.001
	5501-7500	.120	49	.073	.921	49	.003
	7501-9500	.183	16	.154	.948	16	.454
	9501 or above	.178	19	.114	.925	19	.139
	2500-3500	.125	42	.098	.957	42	.114
Decision Making Process	3501-5500	.117	82	.007	.959	82	.010
	5501-7500	.122	49	.068	.930	49	.006
	7501-9500	.196	16	.100	.896	16	.070
	9501 or above	.124	19	.200*	.964	19	.652
	2500-3500	.107	42	.200*	.931	42	.014
Incentive and Evaluation System	3501-5500	.135	82	.001	.949	82	.003
	5501-7500	.130	49	.037	.966	49	.159
	7501-9500	.187	16	.136	.904	16	.093
	9501 or above	.183	19	.092	.903	19	.055
	2500-3500	.080	42	.200*	.978	42	.577
Motivation	3501-5500	.069	82	.200*	.975	82	.104
	5501-7500	.177	49	.001	.892	49	.000
	7501-9500	.132	16	.200*	.978	16	.945
	9501 or above	.152	19	.200*	.935	19	.216
	*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 10: Tests of Normality for Income Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by income ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.16. Comparison of Scores According to the Income Variable

Comparison of scores according to the income variable is given in Table 11.

Subdimension	Income	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	Chi-square	sig	Difference
Procedural Justice	2500-3500	3.06	0.98	3.14	1.00	5.00	93.04	4.69	0.320	
	3501-5500	3.39	0.82	3.43	1.00	5.00	113.37			
	5501-7500	3.23	0.97	3.43	1.43	5.00	104.24			
	7501-9500	3.28	1.09	3.50	1.29	5.00	108.63			
	9500+	3.00	0.95	2.86	1.29	4.57	88.76			
Distributive Justice	2500-3500	3.17	1.02	3.13	1.00	5.00	100.24	4.56	0.335	
	3501-5500	3.25	1.19	3.63	1.00	5.00	105.69			
	5501-7500	3.10	1.23	3.00	1.00	5.00	97.62			
	7501-9500	3.78	1.15	4.00	1.50	5.00	133.09			
	9500+	3.16	1.35	3.00	1.25	5.00	102.45			
Interactional Justice	2500-3500	3.36	0.87	3.56	1.00	4.56	96.86	5.09	0.278	
	3501-5500	3.49	0.74	3.67	1.67	4.56	105.15			
	5501-7500	3.59	0.85	3.78	1.00	5.00	114.47			
	7501-9500	3.61	0.94	3.78	1.78	5.00	116.28			
	9500+	3.16	0.87	3.33	1.56	4.56	82.97			
Organizational Justice	2500-3500	3.22	0.77	3.30	1.00	4.75	94.58	4.15	0.385	
	3501-5500	3.41	0.72	3.40	1.75	4.80	108.65			
	5501-7500	3.37	0.84	3.45	1.20	4.90	109.04			
	7501-9500	3.53	0.78	3.68	2.40	5.00	116.66			
	9500+	3.11	0.85	2.90	1.75	4.55	86.55			
Relationships with Managers	2500-3500	3.17	1.04	3.44	1.00	5.00	88.35	12.05	0.017	3501-5500>9501+
	3501-5500	3.60	0.75	3.83	1.78	5.00	116.09			
	5501-7500	3.47	0.98	3.78	1.00	5.00	109.08			
	7501-9500	3.60	0.86	3.78	2.11	5.00	111.63			
	9500+	2.92	0.95	2.78	1.44	4.78	72.39			
Wage System	2500-3500	1.80	0.91	1.60	1.00	4.60	66.61	24.51	0.000	3501-5500>2500-3500 5501-7500>2500-3500 7501-9500>2500-
	3501-5500	2.47	1.10	2.30	1.00	5.00	105.39			
	5501-	2.73	0.98	3.00	1.00	4.00	122.19			



