

Investigation of the correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence of Turkish physical education teachers

Kurudirek M.A^{1*}, Gezer E¹, Kurudirek M.I¹, Gezer H¹, Katkat D², Mizrak O³

1. School of Physical Education and Sport, Kafkas University, TURKEY

2. School of Physical Education and Sport, Mersin University, TURKEY

3. Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Ataturk University, TURKEY

*Corresponding author, Email: Kurudirek.m@yahoo.com

Abstract

The aim of the present study is to determine the correlation between the organizational justice and job satisfaction levels of physical education and sports teachers.

Material and Method: The sample of the study included a total of 116 teachers; 75 male teachers (64.6%) and 41 female teachers (35.4%).

Data collection was done with 'Organizational Justice Scale' developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and Organizational Silence Scale developed by Kahveci and Demirtaş (2013). The scales consisted of 20 and 18 items (ordinary) were used in order to determine the organizational justice and organizational silence levels of the participants and average total scores obtained from both scales were calculated to determine the level of organizational justice and organizational silence of the participants. Statistical analyses were based on ($p < 0.05$) significant level. Data analysis included frequency analysis, descriptive statistics, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests to examine and to compare the demographic information of participants, organizational justice and organizational silence levels, managerial status, age and working age (length of service). Furthermore, correlation analysis was conducted in order to measure the correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence.

Finding: The average organizational justice ($X = 2.94 \pm 0.978$) and organizational silence ($X = 3.35 \pm 0.884$) scores of the participants were found to be lower than satisfactory level in the result of the study.

Conclusion: The results of the study indicated that there was a statistically significant negative correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence levels ($r = -.532, p < 0.01$).

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Silence, Physical Education, Teacher.

Introduction

Organizational justice perception has recently become a research subject on which researchers and scientists have focused comprehensively and many studies in relation to organizational justice perception have been conducted in scientific fields (Bakhshi et al. 2009). The concept of justice is used to refer to fairness and equality and the word of justice is derived from the root of the adjective "just" in English and connotes doing what is

necessary for a system or an organization to function properly (İçerli 2010). The term of justice has been investigated from many different perspectives in social sciences. In this sense; organizational justice perceptions lead to such important outcomes as leadership, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, job performance, leaving job (Özmen et al. 2007). Organizational justice

perceptions reflect employees' views about fairness in the organization (Greenberg, 1987). In the emergence of the concept of organizational justice; it is seen that social justice theories have been adapted to organizations and thus the concept of organizational justice has been developed (Eker, 2006). These theories can be listed as relative deprivation theory of Stouffer et al. (1949), distributive justice theory of Homans (1961) and equity theory of Adams (1965).

People are sometimes forced to make decisions about different issues during their work lives. Some of these decisions are about their wages, duties and tasks assigned to them while some of them are related to social environments they are in. The decisions made may produce very important outcomes. Therefore; individuals question these decisions and want to find the answer to the question "Was the decision I made just?" (Colquitt 2001). For Moorman (1991); organizational justice focuses on whether or not employees are treated fairly and ultimately whether or not employees' job related behaviors and attitudes are affected (Sezgin 2009).

Organizational Justice Types, Distributive Justice Theory

Distributive justice concerns whether or not the rate of outcomes that employees in an organization receive in exchange for incomes that they have created for the organization is above or below their expectations. If an employee perceives that, they receive fair outcomes in exchange for incomes they have produced in the organization; then, it can be said that there is distributive justice. If an employee does not receive the outcome or receives more outcomes in exchange for incomes they have produced in the organization; they react accordingly. Outcomes offered to the employees below their expectations may cause anger while those given above their expectations may lead to a sense of guilt. At this point, management should objectively assess each income created by employees in the organization and fix the outcomes the employees receive at an optimal level. This leads to a motivation that affects employees' productivity directly (Kurudirek 2014; Deutsch 1975; Çolak and Erdost, 2004; Erkanlı 2009).

