

Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies

Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 400-410, May 2014 (ISSN: 2220-6140)

A Study of Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and Individualism/Collectivism Values Among Academic Staff

*Şaban ESEN¹, ²Ash ÇİLLİOĞLU KARADEMİR

¹Bartın University, Bartın, Turkey

²Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

*sabanesen@hotmail.com

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the individuals' perceptions of justice in the organizations they work in and the personality tendencies of individualism or collectivism they have. For that reason, firstly the concept of organizational justice and the values of collectivism and individualism were explained; their relationship was mentioned through theoretical and empirical studies in the literature. As measurement tool, survey method was used. The surveys were conducted on 133 academicians working at Bartın University which is one of the state universities in Turkey. As a result of doing reliability analysis and factor analysis, the last form of scale was given. The perceived organizational justice handled in the scale was composed of three dimensions which are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice; and despite individualism and collectivism have four sub-dimensions (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism and vertical collectivism) this was not taken into account in the study and they were discussed from only individualism and collectivism dimensions. In consequence of ANOVA analyses performed, it is found that there is a low relation between collectivism value and distributive justice as well as between individualism value and interactional justice. The findings of ANOVA analysis showed that in the demographic characteristics only the title variable groups showed significant differences between interactional justice and individualism. By multi-regression analysis, it is seen that as much as procedural justice increases the exhibited collectivism characteristic increases, in similar way as much as distributive justice increases the collectivism characteristic increases. There was no obvious significant correlation between individualism variable and justice dimensions.

Keywords: *Perceived Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Individualism/Collectivism*

1. Introduction

Having a historical development long way back, the concept of organizational justice was used for the first time in 1987 by Greenberg in order to take in consideration the equity within an organization and to perceive the fairness. Especially after 1980, it became one of the most researched matter at industrial-organizational psychology, human resources management and organizational behavior areas. These sciences dealt organizational justice basically as "a social structure" (Colquitt et al., 2001) and participated to the organizational approaches of the recent years which put the individual at the center and reinforce the attitude concentrated on the interaction between the individuals and the problems arising from this interaction. Individuals evaluate how fair all the goings-on happened in their environment as well as organizations they work in where they spend most of their time, and may develop different behaviors according to this assessment. The fact that employees have positive perception concerning the justice of their organization ensures them to display positive behaviors. For example, the employees having fair perception in the organization feel themselves as valuable and esteemed members of the organization and develop relations based on harmony and confidence with their colleagues and managers (Beugre, 2002). Whereas the perceived injustices lead to negative behaviors like robbery, sabotage, aggression that make it difficult to achieve the objectives of the organization (Folger & Konovski, 1989).

The perceptions change from individual to individual. The positive or negative behaviors displayed in consequence of different perceptions change according to the individual. With a simple expression, from this starting point, in the recent researches conducted about justice, the relationships between "values" and justice have already examined. For instance, the "moral values" of individuals (Skitka & Muellen,

2002) and “social value tendency” (De Cremer, 2002) have been discussed in studies relating to justice. Values have a structure coinciding to the relative personality tendencies and cultural features of the individuals and societies (Berry et.al., 1992). The work values are interests, beliefs, attitudes and preferences about the work (Dhanasarnsilp et al., 2006). It is mentioned that business values are related to the personality, job satisfaction, motivation, job performance, organizational commitment, career selection and adaptation to the work (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). The role of personality characteristics on the values and attitudes about work became more interesting in 1990s and was investigated by various researchers (Salgado, 1997).

There are also some studies mentioning individualism and collectivism among personality tendencies. Triandis (1995) claims that individualism and collectivism may be tracked over “the self”. A person having individualism feature is an individual-self, and as for him/her it is important to be unique, different and accomplishing his/her personal goals; and his/her talents, emotions, thoughts, personal needs and preferences determine and orient the behaviors of individual within the society. Whereas person having collectivism feature has a relational self and for him/her, other people’s emotions, thoughts, needs and preferences are important and determine and orient his/her social behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Considering this approach from linear logic for the workplaces, it is expected that assessments of facts and events they experience at work as well as their perception of justice from that perspective of people having individualist personality tendency are different than people having collectivist personality tendency. This study has been designed in order to measure this expectation; to determine if there is a relation or not between individualist and collectivist personality tendencies and organizational justice perceptions, and if any, to investigate the direction of correlation.

