



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de Cercetare si Interventie sociala

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

RESEARCH ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATION CULTURE AND ITS JUSTICE IN THE HEALTH PROFESSION

Servet KAYA, Hilmet SECIM

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2018, vol. 61, pp. 77-90

The online version of this article can be found at:
www.rcis.ro, www.doaj.org and www.scopus.com

Published by:
Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:
„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,
Department of Sociology and Social Work
and
HoltIS Association
REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA
is indexed by Clarivate Analytics (Web of Science)
Social Sciences Citation Index
(Sociology and Social Work Domains)

Research on the Relationship between Organization Culture and Its Justice in the Health Profession

Servet KAYA¹, Hilmet SECIM²

Abstract

To realize the potential benefits from looking at the relationship between an organization's culture and its justice in the health profession, inputs need to be decided up and then measured. While various inputs could be considered, the people who work within the organization, the human assets are perhaps the most essential factor to consider even though this element is capricious. Examination into the relationship under study recognizes that an organization's culture, along with its internal justice is two components that empower representative fulfillment. Upon recognizing this, exploration has been underway in these territories as two separate fields of study which have produced few results. Therefore, the interrelation between culture and justice remains obscure, particularly in the ways these two impact each other in the machinations of the organization. One study produced some data by using a cross-section of 223 wellbeing laborers at a Malatya, Turkey open clinic. The study explored connections between culture and justice within the organization from May 2016 to June 2016. With twenty being the highest score possible in this particular study, the mean score for the organization's culture was 11.4 ± 2.3 and their justice mean score was 14.0 ± 4.8 . Relationship examination demonstrated all areas of the organization's culture had measurably critical positive relationships with areas of the organization's justice ($0.434 \leq r \leq 0.636$), except for the force space. The study found a positive relationship between the justice scores and the scores of general society. However, connections between them are moderate, indicating different elements can greatly impact final determinations. This finding suggests that even though it might be helpful for supervisors to use hierarchical society as a way to measure or modify the culture within their organization, this measurement or comparison should not be overly depended upon.

Keywords: organizational behavior, organizational culture, organizational justice, human resources management, employee perception.

¹ Cyprus International University, North Nicosia, NORTH CYPRUS. E-mail: servet_kaya03@yahoo.com

² Cyprus International University, North Nicosia, NORTH CYPRUS. E-mail: hsecim@ciu.edu.tr

Introduction

Any staff connected with a foundation has his/her own particular intentions in joining the organization. A crucial functionality of organizations is providing an arena in which their human assets can create meaningful connections (Desson & Clouthier, 2010). When issues develop within an organization, the culture demands the development of changes to accommodate the issue. Herein lies the fundamental purpose of culture within an organization: ensure the culture is beneficial to workers (Beeks & Ziko, 2018). To accomplish this objective, representatives responsible for the organization's culture must have an environment conducive to achieving the organization's objectives. An organization's culture is defined by the practices done by certain groups of individuals inside an organization. Workers have a certain state of mind that allows them to accommodate the culture and become proficient within it (Peters, Waterman, & Jones, 1982). The justice of an organization is another significant aspect of an organization, and is comprised of standards and qualities. Justice is a measurement of the degree to which an organization is considered reasonable (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001; Darwish & Qasim, 2016; Tang, 2017; Vaiz & Altınay, 2017).

Associations can be influential in adjusting workers' qualities and standards by means of their societies. In this manner, they might constitute a connection between staff and establishment. Effective organizations use their objectives and goals to shape the organization's culture, and establish safeguards to secure their efforts (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). How employees perceive how equity is distributed within the culture of the organization plays a significant role in their ability to adjust to the association and meet the organization's goals. Employees who cannot discern the culture within the organization, or observe equity distributions cannot adjust to the organization's justice. The significance of culture and justice to the degree of the cohesiveness of the organization's representatives has been studied and shown to affect the overall success of the business (Schein, 2006; Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2013). Recent advancements in investigating culture indicate spaces within the organization have improved as a result. In addition, examinations that look at many levels of communications between the different areas of organizational justice have been studied (Goodin, 2010; Usmani & Jamal, 2013). In any case, very little information has come to light that shows how organizational justice either advances or frustrates organizational culture. Data such as this would be of immense help to directors in their attempts to comprehend and shape the mechanics of culture and justice within their organization since both of these components contribute significantly to the overall growth and accomplishment of their foundation. The study data from researching the juxtaposition of culture to justice sheds light on the relationship between these two important organizational components.