Procedural Justice

In the most general meaning, procedural justice is related to how a distribution-decision is made (Kovonsky, 2000; Sulu, 2010). It is possible to define procedural justice as perceived fairness of processes in which outcomes or incomes, which are the focus of distributive justice, are determined, therefore, administration should be just and fair in their decisions as well as processes (Lambert 2003). Greenberg and Kennedy et al. suggest that employees can have a say about a promotion

process regardless of those promoted (Greenberg 1987; Kennedy et al., 2009). Therefore; achievement as an organizational outcome may be fair but the processes used to attain these outcomes may not be fair and just.

Interactional Justice

In the study of Bies and Moag (1986) on organizational justice, they found that employees are sensitive to quality of interactions and behaviors they experience during implementation of the processes although they pay attention to the fact that the distributions and processes are just and thus discovered another aspect of organizational justice. Bies and Moag (1986) termed this aspect interactional justice (Colquitt et al. 2001). Interactional justice includes assessment of those who run procedures existing in the distribution of interactional justice –that is, administrators/managers- by their interlocutors – that is, employees- in terms of respect, honesty and politeness.

Organizational Silence

According to Hirschman (1970); silence is a response of employee to job dissatisfaction. Because of this silence; organizations do not use innovative ideas of employees and miss an important advancement opportunity. According to Brinsfield (2009); when employees feel hopeless in organizational objectives or processes and believe that nothing can be changed; they feel job dissatisfaction and get silent. Morrison and Milliken (2000) define organizational silence as a collective phenomenon which is a dangerous barrier to organizational change and advancement and prevents establishing a pluralistic organization. Employee silence about administration is attributed to Hirschman who undertakes to define the term for the first time. Hirschman (1970) formulized silence as a constructive reaction of employees synonymous to passiveness but loyalty/commitment and later administrative scientists continued to consider silence equal to commitment. As an example; employees, who are maltreated but do not report these complaints, are commonly considered as silent but contented (Çakıcı 2007). From these definitions and clarifications, organizational silence can be defined as an intentional deprivation and quietness of employees in order not to expose their opinions and views about technical and/or behavioral issues that are related to job or workplace and needed for advancement and progression. Silence is an ongoing dynamic process that continues as a response to various individual and situational factors under inequity conditions (Pinder and Harlos, 2001).

Dimensions of Organizational Silence

Acquiescent silence: Dyne et al. defines acquiescent silence as employees' act of intentionally withholding ideas, information, and opinions regarding a particular situation, problem or subject as a result of surrendering to that particular situation, problem or subject. In addition to contenting to organizational conditions, employees with acquiescent silence behaviors are not aware of alternative solutions to change these conditions at all (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). The employees have already given up correcting the defective situation that leads to dissatisfaction because they have accepted it hopelessly. Since employees think that discussing the defective situation is pointless and frustrating; they choose silence (Brinsfield, 2009).

Defensive Silence: Defensive silence can be defined as intentionally withholding ideas, information, and opinions regarding a particular situation, problem or subject in order to protect themselves fearing the reactions when they express their views about that particular situation, problem or subject. Defensive silence is defined as a proactive behavior for self-protection against external dangers and Dyne et al. argued that in addition to being proactive, employees with defensive silence are aware and think of alternatives and consider future-decision making as a personal strategy (Dyne et al., 2003).

Prosocial Silence: Prosocial silence, conceptualized by Dyne et al. within the framework of organizational citizenship literature, is defined as employees' intentionally withholding ideas, information, and opinions regarding a particular situation, problem or subject in order to gain favor for the organization or other individuals due to protecting other employees or cooperative reasons (Dyne et al., 2003).

Materials and Methods

The study was done with a total of 116 physical education and sports teachers recruited from different regions of Türkiye (75 male teachers and 41 female teachers) between 2015 and 2016. Data collection form was a survey form composed of demographic information form designed by the researchers, Organizational Justice Perception Scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman in 1993 and adapted by Karaeminoğulları into Turkish Language in 2006 and Organizational Silence Scale developed by Kahveci and Demirtaş (Karaeminoğulları 2006, Kahveci and Demirtaş 2013). Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale are five point Likert scales with 20 items and 18 items; respectively. Organizational Justice Perception Scale has three subscales: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Organizational Silence Scale has five subscales: school environment, emotion, source of silence, administrator and isolation. Cronbach Alpha values are .96 for Organizational Justice Perception Scale and .89 for Organizational Silence Scale (Dündar 2011; Kahveci and Demirtaş, 2013).