2. Literature Review

The Concept of Organizational Justice: Justice is a concept on which the human beings work down the ages and try to explain. Justice is a matter on which philosophical discussions have been conducted, that takes place in religious advices and shows as power element of the leaders. As Montada (1998) stated, justice ensures a system necessary to provide our requirements fairly. Namely, human being is included in a group in order to meet his social-emotional needs. However, if the members think that their needs are not met, they review this relation within the rules relating to justice. In other words, within the scope of the interaction between group members and the rules developed to ensure fair exchange, the decision is given about if something is correct and fair or not. Hence, these rules provide the criteria necessary to both direct the behaviors of himself/herself and evaluate the behaviors of other people. The organizational justice term which entered first in business literature with theories based on psychology, in the words of Montada (1998), “has no aim to develop objective criteria about what is fairness or equity, it examines the perception of events by the individuals and their reaction processes”. But still, people have some criteria relating to the justice, be fair and equality and are ideological by their nature. The organizational justice term was used for the first time as the perception of fairness inside an organization by Greenberg (Colquitt et al., 2001). In the literature, since used from that time to nowadays, different definitions have been assigned for organizational justice. The points highlighted in these definitions are “perception” and “reaction”. Greenberg’s (1990) and Ployhart & Ryan’s (1997) studies support that, organizational justice is a notion about how employees perceive justice concerning the work and how they react to their assessment.

Many theories have been proposed about organizational justice. Greenberg (1987) gathered these theories into four categories arising from two independently aspects (reactive–proactive aspect and process content aspect). Reactive theories are focused on the escape or avoiding attempts from unfair applications of employees and investigate the reactions against injustice. Proactive theories are focused on behaviors displayed by employees to provide justice and analyze behaviors displayed in order to ensure fair applications. Justice process theories are related to how acquisitions such as wage and promotion will be determined. Different classifications have been done for organizational justice, the widely accepted one is the classification done in distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). The points come to consensus in researches are the outputs relating to work suggested by Adams, the procedures suggested by Leventhal which applied in order to achieve the outputs and get respect and reputation from other employees. These expressions also respectively clarify the types of distribution, procedures and interactional justice (Johnson et al., 2005). The distributive justice is in general focused on economic outputs and is defined as the fairness level

perceived by the employees in the distribution of organizational resources (wage, promotion decisions etc.) (Cohen & Spector, 2001). The interactional justice expresses the perceptions relating to the behavior of managers who are responsible for the distribution of resources and determines if they are fair or not during the process they followed for it (Scandura, 1999). As Greenberg (1990) stated international justice consists of two interpersonal treatment: Interpersonal justice and informational justice. The first reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, respect by others involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. The second focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in that way or why outcomes were distributed in certain fashion.

Values of Individualism and Collectivism: In the study conducted by Hofstede (1980) in 1967-1968 and 1971-1973, he investigated the differentiation between cultures within the following categories: collectivism or individualism of the society, position as per power distance, avoiding level from uncertainty, masculinity or femininity. Despite various criticisms, in most of cross-cultural studies conducted in the scope of individualism-collectivism, it is seen that many references done to this country-based study of Hofstede (Wasti & Erdil, 2007). Triandis (1995) has named the part of a culture which represents its intangible parts like language, symbols, ideas, beliefs, values and norms as subjective culture. He also claims that individualism and collectivism are parts of subjective culture and that can be observed in the values, attitudes and behaviors of individual, in other words in the personality of him/her. Accordingly, regarding cultural aspect the subjective reflection of individualism is autonomous-self and reflection of collectivism is relational-self. According to Triandis (1995) the dimension of individualism and collectivism is the most single important aspect of the cultural difference in social behavior. It would be wrong to accept that an individual has an individualist culture features just because he/she comes from a society having an individualist culture features or is collectivist just because he/she comes from a society having collectivist features. In opposition to Hofstede who took the cultural dimensions at social level, Triandis approached that dimension at individual level. According to his opinion, this dimension should be investigated as multi-dimensional notion composed of many criteria, not as two opposing edges (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Triandis made vertical and horizontal distinction both in individualist and collectivist categorization. Collectivist and individualist tendencies present in each individual. These tendencies formed depending on the environment, personality features and culture where the individual grows up, with the dominance of one tendency to the other. In the same way, every individual has tendencies of vertical individualism, vertical collectivism, horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism but their rates change according to the situations.