Literature Review

Organizational Justice: In 1987, Greenberg developed the idea of justice within an organization (Greenberg, 1987). Justice is the way a worker sees their organization's actions, interactions and decisions based on the individual's own state of mind and the way they relate to the world. This type of justice is a term fundamental to a worker's idea of what is decent. In each association, workers consider the edicts of their bosses or the administration and decide for themselves whether they are out of line, or reasonable, based on their own internal sense of justice. These judgments impact the representative's conduct and appear to affect worker inspiration, maintenance and yield.

Justice is significant to the basic accomplishments of any organization and therefore should be extremely significant to the administration. Justice is portrayed as a paste through which representatives can powerfully cooperate (Cropanzana, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). In addition, Akanbi and Ofeogbu (2013) assert that an organization perceived as fair and just in its processes, procedures, interactions and policies, with an equal or equitable distribution system sees employees responding more positively in their behaviors with increased levels of productivity. Therefore, enhancing the perceived justice within an organization improves staff outcomes. The significance of organizational justice prompted vast amounts of writing that is accessible to directors in regards to the connection of various work area environments (Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2013; Frenkel, Li, & Restubog, 2012) In investigating writing on justice within an organization, , three major sections of equity were uncovered in the culture: distributive, procedural and interactional. Equity is connoted by feelings of fairness, justice, right, and goodness (Akanbi & Ofoegbu, 2013).

Distributive equity relates to allotments or results only some workers get which speaks to how fundamentally difficult it is for an organization to treat all workers equally. Even though every employee in the organization gets the same information, the distribution of the associated equity is isolated. This implies that the reward system of the organization should be perceived to be reflective of the performance. In addition, distributive equity should also be seen in decision-making procedures, implying that proper and equitable involvement is a factor to this. Hence, the extent of information on their prizes is of concern to representatives. Equity such as this is an expression of the value hypothesis. Cropanzana, Bowen, and Gilliland (2007) suggest the value hypothesis relates to how proportional the amount representatives get, to the amount contributed. In this way, distributive would be considered reasonable if a specific worker received in relation to what he was expected to contribute based on his pay rather than getting exactly what his partner with the higher pay received Innovative ways to look at distributive equity bring different elements to light that can be considered when developing processes to following in distributing equity. Rather than administrations focusing on either balance (giving the same to each person), or need (giving to the most critical) to

the exclusion of one or the other, analysts recommend mixing the two in a way that works best for their organization (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Procedural Justice: This type of equity refers to routes in the allocation of results. Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) began examining procedural equity and determined it is comprised consistency (suggesting staff are treated the same), absence of predisposition (inferring no segregation) and rightness in the decision process. What's more, procedural equity bargains with the strategies utilized as a part of coming to determination or choices and accentuates certain standards, such as the way ensuring all partners have satisfactorily shared data and that best practices have not been violated (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). When when an unfavorable choice has been made, however, findings indicate that if sufficient levels of thoughtfulness in relation to procedural equity has been demonstrated, a noteworthy backing of the choice occurs along with an expanded trust towards the businesses. In their book, Mauborgne and Kim (2005) suggest that reasonable procedures fortify enthusiastic, scholarly acknowledgment which fabricates even more trust and facilitates responsibility coming full circle with willful collaboration in the execution of concurred choices. Procedural justice is more predictive of several work attitudes, for instance, organizational commitment as a direct result of perceived procedural justice (Oztug & Bastas, 2012; Akanbi & Ofoegbu, 2013; Mirmohamdi & Marefat, 2014).