The study-data obtained from the participants were statistically processed through IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 program. As a result of Shapiro-Wilk normality analysis done with the data; it was found that data did not follow a normal distribution and non-parametric analyses were performed. These analyses were independent Mann Whitney U test for groups with two-variables and Kruskal Wallis H test for groups with more than two variables. To detect the correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence; Spearman's correlation analysis was performed.

Results

Table 1. Demographic information of the participants

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percent
Sex	Female	41	35.3
	Male	75	64.7
	Total	116	100.0
Managerial task and duty	Yes	36	31
	No	80	69
	Total	116	100
Working year (length of service)	0 – 5 years	29	25
	6 – 10 years	37	31.9
	11-15 years	26	22.4
	16 years and above	24	20.7
	Total	116	100

According to Table 1; most of the participant teachers worked for 6-10 years at the schools where

they were employed. Again, most of the participants did not have any managerial and

administrative task and duty. Most of the participants were male teachers.

Table 2. Mean scores of the participants' Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Organizational justice	116	1.00	4.8	2.94	.978
Organizational Silence	116	1.00	4.72	3.35	.884

According to Table 2; participants' mean score of organizational justice perception was 2.94±.978 and organizational silence level was 3.35±.884.

Table 3. Results of Mann Whitney U test done to compare participants' mean scores of Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale in terms of sex and managerial task and duty variables

	Variable	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Z	P	
Organizational Justice	Sex	Female	41	52.28	3921	1071	-2.695	.007**
		Male	75	69.88	2865			
	Managerial task and duty	Yes	36	61.73	1848	1182	-1540	.124
		No	80	51.33	4938			
Organizational silence	Sex	Female	41	75.99	3115.5	820.5	-4.144	.000**
		Male	75	48.94	3670.5			
	Managerial task and duty	Yes	36	38.56	1388	722	-4288	.000**
		No	80	67.48	5398			

** (p<0.01)

Table 3 included results of Mann Whitney U test done to explore whether or not participant teachers' mean rank scores of Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale differed significantly in terms of sex and managerial task and duty variables. Accordingly; it was identified that there was a statistically significant difference in mean rank scores of both

Organizational Justice and Organizational Silence Scales in terms of sex variable (u=1071 p<.05), (u=820 p<.05). As for managerial task and duty variable; there was a statistically significant difference in mean rank scores of Organizational Silence Scale (u=722 p<.05) while there was not a statistically significant difference in mean rank scores of Organizational Justice Scale.

Table 4. Results of Kruskal Wallis H test done to compare participants' mean rank scores of Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale in terms of working-age (length of service)

	Working age	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	p
Organizational justice	0-5 years	29	59.32	1.115	3	.773
	6-10 years	37	54.47			
	11-15 years	26	63.60			
	16 years and above	24	56.58			
Organizational silence	0-5 years	29	56.19	4.681	3	.197
	6-10 years	37	65.98			
	11-15 years	26	58.28			
	16 years and above	24	62.76			

*(p<0.01)

In Table 4, Kruskal Wallis H test was done to explore whether or not participant teachers' mean rank scores of Organizational Justice Perception Scale and Organizational Silence Scale differed

significantly in terms of working-age (length of service) at the schools where they were employed and it was identified that there was not statistically significant difference between the groups.

Table 5. Correlation analyses done to explore the correlation between participants’ organizational justice and organizational silence levels

		Organizational justice	Organizational silence
Organizational justice	Spearman’s correlation	1	-.532**
	P		.000
	N	116	116
Organizational silence	Spearman’s correlation	-.532**	1
	P	.000	
	N	116	116

** (p<0.01)

In Table 5, Spearman’s Correlation test was employed to detect the correlation between participants’ organizational justice and organizational silence levels. According to test

results; there was a negative and significant correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence concepts ($r=-.532$ $p<0.01$).