In general, horizontal dimension of relations means perceiving themselves as equal basis with others, association, integration and having an equal feature in terms of status. Whereas the vertical dimension of relations means in fact the perception to see themselves different from others, the acceptance of hierarchy, service to internal group (family, relatives, colleagues, nation), making self-sacrifice in the name of the group, the acceptance of inequality and hierarchy. The dimension of horizontal collectivism has the following main features: the reciprocal dependency, perceiving himself/herself as similar to others, wanting the goodness of the group he/she is in, unyielding authority. Whereas the dimension of vertical collectivism carries values such as family integrity, sacrificing personal goals to group goals, acceptance of authority, obeying the norms of the group. The dimension of horizontal individualism involves self-confidence, trying to be original, acting different from the group and not comparing himself/herself with others. While the dimension of vertical individualism includes giving importance to competition, trying to keep always ahead by compared with others, being privileged and trying to gain status (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Various attitude scales have been developed to measure individualism and collectivism tendencies e.g. in the study of Triandis & Gelfand, (1998); Self Construal Scale- Singelis (1994); INDCOL Scale, Triandis, Bhawuk & Gelfand (1995).

Relationship between the Perceived Organizational Justice and Individualist/Collectivist Values: The relationship with the perceived organizational justice has many personal and organizational variables researched. It is also important to figure out how the demographic features like personality characteristics, gender, education, title, seniority affect the perception of justice (Beugre, 1998). The group-value model explains the perceptions about the quality of relation among the members of the group and between workers and their managers with reference to the justice perception in the organization. In consequence of individual's interactional justice and distributive justice perception in the organization, he/she can be proud of being part of the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000). One of the core

elements of the identity is the values and they affect the behavior of individuals. Besides, individualism and collectivism are observed in the values, behaviors and/or attitudes of person (Triandis, 1995). Consequently, it is important how compatible are the individual values with the distributive justice and the interactional justice. In the organizational justice studies conducted after 1990s, the relation between the organizational justice perception and some output variables (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, etc.) (Dieckmann et al., 2004; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) as well as variables such as self-reputation relating to personality (De Cremer, 2002) were examined. Also some studies done in order to measure the relationship between these output variables and individualism-collectivism. For example; in his study where the individualism and collectivism are discussed from the cultural point, Clugston (2000) specified that these values affect the organization commitment. Regarding from emotional point, individualism involves the feeling of independency from the organization and collectivism implies the feeling of loyalty and belonging to the group. Thus, employees working in individualist societies give more importance to the work or wage while the collectivists attach importance to the emotional commitment level.

Furthermore, it has been remarked that there are not so many studies in the literature investigating the relationship between the values of individuals and the perceived organizational justice (Lipponen et al., 2004). In some studies, it has been shown that there is no statistically significant relationship between individualism and collectivism tendencies with the perceived organizational justice. For instance, Lam, et al. (2002) cited that in researches that bear on the generalizability of procedural and distributive justice effects has focused on reward allocation preferences across cultures that are known to differ on collectivism and individualism. However, the results are not entirely consistent in that preferences for more equality-based reward allocations in collectivistic cultures, whereas other did not. None of them demonstrated that cultural value dimensions such as collectivism or individualism underlay the cross-cultural differences they observed. Besides, given that many factors besides the relative emphasis on harmony versus self-interest tend to distinguish the societies within which some studies were conducted, a host of other variables may be responsible for cross-national differences. As is seen, more studies are needed relating to the perceived justice and individualism and collectivism values (Feather, 1994).