Interactional equity essentially addresses the way one person treats another. It is exhibited when data is shared to all who require it in a suitable way without discourse, and without foul or vulgar comments (Blodgett, Hill, & Tax, 1997). Colquitt *et al.* (2001) divided this type of equity into two main viewpoints. The principal angle, also called instructive equity, alludes to the honesty of a worker and/or boss and the ability to procure satisfactory supports when outcomes are not as positive as desired.. The other viewpoint, called interpersonal equity, alludes to the appreciation and nobility of character shown in one's treatment of another (Usmani & Jamal, 2013; Bies & Moag, 1986; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Each of these angles is just as vital as the other. Since interactional equity normally deals with customized exchanges, workers frequently desire this type of equity from chiefs, or the administration. Therefore, as illustrated by Skarlicki and Latham's study of 119 respondents (1996), when directors and administrative staff are taught to give clarifications and conciliatory sentiments (enlightening equity), and relate to staff with affability and admiration (interpersonal equity), enhanced relations with workers resulted. Research on organizational justice divides this arena into two parts: fleeting and spatial equity. Goodin (2010) originated the notion of time equity, which accentuates the power each person has to manipulate the hours and minutes of their lives. He equates it to 'having optimal control over your own opportunity'. This new concept of organizational justice emerged from the original idea, yet holds its own place of importance. Transient equity in an association is concerned with the reasonable appropriation of time. This type of equity is a

measure of the way staff evaluates how tedious an assignment is, or his valuation of the time it will take him to finish assignments (Usmani & Jamal, 2013).

Spatial justice has to do with geological space. It is the impartial distribution of assets across geological units (Usmani & Jamal, 2013). Geographically, unpredictable change lends itself to comprehension treachery in the working environment (Soja, 2009). Spatial justice addresses the dissemination of assets across zones (Lefebvre, 1968; Lefebvre, 1972). Current research in organizational justice indicates certain variables exist that tend to prompt workers to care more about equity (content hypotheses) than the methods that force a decent outcome (Rupp, 2011). Furthermore, recent research shifts the consideration from concentrating on the extent to which workers view themselves as handled reasonably, to whether they view another's treatment as reasonable, or out of line. This shift in viewpoint has driven scientists to debate workers' responses to corporate social obligations which are currently being addressed as instances of outsider equity discernments (Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010; Topa, Moriano, & Morales, 2013). Finally, the examination of organizational justice turned out to be a multilevel investigation with shared impressions of the equity structure inside work gatherings and associations (justice atmosphere), with equity recognitions and responses fluctuating across social gatherings (Rupp, 2011; Li & Cropanzano, 2009).

Authoritative Culture is characterized as "an example of essential suspicions shared by a gathering". Scholarly research delves into issues of outside adjustment and inner coordination. When they function well, they are viewed as legitimate, and therefore modeled to individuals new to the culture as the appropriate way to see, think and feel in relation to the issues of the culture" (Schein, 2006). With this definition, it is clear that the term organizational culture is applicable to any organization whether it is a school, club, government or even a gang. After a period of speculation and activities within the group, the eventual end is a culture that is normal and adequate to their gatherings. If the truth be told, the culture turns into a standard that is expected of individuals at the gatherings, and if anybody deviates from it they are seen as odd or acting like a maverick. Research on the subject of organization culture dates as far back as Henry Mayo's study in the 1930's in which he depicted groups of work societies. Nevertheless, depicting organizational culture as a field in its own right didn't occur until the decade of the 80's when scientists Deal and Kennedy (Deal & Kennedy, 1982), Ouchi (1981), and Peters and Waterman (1982) published books on the culture of organizations. From that point forward, unmistakable impacts have developed from an assortment of scholastic writings on the topic. Specialists derived that organizational justice is much the same as the identity of a person. However because of the creators' alternate points of view on the culture of organizations, a whole host of definitions associated with the topic. For example, while Deal and Kennedy (1982) named four loose types of societies: the extreme fellow/macho society, "the buckle down/play-hard culture, the wager your organization culture and the procedure

society". While Handy, (1996) stated organizational culture consists of four kinds of orders: force, part, errand and individual societies. He proceeded to examine society through the organizational culture model to the errors or discrepancies, if any, between the general and favored societies within the organizational model. The cultural model establishes the four measurements of society introduction (power, part, accomplishment, and bolster) and measures them in two operational behaviors, formalization and centralization (Carroll & Harrison, 1998). Every mode, or measurement, is recorded as either high or low.