	7500									3500 9500+>2500- 3500	
	7501- 9500	2.75	1.02	2.50	1.00	5.00	122.81				
	9500+	2.78	1.08	2.40	1.20	4.80	123.37				
Decision Making Process	2500- 3500	2.99	0.98	3.11	1.00	5.00	90.36	3.66	0.453		
	3501- 5500	3.29	0.87	3.39	1.00	5.00	108.26				
	5501- 7500	3.28	0.98	3.44	1.00	5.00	108.56				
	7501- 9500	3.52	0.87	3.44	2.00	5.00	116.47				
	9500+	3.15	1.06	3.22	1.00	5.00	99.00				
Incentive and Evaluation System	2500- 3500	2.44	1.05	2.43	1.00	4.29	87.88	6.04	0.196		
	3501- 5500	2.84	1.10	2.86	1.00	5.00	109.20				
	5501- 7500	2.96	0.97	3.00	1.00	5.00	116.02				
	7501- 9500	2.68	0.79	2.43	1.29	3.86	96.34				
	9500+	2.62	1.24	2.29	1.00	4.71	98.11				
Motivation	2500- 3500	2.72	0.88	2.82	1.00	4.63	82.42	8.94	0.063		
	3501- 5500	3.14	0.82	3.17	1.57	5.00	109.74				
	5501- 7500	3.17	0.85	3.33	1.00	4.73	115.66				
	7501- 9500	3.22	0.69	3.20	1.90	4.37	113.91				
	9500+	2.90	1.02	2.80	1.53	4.83	94.00				

Table 11: Comparison of Scores According to the Income Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of relationships with managers and the wage system scores differ significantly by income ( $p < .05$ ). The median of perceptions of relationships with managers of employees with an income between 3501-5500 was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the employees with an income of 9501 or above. The median wage system perception of employees with an income of 3501-5500, 5501-7500, 7501-9500, and over 9500 were found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the employees with an income of 2500-3500. Looking at this table, it is possible to say that employees with an income between 2500-3500 do not get the wages they deserve for their performance and they think the wage system is unfair.

#### 4.17. Analyses Regarding the Total Time in the Occupation Variable

The results of the normality test for the total time in the occupation variable are given in Table 12.

Tests of Normality		
Total Time in	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>	Shapiro-Wilk

	<b>the Occupation:</b>	<b>Statistic</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Statistic</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Procedural Justice	1-3 years	.096	48	.200*	.963	48	.135
	4-7 years	.114	77	.015	.970	77	.063
	8-11 years	.126	29	.200*	.921	29	.032
	12-15 years	.202	18	.050	.916	18	.108
	16 years or above	.101	36	.200*	.970	36	.434
Distributive Justice	1-3 years	.135	48	.028	.954	48	.060
	4-7 years	.184	77	.000	.914	77	.000
	8-11 years	.134	29	.196	.931	29	.059
	12-15 years	.228	18	.014	.876	18	.023
	16 years or above	.120	36	.200*	.955	36	.146
Interactional Justice	1-3 years	.124	48	.064	.955	48	.064
	4-7 years	.151	77	.000	.925	77	.000
	8-11 years	.160	29	.057	.931	29	.057
	12-15 years	.197	18	.064	.892	18	.042
	16 years or above	.143	36	.061	.960	36	.208
Organizational Justice	1-3 years	.101	48	.200*	.959	48	.089
	4-7 years	.107	77	.029	.966	77	.036
	8-11 years	.134	29	.197	.936	29	.080
	12-15 years	.102	18	.200*	.961	18	.615
	16 years or above	.103	36	.200*	.950	36	.103
Relationships with Managers	1-3 years	.153	48	.007	.922	48	.004
	4-7 years	.155	77	.000	.949	77	.004
	8-11 years	.158	29	.063	.896	29	.008
	12-15 years	.330	18	.000	.743	18	.000
	16 years or above	.131	36	.121	.926	36	.018
Wage System	1-3 years	.102	48	.200*	.948	48	.035
	4-7 years	.163	77	.000	.909	77	.000
	8-11 years	.118	29	.200*	.929	29	.052
	12-15 years	.134	18	.200*	.919	18	.124
	16 years or above	.181	36	.004	.916	36	.010
Decision Making Process	1-3 years	.131	48	.038	.959	48	.088
	4-7 years	.131	77	.002	.960	77	.016
	8-11 years	.163	29	.046	.934	29	.069
	12-15 years	.146	18	.200*	.947	18	.386
	16 years or above	.185	36	.003	.939	36	.047

Incentive and Evaluation System	1-3 years	.096	48	.200*	.971	48	.277
	4-7 years	.104	77	.039	.943	77	.002
	8-11 years	.121	29	.200*	.933	29	.067
	12-15 years	.148	18	.200*	.923	18	.147
	16 years or above	.097	36	.200*	.938	36	.043
Motivation	1-3 years	.111	48	.181	.968	48	.206
	4-7 years	.115	77	.014	.959	77	.013
	8-11 years	.132	29	.200*	.954	29	.238
	12-15 years	.122	18	.200*	.969	18	.781
	16 years or above	.145	36	.053	.949	36	.100
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 12: Tests of Normality for Total Time in the Occupation Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by total time in the occupation ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.18. Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Occupation Variable

Comparison of scores according to the total time in the occupation variable is given in Table 13.

