The Effect of Organizational Justice Perception on Employee Motivation in Business Life and a Research

1. Introduction

In today's business world, technological developments and globalization makes the effects of the competitive environment felt intensely. Organizations need to take various strategic steps to ensure an advantage in the increasingly competitive environment. Increasing employee satisfaction and productivity make significant contributions to institutions under these competitive conditions. Organizations that wish to have more efficient employees and gain superiority in the competitive environment offer various compensations to their employees. The fairness in the distribution of these compensations is as important as the compensations themselves. In today's circumstances, the perception of justice affects employees both physiologically and psychologically. The perceived justice within the organization affects the quality of work life as well as the motivation of the employees.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Concept, Definition, and Dimensions of Organizational Justice

The concept of justice has unwritten rules and sanctions that have emerged through traditions, customs, and social behavior throughout human history.

With the spread of humanity and formation of states, laws were put into writing, thus securing the concept of justice. The communication of people with each other and how available resources should be allocated have been discussed in studies on this subject (Arabacı, 2019: 30). Aristotle explains justice in more than one sense and argues that it is necessary to explain justice along with the concept of injustice. According to Aristotle, while justice constitutes the entirety of virtue, injustice constitutes the entirety of evil (Babür, 2012: 5-10).

The concept of justice in organizations encompasses a different understanding than this general understanding of justice. Communities that come together with a common goal create organizations. The expectations of the employees and employers and the work environments in which they will carry out their activities constitute the basis of organizational life. Organizations are the institutions that provide this environment for the employees. Organizations have realized how the critical issues of managerial problems are in their work environments. As a result, in order to understand the attitudes and behaviors of the employees, the justice in the organization has been taken into consideration together with the concept of social justice, but the focus has been on the justice that occurs in the structure of the organization, not on the part that is protected by laws.

The concept that organizations should consider important in order to successfully continue their activities is justice. Organizational justice is defined as the division of the justice within the organization with the individual evaluation...
degrees of the employees regarding the outputs and the implementation of the correct stages in the allocation of the outputs by the employers (Masterson, Taylor, Lewis, & Goldman, 2000: 738-748).

In this context, organizational justice is important not only for employers but also for employees and organizations. It is important for employees because it affects their motivation and increases their organizational commitment. Employees who feel safe and valued in an environment embrace the organizations in which they work, and this reflects positively on their attitudes and behaviors within the organization. Considering this, organizational justice is important for managers, because as the exchange of ideas between management and employees increases, this results in an increase in motivation-based performance.

Although the boundaries of the theories about justice are not clear in the literature, it is seen that various types of justice and various theories related to them have been developed. This study examines three dimensions of organizational justice.

Distributive Justice is the fair distribution of all compensations such as promotion, training, wage, reward, punishment by employers and employees' perception of fairness about these distributions. Distributive justice is a form of justice that provides employees with access to certain rewards and guarantees these rewards, provided that they have certain actions and behaviors. It is the way that all kinds of compensations such as reward, punishment, and promotion are perceived as fair by the employees (İşcan and Naktiyok, 2004: 183). How and in what direction the distributions within the organization are made is another important issue. It is possible to apply distributive justice through 3 basic elements in this way. These three basic elements are (Greenberg, 1987: 9-22):

- Equity (Fairness): The compensations should be equivalent to the contribution of the employees.
- Equality: It is when all the employees have an equal opportunity to the compensations.
- Needs: The compensations are rewarded by considering the needs of the employees.

Adams emphasized 6 important elements that can be applied to eliminate the inequality that occurs among employees. These elements can be listed as follows (Moorhead and Griffin, 1989: 137, Arnold and Feldman, 1986: 62-64); Employees can change their own contributions; they can work more or less for their job. Just as they can change their contributions, they can also set their own expectations such as wages and promotions. Instead of changing their contributions, they can also change their way of thinking. They can change their thoughts and perceptions of other employees. When the employees see that there is an inequality between themselves and the other employee with whom they compare themselves for various reasons, they can choose to compare themselves with another employee in order to psychologically relieve themselves.

- Finally, employees can leave their current position and situation.