Purpose of This Research: Mainly, there are two starting points of this study. First, many individual and organizational variables' relationships with the perceived organizational justice have been researched. Such as, it can be said that in Schwartz's (1992) theory of basic values, the dimensions of self-enhancement and self-transcendence values are a reflection of the distributive justice and the interactional justice. We think that with this particular model, in the business administration literature, the relationship between organizational justice and values has been researched; but it is observed that still not adequately addressed in. Secondly, the individualism and collectivism have been discussed in several disciplines in particular as a dimension of culture. But in the majority of cross-cultural studies, we think that one point would need to be more watched out: "the cultural tendencies of individuals living in the same country may differ from each other". For this, as Wasti & Erdil (2007) stated, in the example of Turkey, as considering the heterogeneous structure of the society and in the process of transition, it would be important to measure the cultural values at individual level in order to understand the social-psychological processes at that level. From this perspective, in this research, we intend to examine the relationships between the individualism-collectivism values emphasized the necessity of discussing at individual level (e.g., Gudykunst & Lee, 2003) and perceived organizational justice. Accordingly, the following hypothesis were tested:

- If there is statistically significant difference between employees' perceptions of organizational justice and individualism-collectivism values according to demographic features (as gender/age/marital status/ years of work experience in the sector) or not
- If the less employees perceive the organization justice dimensions, the more the individualism tendencies increase or not
- If the more employees perceive the organization justice dimensions, the more the collectivism tendencies increase or not

3. Methodology

Participants and Procedure: The sample of the research is composed of 133 academicians working at Bartın University. Most of the participants are men and % 29,3 of them are women. Considering the age repartition, 75% of the sampling is under the age of 40. 55, 6% of the participants are single and 44, 4%

are married. Regarding their working period in the sector, almost 60% of the sampling has work experience under 10 years, 18,8% of them has 11-15 years and 14,3% of them has 16 years and more work experience. 27,8% of the participants are Research Assistant, 33,8% are Assistant Professor, 15,8% are Teaching Assistant and 11,3% are Lecturer and the rest is composed of Professor, Associate Professor and Specialists.

Measures: In order to determine the organizational justice perceptions of employees at the data gathering, the Organizational Justice Scale by Niehoff & Moorman (1993) was used in the study. The scale consists of three-dimensions (distributive justice, procedural justice (formal procedures) and interactional justice) model of organizational justice. After doing confirmatory factor analyses, two items removed and the last form of scale with 18 items determined, the scale reliability is ,898. Distributive justice was measured using five items same as the original scale, assessing the fairness of different work outcomes, including pay level, work schedule, work load, and job responsibilities. Formal procedures (procedural justice) measured the degree to which job decisions included mechanisms that insured the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeals process. Interactional justice measured the degree to which employees felt their needs were considered in, and adequate explanations were made for, job decisions. A five point Likert-type scale evaluates the responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

In this study, INDCOL scale (by Singelis et al., 1995) was used. INDCOL scale is a 32-item scale consisting of items designed to measure four dimensions of collectivism and individualism (vertical individualism/collectivism and horizontal individualism/collectivism) and all items are answered on a 9-point scale. In our study, after doing confirmatory factor analyses, it was seen that when the dimensions took separately, reliabilities were low. When only the main dimensions (individualism and collectivism) were taken into analyze, the scale's reliability were high enough. Also, this main categorization of dimensions is enough for this study's aim. That's why, items designed to measure the main two dimensions (individualism and collectivism) instead of four dimensions (vertical individualism/collectivism and horizontal individualism/collectivism). Two items removed and the last form of scale with 30 items determined. Each item has been answered with the scale of five-point likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) widely preferred as it gives better results in the researches performed in Turkey. The questionnaires were sent to the university academicians' mails two times however only 70 questionnaires were responded. After this, the questionnaires were delivered to participants by hand.

The Data Analysis: The gathered data were analyzed by SPSS 20.0 program using appropriate statistical techniques. In the study, it was first analyzed the demographic features of the academicians who had participated to the survey. In consequence of the reliability analysis and factor analysis performed, the final configuration of the two scales used in the study were obtained. Even if the individualism-collectivism values used here have different sub-dimensions, the two fundamental dimensions have been used in this study. The relationships of organizational justice perceptions' dimensions with each other and the relationships between these dimensions and the individualism-collectivism values of academicians for each dimension and demographic features have been measured with one-way ANOVA. In order to determine the relationship strength, prediction of the target variable (forecasting) and modelling the relationship between variables, regression analysis was performed.