Subdimension	Time in the Occupation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	Chi-square	sig
Procedural Justice	1-3 years	3.27	0.87	3.36	1.43	5.00	106.27	5.62	0.230
	4-7 years	3.41	0.92	3.43	1.00	5.00	115.56		
	8-11 years	3.04	1.11	3.00	1.29	4.57	94.34		
	12-15 years	3.04	1.08	2.93	1.71	5.00	90.94		
	16 years or above	3.10	0.72	3.21	1.57	4.29	93.43		
Distributive Justice	1-3 years	3.22	1.03	3.00	1.25	5.00	102.10	0.56	0.967
	4-7 years	3.17	1.25	3.75	1.00	5.00	102.11		
	8-11 years	3.28	1.25	3.00	1.00	5.00	107.38		
	12-15 years	3.31	1.35	3.63	1.25	5.00	111.22		
	16 years or above	3.30	1.14	3.38	1.00	5.00	107.13		
Interactional Justice	1-3 years	3.60	0.79	3.78	1.22	5.00	114.11	5.03	0.284
	4-7 years	3.57	0.74	3.67	1.00	5.00	110.27		
	8-11 years	3.16	1.05	3.44	1.00	4.56	88.33		
	12-15 years	3.38	0.82	3.67	1.89	4.56	95.06		
	16 years or above	3.37	0.81	3.50	1.56	4.78	97.08		
Organizational Justice	1-3 years	3.41	0.73	3.45	1.50	4.90	108.84	3.11	0.539
	4-7 years	3.43	0.77	3.40	1.00	5.00	111.38		
	8-11 years	3.14	0.95	3.00	1.20	4.55	93.83		
	12-15 years	3.25	0.85	3.38	1.75	4.75	96.92		

	16 years or above	3.26	0.68	3.35	1.90	4.40	96.38		
Relationships with Managers	1-3 years	3.52	0.93	3.78	1.00	5.00	111.85	2.13	0.712
	4-7 years	3.42	0.95	3.78	1.00	5.00	103.55		
	8-11 years	3.20	1.05	3.44	1.00	4.78	93.38		
	12-15 years	3.57	0.77	3.83	1.89	4.56	112.42		
	16 years or above	3.40	0.80	3.56	1.22	4.56	101.72		
Wage System	1-3 years	2.32	0.89	2.30	1.00	4.00	99.36	1.48	0.830
	4-7 years	2.45	1.22	2.00	1.00	5.00	102.66		
	8-11 years	2.57	1.18	2.40	1.00	4.80	111.40		
	12-15 years	2.37	1.16	2.10	1.00	4.60	99.92		
	16 years or above	2.54	0.85	2.40	1.20	4.00	112.01		
Decision Making Process	1-3 years	3.29	0.91	3.44	1.11	5.00	108.42	0.45	0.978
	4-7 years	3.19	0.96	3.33	1.00	5.00	102.45		
	8-11 years	3.24	1.05	3.44	1.00	5.00	104.67		
	12-15 years	3.35	0.95	3.28	1.11	5.00	108.33		
	16 years or above	3.19	0.88	3.39	1.00	4.67	101.61		
Incentive and Evaluation System	1-3 years	3.00	1.00	3.07	1.00	5.00	118.16	5.55	0.235
	4-7 years	2.65	1.15	2.57	1.00	5.00	98.86		
	8-11 years	2.53	1.12	2.29	1.00	4.71	91.74		
	12-15 years	2.98	0.97	3.00	1.00	4.29	118.58		
	16 years or above	2.70	0.89	2.86	1.00	4.00	101.58		
Motivation	1-3 years	3.13	0.81	3.20	1.17	4.73	109.76	1.10	0.893
	4-7 years	3.01	0.93	3.23	1.00	5.00	103.19		
	8-11 years	2.95	1.00	2.87	1.00	4.83	97.71		
	12-15 years	3.17	0.79	3.30	1.37	4.63	111.92		
	16 years or above	3.03	0.69	3.07	1.60	4.10	102.06		

Table 13: Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Occupation Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not significantly differ by total time in the occupation ( $p > .05$ ).

