



THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTION ON WOMEN EMPLOYEES: A RESEARCH ON HOTELS¹

Şükran ÖKTEM

Ass.Prof..Dr.,Başkent University
sukran@baskent.edu.tr

Menekşe ÖZTOPRAK

Ass.Prof..Dr.,Başkent University
tarhan@baskent.edu.tr

Abstract

Efficient, successful and competitive advantage in the services sector is also important, as in every business. Organizational justice perceptions of the employees are features that affect the internal and external customer satisfaction because of the service sector is labor-intensive. Businesses are aware of this feature always take into account the employees, especially endeavor for the development of the negative perception about the business. Between female and male employees may differ based on gender as well as other factors about the high or low of organizational justice perception. In this study, women organizational justice perception level who work in the hotel were investigated. Organizational justice, which has an efficient role on the business' productivity is staff's perception of whether the management treats them just or not. The other researchers' views have been examined by performing a literature review. This study has been realized with the individuals working in the tourism businesses in Ankara (Turkey).

Keywords: Organizational justice, women employees, hotels.

¹ Study has been presented in the 5th advances in hospitality & tourism marketing and management (ahtmm) conference 18-21 June 2015, Beppu, Japan.

1. Introduction

The hospitality industry is an important source of employment and income. There is a very close relationship that organizational justice perception of the hotel staff between customer satisfaction to obtain revenue. Employee who providing satisfaction from business and high motivation increase their productivity and integrate with organizations in other words also organizational citizenship increases customer satisfaction by providing increased service quality. Hotels that employee who high organizational justice perception will be one step ahead of the competition, in which case the country will be contributing to the development of tourism (Keleş & Pelit, 2009). Gender which is one of the demographic factors is an important factor to decide whether the perception of organizational justice of the employees is low or high. Although the activities in the tourism sector are thought to be more suitable for female employees, it is seen that women and men do not work under equal conditions in patriarchal societies (Çiçek et al, 2017). Perception concerning gender discrimination naturally leads to low of organizational justice (Yelboğa, 2012). Justice were interpreted by philosopher in different ways because of differences in the values from the past to the present. Plato advocated absolute equality if the distributed resources would happen equally to all individuals but Aristotle advocated the view that the economic system is important to ensure justice (Cihangiroğlu&Yılmaz, 2010; Colquitt, Wesson, Porter, Ng, & Conlon, 2001).

2. Conceptual Framework

The perception of organizational justice studies began with Adams' The Theory of Equality and the employees' degree of success and satisfaction were associated with perceived equality or inequality in the work environment (Gosser et al, 2018). Rawls advocated two principle about justice. First, individuals should have the same rights, and second individuals should have equality of opportunity (Eker, 2006). Developed the concept of justice from the past to present; personal rights to be respected on an equal basis, regardless of the differences among individuals, to be able to live together in a peaceful manner, it has taken place today as a basic concept that enables organized around specific purposes.

For this purpose the word justice means, truth, honesty, equality, rights, be unfair, adhere to the equitable, legitimacy, impartiality, humanity, kindness, observance of the right to fulfill.

According to the Turkish Language Association "Justice" concept is described as "the rights and compliance with the law, regardless of right, truth, not falling himself to everyone, providing its own right" (Türk Dil Kurumu Türkçe Sözlük, 2005).

Guidelines and standards have been formed within the community social justice gains importance in time. Later social justice theories have been adapted to organization and the concept of organizational justice has emerged. The theory of relative deprivation developed by Stouffer et al in 1949 which of social justice theory based on the idea of social comparison process is important. In 1961, according to developed distributive justice theory from the relative deprivation theory by Homans stressed that people expect hope and their investment rate of exchange relationship that they have the justice perception when they obtain those expectations are met.

Distributive justice theory, and in 1964, Blau's "The Role of Expectations", have been a pioneer in Adams put forward equity theory in 1965. Equity theory is important because views on whether act fair treatment of management to personnel in the workplace and significant contribution to the concept of organizational justice (Meydan, 2010). In 1976, Leventhal's "Judicial Justice Model" and finally "Motive Justice" has been laid out by Lerner in 1977, in particular has contributed to the development of theories of the concept of distributive justice (Karaman, 2009). Following these developments a variety definition of organizational justice have been made by researchers. Justice intuition of the individuals in the organization define as organizational justice (Schmiesing, Safrit&Gliem, 2003).