4. Results

Relationship Between Organizational Justice Perception and Individualism/ Collectivism Values: By ANOVA analysis (Table 1); no significant relationship was found between organization justice perception and individualism and collectivism values ($p < 0, 01$). However, it is seen that coefficients results are close to the significance limit, specially the collectivism value which is rated as 0,013. On the other hand, a relationship between the three sub-dimensions of perceived organizational justice and individualism-collectivism variables was found. While no relationship was found between the variables, a relationship was determined between the sub-dimensions of variables, the effect of restricting the range of scores on the correlation between variables which is called as range restriction was considered. As Bobko (2001) stated that it happens when the correlation is artificially attenuated making the measure look less effective. Further, the correlation among the respondents addresses the wrong question. Accordingly, for measuring the random state of the answers and the independency of data with each

other runs test was used and as a result very few items of individualism-collectivism value showed 'range restriction'. As this test could not give enough explanations, the average and standard deviation values were investigated. Compared to the average, an important part of the standard deviation values (one third) is quite low (less than 20% of the average). That is why; it may say that some participants are always giving the same answers for the data set. Therefore it should be necessary to continue the analyses based on dimensions.

Table 1: Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Perceived Organizational Justice and Individualism/ Collectivism Variables

	Individualism	Collectivism	Perceived Organizational Justice
Perceived Organizational Justice	-,077	-,013	1
Individualism	1	-,569**	-,077
Collectivism	-,569**	1	-,013

**p<0,01

Relationship between the Dimensions of Perceived Organizational Justice and Individualism /Collectivism Values: By ANOVA analysis done (Table 2), the relationship between the perceived organizational justice dimensions and individualism-collectivism values was examined.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Dimensions of Perceived Organizational Justice and Individualism-Collectivism Variables

	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
Individualism	,060	,044	-,171*
Collectivism	,183*	,536**	,143

**p< 0,01 ; * p<0,05

Pallant (2005) cited from Cohen that,

r= .10 to .29 or r=-10 to -.29 *low correlation

r= .30 to .49 or r= -.30 to -.49 *middle correlation

r= .50 to 1.0 or r= -.50 to -1.0 *high correlation

According to this, at Table 2, the highest relation level (correlation) is between collectivism and procedural justice dimension (r= .536). There is a low relationship between individualism and interactional justice dimension as well as between collectivism and distributive justice dimension.

Relationship Between the Perceived Organizational Justice Dimensions with Individualism / Collectivism Values According to the Demographic Features: In the comparison of the perceived organizational justice dimensions and individualism/ collectivism values, independent groups t test was done in order to analyze if there is a significant difference or not between women-men and single-married groups. No significant differences determined between the groups. ANOVA was used in order to examine if there is a significant difference or not between the dimensions of perceived organizational justice and individualism-collectivism values of academicians who participated to the research according to their ages, working periods in the sector and titles. In result of one-way ANOVA, in case of differences between averages, Scheffe and LSD tests were used for bringing out in which groups there is such difference. In conclusion, no significant difference was found according to the age and working period in the sector. For testing the dimensions of perceived organizational justice and individualism/collectivism values if they become different or not according to the title, ANOVA analysis was done. Its results were given at Table 3. According to these results, for p<.05; the interactional justice and individualism values have difference between the groups. According to LSD test, at the individualism tendency, significant differences were determined between the groups of Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Research Assistants. Also, there is significant difference between groups of Assistant Professors and Lecturers. Furthermore, a meaningful difference was determined between the groups of Lecturers and Research Assistants, Lecturers and Teaching Assistants. Regarding from the point

of interactional justice perception, there is also significant difference between these groups: Teaching Assistants and Associate Professors; Teaching Assistants and Assistant Professors. No significant difference between groups found according to other demographic variables in the survey.

Testing the Interactions between Perceived Organizational Justice Dimensions and Individualism/Collectivism Values: The regression equation representing how much y (first variable) changes with any given change of x (other variable). The direction in which the line slopes depends on whether the correlation is positive or negative. In this research, multiple regression analysis between individualism-collectivism values and the dimensions of organizational justice was done; after the regression analysis only collectivism variable gave significant results. In other words, after analyzing, “the less employees perceive the organization justice dimensions, the more the individualism tendencies increase” was rejected whereas “the more employees perceive the organization justice dimensions, the more the collectivism tendencies increase” was accepted. R square value (368) shows collectivism’s explanation power of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice variables. These dimensions explain 368 of collectivism value and the regression model is significant. Considering β , it is seen that each of the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) affects the collectivism variable at the rate of 0,327; 0,737; 0,081 respectively. However, as different from the others ($p=, 000$), in the analysis between interactional justice and collectivism p is equal to 0,082 which is not significant. With reference to these results, as much as procedural justice increases the collectivism feature increases. In similar way, as much as distributive justice increases collectivism aspect increases, too.