#### 4.19. Analyses Regarding the Total Time in the Institution Variable

The results of the normality test for the total time in the institution variable are given in Table 14.

Tests of Normality			
	Total Time in the	Kolmogorov-	Shapiro-Wilk

	Institution:	Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Statistic	df	Sig.
		Statistic	df	Sig.			
Procedural Justice	1-3 years	.072	78	.200*	.977	78	.168
	4-7 years	.151	75	.000	.943	75	.002
	8-11 years	.107	24	.200*	.940	24	.164
	12-15 years	.271	11	.024	.851	11	.044
	16 years or above	.132	20	.200*	.976	20	.873
Distributive Justice	1-3 years	.160	78	.000	.939	78	.001
	4-7 years	.153	75	.000	.938	75	.001
	8-11 years	.144	24	.200*	.895	24	.017
	12-15 years	.219	11	.147	.898	11	.173
	16 years or above	.091	20	.200*	.972	20	.788
Interactional Justice	1-3 years	.136	78	.001	.939	78	.001
	4-7 years	.163	75	.000	.940	75	.001
	8-11 years	.170	24	.072	.933	24	.113
	12-15 years	.237	11	.085	.920	11	.321
	16 years or above	.106	20	.200*	.959	20	.517
Organizational Justice	1-3 years	.068	78	.200*	.975	78	.124
	4-7 years	.143	75	.001	.951	75	.006
	8-11 years	.116	24	.200*	.953	24	.318
	12-15 years	.230	11	.109	.894	11	.158
	16 years or above	.132	20	.200*	.947	20	.322
Relationships with Managers	1-3 years	.145	78	.000	.954	78	.007
	4-7 years	.172	75	.000	.931	75	.001
	8-11 years	.206	24	.010	.856	24	.003
	12-15 years	.328	11	.002	.728	11	.001
	16 years or above	.193	20	.049	.898	20	.037
Wage System	1-3 years	.140	78	.001	.958	78	.011
	4-7 years	.128	75	.004	.901	75	.000
	8-11 years	.184	24	.035	.892	24	.015
	12-15 years	.258	11	.039	.881	11	.107
	16 years or above	.196	20	.043	.929	20	.147
Decision Making Process	1-3 years	.082	78	.200*	.966	78	.036
	4-7 years	.124	75	.006	.959	75	.015
	8-11 years	.260	24	.000	.799	24	.000
	12-15 years	.220	11	.142	.846	11	.038

	16 years or above	.280	20	.000	.886	20	.023
Incentive and Evaluation System	1-3 years	.118	78	.009	.955	78	.008
	4-7 years	.088	75	.200*	.934	75	.001
	8-11 years	.115	24	.200*	.934	24	.118
	12-15 years	.178	11	.200*	.955	11	.705
	16 years or above	.137	20	.200*	.930	20	.151
Motivation	1-3 years	.063	78	.200*	.984	78	.457
	4-7 years	.114	75	.017	.944	75	.002
	8-11 years	.170	24	.070	.888	24	.012
	12-15 years	.189	11	.200*	.909	11	.237
	16 years or above	.199	20	.037	.925	20	.124
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

Table 14: Tests of Normality for Total Time in the Institution Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by total time in the institution ( $p < .05$ ).

#### 4.20. Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Institution Variable

Comparison of scores according to the total time in the institution variable is given in Table 15.