Beugre and Baron defined organizational justice as "individual colleagues, including the perception of a social system in terms of relations with superiors and the institution" (Beugre & Baron, 2001). Greenberg's definition of the organizational justice is; "The justice in workplace, the term that find out the impact to individual and the organization" (Greenberg, 1990).

The definition common point of organizational justice perceptions which of employee are salary, promotion and the decisions taken by the management of reward or punishment are perceptions that the process is fair. Cultural structure, demographic characteristics, and personality traits of employee are effective in the formation of this perception (Söyük, 2007). In fact, the perception of justice is universal, but the interpretation and the application of justice can show cultural differences. It must know the norms of the culture in order to evaluate the perception of employee related fairness in business. Employee personality traits also create different applications, if he does not have a problem does not take care of organizational justice in the workplace, in the contrary case increased concerns and occurs the perception of fairness of management's decision. The issue of distribution of resources varies according to whether the resources are limited the perception of fairness in the formation and organizational justice perception is different according to different conditions (Yürür, 2005).

Employee compares behavior and attitude of managers and colleagues, given to the importance and the respect shown, briefly output gained in return for the success it has demonstrated (awards,

promotions, bonuses, etc.), when she/he thinks injustice feels guilt or anger which negatively affects the attitudes and behavior within the organization (Güllüce & Kahyaoğlu, 2016).

In an organization where equality and fairness are ensured, organizational justice is one of the most important elements that increases job satisfaction, success and efficiency in the organization, as it organizes the employees, associates organizational values with their own values, facilitates cooperation among employees. Employees who are work with unfair managers lose their organizational commitment and even leave work (Hsu et al, 2018).

The perception of organizational justice is a perception that separates individuals from each other and from the organization. It is the responsibility of managers to ensure organizational justice because organizational peace and serenity in the business environment is an important influence on personnel productivity.

Leventhal states that there are six rules for the provision of organizational justice: that they are truthfulness and honesty, conformity to professional ethics, consistency, non-prejudice, consideration of objections and flexibility, participation in decisions (Eren, 2012). Justice is a social phenomenon, affecting attitudes and behaviors such as commitment, trust, performance, workforce and aggression, how employees are treated as the most important sources of organizations, and the shift towards a more educated workforce. Nowadays, when employees become more skilled and educated, demanding respect and sincerity in the workplace, and the need to conduct research on organizational justice for these and similar reasons (Yilmaz, 2004).

Organizational justice theory is examined in the literature in three parts. These; Distribution Justice, Procedure (Operational) Justice, Interaction Justice. Now let's examine these three definitions of justice.

3. Types of Organizational Justice

The perception of organizational justice studies began with Adams' The Theory of Equality and the employees' degree of success and satisfaction were associated with perceived equality or inequality in the work environment. Organizational justice is a social system that includes perception with regard to individual's relationships with superiors colleague organization (Beugre&Baron, 2001), (Li&Zeng, 2019).

Organizational justice is the term that serve to reveal the effects of the justice to the individual and the organization (Greenberg,1990), (López-Cabarcos et al, 2015). Scholars have generally identified three components of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Sia & Tan, 2016).

3.1. Distribution justice

Distribution justice is the perception of the organization's decisions about the distribution of resources in operation and whether the actions are fair to the staff. In other words, it can be said that the comparison of the earnings obtained by the distribution justice perception staff is the predominant perception (McShane & Von Glinow, 2009). Organizational resources; such as wages, bonuses, promotions, gratuities, extra permits and similar awards given to employees, and in some cases, cuts during wages or permits, not giving premiums or bonuses, or giving less or not promoting. When employee thinks that management resource distribution is unfair is angered and is happy when they think that decisions are fair, also distribution justice is directly correlate with emotional and behavioral characteristics of employee (Yöney, 2010).

Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star and Williams (1949) developed the "theory of relative deprivation" as a result of their examination of US troops in World War II. This theory of Stouffer and colleagues shows that employees' perceptions of practice compares their own findings with results obtained by other workers (Colquitt, Greenberg& Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

The concept of "distribution justice" of Homans was based on the social exchange theory developed in 1958 by Homans, in the light of the Relative Absence theory. According to this theory, in the enterprises personnel respect, honor, friendship, consideration etc. they are in a rewarding expectation.

Since an individual's behavior affects the behavior of another, they have compared the gains they provide to the individuals involved in the exchange relationship. Personnel thinks that it should be proportional to the contribution that the earned income makes, and the perception of justice develops according to whether this proportion is provided or not. Blau (1964) emphasizes the concept of fair exchange and states that being fair is a moral behavior (Colquitt, Greenberg& Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Adams's (1965) Theory of Equality is based on the idea that individuals want to have fair behavior against themselves (Eker, 2006), a resultant theory that is a comparison of the rate of earnings they have earned on the labor they earn against the labor of other employees (Başar, 2011).

