

The effects of demographic factors on the viewpoints in shaping the dimensions of organizational justice in Isfahan

Mohammad Sotoudeh

zshahrokhian@alumni.ut.ac.ir

Abstract: This study aimed to consider the organizational justice in three perspectives of distributive, procedural and interactional justice from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization in 2012. The research population consisted of all the teachers and staffs of the areas of education organization in Isfahan. The research participants were selected based on the cluster random sampling; from among the areas of Isfahan Education Organization, areas 1, 5, and Jay area were selected. Finally 85 staffs and 474 teachers were selected based on the cluster random sampling. The research method was descriptive and quantitative, and the data collection instrument was Noorman and Niehoff organizational justice questionnaire. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.95 based on the Cronbach's alpha. The data analysis was descriptive and inferential. In descriptive statistics, frequency tables and percentage graphs were used, and in inferential statistics, Z-test, dependent t-test, variance analysis and Hetling t-test were used. The results of the research show that demographic factors have an impact on organizational justice in shaping opinions and votes in the highest score lowest score of distributive justice and social justice have been awarded.

[Mohammad Sotoudeh. **The effects of demographic factors on the viewpoints in shaping the dimensions of organizational justice in Isfahan.** *Academ Arena* 2013;5(10):8-14] (ISSN 1553-992X).

<http://www.sciencepub.net/academia.2>

Key words: organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice.

Introduction

Today achieving the goals of organizations depends mostly on the true and efficient activities of the employees. This is more essential in important organizations such as education organization, and the efficiency of these organizations is yet related with the concept of organizational justice. An organization is a social system whose life and resistance depends on the existence of a strong relationship among its including parts and sections. Some of the organization theorists believe that the organizational structure is one of the most important determining factors of behavior (Giddens, 1979). Therefore observing justice is one of the most important factors which affect the organization's existence and its health in long time; so justice is specially attended in the revolution of organization theories. Therefore understanding injustice has harmful effects on collective working; because it influences the willing and motivation of the human sources. Injustice and unfair distribution of the organizations' achievements weaken the staffs' motivation for effort and doing activities. But observing justice increases the feeling of belonging, fidelity, and trust of people to the organization and increases the organizations' human and social resources. Organizational justice is a term which describes the role of justice in job situations. It is specially considered in organizational justice that how the staffs should be encountered to feel they are behaved fairly. Distributive justice is one of the types

of organizational justice, which refer to the fair distribution of the achievements and benefits of the organization among the staffs (Moorman, 1991). Procedural justice is after proving that the equality theory and other models of distributive justice are not able to explain people's reactions to their understanding of injustice. This kind of justice refers to the understood justice of the procedures of assigning the results and achievements (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004). Finally, interactional justice is defined based on the understood justice from inter-personal relations pertained to the organizational procedures and the quality of inter-personal relations. It is more than one century that the prevailing thought in management is that all of the organizations' activities should be for continuous improvement. Justice is one of the most beautiful and holiest words in the human civilizations, and its observation is one of the most essential factors from the point of view of each human being, and no human being denies this fact, even if s/he is oppressive (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004). Investigating organizational justice in a research project has always been attended. In this research, the viewpoints of the teachers and staffs of education organization are noticed. The results of Samavatian's study (2007) show that there is a meaningful relationship between organizational justice and the type of employment, the amount of revenue and the living place of the employees; but there is no meaningful relationship between the understood

organizational justice and the variables of the record of service, marriage, and the number of children. Ghafouri (2007) in a research among Isfahan municipality's employees showed that there is a positive and meaningful correlation between the organizational justice and different aspects of organizational commitment. Mazlo states that justice is an essential need, and groups justice with fairness, loyalty and good order, and believes that they are necessary for satisfying needs (Talor, 2003). In this research, it is tried to investigate the effects of demographic factors (gender, age, record of service ...) on the difference in the repliers' responses.

Methodology

Participants

Statistical population includes all the members of a real or imaginary group of people, things or events, and the researcher is supposed to generalize the research findings to that population (Gall et al, 1383; 369). In fact statistical population includes a group of people who are the same in one or more features which are attended by the researcher (Eshaghian, 1382; 37). The statistical population of this research includes the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization. In this research, cluster random sampling was used.