Subdimension	Time in the Institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Min	Max	Mean Ranks	Chi-square	sig	Difference
Procedural Justice	1-3 years	3.47	0.85	3.43	1.43	5.00	117.74	15.77	0.003	1-3>8-11
	4-7 years	3.30	0.93	3.43	1.00	5.00	110.35			
	8-11 years	2.77	1.00	2.79	1.29	4.43	74.69			
	12-15 years	2.96	1.13	2.29	1.71	4.57	87.59			
	16 years or above	2.85	0.71	2.86	1.57	4.29	76.00			
Distributive Justice	1-3 years	3.36	1.14	3.75	1.00	5.00	110.86	2.38	0.667	
	4-7 years	3.19	1.15	3.50	1.00	5.00	102.11			
	8-11 years	3.10	1.48	3.00	1.00	5.00	101.02			
	12-15 years	3.34	1.27	3.75	1.50	5.00	110.00			
	16 years or above	2.98	1.03	3.00	1.25	5.00	89.80			
Interactional Justice	1-3 years	3.68	0.74	3.78	1.22	5.00	120.36	14.03	0.007	1-3>16 or above
	4-7 years	3.49	0.78	3.67	1.00	5.00	105.31			
	8-11 years	3.11	1.02	3.44	1.00	4.78	81.85			
	12-15 years	3.23	0.83	3.44	1.89	4.44	84.41			
	16 years or above	3.13	0.82	3.17	1.56	4.33	77.83			
Organizational Justice	1-3 years	3.54	0.72	3.55	1.50	4.90	118.97	14.04	0.007	1-3>16 or above
	4-7 years	3.36	0.77	3.40	1.00	5.00	107.08			
	8-11 years	2.99	0.91	3.00	1.20	4.40	81.77			

	12-15 years	3.16	0.81	3.55	1.75	4.10	90.64			
	16 years or above	3.00	0.62	3.00	1.90	3.95	73.30			
Relationships with Managers	1-3 years	3.61	0.80	3.78	1.44	5.00	114.79	3.75	0.441	
	4-7 years	3.31	1.01	3.67	1.00	5.00	99.54			
	8-11 years	3.24	1.01	3.72	1.00	4.56	96.29			
	12-15 years	3.33	0.89	3.78	1.89	4.00	97.32			
	16 years or above	3.34	0.84	3.44	1.22	4.44	96.75			
Wage System	1-3 years	2.61	1.06	2.60	1.00	5.00	113.49	6.40	0.171	
	4-7 years	2.35	1.16	2.20	1.00	5.00	98.41			
	8-11 years	2.04	0.95	2.00	1.00	4.00	82.88			
	12-15 years	2.65	1.11	3.00	1.00	4.00	117.09			
	16 years or above	2.51	0.77	2.40	1.20	4.00	111.30			
Decision Making Process	1-3 years	3.46	0.86	3.56	1.78	5.00	117.08	6.56	0.161	
	4-7 years	3.14	0.99	3.33	1.00	5.00	99.50			
	8-11 years	3.09	0.99	3.44	1.00	4.00	99.81			
	12-15 years	3.12	0.91	3.00	1.11	4.00	96.59			
	16 years or above	2.93	0.88	3.17	1.00	4.11	84.18			
Incentive and Evaluation System	1-3 years	3.09	1.09	3.14	1.00	5.00	123.28	12.85	0.012	1-3 > 4-7
	4-7 years	2.57	0.98	2.57	1.00	4.00	94.71			
	8-11 years	2.55	1.18	2.43	1.00	5.00	92.17			
	12-15 years	2.70	0.83	2.86	1.14	4.00	100.91			
	16 years or above	2.41	0.92	2.36	1.00	4.00	84.75			
Motivation	1-3 years	3.28	0.84	3.25	1.37	5.00	118.12	7.14	0.128	
	4-7 years	2.93	0.90	3.00	1.00	4.37	98.96			
	8-11 years	2.83	0.87	2.87	1.00	3.87	91.35			
	12-15 years	3.01	0.79	3.30	1.37	3.87	103.00			
	16 years or above	2.86	0.69	3.05	1.60	4.10	88.78			

Table 15: Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Institution Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of relationships with managers and the wage system scores differ by the total time in the institution ( $p < .05$ ). The median of procedural justice perception of those who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked at the institution for 8-11 years. The interactional and organizational justice median of the employees who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked for 16 years or more. The median of the incentive and evaluation system perception of the employees who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked for 4-7 years. The employees whose seniority has increased in the organization and who has improved themselves in their work, will contribute more to the organization with their experience and will desire to see this being reflected in their wages and status in return. According to this table, it is possible to say that the justice perception of the employee whose seniority has increased, but whose expectations are not met, has weakened.