The significance of culture within an organization hinges on whether its vital components are a good match for the business. These components, by and large, contribute to the organization's power and its ability to be fruitful. Khan and Rashid (2015) assert that organizational culture has a profound impact on organizational justice because it is what guides the perception of equity and fairness among the employees of the organization. Barney, (1986) attributed the great monetary major contributions of Procter and Gamble, McDonald's and other benefactors to a solid sense of justice within their organization. A solid culture within an organization becomes a sensitive barometer that helps control conduct (Deal & Kennedy, 1982), encourages objective arrangement (Brown & Dodd, 1998), and cohesiveness, rewards steadfastness, lowers employee turnover and supports hierarchical duty among representatives (Martins & Terblanche, 2003). These advantages are collated in view of the way authoritative society shapes parts of an association's exercises. Illustrations are: (1) Choosing correctly; (2) Appropriate internal relations; (3) Implementation of errands; (4) Procedural efficiency; (5) Inclination to adjust.

In conclusion, the pervasiveness of an organization's culture points to the level of achievement level of new activities embarked on by the association as well as the likelihood of it accomplishing its general objectives. For instance, Akanbi and Ofeogbu (2013) found significant relationships between distributive justice and organizational commitment. In addition, there are many crossover points between procedural justice and organizational commitment. However, in relation to job satisfaction, Iqbal (2013) found out both procedural and interactional justice boost job satisfaction while distributive justice had a negative connotation when it came to the degree of job satisfaction felt by staff. He thus emphasizes that an organization should concentrate more on procedural and interactional justice in its culture. Therefore, organizations that have embedded both forms of justice in their culture are likely to have better performance than their peers. This is true because having the correct culture is crucial in promoting leadership that guides an organization's staff to productivity (Khan & Rashid, 2015). However, it is prudent to point out that despite being a relationship between organizational culture and organizational justice (Khan & Rashid, 2015) found out that a bureaucratic culture in an organization showed no significant relationship with organization justice. Specifically, in the health profession, Yuen-Chen, Wu, Chang, Lin, Kung, Weng, Lin and Lee (2015) conclude that hospital managers could enhance the

attitudes of frontline nursing personnel by putting in place measures that enhance organizational justice, as this would boost their motivation towards work and extra-role performance. Therefore, improved attitudes would in turn facilitate teamwork, boost the morale, and reduce resignations by nurses and other healthcare employees.

Methodology

This study's objective is to analyze the threads that connect an organization's culture to its sense of justice. The process was to measure staff impressions on each of the parameters of culture and justice that are powerful and accessible in their association. Quantitative exploration routines were utilized in this study for information gathering purposes. Quantitative methodology was the most ideal approach to gauge singular's recognitions in light of the fact that, as expressed by Edwards (1998), "quantitative systems permit analysts to use surveys and research techniques to gauge variables, control them, and quantify the connections among considered ideas". This strategy consists of measurable investigation and is very time proficient (Meredith, Raturi, Amoako-Gyampah, & Kaplan, 1989).

This study embraces the following speculations:

H0: A relationship does not exist between a culture's measurements of accomplishment, backing and chain of command when compared to equity types such as procedural, interactional and distributive.

H1: Culture measurements (accomplishment, backing and progressive system) do form a relationship with these equity types: procedural, interactional and distributive).

Test: From May 2015 through June 2015 information was gathered from 258 human service workers working full-time at an open clinic in Malatya, Turkey. Thirty-five of the overviews were disposed of because of the fragmented data. Therefore, 223 overviews were incorporated into the examination.