Table 3: Average Difference Test of Participants’ Opinions Regarding Dimensions According to Titles (ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Collectivism	Between groups	1,167	4	,292	1,159	,332
	Within groups	31,975	127	,252		
	Total	33,142	131			
Individualism	Between groups	2,601	4	,650	3,454	,010
	Within groups	23,912	127	,188		
	Total	26,514	131			
Interactional Justice	Between groups	6,641	4	1,660	2,679	,035
	Within groups	78,704	127	,620		
	Total	85,345	131			
Procedural Justice	Between groups	,520	4	,130	,777	,542
	Within groups	21,229	127	,167		
	Total	21,748	131			
Distributive Justice	Between groups	,507	4	,127	,898	,467
	Within groups	17,926	127	,141		
	Total	18,432	131			

Results and Discussion: In the business management literature, in various studies (e.g. Dieckmann et al., 2004; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993), the perceived organizational justice was researched under its relationship with outcome variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, on the other hand, in a few studies (De Cremer, 2002) it was researched with the variables such as value, self-respect relating to the personality e.g. which based on psychology and social psychology origin. The values of person structure his/her attitudes. Considering from this point of view, the importance of investigating the values of individual in the sense of justice perception may be understood. However, in the literature relating to this subject, it is seen that there is not enough studies which have examined the relationship between the value systems of the individuals and the organizational justice perception. That was emphasized in the study of Lipponen et al. (2004) which was on the basis of conceptual correspondences between values of Schwartz’s value typology (self enhancement and self-transcendence) and previous

conceptualizations of distributive and procedural justice. In his study, Schwartz stated that individuals who give high importance to self-transcendence value are generally the individuals who have collectivism value as reported in Hofstede (2001) study. In Hofstede's study, it is mentioned that Turkish society is among cultures in which collective behavior is dominant and considering from the organization level it is occurred that organization members are connected to their own organizations with stronger emotional bond.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between values and the perception of organizational justice that authors think it is needed to investigate more in this field. In this study, the authors have analyzed the individualism and collectivism values because of the idea that these two values are more explicit regarding from measurability point and are the most examined items in the cultural differentiation, similar with Triandis (1995), in both theoretical and empirical organizational studies. Yet it had to measure in Turkey, different than Hofstede it was preferred to deal them at individual level like Schwartz's approach, not as a cultural value. The reason is that as societies are not mostly homogeneous today, it is not possible to agree that the findings found over the whole country is available at individual level. The cultural tendencies of individuals living in the same country can be different than each other; as it is the same in developed countries where they accommodate various immigrants, the same event can be observed societies being in transition process and countries showing quick change like Turkey (Wasti & Erdil, 2007). In result of the first correlation analysis performed in the study, there was no significant relationship between organizational justice perception and individualism/collectivism values ($p < 0,01$). While there was not relationship found between the variables there was relationship between the sub-dimensions of the variables; this leads to think that data are interconnected and that answers are not random. In result of the runs test done, only a few individualism-collectivism value items showed range restriction. As this test could not provide enough explanations, average and standard deviation values were examined. According to this, it is remarked that there are some individuals who gave the same answers in the data set. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to continue the analyses at the basis of dimension. This result reminds the study of Lam et al. (2002), where no relationship was found between these variables. By the result of the ANOVA analysis, it was found that a low relationship between individualism/collectivism and the perception of organizational justice as well as between collectivism and distributive justice perception. Besides, again a low relationship was seen between individualism and interactional justice.