Procedural Justice focuses on how the distribution is made rather than the distribution itself. In this way, it explains the points that distributive justice cannot explain. Negative perceptions of procedural justice will lead to negative attitudes and behaviors in employees as well, damaging their organizational commitment and decreasing their motivation. For this reason, while making decisions concerning the employees, the procedures and methods applied should be explained to the employees and their opinions should be taken. If we look at the importance of procedural justice for employees and managers in this way, the most important thing about it is that even when the decisions taken are unfair, they cannot be reacted to.

Interactional justice is a type of justice that examines the dimensions of the relationships between the people who manage the processes within the organization and the employees. During the implementation phase of the procedures, what attitudes and behaviors employees are exposed to by their managers and the role this has in the perception of justice are very important (İyigün, 2012: 59). Interactional justice explains the communication between managers and employees and how this communication should be (Serinkan & Erdiş, 2014: 123). As such, it focuses on the humanitarian aspect of justice. The purpose of interactional justice is to provide justice within the organization. The outline of interactional justice is determined not only through decision-making processes but also through positive communication (Karaeminoğulları, 2006: 19, Taşkıran, 2011: 109, Barling and Phillips, 1993: 649-656). Being respectful and kind to employees, showing that they are valued, and the quality of the established communication are also aspects of this concept of justice. Employees who see that they are treated with tolerance, they are included in the processes, and their personal interests are protected will not have difficulty in embracing the decisions taken by the managers (Karaeminoğulları, 2006: 19).

3. Concept, Definition, and Importance of Motivation

Motivation is a process that makes people take action to achieve certain goals. Organizational motivation sets the level of employee performance. Motivation is the energy needed to willingly take action in line with the desire to achieve a certain goal. In its simplest definition, it is directing one’s behavior in the desired direction.

From an individual aspect, motivation is a personal process in which the individuals are motivated only by their own drives. From an organizational aspect, motivation can be explained as gaining benefits for both the organization and the employee by establishing a link between the objectives of the employees and the objectives of the organization (Karadağ, İşık, Akbolat, & Çelen, 2015: 313).

In order to increase productivity within the organization, the motivation of the employees needs to be increased by the management. Managers who want to motivate their employees should pay attention to their training and development and take actions that support this (Koçak, 2011: 43, Akbaş, 2007: 14). Motivation is the most important factor that determines the performance of the employees (Semerci, 2005: 9). Managers who want to achieve their goals
need to give importance to their employees’ motivation in order to ensure that they work willingly so that this leads to a high level of performance, and therefore, to a high level of outturn. At this point, managers should follow up with their employees and not depend on a single factor for motivation. The level of employee motivation is important for the organization to achieve its goals.

Organizations that give importance to motivation and work on it achieve success. Employees who perform tasks with high level of motivation will focus on their work since they will already have embraced the goals set by the organization (Manzoor, 2012: 3). If the managers cannot motivate their employees, financial losses will occur due to decrease in efficiency. Another issue that should be given importance at this point is providing an appropriate work environment where the employees can use all their knowledge and experience for the purposes of the organization.

Motivation is a process that occurs with a disruption in psychological and physiological balance, takes place within a certain period of time and through certain stages that interact with each other. The process of motivation consists of several stages. The following factors are important in this process (Güney, 2015: 259):

- Needs: These are all the psychological and social factors needed to ensure harmony with the environment.
- Drive: It is the desire to take action in order to meet the needs. As the needs emerge, a desire to take action in order to meet them will occur in the employees. They will begin to have behaviors towards achieving this goal.
- Satisfaction: Satisfaction is the last stage of motivation. Satisfaction occurs when the needs are met at the desired level. Employees whose needs are met will be satisfied and happy. If the needs are not met, the employees who cannot reach satisfaction will be unhappy. The productivity of unhappy employees will decrease.

Employees' personality traits, social and cultural differences have lead to an increase in motivational factors in organizations. The motivation techniques applied do not have the same effect on each employee. For this reason, it is seen that more than one motivation technique is applied in organizations. There are some points that need to be considered when applying motivational factors. These can be listed as follows;

- The result desired from motivation should be determined,
- The people to be motivated should be clarified,
- The tools to motivate and how these tools will be implemented should be determined,

3.1. Evaluation Should Be Made After the Implementation

The organizations that are aware of the importance of this conduct analyses in order to increase motivation and use appropriate motivation techniques and tools for their employees. Managers should also consider the needs of employees when choosing motivational tools. Because employees get motivated and make efforts in accordance with their needs. Motivational factors can consist of economic, social, and organizational tools (Sabuncuoglu and Tuz, 1996: 107-108). Personality traits, expectations, and abilities of employees are different from each other. Therefore, the factors that motivate them will be different from each other. The managers’ duty is to identify the characteristics of each employee, determine the appropriate factors, and establish a strong communication.