Instruments: A modified culture scale utilizing the Harrison's organizational justice model (progressive system, accomplishment, force, and support) created by Nihal Mamatoğlu (2006). The poll had 16 questions that evaluated the four spaces of an organization's culture. Each of these areas had four organized inquiries to quantify it. The survey utilized a five-direct Likert scale so respondents could rate different parameters of justice within their organization. The Justice scale was modified to represent an institutionalized survey created by Colquitt *et al.* (2001) which was comprised of twenty objects that measure the three areas of justice being analyzed: distributive, procedural and interpersonal equity. A five-point scale was used to evaluate the objects with 1 = "Not very many" and 5 = "Considerably". Hospital classification was based on bed capacities in these increments: 25, 50, 100, 200, 400, 600, and 800 and above (Secim, 1994). Information derived from a pre-test amongst a comparable populace in another city (Istanbul), showed Cronbach

Alpha scores of 0.94. This demonstrated that the poll had an exceptionally solid capacity to gauge the study parameters by including scores for the individual areas, general scores were calculated.

Findings and Discussion

Socio-demographic attributes: Females comprised nearly 66% of the respondents (65.9%) while the remaining 76 respondents were male (34.1%).

Table 1. Uniqueness of Respondents within the Socio-Demographic Arena

	N	%
Gender		
Male	76	34.1
Female	147	65.9
Age Classification		
Under 20	4	1.8
20-29	43	19.3
30-39	103	46.2
40-49	57	25.6
50 and above	16	7.2
Marital Status		
Single	47	21.1
Married	176	78.9
Educational attainment		
Basic	52	23.3
Tertiary	171	76.7
Type of position		
Doctor	23	10.3
Nurse	84	37.7
Other	116	52.0
Employment Length		
10 years or less	151	67.7
Above 10 years	72	32.3

Salary		
0 - 2,000 Tl	64	28.7
More than 2,000Tl	159	71.3
Work status		
Public sector	165	74.0
Private sector	58	26.0

Table 2 demonstrates that data in each of the four areas identified as part of the culture class found in an organization was within a close range and considered normal (Max=12.7, Min= 10.5). The power area was the most noteworthy with a score of (12.7 ± 2.7). The order area had tallied lowest (10.5 ± 3.3). In the justice classification, prominent fluctuation was seen between the spaces, particularly interactional justice with the highest scores (17.3 ± 6.7) and distributive equity with the lowest tally (9.8 ± 4.3). For organizational culture, the general, normal score was 14.

Table 2. Justice and Culture Statistics

Category	Variable	Mean* ± S.D
CULTURE	Accomplishment	11.2 ± 3.4
	Power	12.7 ± 2.7
	Backing	11.2 ± 3.3
	Progressive system	10.5 ± 3.3
	Total	11.4 ± 2.3
JUSTICE	Procedural	14.8 ± 5.3
	Interactional	17.3 ± 6.7
	Distributive	9.8 ± 4.3
	Total	14.0 ± 4.8

* Parameter scores must be between 0 and 20

The extreme score for every space was 20 and the least was 0.

Relationships between the different spaces of culture and justice within an organization are laid out in Table 3. Scores demonstrated interesting relationships between the association spaces and culture areas . Each scored under 0.1%. Differences arise in the relationship of the force space where force was contrarily connected to areas of justice and to the general tallies for culture ($- 0.149 \leq r \leq$

- 0.071). Still, of the four connections that came about, the relationship of force space to distributive equity was the largest tally coming in at 5% ($p= 0.026$).

Table 3. Analysis of the Correlation between Culture and Justice

Procedural R (p-value)		ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE			
		Interactional	Distributive	Overall	
		R (p-value)	R (p-value)	R (p-value)	
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	Accomplishment	0.582 (<0.001)	0.557 (<0.001)	0.446 (<0.001)	0.606 (<0.001)
	Power	-0.071 (0.288)	-0.124 (0.065)	-0.149 (0.026)	-0.128 (0.056)
	Backing	0.636 (<0.001)	0.570 (<0.001)	0.434 (<0.001)	0.629 (<0.001)
	Progressive system	0.570 (<0.001)	0.545 (<0.001)	0.493 (<0.001)	0.610 (<0.001)
	Total	0.622 (<0.001)	0.565 (<0.001)	0.450 (<0.001)	0.626 (<0.001)

Various relapse examinations were done to anticipate the general equity score from each of the spaces of authoritative society. These variables measured anticipated general equity score $F(4, 218) = 51.613, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.486$. The sum of all of the four areas were added factually to the forecast ($p < 0.05$)