According to Leventhal's (1976) "Justice Judiciary Model", the staff strive for the implementation of different distribution systems so that a fair distribution can be made, the basis of this model is the need for the earnings that the employees have obtained in a fair way (Leventhal, 1980).

In Lerner's (1977) Justice Motive Theory, there are four distributional principles; competition that envisages to distribute according to their individual performance of employees, equality expressing equality of distribution, which emphasizes that distribution should be based on relative contributions,

Marxist Justice explaining justice and distribution taking into account the needs of employees (Söyük, 2007).

3.2. Procedural (operational-process) justice

The concept of procedural justice is also referred to in the literature as "justice for implementation", "operational justice" and "process justice". Basically, procedural justice means that organizational processes are equally, honestly and fairly implemented among staff. In particular, decision making, participation in decisions, promotion and rewarding, performance appraisal, career planning, etc. perception of whether management is fair in activities (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Procedural justice has two important elements; the first is that employees' ideas, opinion and proposals are listened and the decisions made by the employees are made easier and easier to adopt by employees, and the increased commitment of the employees as they feel they have a say in the decisions taken. The second is the style of application of policies or used by management in decision-making, resource distribution and conflict resolution (Söyük, 2007).

The high procedural justice perception results in high job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Flint, 1999). The concept of procedural justice appears for the first time in research of Thibaut and Walker (1970), on the process of resolving conflicts among employees (Greenberg, 1990), it is thought that decisions taken in this study and how these decisions are taken are the effects on justice perception (Gürpınar, 2006).

Two different judicial systems used in England and USA; the combat system and the continental system used in Europe were compared by Thibaut and Walker, and the combat system was found to be more pleasing. According to Thibaut and Walker, the main reason for such an outcome is the opportunity to defend themselves in the fighting system, in which the judge assumes the task of referee and the final word is spoken by the jury. In the continental system, the judge both performs the task of arbitration and makes a final decision, suggesting that judging the individual is less fair and dissatisfaction is higher than the struggle system. It was also seen during the research; the recognition of the right to speak to the parties when the judicial process is difficult to reach a conclusion increases the perception that the decision is fair. According to Thibaut and Walker, this study shows that having a say on the decisions made increases the perception of justice.

The reason for this is that the parties can express their ideas freely and think that they can be influential on the decision and that a more positive decision can be reached for them (Yöney, 2010). Thibaut and

Walker (1978) found that individuals who had disagreement in their theories of procedural justice were two separate parties, and that a mediator acting as an arbitrator in resolving the dispute was a third party. In the solution of the disagreement, there are two stages that are called the stage of decision, in which the evidence is used, and the stage of process, in which the evidence is reveal (Karaman, 2009). Two control mechanisms, namely decision control and process control, have been developed at these stages. As a result, this research shows that individuals who have a say in process control find decisions more fairly (Greenberg, 1990). In this situation, it has been revealed that not only the outputs of the employees but also the processes in the process of getting these outputs play an important role in justice perceptions (Karaman, 2009).

Leventhal et al. (1980) examined the different aspects of procedural justice and reveal six basic rules affecting justice perceptions. This is the first of the six rules; accuracy is to provide accurate and as complete information as possible to those who communicate and interact. The second one is consistency. According to this rule, the justice of distribution and procedure should be adhered to and not in conflict with each other in taking and implementing decisions such as purpose, strategy, policy. Another rule is not prejudiced, but this rule implies that in the implementation of the decisions and plans to be taken, in action, in interaction and in communication, all prejudice and prejudice must be avoided and that the person should be kept away from objective and discriminatory. Considering objections and being flexible is the fourth rule. This rule refers to taking objections and complaints from employees, departments or institutions and objectively reviewing the decisions taken, taking into account the objections and complaints, and making the necessary changes and amendments. The fifth rule is the representation (participation in decisions). It is important that the decisions taken within the organization are fair and consistent with the decisions made by the employees directly or through their representatives, their values, their views and their needs. If the last rule is ethics (compliance with professional ethics), all decisions, practices and processes taken within the organization must be in accordance with the professional ethics principles and ethical values of the workplace (Leventhal, 1980). In some organizations it seems that these six rules are not fully implemented; procedural justice is perceived to be high and accurate in the organizations in which the six rules are applied, and their gains are high.

