

The Study of the amount of organizational justice in education organization from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization

Mohammad sotoude

Email: mohammadsotoodeh@yahoo.com

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 the amount of procedural justice among the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization is less than the average level. In addition, the amount of distributive justice was more than the average level. The amount of interactional justice among the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization was also more than the average level.

[Mohammad sotoude. **The Study of the amount of organizational justice in education organization from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan Education Organization.** *Rep Opinion* 2013;5(7):1-8]. (ISSN: 1553-9873). <http://www.sciencepub.net/report>. 1

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

Introduction

The concept of justice has been common in human societies from long time ago, both unconsciously in human mind and consciously in human behavior. One of the most stable research results about justice is that human being react more positively to the procedures which are more just. Organizational justice is a term used for describing the role of justice in job situations. It is especially

important in organizational justice that the staffs are encountered in a way that they feel they are justly behaved. In the management and organization literature, Greenberg was the first person who used the term organizational justice (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004). So organizational justice is a subject always studied along time, and is also a subject interpreted in different ways these years. Some of these interpretations are in short rendered in table 1.

Table 1. The interpretations of organizational justice

Type of justice in organization	Description
organizational justice	the study of people's image of equity and justice in organization (Greenberg & Corpanzano, 2001)
distributive justice	distributive justice for staffs' worries about the distribution of resources and its results (Folger & Corpanzano, 1998)
procedural justice	the justice understood from the procedures which are used for determining the decisions about the results (Folger & Konovsky, 1989)
interactional justice	the justice obtained from the inter-person behavior of people
interpersonal justice	The amount of polite and respectful behavior of the managers with people when doing an activity or determining results (Colquitt, 2001)
informational justice	Explanations about the reason why a procedure is used or a result is obtained (Colquitt, 2001)

Human resource is one of the effective factors on the education of each country and has a key role in effective education. Efficient human resources can be considered the most important investment of education organization. So each process which promotes the ability of human resources in this organization can increase the investments, the effects of which affects on the students as future builders and hopes of a society. Therefore the education organization which is very responsible in this respect needs to have a scientific and investigative view about the study of the amount of feeling the organizational justice. With attention to the importance of the mentioned variables and effective activity of the teachers and staffs of the education organization, this research aimed to study the staffs' understanding of the equity and justice of behaviors, viewpoints, decision, judgments and assessments of their managers, and equal performance of procedures, organizational rules, and what is received from the organization by them.

In past the existence of three kinds of natural, physical, and human resources together was considered a base for the development of economical performance. But today it is found that for the development of each society, the amount of social investment of organizations should be increased (Zhang & Fung, 2006). With attention to the importance of social investment for societies and social organizations, the factors effective on the increase of social investment should be in the center of attention. The understanding of the organizational justice which is a necessity for the effective performance of the organizations, personal satisfaction of the staffs, and forming their viewpoints and behavior, is of great importance (Lambert, 2003), because the injustice causes a damage to human greatness, and causes the exit of social resources, decrease of national will for being active and damage of social health (Pourezat, 1382).

Investigating organizational justice in the form of a research is always of special importance. This study aimed to investigate the viewpoints of teachers and staffs of education organization. Therefore the question in this research is that each of the aspects of the organizational justice (distributional, procedural, and interactional justice) to what extent is observed in organization interactions from the point of view of the teachers and staff of Isfahan Education Organization.

Since long time ago, the most essential subject and the most important human desire have been equity and justice, to which each scientist attended (Brocner & Cigool, 1995). The term justice is a human ideal and has a precedent as long as human

life. Human beings know it as an inward desire and precede it and make it a base for their rules and judgments. Nothing is so bothering and hateful for human nature as violating the weeks' right and nothing cause so much hatred and enmity in human heart as injustice (Haghpanah, 1380:64). Justice necessitates generating an all-inclusive and public growth for all people of the organization. No one should stop growing and the way should be paved for fostering talents (Hoseinzadeh, Naseri, 1386:176). Justice is a characteristic of God. So it's one of the principles of creation; and Islam has a special ideology based on justice. When one says justice is one of the characteristics of God, it means that justice is a basis for the world and human life, so it should be a basis for the society we live in (Shariati, 1359:16). Observing justice in organizations can influence greatly on the increasing of the efficiency of the organizations and activities of their managers, the basis for appearing injustice in an organization or its management causes the staffs' discontent and decrease of job and organization commitment.

Golparvar and Nady (1389) investigated "the relationship between cultural values and organizational justice, job satisfaction and leaving service among the staffs of Isfahan Education Organization. Their findings show that general justice has a meaningful relation ($p < 0.05$) with distributive, procedural, and interaction justice, leaving services, job satisfaction, and materialism, but it doesn't have any meaningful relation with power distance ($p < 0.05$). The results of modeling the structural equation and the analysis of the mediating regression show that general justice relatively mediates the relationship between the procedural justice and leaving the job, but it doesn't play this role for the interactional and distributive justice. The analysis of the adjustable hierarchical regression show that it is very probable that power distance has an adjusting role in the relationship between general justice, job leaving, and job satisfaction.