Dependent variable	Independent variables	R ²	Beta	p
Justice Score Overall		0.486		0.002
	Achievement	accomplishment backing and progressive system	0.289	0.01
	Power		-0.202	0.22
	Support		0.431	<0.001
	Hierarchy		0.384	<0.001

Table 4. Regression Analysis of the Justice Score

Usmani and Jamal (2013) acquired comparable results when they studied organizational culture. The contrast observed in the force space may have been a consequence of the way they led their Pakistan, a nation Hofstede portrayed as being high on force separation to the degree that workers think it is almost a prerequisite for them to have to endure shameful acts perpetrated by their bosses.

These representatives may not understand that a positive culture within an organization and the idea that workers have rights are goals many companies strive to achieve. Even if they did understand these concepts, the fear of being laid off with high unemployment rates still in the norm keeps them quiet. They simply

accept the conditions as they are. In Turkey, representative rights are the norm, and laborers are not apprehensive about being treated unfairly based on assessments. Normal scores tallied in equity spaces closely mirrored those of Kivimaki, Elovainio, Vahtera, and Ferrie in their Finland study on hierarchical equity. Perhaps this occurred because both countries are in close geographic proximity and that capacity comparable circumstances prevail in this type of working environment. Minimal distributive equity scores may point to administration moving away from concentrating their efforts on efficient methods of circulating their assets to a closer focus on making empowering choices for their workers. The interactional justice area, which had the most elevated scores, further, alludes to this. The measured a positive relationship between the scores of general justice and general culture. But the modest connection demonstrates other variables are just as connected, or even more strongly related. As a result, management should not depend on parameter without taking into consideration others. This study was undertaken to get an overview of health worker impressions and data accumulated based on their reactions. Revisiting these medical service representatives at a later date to record whether their reactions to these parameters have progressed may be helpful in developing a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships between culture and the perceived justice inherent within an organization. Progressions, and the reasons for them, might help directors rectify issues in their association with society, workplace, administration styles and developing related occupational game plans. In addition, conducting a longitudinal study could be helpful in assessing time variables.

Conclusion

Knowing how distributive equity and procedural justice influence organizational culture is crucial since it affects administration choices when deciding which system to use to address the justice needs of employees while ensuring organizational objectives are met, as well. The results of this study found a factually positive relationship between general justice and culture scores. Even so, the relationship is moderate, indicating other components are related just as strongly, and perhaps even more critically. Along these lines, directors are advised to not depend entirely on implementing one measure over another. Rather, all parameters should be considered.

Recommendations

A state doctor's facility association in Malatya, Turkey worked to support the execution of this study. Since it only drew a small sampling of data from a single area the results may not be representative of other regions or across larger geographic spans. In addition, the data was self-reported, with information

obtained from employees. Hence, there is room for biases. Therefore, a more extensive examination at different clinics and nations using either the proposed or an alternate model is proposed.

References

- Akanbi, P.A., & Ofoegbu, O.E. (2013). Impact of Perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment of a Food and Beverage Firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 207-218.
- Barney, J.B. (1986). Organizational Culture: Can It Be a Source of Sustained Competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 656-665.
- Beeks, J. C., & Ziko, A. (2018). Internalizing Economic Externalities on the Macroeconomic Stage. Exploring and Expanding Paul Hawken's The Ecology of Commerce: A Declaration of Sustainability for Globalized Solutions. *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, 2(1), 03. <https://doi.org/10.20897/ejosdr/7675>
- Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.
- Blodgett, J.G., Hill, D.J., & Tax, S.S. (1997). The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on postcomplaint behaviour. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(2), 185-210.
- Brown, F.W., & Dodd, N.G. (1998). Utilizing organizational culture gap analysis to determine human resource development needs. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 19(7), 374-385.
- Carroll, G.R., & Harrison, J.R. (1998). Organizational demography and culture: Insights from a formal model and simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, 637-667.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O., & Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C.P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. *The Handbook of Organizational Justice*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Cropanzana, R., Bowen, D.E., & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 2, 34-48.
- Darwish, N. A., & Qasim, M. (2016). Quantitative evaluation of flexibility in undergraduate engineering curricula in the United Arab Emirates. *European Journal of STEM Education*, 1(1), 9-18.
- Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of organizational life*. 2 ed. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Desson, K., & Clouthier, J. (2010). www.iaea.org/safeguards/Symposium/2010/Documents. Accessed June 15, 2016.
- Edwards, D.J. (1998). Types of case study work: A conceptual framework for case-based research. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 3, 36-70.
- Frenkel, S.J., Li, M., Restubog, S.L., & Frenkel, S. J. (2012). Management, Organizational Justice and Emotional Exhaustion among Chinese Migrant Workers: Evidence from