Justice perceptions also show an increase in the positive direction if the trustworthiness of the managers in the employees affects the perception of procedural justice, and if there is a sense of confidence in the employees' managers (Bos, 2001). If there is a trust relationship between employees and managers, employees see the procedures and decisions taken within the organization as very unquestioning and fair. However, in organizations where this trust relationship can not be established, it is seen that the

employees question the procedures and decisions taken more than necessary and may even be prejudiced.

Procedure justice also has a social aspect, especially when the quality of communication among employees in the organization is positive, employees perceive fair that the procedures and decisions taken within the organization.

3.3. Interaction justice

Interaction justice is defined as the communication between employee and the executives who in charge in implementing justice organization procedures. It is seen that the behavior of the managers towards the employee is good or bad in the formation of the interaction justice perception. If the manager is disrespectful to the employee, if he does not give information about the activities, employee does not respect and trust the manager, and therefore does not think that the decisions he makes or the procedures he applies are fair.

A manager who respectful, descriptive, accurate and full information and considering the personal situation of the employee is respected and respected by his employees and the decisions he makes and the procedures he applies are applied and accepted without much questioning by the employees. When the interaction justice perception is low, employee can react manager and even the whole organization negatively (Şehrinaz, 2005).

Bies and Moag (1986) point out that the dimension of interaction justice in their work on organizational justice is influenced by organizational communication and that the behavior and attitudes of the organization are also effective in the perception of interaction justice (Colquitt, Wesson, Porter, Ng, & Conlon, 2001). Bies and Moag (1986) have identified four rules of interaction justice perception; truthfulness is the first rule that honest, sincere in communicating between management and employee, it is the second rule to explain the decisions taken by the management and to inform the employee, the third rule is that managers should be respectful and courteous in the relationships show that they appreciate the value of employees and need to act sincerely and respectful. Compliance rule means that the managers are not against the employee and are respectful of their personality rights.

In later researches, the criteria of consistency and impartiality, opinions of the employees were added (Poussard & Erkmen, 2008: 114).

4. Research Method

In this research, firstly, success of female staff working in accomodation businesses and equality or inequality perceived from the point of satisfaction level, in other words whether the gender makes difference on the perception of organizational justice is researched.

In order to determine the perception of organizational justice of female staff, a research has been made in Ankara (Turkey). In the used organizational justice of perception scale, questions about gains and process are directed to attendees during face-to-face meetings.

The selected sample of 36.3% (109 employees) were female and the remaining 63.7% (191employees) is also found to be the man. Demographic information such as duties, working time education level, and age of participants by gender are given in Table1.

Table1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

		Sex				Total	
		Female		Male			
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Educational Status	Illiterate	4	100,0	-	-	4	100,0
	literate	11	40,7	16	59,3	27	100,0
	primary education	42	56,0	33	44,0	75	100,0
	high School	34	25,8	98	74,2	132	100,0
	university	18	33,3	36	66,7	54	100,0
	MSc / PhD	-	-	7	100,0	7	100,0
Age (Avg. ± Stan. Dev.)		32,95 ± 7,86		33,16 ± 7,84		33,09 ± 7,83	
Task	Kitchen Staff	28	42,4	38	57,6	66	100,0
	Housekeeping staff	25	64,1	14	35,9	39	100,0
	Social Services staff	12	37,5	20	62,5	32	100,0
	Accounting	3	30,0	7	70,0	10	100,0
	Reception	10	29,4	24	70,6	34	100,0
	Administrative Services Staff	7	28,0	18	72,0	25	100,0
	Cleaning Staff	14	73,7	5	26,3	19	100,0
	Front Office Staff	2	22,2	7	77,8	9	100,0
	Security Staff	1	7,1	13	92,9	14	100,0
	Technical Service Staff	-	-	25	100,0	25	100,0
	Valet	4	26,7	11	73,3	15	100,0
Other	-	-	7	100,0	7	100,0	
Working Hours	Less than 1 year	15	34,9	28	65,1	43	100,0
	1-2 years	33	38,4	53	61,6	86	100,0
	3-5 years	36	41,9	50	58,1	86	100,0
	6-9 years	15	41,7	21	58,3	36	100,0

10-14 years	8	21,6	29	78,4	37	100,0
15 years and over	2	16,7	10	83,3	12	100,0

4.1. Data collection method

Perceived Organizational Justice to determine by Colquitt (2001) was designed the scale, consists of 20 items, has been applied in a survey of 300 people face to face, 4 and 5 star hotels and tourism employees in business activities in Ankara.