#### 4.21. Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis results are given in Table 16.

	Motivation	Incentive and Evaluation	Decision Making	Wage System	Manager Relation	Organizational	Interactional	Distributive	Procedural	Dimensions
	3.04	2.75	3.23	2.44	3.41	3.34	3.46	3.23	3.24	Mean
	0.86	1.05	0.94	1.07	0.91	0.78	0.82	1.18	0.92	Std.
	0.668**	0.542**	0.695**	0.428**	0.624**	0.891**	0.606**	0.593**	-----	1
	0.615**	0.520**	0.608**	0.512**	0.494**	0.735**	0.381**	-----	-----	2
	0.703**	0.579**	0.665**	0.380**	0.752**	0.823**	-----	-----	-----	3
	0.802**	0.662**	0.788**	0.520**	0.764**	-----	-----	-----	-----	4
	0.853**	0.680**	0.777**	0.477**	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	5
	0.754**	0.641**	0.589**	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	6
	0.912**	0.747**	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7
	0.894**	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	8
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	9

Table 16: Correlation Analysis Regarding the Relationship Between Organizational Justice Perception and Motivation

According to the analysis, procedural justice has a moderate positive correlation with relationships with managers ( $r = 0.62$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system ( $r = 0.43$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a high level of positive correlation with decision making ( $r = 0.70$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system ( $r = 0.54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and a moderate positive correlation with motivation ( $r = 0.67$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Distributive justice has a moderate positive correlation with relationships with managers ( $r = 0.49$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system ( $r = 0.51$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with decision making ( $r = 0.61$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system ( $r = 0.52$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and a moderate correlation with motivation ( $r = 0.62$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Interactional justice has a high level of positive correlation with relationship with managers ( $r = 0.75$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system ( $r = 0.38$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with decision



making ( $r = 0.67$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system ( $r = 0.58$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and a high level of correlation with motivation ( $r = 0.70$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Organizational justice has a high level of positive correlation with relationships with managers ( $r = 0.76$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system ( $r = 0.52$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a high level of positive correlation with decision making ( $r = 0.79$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system ( $r = 0.66$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and a high level of correlation with motivation ( $r = 0.80$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

#### 4.22. Regression Analysis

- H1: Organizational justice perceptions of the employees have a positive effect on motivation.

Results of the regression analysis are given in Table 17.

Independent Variable	Motivation		
	$\beta$	t	p
Constant	0.044	0.286	0.776
Organizational Justice Perception	0.898	20.083	0.000
F	403.329		
Model (p)	0.000		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.662		

Table 17: Regression Analysis

Regression coefficients have been tested with t statistics, and perceived organizational justice ( $p < 0.01$ ) was found to be statistically significant in the regression equation that explains motivation. One-unit increase in perceived organizational justice score leads to a 0.898-fold increase in motivation. Perceived organizational justice has a statistically significant effect on motivation.

As a result of the regression analysis, the explanatory coefficient ( $R^2$ ), which is the percentage of the independent variable explaining the model was found to be 0.662. The regression equation that was found to be statistically significant is as follows.

$$\text{Motivation} = 0.044 + 0.898 (\text{Perceived organizational justice})$$

## 5. Conclusion

In this study, based on the organizational justice and motivation scale, whether the organizational justice perceptions of the aviation sector employees with distinctive demographic characteristics have an effect on their motivation has been examined.

When the correlation analysis we applied to determine the direction and degree of the relationships between the variables was evaluated according to the hypotheses, the hypothesis that 'perceptions of organizational justice and sub-dimensions of aviation sector employees have an effect on organizational motivation' has been accepted.

When the correlation analysis between organizational justice and motivation was examined, it was found that interactional justice was the sub-dimension that affects motivation the most, and participation in the decision-making process had the highest effect on employee motivation.

Multiple regression analysis test was used to examine the effects of organizational justice dimensions on motivation level. According to the results of the regression analysis, the perceived organizational justice has a statistically significant effect on motivation. One-unit increase in perceived organizational justice score leads to a 0.898-fold increase in motivation. According to the results obtained in the research, as the perception of justice within the organization improves, the motivation of the employees also increases.