- two Manufacturing Firms: Management, Organizational Justice and Emotional Exhaustion. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(1), 121-147.
- Goodin, R.E. (2010). Temporal justice. *Journal of Social Policy*, 39(1), 1-16.
- Greenberg J. A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*. 1987;12(1):9-22.
- Handy, C.B. (1996). *Gods of management: The changing work of organizations*: Oxford University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1968). *La vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lefebvre, H. (1972). *La vida cotidiana en el mundo moderno*. Madrid: Tapa Blanda.
- Leventhal, G.S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W.R. (1980). *Leventhal, Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences*. In G. M. (Ed.) (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Fairness at the group level: Justice climate and intraunit justice climate. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 564-599.
- Martins, E.C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1), 64-74.
- Mauborgne, R., & Kim, W.C. (2005). *Blue Ocean Strategy-How to Create Uncontested Market Space and Make Competition Irrelevant*. 1 ed. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Meredith, J.R., Raturi, A., Amoako-Gyampah, K., & Kaplan, B. (1989). Alternative research paradigms in operations. *Journal of Operations Management*, 8(4), 297-326.
- Mirmohhamdi, S.M., & Marefat, A. (2014). The Effect of Perceived Justice and Organizational Silence on. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 3(3), 1773-1789.
- Nihal, M. (2006). Organizational Communication and Performance Evaluation System Perception Is Organizational Culture Predict perception? *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 4, 177-201.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. *Business Horizons*, 24(6), 82-83.
- Oztug, O., & Bastas, M. (2012). The Effects Of Teachers'organizational Justice Perceptions On Organizational Commitment. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi-Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 125-133.
- Peters, T.J., Waterman, R.H., & Jones, I. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run corporations*. New York: Warner.
- Rupp, D.E. (2011). An employee-centered model of organizational justice and social responsibility. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1(1), 72-94.
- Schein, E.H. (2006). *Organizational culture and leadership*. 3 ed. San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M.G., & Macey, W.H. (2013). Organizational Climate and Culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 361-388.
- Secim, H. (1994). *Hastane Yönetimi ve Organizasyonu*. 2 ed. Eskişehir: Anadolu University Publishings.
- Shao, R., Rupp, D.E., Skarlicki, D.P., & Jones, K.S. (2013). Employee Justice Across Cultures: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 263-301.

- Skarlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- Skarlicki, D.P., & Latham, G.P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 161-169.
- Skarlicki, D.P., & Rupp, D.E. (2010). Dual processing and organizational justice: the role of rational versus experiential processing in third-party reactions to workplace mistreatment. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 944-952.
- Soja, E.W. (2009). The city and spatial justice. *Justice Spatiale, Spatial Justice*, 1, 1-5.
- Tang, H. (2017). Effects of Leadership Behavior on Knowledge Management and Organization Innovation in Medicine and Health Sciences. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(8), 5425-5433.
- Topa, G., Moriano, J.A., & Morales, J.F. (2013). Organizational injustice: third parties' reactions to mistreatment of employee. *Psicothema*, 25(2), 214-221.
- Usmani, S., & Jamal, S. (2013). Impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice, spatial justice on job satisfaction of banking employees. *Review of Integrative Business & Economics Research*, 2(1), 351-383.
- Vaiz, M. E., & Altınay, Z. (2017). Reaching out Merits of Information Technology: Conflict Management in Schools. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(7), 2979-2992.
- Yuen-Chen, S., Wu, W.C., Chang, C.S., *et al.* (2015). Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15, 363.