4.2. Analysis of data

To test the validity of the scale was used factor analysis and has been shown to be divided into 4 subscales of the same factors. The results of the reliability analysis applied to this scale is given in Table 2. The analysis of the validity and reliability of this scale developed by Colquitt (2001) can be said that the results achieved.

Table 2. Reliability Analysis and Normality Test Results Related to Scale

	Reliability Analysis		Normality Test		
	Cronbach's Alpha	n	Statistic	df	p
Organizational Justice	,944	20	,981	300	,000
Procedural Justice	,890	7	,977	300	,000
Distribution Justice	,852	4	,965	300	,000
Interpersonal Justice	,737	4	,973	300	,000
Informational Justice	,898	5	,965	300	,000

The purpose of the survey is to find out the organizational justice perceptions differ according to gender. For this purpose;

- H1: Organizational justice perception does not differ by gender,
- H2: Procedural justice perception does not differ by gender,
- H3: Distributive justice perception does not differ by gender,

- H4: Interpersonal perception of justice does not differ by gender,
- H5: Informational justice perception does not differ by gender,

form hypotheses were established.

As indicated in Table 2 normality test results to determine the variables differ significantly by gender, the scale of the Independent Sample t test was applied. Made results of this analysis are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparison of the Organizational Justice and the Sub Dimensions by Gender

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
OrganizationalJustice	Female	109	3,0569	,93049	-1,588	0,114
	Male	191	3,2270	,82137		
ProceduralJustice	Female	109	2,9976	,97965	-2,455	0,015*
	Male	191	3,2808	,92688		
DistributionJustice	Female	109	3,0344	1,11776	-0,804	0,422
	Male	191	3,1401	1,05398		
InterpersonalJustice	Female	109	3,1399	,96491	-1,154	0,250
	Male	191	3,2696	,88515		
InformationalJustice	Female	109	3,0917	1,13807	-0,724	0,468
	Male	191	3,1864	,98260		

The results in Table 3;

- perceptions of organizational justice does not differ according to gender ($p= 0.114 > 0.05$).
- Procedural justice perceptions vary by gender. It seems lower rates for the female employees ($p=0.015 < 0.05$).
- Distributive justice perception does not differ according to gender ($p= 0.422 > 0.05$).
- Interpersonal perception of justice does not differ according to gender ($p= 0.250 > 0.05$).
- Informational justice perception does not differ according to gender ($p= 0.468 > 0.05$).

It is possible to say that information.

5. Conclusions

The organizational justice in business has a property affecting the business performance. There are the individual having the different personality traits in the organizational so male and female workers for

justice can perceive differently. In this study, has been researched the effect of organizational justice perception on women employees on hotels in Ankara/Turkey. This study shows differences according to gender in the procedural justice perceptions, so second hypothesis is rejected. Procedural justice is described as an increase in organizational commitment when employees feel that they have a say in the implementation, adoption and decisions taken by the employee by listening to ideas, opinions and proposals. When we consider demographic characteristics in this study, the result of procedural justice perception is lower of woman than men. It is considered that this result is to depend on the demographic characteristics because of women work more in cleaning and housekeeping department. To research the reasons for the results obtained from this study may be able to guide the future researches.

6. References

- Başar, U. (2011). Örgütsel adalet algisi, örgütsel özdeşleşme ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişkilere yönelik görgül bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi T.C. Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü Savunma Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara, 1-169.
- Beugre, C. D.& Baron, R. A. (2001). Perceptions of systemic justice: the effects of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.31, No: II, 324-338.
- Bos, K. V. D. (2001). Fundamental research by means of laboratory experiments is essential for a better understanding of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 58, 254- 259.
- Cihangiroğlu, N.&Yılmaz,A. (2010). Çalışanların örgütsel adalet algisinin örgütler için önemi, *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi (The Journal of Social and Economic Research)*, Cilt:13, Yıl:10, Sayı:19 (Volume:13, Year:10,Issue:19).
- Colquitt, J. A.;Wesson, M.J.;Porter., C.O.L.H.; NG, K.Y. & Conlon, D.E.(2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* LXXXVI,3, 425–445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg J. ve Zapata-Phelan C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? a historical overview. Greenberg J. ve Colquitt J. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*. Mahwah: NJ, 3 – 56.
- Çiçek, D.; Zencir, E.; Kozak, N. (2017). Women in Turkish tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 31 (2017) 228-234.
- Eker, G. (2006). Örgütsel adalet algisi boyutları ve iş doyumunu üzerindeki etkileri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Eren, E. (2012). Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Flint, D. H. (1999). The role of organizational justice in multi- source performans appraisal: theory- based applications and directions for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 9, No: I, s. 1- 20.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 32, No: I, s. 23-53.
- Gosser, K.; Petrosko, M. J.; Cumberland, D.; Kerrick, S.; Shuck, B. (2018). Organizational Justice and Socialization in a Franchising Context: Factors Influencing Hourly Workers' Intent to Stay. *Small Business Institute® Journal*, Vol. 14, No.1 1-18.

- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today and tomorrow, *Journal of Management*, XVI,2, 399 –432.
- Güllüce, A. Ç.; Kahyaoglu, M. (2016). Correlation between Organizational Justice Perception and Organizational Identification: A Case Study in the Hotels of the Urartu Culture and Tourism Development Region. *International Journal of Business Administration* Vol. 7, No. 3; 2016.
- Gürpınar, G. (2006). An empirical study of relationships among organizational justice, organizational commitment, leader-member exchange, and turnover intention. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Hsu, F. S.; Liu, Y. A.; Tsaor, S. H. (2019). The impact of workplace bullying on hotel employees' well-being: Do organizational justice and friendship matter? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 1702-1719.
- Karaman, P. (2009). Örgütsel adalet algısı ile tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesine yönelik öğretmenler üzerinde bir uygulama. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Keleş, Y., Pelit, E. (2009). Otel işletmesi işgörenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: İstanbul'daki beşyıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Güz 2009, Cilt 5, Sayı 2, 24-45.
- Leventhal, G. S., (1980). What should be done with equity theory? K. J. Gergen., M. S. Greenberg ve R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Change: Advances in Theory and Research*, New York: Plenum, 27 – 55.
- Li, X.& Zeng, Y. (2019). How to Reduce Hospitality Employees' Deviant Behavior: An Organizational Justice Perspective. 2019 5th *International Conference on Economics, Management and Humanities Science (ECOMHS 2019)*
- López-Cabarcos, M.A.; Pinho, A. I. M. L. S.; , Rodríguez, P. V. (2015). The Influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment in Portugal's Hotel Industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 56(3) 258–272.
- McShane, S. L.& Von Glinow M. A. (2009). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Meydan, C. H. (2010). Örgüt kültürü, örgütsel güç ve örgütsel adalet algılarının bireyin iş tatmini ve örgüte bağlılığı üzerine etkisi: Kamuda bir araştırma, Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Savunma Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, 1-245.
- Poussard, M, J. & Erkmen T. (2008). *Yönetim iletişim kültürü*. İstanbul: Arıkan Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Schmiesing, R. J.; Safrit, R. D. & Gliem, J. A., (2003). Factors affecting OSU extension agents' perceptions of organizational justice and job satisfaction: Critical Insights Into Emerging Trends and Existing Policies in Extension Human Resources Management. *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference, Carolina*, 589-600.
- Sia, L.A. Sia & Tan, T.A. (2016). The Influence of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction in a Hotel Setting. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, 26(1): 17-29.
- Söyük, S. (2007). Örgütsel adaletin iş tatmini üzerine etkisi ve İstanbul ilindeki özel hastanelerde çalışan hemşirelere yönelik bir çalışma. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Şehrinaz, P. (2005). Mesleğe örgüte bağlılık ve iş tatmini ile işten ayrılma ilişkisi ve hemşireler üzerine bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Yönetim Organizasyon Bilim Dalı, İstanbul.
- Türk Dil Kurumu Türkçe Sözlük, (2005). 10.Baskı, Ankara.
- Yelboğa, A. (2012). Örgütsel adalet ile iş doyumunu ilişkisi: Ampirik bir çalışma, *Ege Akademik Bakış*, Cilt: 12 • Sayı: 2 • Nisan 2012 ss. 171-182.
- Yılmaz, G. (2004). İnsan kaynakları uygulamalarına ilişkin örgütsel adalet algısının çalışanların tutum ve davranışları üzerindeki etkisi. *Yayınlanmış Doktora Tezi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

- Yöney, D. (2010). Affects of organizational justice on organizational commitment in terms of survivor syndrome, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yürür, Ş. (2005). Ödüllendirme sistemleri ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkinin analizi ve bir uygulama, Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Yönetim Organizasyon Bilim Dalı, Bursa.