Table 1. The statistical population of the teachers and staffs of the areas of Isfahan Education Organization

Areas of Isfahan education organization	Teachers		Staffs	
	female	Male	Female	male
Area 1	391	354	11	49
Area 2	686	515	12	70
Area 3	912	634	23	73
Area 4	910	700	17	86
Area 5	867	505	12	83
Jay area	350	227	12	49
Total	4116	2935	87	410

In this way of sampling, the participants are selected in a way that each member of the population has an equal and independent chance of being selected as does any other member (Sharifi & Sharifi, 1380; 63). Sampling was in a way that after providing an alphabetic list, each member of the sample was assigned a number. Then each number was written on a small piece of paper and with each time mixing, one piece of paper was taken out and the names of the people were driven. In this research, after the selection of areas by random sampling (area 1, 5, and Jay area), 25 teachers and 10 staffs of Jay area were selected randomly, since the variance of statistical population wasnot known. The preliminary study was performed by handing out the questionnaire. The variance was %32 for area 1 teachers, %17 for area 1 staffs, %43 for area 5 teachers, %19 for area 5 staffs, %30 for the teachers of Jay area, and %17 for the staffs of Jay area. Reliability coefficient was %95. The probability was %5. At the end, the sample size for teachers and staffs was calculated with the above equation. The preliminary study for estimating the population variance was done. For this purpose, 30 teachers and 10 staffs of area 1, and 40 teachers and 12 staffs of area 5 were selected based on the statistical population size and after consulting with statistical experts.

Determining the sample size depends on the following factor:

- Size of the statistical population(N)
- Variance of the population or anticipating this variance(s)
- Reliability level(t)
- Probability level(d)

$$n = \frac{Nt^2s^2}{Nd^2 + t^2s^2}$$

The sample size based on the above equation was 130, 231, and 113 for teachers and 26, 34, and 25 for staffs, respectively for areas 1, 5, and Jay area.

Instruments

The measurement instrument in this study was questionnaire. Questionnaire is a data collection instrument by which the data related to several variables can be obtained (Bazargan, 1383; 184). For each research some data are collected by means of which the research questions can be answered. Moorman and Niehoff's organizational justice questionnaire (1996) was used for data collection in this research. This questionnaire includes 26 sentences in three

main perspectives of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. It is worth nothing that 511 out of 559 distributed questionnaires were returned.

The questionnaire was written based on 5-point Likert scale. This scale includes 5 equal options and the researchers based on their research subject, give some sentences to the participants to show their viewpoints about them. The researchers can assign numbers 1-5 to each option and then calculate the grade of each option (Hafeznia, 1382; 151-2).

Table (2) Scale of valuation of questionnaire items

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No comment	Agree	So agree
1	2	3	4	5

Data analysis

For data analysis, SPSS 13 software was used. The analysis of data was both descriptive and inferential. In descriptive statistics, frequency tables and percentage graphs were used, and in inferential statistics, Z-test, independent t-test, variance analysis, and Hetling t-test were used.

Results

Table 3. The distribution of the frequency and percentage of the teachers and staffs based on gender

Group	gender	percentage	frequency
Teachers	Female	56.3	244
	Male	43.7	189
	Total	100	433
staffs	Female	12.82	10
	Male	87.18	68
	Total	100	78

Based on the results of the table 3, 56.3 percent of the teachers were female and 43.7 percent were male. This is while 12.82 percent of the staffs were female and 87.18 were male.

Table 4. The distribution of the frequency and percentage of the teachers and staffs based on age

Group	Age	Percentage	Frequency
Teachers	Less than 30 years old	5.3	23
	31-40	48.5	210
	41-50	43	186
	51-60	3.2	14
	Total	100	433
Staffs	Less than 30 years old	5.1	4
	31-40	60.3	47
	41-50	32	25
	51-60	2.6	2
	Total	100	78

Based on the results of table 4, 23 teachers (% 5.3) were less than 30 years old, 210 teachers (% 48.5) were between 31 and 40 years old, 186 teachers (% 43) were between 41 and 50 years old, and 14 staffs (% 3.2) were between 51 and 60 years old. The teachers, who were 31-40 years old, with 48.5 percent, had the highest frequency, and the teachers who were 51-60, with 3.2 percent, had the lowest frequency. This is while 4 staffs (%5.1) were less than 30 years old, 47 staffs (% 60.3) were between 31 and 40 years old, and 25 staffs (% 32) were between 41 and 50 years old, and 2 staffs (%2.6) were between 51 and 60 years old. The staffs who were 31-40 years old, with 60.3 percent, had the highest frequency and the staffs, who were 51-60 years old, with 2.6 percent, had the lowest frequency.

Table 5. The distribution of the frequency and percentage of the teachers and staffs based on the record of service

Group	Record of service	Percentage	Frequency
Teachers	Less than 10 years old	11.1	48
	11-20	55.4	240
	21-30	33.5	145
	Total	100	433
Staffs	Less than 10 years old	9	7
	11-20	52.6	41
	21-30	38.4	30
	Total	100	78

Based on the results of table 5, 48 teachers (% 11.1) had less than 10 years record of service, 240 teachers (%55.4) had between 11 and 12 years record of service, and 145 teachers (%33.5) had between 21 and 30 years record of service. This is while 7 staffs (%9) had less than 10 years record of service, 41 staffs (%52.6) had between 11 and 12 years, and 30 staffs (%38.4) had between 21 and 30 years record of service.