Discussion and Conclusion

In the current study which was done with a total of 116 physical education and sports teachers recruited from different regions of Turkiye (75 male teachers and 41 female teachers) between 2015 and 2016 in order to assess their attitudes about organizational justice and organizational silence concepts; different results were obtained. Accordingly; mean scores of participants’ Organizational Justice Scale were not high. That organizational justice perception is not high means that employee does not have a strong justice feeling about the institution where they are employed.

In the literature, it is possible to see studies that indicate that teachers’ organizational justice levels are low to moderate level. For example; the study of Ünlü et al. done with 350 teachers in 2015; it was identified that participants’ organizational justice perception was not high. On the other hand; when the literature was examined; there were studies that reported that teachers’ organizational justice levels were above moderate level. For example; in the study of Altinkurt and Yilmaz conducted with 258 teachers in 2010; it was pointed out that participants’ organizational justice level was high. When the fact that the participant teachers in these above mentioned studies were recruited without any academic branch criteria was considered; it may be suggested that these results included physical education and sports teacher, too. It was understood that participants’ organizational justice levels statistically and significantly differed in terms of sex variable. Accordingly; female teachers had lower level of organizational justice perception than male teachers. It is possible to see studies that report that female employees working in public sector have lower organizational justice perception than male employees. In the study of Kurudirek (2014) done with sports managers employed in public sector; it was reported that female employees had lower organizational justice perception. Furthermore; in the study of Polat (2007) conducted with teachers; it was argued that

female teachers had statistically and significantly lower organizational justice perception than male teachers. There may be numerous reasons for the fact that female employees think that they are treated less justly and fairly in organizations where male employees outnumber female employees and one of them may be that some expectations of women are ignored by the organizations.

Although participants’ organizational justice levels differed according to their managerial task and duty; this difference was statistically not significant. Accordingly; the participants who were employed as a manager/administrator at the schools where they worked had higher level of organizational justice than those who were not employed as a manager/administrator.

Those who are employed for managerial and administrative positions take decisions that pave the way for justice perceptions. Therefore; these employees may be thinking that they are just and fair although decisions they make are not so. That kind of speculative approaches may explain this result.

When participants’ working ages and organizational justice levels were examined; it was identified that those who had the lowest organizational justice levels were those working at the schools for 6-10 years. On the other hand; those working at the schools for 0-5 years had relatively high organizational justice levels; those working at the schools for 11-15 years had the highest organizational justice levels and those working at the schools for 16 years and above had the second lowest organizational justice levels. Therefore; it may be thought that during the early years of their professional careers, individuals try to know administrative procedures that will shape their justice perceptions of the institutions they are employed in. But those who work for 6-10 years have already learnt organizational administrative procedures; which is the reason that their organizational justice levels are lower. In the study

of Yavuz (2010) conducted with 535 participants - 425 participants from public sector and 110 participants from private sector-; similar results were obtained in different organizational justice levels in terms of public workers' length of service. It was found that the mean scores of the organizational silence of the participants of the current study were not at a low level. One's high organizational silence level indicates that they are disposed not to have a say about the organization where they work although they have important opinions related to the organization. Therefore; it is an unfavorable situation for organizations to employ workers with high organizational silence levels. Kahveci and Demirtaş, who developed Organizational Silence Scale used in the current study, did a study with 444 teachers and principals from different academic branches in 2013 and found that participants told that they would prefer to be silent rather than to discuss in case of a situation occurring at the institution where they worked.

The organizational silence levels of the participants differed statistically and significantly in terms of sex variable. Accordingly; female participants had higher organizational silence level than male participants. When the literature was examined; it was seen that women adopt silence behaviors more than men. For example; Tannen (1990) reported that women preferred silence at the fields where men outnumbered women. In the study of Sezgin Nartgün and Kartalın (2013) done with a sample of 90 teachers; it was found that female teachers had higher level of silence than male teachers. Again; the study of Kılıçlar and Harbalıoğlu (2014) done with 392 private sector participants suggested that female employees had higher level of organizational silence than male employees.