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. 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.

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).

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

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.

Table 2. 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

Table 3. The frequency and percentage of employees based on job group

Job	percentage	Frequency
Teachers	84.7	433
Staffs	15.3	78
total	100	511

Table 4. The frequency and percentage of the teachers and staffs based on the place of service

group	Record of service	percentage	frequency
Teachers	Area 1	25.6	111
	Area 5	51.5	223
	Jay area	22.9	99
	Total	100	433
Staffs	Area 1	32.1	25
	Area 2	41	32
	Jay area	26.9	21
	total	100	78

Based on the results of the table 4, 111 teachers (%25.6) serviced in area 1, 223 teachers (%51.5) in area 5, and 99 teachers (%22.9) in Jay area. This is while 25 staffs (%32.1) serviced in area 1, 32 staffs (%42) in area 5, and 21 staffs (%26.9) in Jay area.

The following results were obtained from the distributed questionnaires:

In response to the questions related to procedural justice, the highest percents of "agree" and "very agree" responses assigned to "the lack of discrimination and inequity among the staffs in performing the decisions" with 42.1 percent and "allowing staffs to challenge or review the decisions" with 40.9 percent. And the lowest percents of "agree" and "very agree" responses assigned to "making good decisions about the employees and making essential changes if decisions are wrong" with 25.8 percent. The average grade of responses vacillated between 2.51 and 3.02.

In responses to the question related to distributive justice, the highest percents of "agree"

and "very agree" assigned to "fairness of the amount of the employees' salaries" with 59.9 percent and "fairness of the employees' received remuneration" with 59.1 percent; And the lowest percents of "agree" and "very agree" responses related to "fairness of the distribution of welfare facilities and chances among the employees" with 46.2 percent. The average grade of responses vacillated between 3.15 and 3.45.

The response to the questions related to interactional justice, the highest percents of "agree" and "very agree" responses assigned to "having a fair understanding of the remunerations compared with the employees of other organizations" with 52.6 percent, and "rewarding more responsibility and effort, and punishment of lack of it" with 48.4 percent; And the lowest percents of "agree" and "very agree" responses related to "having a fair and respectful behavior with the employees in the organization" with 33.8 percent. The average grade of answers vacillated between 2.88 and 3.53.

Table 5. The comparison of the average grade of the question 1 with the assumed average ($\mu_0=3$)

Procedural justice		Mean	S	Se	T
	Teachers	2.80	0.98	0.05	-4
	staffs	2.56	0.70	0.08	-5.5

The results of the tables 4-10 show that the observed t for teachers and staffs is lower than the tables' critical value with one percent error of measurement, so the procedural justice is lower than the average level from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization.

Table 6: The comparison of the average grade of question 2 with the assumed average ($\mu_0=3$)

Distributive justice	Mean		S	Se	T
	Teachers	3.29	1.06	0.05	5.8
	staffs	3.55	0.90	0.10	5.5

Based on the results of the table 6, the observed t for the teachers and staffs is higher than the table's critical value, with the error of measurement of 1 percent, so the distributive justice is more than the average level from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization.

Table 7. The comparison of the average grade of question 3 with the assumed average ($\mu_0=3$)

Interactional justice	Mean		S	Se	T
	Teachers	3.17	0.92	0.04	4.25
	staffs	3.25	0.78	0.09	2.78

Based on the results of the table 7, the observed t for the teachers and staffs is higher than the table's critical value, with the error of measurement of 1 percent, so the interactional justice is more than the average level, from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization.

Table 8. The comparison of the average grade of the types of justice from the point of view of the teachers and staffs

Type of justice	Mean		S	
	teachers	staffs	Teachers	staffs
Procedural	2.80	2.56	0.98	0.70
Distributive	3.29	3.55	1.06	0.90
interactional	3.17	3.25	0.92	0.78

For teachers: $P = 0$ $F = 4.106$ $t^2 = 12.159$
 For staffs: $P = 0$ $F = 3.801$ $t^2 = 19.71$

Based on the results of the table 8, the observed F with $P \leq .05$ is meaningful, so the types of justice are not the same from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization. The highest grade was given to distributive justice, and the lowest grade was given to the procedural justice.

Table 9. 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 9, that the observed F with $P \leq 0.05$ 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 10. 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 10 show that the observed F with $P \leq 0.05$ 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.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the table 5, the observed t is lower than the critical value of the table with the error of measurement of 1 percent, so from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization, the procedural justice is lower than the average level.

Therefore, based on the results of the questionnaire, it can be inferred that the procedural justice among the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization was observed less than the average level. The interpretation of the results show that with relation to the procedural justice and its included factors, it seems that based on the focused system of the education organization in having the fixed methods and policies, its decision-making methods are based on the rules and provisions, its policy of compensating the organizations' services is an open policy, and if employed carefully and without prejudice, its payment is viewed as fair, even if it seems very low.