Table 6. The comparison of the means of the types of justice from the point of view of the staffs based on their education level

Type of justice	B.A.		M.A.		T	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.58	0.71	2.38	0.57	-0.657	0.513
Distributive	3.55	0.94	3.56	0.20	-0.022	0.982
Interactional	3.24	0.80	3.37	0.59	-0.416	0.679

The results of table 6 show that the observed t with $P \leq .05$ is not meaningful, so there is no difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the employees of Isfahan education organization with attention to their education level.

Table 7. The comparison of the means of the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their age group

Type of justice	Less than 30 years old		31-40		41-50		51-60		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.71	0.74	2.87	0.98	2.78	0.99	2.18	0.84	2.378	0.069
Distributive	3.15	0.92	3.36	1.06	3.24	1.08	3.17	0.93	0.579	0.629
Interactional	2.95	0.87	3.19	0.93	3.21	0.94	2.83	0.73	1.222	0.301

The results of table 7 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is not meaningful, so there is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers of Isfahan education organization with attention to their age group.

Table 8. The comparison of the means of the types of justice from the point of view of the staffs with attention to their age group

Type of justice	Less than 30 years old		31-40		41-50		51-60		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.42	0.81	2.59	0.68	2.58	0.76	2.0	0.57	0.501	0.682
Distributive	3.53	1.08	3.62	0.90	3.40	0.91	4.0	0.88	0.480	0.697
Interactional	3.72	0.79	3.27	0.76	3.09	0.81	3.81	0.79	1.188	0.320

The results of table 8 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is not meaningful, so there is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the staffs of Isfahan education organization with attention to their age group.

Table 9. The comparison of the means of the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their record of service

Type of justice	Less than 10 years		11-20		21-30		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.30	0.28	2.91	0.95	2.78	1.02	8.09	0
Distributive	2.71	0.98	3.37	1.05	3.36	1.06	8.50	0
Interactional	2.60	0.85	3.25	0.91	3.23	0.9	11.07	0

The results of table 9 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is meaningful, so there is difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers of Isfahan education organization with attention to their record of service.

Table 10. The comparison of the means of different types of justice from the point of view of the staffs with attention to their record of service

Type of justice	Less than 10 years		11-20		21-30		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.47	0.70	2.65	0.67	2.47	0.76	0.673	0.513
Distributive	3.25	0.98	3.68	0.86	3.46	0.94	0.945	0.393
Interactional	3.46	0.78	3.27	0.72	3.17	0.87	0.437	0.647

The results of table 10 reveal that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is not meaningful, so there is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the staffs of Isfahan education organization with attention to their record of service.

Table 11. The comparison of the average grade of the types of justice in relation to the place of service from the point of view of the teachers

Types of justice	Area 1		Area 5		Jay area		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.8	1.05	2.94	0.91	2.50	0.98	7.34	0.001
Distributive	3.33	1.12	3.43	0.97	2.94	1.13	7.66	0.001
interactive	3.17	0.91	3.30	0.88	2.90	0.98	6.81	0.001

It can be inferred from the results of the table 11, that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is meaningful, so there is difference between the types of justice in relation to the place of service from the point of view of the teachers of Isfahan education organization.

Table 12. The comparison of the average grade of the types of justice in relation to the place of service from the point of view of the staffs

Types of justice	Area 1		Area 5		Jay area		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.39	0.67	2.66	0.74	2.62	0.68	1.138	0.326
Distributive	3.13	0.70	3.85	0.92	3.61	0.72	4.964	0.009
interactive	3.07	0.79	3.43	0.82	3.18	0.68	1.621	0.205

The findings of the table 12 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ for the procedural justice is meaningful and for other types of justice is not meaningful, so from the point of view of the staffs of Isfahan education organization, there is difference in procedural justice in relation to the place of service, and there is no difference in distributive and interactional justice in relation to the place of service.

Table 13. The comparison of the means of different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their employment situation

Type of justice	Tentative		Based on contract		official		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	1.92	0.74	2.35	0.72	2.84	0.97	5.11	0.002
Distributive	2.17	0.83	2.55	0.65	3.44	1.05	8.31	0
Interactional	2.28	0.51	2.65	0.68	3.21	0.92	6.25	0

The results of table 13 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is meaningful, so there is difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers of Isfahan education organization with attention to their employment situation. (Among the teachers, only one person is employed based on cooperative contract which is not mentioned in table 13, because its S is zero).

Table 14. The comparison of the means of the types of justice from the point of view of the staffs with attention to their employment situation

Type of justice	Tentative		official		Based on cooperative contract		F	P
	Mean	S	Mean	S	Mean	S		
Procedural	2.05	.21	2.60	0.71	2.40	0.71	1.073	0.366
Distributive	3.44	2.21	3.57	0.88	3.56	0.62	0.713	0.547
Interactional	3.0	1.06	3.24	0.79	3.87	0.01	0.700	0.555

The findings of table 14 show that the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is not meaningful, so there is no difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the staffs of Isfahan education organization with attention to their employment situation. (Among the staffs, only one person is employed based on contract, which is not in table 14, because S is zero).