Participants' organizational silence levels statistically and significantly differed in terms of managerial task and duty variable. Accordingly; organizational silence levels of the participants' without managerial task and duty were higher than those with managerial task and duty. According to a study done by Çakıcı in 2008 with 508 participants employed at a state university; the participants without managerial positions had higher mean scores of organizational silence than those with managerial positions.

Participants' organizational justice levels were different in terms of working ages (length of service) but this difference was statistically not significant. Accordingly; those with highest organizational silence levels were those who worked for 6-10 years at the institutions where they were employed. According to results of the study done by Aktaş and Şimşek (2014) with 102 nurses; as length of service increased so did organizational silence but performance decreased. This finding

concluded with the results of the current study despite not strongly.

According to the results of the correlation analyses done in the current study in which the correlation between organizational justice and organizational silence was examined among physical education and sports teachers; a negative and statistically significant correlation was found between organizational justice and organizational silence. When the findings obtained from the correlation analyses were assessed; it may be concluded that the correlation was high (Cohen 1988). Therefore; organizational justice and organizational silence were inversely proportional and correlated. In other words; as organizational justice levels increased; organizational silence attitude decreased but as organizational justice levels decreased organizational silence attitude increased. When the literature is examined; it is seen that many studies done with similar and different sample groups provided results that support our study results (Tülübaş and Celep 2012, Aküzüm 2014, Ünlü et al. 2015)

The concept of organizational silence is important for organizations in many ways. It is a serious problem to be tackled with that employees -who know features, potential risks and opportunities that organizations have in the best way- withhold their ideas, information, and opinions. There may be many factors that influence organizational silence. It is argued that organizational justice is a concept that predicts organizational silence in organizations (Pinder and Harlos 2001). In sum; it is necessary that teachers should have a high level of organizational justice perception so that they should not hide important opinions and views about the organizations where they work.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

- Adams J.S, 1965. Inequity in Social Change, L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, New York, 267 – 299.
- Aktaş H, Şimşek E. 2014. Örgütsel Sessizlik ile Algılanan Bireysel Performans, Örgüt Kültürü ve Demografik Değişkenler Arasındaki Etkileşim, *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (28), 24-52.
- Aküzüm C, 2014. The effect of perceived organizational justice on teachers' silence: A Practice in Primary Education Institutions. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education*, 5(1), 96-107.
- Altinkurt Y, Yılmaz K, 2010. Evaluation of the Relationship between Management and Organizational Justice According to

- Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, (16) 4, 463-484.
- Bakhshi AK, Kuldeep-Rani E, 2009. "Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment", International Journal of Business and Management, Vol.4, No. 9, (145-154).
- Bies RJ, Moag JS, 1986. Interactional Justice Communication Criteria of Fairness. Lewicki RJ, Sheppard BH, Bazerman MH, (Ed.), Research on Negotiation in Organizations, Greenwich, 43-55.
- Brinsfield CT, 2009. Employee Silence: Investigation of dimensionality, development of measures, and examination of related factors. Dissertation, Ohio State University, USA.
- Cohen J, 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colquitt JA, 2001. "On The Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of A Measure", Journal of Applied Psychology, 3, 386 - 400.
- Çakıcı A, 2007. Örgütlerde Sessizlik: Sessizliğin Teorik Temelleri ve Dinamikleri, Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16 (1), 145-162.
- Çakıcı A, 2008. Quiet Topics in Organizations, A Research on the Causes of Silence and the Perceived Results, CH, U. Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 17 (1), 117-134.
- Çolak M, Erdost HE, 2004. Organizational justice: a review of the literature and some suggestions for future research. Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 22: 51-84.
- Deutsch M. (1975), Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice?. Journal of Social Issues, 31: 137-149.
- Dündar T, 2011. The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences. Master Thesis, İstanbul: T.C. Yıldız Technical University.
- Dyne LV, Ang S, Botero IC, 2003. "Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice As Multidimensional Constructs." Journal of Management Studies, September, 40(6), 1359-1392.
- Eker G. (2006), Dimensions of Organizational Justice Perceptions and Effects on Job Satisfaction Graduate Thesis, İzmir, Dokuz Eylül University Social Sciences Institute.
- Erkanlı H, 2009. The Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Culture: A Comparative Study on Some Businesses Operating in Turkey. Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration. Ph.D Thesis, Ankara: Ankara University.
- Greenberg J, 1987. A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. Academy of Management Review, 12, 9-22.
- Hirschman AO, 1970. Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Harvard University Press, 25.
- Homans GC, 1961. Social Behavior: It's Elementary Forms, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- İçerli L, 2010. Organizational Justice: A Theoretical Approach, Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development, Vol.1, No.5
- Kahveci G, Demirtaş Z, 2013. School Manager and Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Silence, Journal of Education and Science, (38) 167, 50-64.
- Kahveci G, Demirtaş Z, 2013. Development of Organizational Silence Scale for Teachers, Journal of Electronic Social Sciences, (12) 43, 167-182.
- Karaeminoğulları A, 2006. "The Relationship between Teaching Staff's Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Non-Productive Behavior", M.Sc. Thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Kennedy FA, Kohlmeyer JM, Parker RJ, 2009. The roles of organizational justice and trust in a gain-sharing control system. In: Arnold V (ed). Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research, Vol12, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 1-23.
- Kılıçlar A, Harbalıoğlu M, 2014. The Relationship Between Organizational Silence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Research on Five Star Hotel Operations in Antalya, Journal of Business Research, (6) 1, 328-346.
- Konovsky MA, 2000. Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. Journal of Management, 26: 489-511.
- Kurudirek MA, 2014. Perception of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: A Study on the Employees of the Provincial Directorate of Youth Services and Sport in Eastern Anatolia Region, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Ataturk University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Sports Health Sciences. Erzurum.
- Lambert E, 2003. The impact of organizational justice on correctional staff. Journal of Criminal Justice, 31: 155-168.
- Moorman RH, 1991. "Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational

- Citizenship Behavior: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6, 845-855.
- Morrison EW, Milliken FJ, 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (4), 706-725
- Nartgün Sezgin Ş, Kartal V, 2013. Teachers' Opinions about Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Silence, *Journal of Bartın University Education Faculty*, (2) 2, 47-67.
- Özmen ÖT, Arbak Y, Özer PS, 2007. "A Research on the Questioning of the Effect of the Fair Value on the Perceptions of Justice", *Ege Akademik Bakış*, Vol.7 (1), ss. 17-33.
- Pinder CC, Harlos KP, 2001. Employee Silence: Quiescence and Acquiescence as Response to Perceived Injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331-369.
- Pinder CC, Harlos KP, 2001. Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Volume 20, 331-369.
- Polat S, 2007. The relationship between organizational justice perceptions, organizational confidence levels and organizational citizenship behaviors of secondary school teachers. unpublished phd thesis. kocaeli university social sciences institute.
- Sezgin O, 2009. Exploring the relationship between the concepts of organizational culture, organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, doktora tezi, istanbul, yeditepe üniversitesi graduate school of social sciences.
- Stouffer SA, 1949. *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Sulu S, 2010. The Role of Business Attitudes Relating to Organizational Injustice-Business Behaviors. Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration. Doctoral Thesis, Gebze: T.C. Gebze Institute of Technology.
- Tannen D, 1990. *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation*. NY: Ballantine Books.
- Tülübaş T, Celep C, 2012. Effect of perceived procedural justice on faculty members' silence: the mediating role of trust in supervisor. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1221 – 1231.
- Ünlü Y, Hamedoğlu MA, Yaman E, 2015. The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Organizational Silence, *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, (5) 2, 140-157.
- Yavuz E, 2010. "A Comparison Study on Organizational Justice Perceptions of Public and Private Sector Employees", *Dogus University Journal*, Vol.11 (2), pp. 302-312.