As a result, in the study, organizational justice and motivation have been examined and the effect of organizational justice perception on motivation has been investigated. According to the results obtained in the research, as the perception of justice within the organization improves, the motivation of the employees also increases. The strong or weak perception of justice affects the motivation of the employee. In order for organizations to have a long life, to gain competitive advantage, and to become an employer brand, they must first adopt an organizational culture that values the employees and be built on these foundations. Employees should be given duties and responsibilities that are commensurate with their skills and training. It is important that the compensations in return for the assigned duties and responsibilities are fairly distributed. Employees should be promoted in line with their abilities and have a voice in decision-making regarding organizational processes. It should be ensured that the employees embrace the purpose of the organization as their own and that there is a healthy communication with managers and colleagues during these processes.

## 6. References

- AKBAŞ, G. (2007). 'Servis Hemsirelerinin Stres ve Motivasyon Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi', (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Haliç Üniversitesi SBE, İstanbul.
- ARABACI, H. (2019). 'Liderlik Stilleri ve Örgütsel Adalet İlişkisi: Balıkesir İli Bandırma İlçesi Örneği', (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Balıkesir Üniversitesi SBE, Balıkesir.
- ARNOLD, J., C. FELDMAN (1986). Organizational Behavior, New York: McGrawHill International Edition Management Series.
- BABÜR, S. (2007). Aristoteles, Nikomakhos'a Etik, Bilgesu Yayıncılık, Ankara.

- v. BARLING, J., PHILLIPS, M. (1993). 'Interactional, Formal and Distributive Justice in the Workplace: An Exploratory Study', *Journal of Psychology*, 127/6, pp.649-656.
- vi. GREENBERG, J., (1987). 'A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories'. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), pp.9-22.
- vii. GÜNEY, S. (2015). *Liderlik*, Nobel Yayınları, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Ankara.
- viii. GÜNEY, S. (2015). *Örgütsel Davranış*, Nobel Yayıncılık, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, İstanbul.
- ix. İŞCAN, Ö. F., NAKTIYOK, A. (2004). 'Çalışanların Örgütsel Bağdaşımının Belirleyicileri Olarak Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Adalet Algısı.' *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol.59, pp.181-201.
- x. İYİGÜN, N.Ö. (2012). 'Örgütsel Adalet: Kuramsal Bir Yaklaşım', *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (11)21: pp.49-64.
- xi. KARADAĞ, M., IŞIK, O., AKBOLAT, M., ÇELEN, Ö., (2015). 'Örgütsel Bağlılık Açısından Motivasyon: Sağlık Kurumlarında Çalışan İdari Personel Üzerinde Bir Uygulama', *The Journal Of Academic Social Science Studies*, No: 40, p.313.
- xii. KARAEMİNOĞULLARI, A. (2006). 'Öğretim Elemanlarının Örgütsel Adalet Algıları ile Sergiledikleri Üretkenliğe Aykırı Davranışlar Arasındaki İlişkiye Bir Araştırma', (Unpublished Master's Thesis), İstanbul University SBE, İstanbul.
- xiii. KOÇAK, R. D. (2011). 'Yöneticilerin Liderlik Özelliklerinin Çalışanların Motivasyonu ve Performansı Üzerindeki Etkileri: Kamu ve Özel Hastanelerinde Bir Uygulama' (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Gazi Üniversitesi EBE, Ankara.
- xiv. MANZOOR, Quratul-Ain., (2012). "Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness", *Business Management and Strategy*, Vol:3, No:1, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, p.3.
- xv. MASTERSON, S. S., LEWIS, K., GOLDMAN, B. M. & TAYLOR, M. S. (2000). 'Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships', *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), pp.738-748.
- xvi. MOORHEAD, G.; RICKY W. Griffin, (1989). *Organizational Behavior*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Second Edition, USA.
- xvii. SABUNCUOĞLU, Z. & TÜZ, M. (1996). *Örgütsel Psikoloji*, Ezgi Kitabevi Yayınları, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Bursa.
- xviii. SEMERCİ, A. (2005). 'İş Motivasyonu ve Sonuçları: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankasında Bir Uygulama', (Specialization Qualification Thesis), Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası, Ankara.
- xix. SERİNKAN, C., ERDİŞ, Y. (2014). *Dönüşümcü Liderlik Bağlamında Örgütsel Vatandaşlık ve Örgütsel Adalet*, Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- xx. TAŞKIRAN, E. (2011). *Liderlik ve Örgütsel Sessizlik Arasındaki Etkileşim Örgütsel Adaletin Rolü*. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. Beta Publishing, İstanbul.