4. Research

4.1. Objective and Importance of the Study

In today's business world, technological developments and globalization makes the effects of the competitive environment felt intensely. Organizations need to take various strategic steps to ensure an advantage in the increasingly competitive environment. Increasing employee satisfaction and productivity make significant contributions to institutions under these competitive conditions. Organizations offer various compensations in order to ensure higher efficiency from their employees. The fairness of the distribution of these compensations is important. The sense of justice perceived within the organization directly affects the motivation of the employees. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of justice perception on employee motivation in organizations that wish to obtain high efficiency from employees and want to gain superiority in the competitive environment.

4.2. Population and Sample of the Study

The sample of the research consists of 208 individuals who were reached through random sampling method from those who work in the aviation industry. Although the aim was to reach 400 participants, feedback could only be received from 208 people to participate in the research due to the current worldwide pandemic and time constraints. The fact that 208 people who participated in the study work in various departments indicates that the results have the potential to represent the entire population. In order to achieve this diversity, opinions of a high number of managers and employees have been evaluated.

4.3. Data Collection Method

In this study, survey method has been used as data collection tool. The survey consists of three sections. In the first section, there are personal information questions in order to reach data regarding the demographic characteristics of the aviation sector employees. In the second section, the organizational justice perception scale has been used to measure the organizational justice perception levels of the employees. In the third section, motivation scale has been used to identify its effect on employee motivation.
4.4. Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the research are given below.

- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by gender.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by gender.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by gender.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by gender.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by gender.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by gender.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by marital status.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by marital status.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by marital status.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by marital status.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by marital status.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by marital status.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by age.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by age.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by age.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by age.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by age.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by age.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by title.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by title.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by title.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by title.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by title.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by title.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by income.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by income.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by income.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by income.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by income.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by income.
- H1: Procedural justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H2: Distributive justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H3: Interactional justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H4: Organizational justice perceptions of the participants differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H5: Participants’ perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H6: Participants’ perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H7: Participants’ perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H8: Participants’ perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.
- H9: Participants’ perceptions of motivation differ significantly by time spent in the occupation.

Vol 9 Issue 5 | DOI No.: 10.24940/theijbm/2021/v9/i5/BM2105-077 | May, 2021

448
- H5: Participants' perceptions of relationships with managers differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H6: Participants' perceptions of the wage system differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H7: Participants' perceptions of the decision-making process differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H8: Participants' perceptions of the incentive and evaluation system differ significantly by time spent in the institution.
- H9: Participants' perceptions of motivation differ significantly by time spent in the institution.

4.5. Data Analysis

In the selection of the analysis methods to be used, the results of the normality analysis were taken as a basis. According to the Shapiro-Wilk W test applied in the study, the hypothesis 'H1: the distribution of the variable is not normal' was accepted and non-parametric tests were applied. In the research, Correlation Test and Regression Analysis have been used. In addition, Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.938 for organizational justice and 0.973 for motivation as a result of reliability analysis. In the survey, 7 questions were asked to the participants in order to identify their demographic characteristics. The analysis table regarding the answers is given below.

|                          | n  | %   |
|--------------------------|----|-----|
| **Gender**               |    |     |
| Female                   | 112| 53.8|
| Male                     | 96 | 46.2|
| **Marital Status**       |    |     |
| Single                   | 101| 48.6|
| Married                  | 107| 51.4|
| **Age**                  |    |     |
| 25 or below              | 25 | 12  |
| 26-30                    | 77 | 37  |
| 31-35                    | 51 | 24.5|
| 36-40                    | 17 | 8.2 |
| 41-45                    | 14 | 6.7 |
| 46 or above              | 24 | 11.5|
| **Title**                |    |     |
| Official                 | 58 | 27.9|
| Engineer                 | 36 | 17.3|
| Chief                    | 36 | 17.3|
| Technician               | 14 | 6.7 |
| Specialist               | 64 | 30.8|
| **Income Status**        |    |     |
| 2500-3500                | 42 | 20.2|
| 3501-5500                | 82 | 39.4|
| 5501-7500                | 49 | 23.6|
| 7501-9500                | 16 | 7.7 |
| 9501 or above            | 19 | 9.1 |
| **Total time in the occupation** |    |     |
| 1-3 years                | 48 | 23.1|
| 4-7 years                | 77 | 37  |
| 8-11 years               | 29 | 13.9|
| 12-15 years              | 18 | 8.7 |
| 16 years or above        | 36 | 17.3|
| **Total time in the institution** |    |     |
| 1-3 years                | 78 | 37.5|
| 4-7 years                | 75 | 36.1|
| 8-11 years               | 24 | 11.5|
| 12-15 years              | 11 | 5.3 |
| 16 years or above        | 20 | 9.6 |