When the understanding of the procedural justice increases, the employees will have positive view about their managers and organization, even if they are not satisfied with their payments, promotions and other personal events. If the assignment of the procedures during time is fixed for everyone, and

prejudice and partiality are prevented during the assignment process, and the opportunity for changing an unfair decision is created, the procedural justice will be accompanied by the employees' recognitional, emotional and behavioral relations to the organization (organizational commitment). Therefore, when a process is known as unfair, it causes some special results.

The results of the table 6 show that the observed t is higher than the critical value of the table with the error of measurement of 1 percent, so the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization believe that the distributive justice is higher than the average level.

Therefore, based on the results of the questionnaire, it can be concluded that the distributive justice among the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization is observed higher than the average level. It is interpreted that with attention to the distributive justice and its included factors, the employees of Isfahan education organization, on average, experience a higher level of justice in some aspects such as rewarding and merit division, because in governmental organizations there is a focused organizational structure, and all of these organizations follow the same rules and rely on the regulations and circular letters such as staff department orders and their written contents. This is while the people create a feeling of injustice and partiality when they work unfocused and based on their own authority. So making people familiar with justice and sharing the advantages, release of partiality, and observing the valued statements prepared with the cooperation of the employees, are solutions that can help the employees recognize the differences and be after the payment of merits and facilities based on the people's working activities; of course it should be without

taking the authority of the managers in giving promotions, remunerations,....

In this way, not only the differences are not recognized as the symbols of injustice, but are the tools for the increasing competition among the employees, and improve the organization; and the organizational managers would be able to harmonize their employees with themselves and create a kind of exchanging management in the organization.

In this way, the managers work in a style in which they can reward the employees' effective cooperation, praise the subordinates who are worth praising, create ideals and make concrete the mental models of justice in organization.

Based on the results of the table 7, the observed t is higher than the critical value of the table with the error of measurement of 1 percent, so the interactional justice is higher than the average level from the point of view of the teachers and staffs of Isfahan education organization.

Therefore, it can be concluded that with attention to the factors of this kind of justice, it seems that the education organization is different from other organizations for various reasons; and its policy-making structures are different.

In education organization, the clients are served, because they are products. The presence of skills and different demands increases the ambiguity in this organization. In this open system, there are various interactions between the environment and different elements of the system.

The management subsystem and the technical and specialized subsystems' environment are three included systems of this organization which interact with each other. The employees of this organization are skillful and emphasize on the skills and abilities such as mobile cooperation and preparing teams for doing the interactional processes of teaching and learning, and creating and managing the interactions as a principle in the mobile world.

Therefore, having a fair understanding in comparison with the employees of other organizations, interacting fairly and respectfully with each other, and having a fair understanding of the organization in comparison with other organizations, are the factors noted by education organization, and these factors caused the teachers and staffs of this organization to recognize the interactional justice of the organization higher than the average level.

Reference

1. Baazargan, A. (2004). Educational assessment, concepts, patterns and operational process. Tehran: Semat Press.
2. Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational Justice* (pp. 89-118). Lexington, MA: New Lexington Press.
3. Brockner, J., & Sigol, F. (1995). The history of theories and researches on organizational justice (Goly). *Mesbah Seasonal Paper*, 46.
4. Brockner, P., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Martin, C. L. (1995). Decision frame, procedural justice and saruluors reactions to job layoffs. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes* 63 (1), pp. 59-68.
5. Colquitt, A., Donald, K. Yee Ng, Michael, W. & Christopher p. (2001). Justic at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (3): 524-445.
6. Folger, R. & Kussel, C. (1998). *Organizational Justic and human resources management*, sage Publications.
7. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of Procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31 (1), 115-130.
8. Gall, M., Boog, V. & Gall, J. (2003). Quantitative and qualitative research methods in educational and psychological sciences (Esfahani, et al.). Tehran: Semat and Shahid Beheshti Press.
9. Golparvar, M. & Nadi, M. (2010). Cultural values and justice: organizational justice, job satisfaction and service leaving. *Historical researches seasonal paper*, 9, 207-228.
10. Greenberg, J. and Lind, E. A. (2000). "The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application." In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (72-108).
11. Hafeznia, Gh. (1999). *An introduction to the research methods in human sciences*. Tehran: Semat Press, 1.
12. Haghpanah, R. (2001). *Social justice in Quran. Hozeh reflection*, 2.
13. Hoseinzadeh, A., Naseri, M. (2007). *Organizational justice. Tadbir*, 190, 18-23.
14. Lambert, E. (2003). "The Impact of Organizational Justice on Correctional Staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31 (2): 155-168.

15. McDowall, A. & Fletcher, C. (2004). "Employee development: An organizational justice perspective." *Personal Review*, 33(1): 8-29.
16. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41 (3), 351-357.
17. Pourezat, A. (2003). The design of the system of policy-making for social justice based on Alavi's right-centered government. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tarbiatmoddarras University, Tehran, Iran.
18. Shariati, A. (1980). *Ali is alone*. Tehran: Hoseinieh Ershad Press.
19. Zhang, Q. & Hung-Gay, F. (2006). "China's social capital and financial performance of private enterprises." *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 13 (2): 198-199.

9/12/2013