The low relationship between collectivism value and distributive justice dimension is found according to 0,01 significance level. This finding is such as to support the literature. Namely, the individual having collectivism value is loyal to his/her organization which can be defined as internal group instead of his/her career or his/her job (Clugston, 2000); he/she pays attention to the group. The individuals having this value will extremely attach importance to the equal resource distribution to all members of the group; because giving decisions with the distributive justice will ensure the avoiding of the systematic discrimination against people because of subjective decisions based on various features like age, gender, race and religion (Colquitt & Chertkoff, 2002). Besides, low relationship between individualism value and interactional justice dimension was observed in this study according to 0,05 significance level. Hence, for example, if a person having individualist value thinks he/she is subjected to a different treatment in the implementation of operational justice, his/her injustice perception will increase. The interaction justice deals with interpersonal relationships and is related to how will the behavior from top to subordinate be perceived during the decision making process. In case the directors behave in respectful manner to their employees, are sensitive to them and they share fairly their logical explanations about the decision taken, the interaction justice of employees may increase (Colquitt, 2001). Analysis done to see if the dimensions of organizational justice perception and individualism/collectivism values change or not according to various demographic variables. Accordingly, only at the title, there is a significant difference between groups at interactional justice and individualism values for $p < 0,05$. In the individualism tendency, significant differences were determined between the groups of Associate Professors and Assistant Professors; Associate Professors and Research Assistants; Assistant Professors and Lecturers; and also between the groups of Lecturers and Research Assistants and Lecturers and Teaching Assistants.

The individualism tendency may be formed with the effect of genetic, environmental, social learning factors. Set aside the genetic features, the titles of academicians may give clues about their status, their expectations from future, their experiences and their perspective about their needs of their positions. However, it would be wrong to generalize on this matter. Regarding the perception of interactional

justice, a significant difference was found between the groups of Teaching Assistants and Assistant Professors; and between Teaching Assistants and Associate Professors. The interactional justice is a term involving the sufficiency of the explanations made relating to the official decisions and the sensitivity in interpersonal relationships. The first item involves the criteria concerning the respect and kindness in the relationships. Whereas the explanations ensure the knowledge and reasons concerning why the events have developed in such a way (Cropanzano & Folger, 1998). The difference between the opinions about these two expectations according to the title may be based on the status and power distance. In countries like Turkey where power distance is high, people pay attention to values like harmony, respect to authority and more likely to accept the inequalities (Hofstede, 1980). Thus, people having power may be in expectation of this kind. In this case, considering from the interactional justice, it is understandable to have perception differences between people who have power and those who are affected by that. In result of the regression analysis conducted, it is occurred that as much as procedural justice increases the collectivism feature increases and that in similar way as much as distributive justice increases collectivism feature increases. It was also put forward that among demographic features, only the title variable gives differences between the interactional justice and individualism. However, this study has some limitations. The study was conducted with 133 academicians at only one university. Furthermore, the study examined only two individual values without taking sub-dimensions into consideration. It is thought that better results would be obtained by conducting the study on a large sample at different universities as interdisciplinary research (for example; studies of psychology and business administration or social psychology and business administration).

5. Conclusion

The researches in the literature showed that individualism and collectivism are observed in the values, behaviors and/or attitudes of person. This is seen in organizations with reference to the justice perception. About this connection, many studies were done investigating the relationship between the values of individuals and the perceived organizational justice. However, none of the results demonstrated that cultural value dimensions such as collectivism or individualism underlay the cross-cultural differences they observed. Moreover, the cultural tendencies of individuals living in the same country may differ from each other. And it would be important to measure the cultural values at individual level in order to understand the social-psychological processes at that level in Turkey as having heterogeneous structure of the society. From this point of view, in this study, the relationships between the individualism-collectivism values emphasized the necessity of discussing at individual level and perceived organizational justice was examined. Low relationship between individualism and interactional justice dimension was found as well as between collectivism and distributive justice dimension. Besides, as much as procedural justice increases the collectivism feature increases. In similar way, as much as distributive justice increases collectivism aspect increases, too. And, according to title statistically significant difference between employees' perceptions of organizational justice and individualism-collectivism values was found. Considering from linear logic for the workplaces, it is expected that assessments of facts and events employees experience at work as well as their perception of justice from that perspective of people having individualist personality tendency are different than people having collectivist personality tendency. According to this, mainly it is thought that managers would identify and be applied strategies, behave employees, and motivate them.