Conclusion

It is inferred from the above tables that the types of justice are not the same from the point of view of the teachers and staffs. The highest grade is given to the distributive justice and the lowest grade is given to the procedural justice. The staffs assigned higher grades to the types of justice than teachers, and it seems that it is because the staffs are more aware of the organizational structure, procedures, and administrative rules. There is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the male and female teachers and staffs. The highest grade was assigned to the distributive justice and the lowest grade was assigned to the procedural justice.

The results of tables 5 and 6 reveal that there is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers and staffs with attention to their education level. The highest and the lowest grades are assigned to the distributive and procedural justice, respectively. The findings of the tables 7 and 8 show that there is no difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers and staffs with attention to their age group. The highest and the lowest grades are assigned to the distributive and procedural justices, respectively. The results of

tables 9 and 10 reveal that there is difference among different types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their record of service. But there is no difference among the staffs with attention to their record of service. The highest and the lowest grades are assigned to the distributive and procedural justices, respectively. The teachers with more record of service gave higher grades to the procedural justice. It seems that it is because the staffs with more record of service are more familiar with the organizations' procedures and structures. It is inferred from the findings of the tables 11 and 12 that there is difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their place of service, but there is no difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the staffs with attention to their place of service. The lowest grade was given to the procedural justice and the highest grade was given to the distributive justice.

The teachers of area 5 gave higher grades to the distributive justice; its reason may be related to the organizational structure and atmosphere of the schools in this area. It is in a way that the ruling organizational culture may emphasize more on observing the directions and circular letters, and centralism and being disciplined are focused more in this area. In this way, the distributive justice is assigned a higher grade in comparison with other dimensions of justice. The results of tables 13 and 14 show that there is difference among the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers with attention to their employment situation, but there is no difference among the types of justice from the point of view of

the staffs with attention to their employment situation. The lowest and the highest grades are assigned to the procedural and distributive justices, respectively.

The teachers, who are employed officially, gave higher grades to the distributive justice than other teachers; the reason is their more familiarity with the procedures ruling the working place, because of having more record of service. Since official employment is dependent on longer record of service.

The results of the research of Samavatian (1386) reveal that there is a meaningful relationship between the organizational justice and the type of employment, the amount of revenue and the place of living of the employees. On the other hand, the variables of record of service, marriage, and number of children did not show a meaningful difference in relation to the understood organizational justice. The results of the present research display that in relation to the organizational justice, there is no difference in respect to gender, age, and education level, but in respect to the record of service, place of service and employment situation, there is difference. The results of the research of Samavatian is in agreement with the findings of this study in relation to the employment situation, but they are different in relation to the record of service and place of service; it is because their statistical population, the investigated organizations, the geographical situations and the year of doing the research were different. Ilmaz (2010) found in his study “ the viewpoints of high school teachers about the organizational justice” that high school teachers had positive ideas about the organizational justice; and these ideas were different in relation to their age, record of service, and number of students; this is while this difference is not observed in gender, major, education level, and number of teachers.

References

1. Bazargan, A. (2004). Educational investigations, concepts, symbols, and operational processes. Tehran: Semat Press.
2. Eshaghian, M. (2003). I want to be a researcher. Isfahan: Neveshteh.
3. Ghafouri, M. (2007). The investigation of the relationship between the image of justice and organizational commitment. Isfahan: The First Psychological Conference.
4. Giddens, A. 1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, And Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
5. Hafeznia, Gh. (1999). An introduction to the research method in human sciences. Tehran: Semat Press, 1.
6. Kazemi, A. (2003). Justice in the political thought of Islam. Qom: Bostaneketab Press.
7. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness receptions influence employee citizenship? Journal of applied psychology, vol (76), 845-855.
8. McDowall, A. & Fletcher, C, (2004), “Employee development: an organizational justice perspective”, Personnel Review, vol.33, No.1.
9. Pashasharifi, P; Sharifi, N. (2004). The research methods in behavioral sciences. Tehran: Sokhan Press.
10. Samavatian, H. (2007). The effect of demographic factors on the organizational justice. Isfahan: Psychological Conference.
11. Sitter, Victoria. L, (2003), “Communication style as a predictor of interactional justice”, International leadership studies conference.
12. Tyler, T.r and Bies, R.J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: the interpersonal context of procedural justice. In Carrill, J.s(Ed). Belakli, G.I.applied social psychology and organization selteing, Lawrence Erlbaum associotes, Hillsdale, NJ

9/12/2013