Recommendations: The study was conducted with 133 academicians at only one university. Furthermore, the study examined only two individual values without taking sub-dimensions into consideration. For future researches, it is thought that better results would be obtained by conducting the study on a large sample at different universities as interdisciplinary research (for example; studies of psychology and business administration or social psychology and business administration).

References

- Berry, J. B. , Portinga, Y. H., Marshall, H. S. & Dosen, P. R. (1992). *Cross Cultural Psychology Research and Applications*, Cambridge University Press.
- Beugre, C. D. (2002). Understanding Organizational Justice and Its Impact on Managing Employees: An African Perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(7), 1091-1104.

- Beugre, C. D.(1998). *Managing Fairness in Organizations*. Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, CT, USA.
- Bobko, P. (2001). *Correlation and Regression: Applications for Industrial Organizational Psychology and Management*. SAGE Publications.
- Clugston, M. (2000), The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 477-486.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Paul Spector, P. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A. & Chertkoff, J. M. (2002). Explaining Injustice: The Interactive Effect Of Explanation And Outcome On Fairness Perceptions And Task Motivation. *Journal of Management*, 28(5), 591-610.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A.,Conlon, D. E.,Wesson, M. J.,Porter, C. O. L. H., 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.
- Cropanzona, R. & Folger, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. London: Sage Publications.
- De Cremer, D. (2002). The Self-Relevant Implications of Distribution Rules: When Self-Esteem and Acceptance Are Influenced by Violations of Equity Rule. *Social Justice Research*, 15(4), 327-339.
- Dhanasarnsilp, P., Johnson, H. & Chaipoopirutana, S. (2006). An Investigation of Work Values and Resulting Job Satisfaction in Relation to Two Work Roles in Thailand. *The Business Review*, 5(1), 161-170.
- Dieckmann, K. A., Zoe I. B. & Haris, S. (2004). Uncertainty, Fairness Perceptions, and Job Satisfaction: A Field Study. *Social Justice Research*, 7(3), 237-255.
- Feather, N. T. (1994). Human Values and Their Relation to Justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 129-151.
- Folger, R. & Konovski, M. A. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice On Reactions To Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 111-130.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday,Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction tounderpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*,12 (1), 9-22.
- Gudykunst, W. B. & Lee, C. M. (2003). Assessing the validity of self-construal scales: A response to Levine et al. *Human Communication Research*, 29(2), 253-274.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture Consequences; Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Accross Nations*. Second Editions, Sage Publications Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 2, 42-63.
- Johnson, R. E., Selenta C. & Lord, R. G. (2005). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet: consequences for the organization and its memers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 175-201.
- Lam,S. S. K., Schaubroeck, J. & Aryee, S. (2002). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 1-18.
- Lipponen, J., Olkkonen, M. E. & Myyry, L. (2004). Personal Value Orientation as a Moderator in the Relationships Between Perceived Organizational Justice and its Hypothesized Consequences. *Social Justice Research*, 17(3), 275–292.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98 (2), 224-253.
- Meglino, B. M. & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual Values in Organizations: Concepts, Controversies Research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.
- Montada, L. (1998). Justice:Just a rational choice? *Social Justice Research*, 11, 81-101.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Olkkonen, M. E. & Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationship between organizational justice, identification with Organization and work Unit, and group-related outcoes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 202-215.

- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 12)*. Open University Press.
- Ployhart, R. E. & Ryan, A. M. (1997). Toward An Explanation of Applicant Reactions: An Examination of Organizational Justice and Attribution Frameworks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 72(3), 308-335.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The Five Factor Model of Personality and Job Performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30-43.
- Scandura, T. A. (1999). Rethinking Leader-Member Exchange: An Organizational Justice Perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1), 25-40.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S. & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 240-275.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent selfconstruals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580-591.
- Skitka, L. J. & Mullen, E. (2002). Understanding judgments of fairness in a real-world political context: A test of the value protection model of justice reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1419 - 1429.
- Triandis, H. C. & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (1), 118-128.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tyler, R. T. & Blader, S. L. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Wasti, A. & Erdil, S. E. (2007). Bireycilik ve Toplulukçuluk Değerlerinin Ölçülmesi: Benlik Kurgusu ve Indcol Ölçeklerinin Türkçe Geçerlemesi. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1-2), 39-66.