*Table 1: Analyses of Demographic Information*
When the analysis is examined in general, it is seen that the majority of the participants are women, they are between the ages of 26-30, married, specialists, have an income of 3501-5500, spent 4-7 years in the occupation, and 1-3 years at the institution.

4.6. Analysis of Hypotheses Related to Demographic Variables

'Normality Test' was used to decide on parametric or nonparametric tests for the analysis of the hypotheses related to demographic variables. For this test, hypotheses are established as H0: With 95% confidence level, the data is not normally distributed and H1: With 95% confidence, the data is normally distributed. Whether the established hypotheses have normal distribution is examined according to the results of 'Kolmogorov-Smirnov' and 'Shapiro-Wilk' tests.

It is seen that there are two different tests in Table 2. One of them is 'Kolmogorov Smirnov,' the other is 'Shapiro-Wilk' test. Although making a decision based on the results of the ‘Shapiro-Wilk’ test, which is one of the normality tests, is considered more reliable, it is acceptable based on the results of both tests. If the results of the tests are different, it is possible to apply both parametric and non-parametric tests.

4.7. Analyses Regarding the Gender Variable

The results of the normality test for the gender variable are given in Table 2.

| Tests of Normality | Gender: | Kolmogorov-Smirnov* | Shapiro-Wilk |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|
|                    | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Procedural Justice | Female | .074 | 112 | .168 | .980 | 112 | .100 |
|                    | Male | .102 | 96 | .016 | .969 | 96 | .021 |
| Distributive Justice | Female | .159 | 112 | .000 | .937 | 112 | .000 |
|                    | Male | .124 | 96 | .001 | .947 | 96 | .001 |
| Interactional Justice | Female | .134 | 112 | .000 | .932 | 112 | .000 |
|                    | Male | .137 | 96 | .000 | .942 | 96 | .000 |
| Justice in General | Female | .075 | 112 | .150 | .972 | 112 | .019 |
|                    | Male | .100 | 96 | .020 | .972 | 96 | .037 |
| Relationships with Managers | Female | .167 | 112 | .000 | .928 | 112 | .000 |
|                    | Male | .175 | 96 | .000 | .921 | 96 | .000 |
| Wage System | Female | .160 | 112 | .000 | .921 | 112 | .000 |
|                    | Male | .088 | 96 | .064 | .959 | 96 | .004 |
| Decision Making Process | Female | .087 | 112 | .038 | .962 | 112 | .003 |
|                    | Male | .142 | 96 | .000 | .951 | 96 | .001 |
| Incentive and Evaluation System | Female | .091 | 112 | .025 | .958 | 112 | .001 |
|                    | Male | .116 | 96 | .003 | .956 | 96 | .003 |
| Motivation in General | Female | .064 | 112 | .200* | .987 | 112 | .357 |
|                    | Male | .102 | 96 | .015 | .966 | 96 | .013 |

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 2: Tests of Normality for Gender Variable

When The Table Is Examined, It Is Seen That the Perceived Organizational Justice, Motivation and Subdimension Scores Do Not Have Normal Distribution by Gender (P<.05)

4.8. Comparison of Scores According to the Gender Variable

Comparison of scores according to the gender variable is given in Table 3.
| Subdimension       | Gender | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Median | Min  | Max  | Mean Ranks | U   | sig  |
|--------------------|--------|-------|----------------|--------|------|------|------------|-----|------|
| Procedural Justice | Female | 3.27  | 0.89           | 3.14   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 105.15     | 5303.5 | 0.867 |
|                    | Male   | 3.21  | 0.97           | 3.29   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 103.74     |      |      |
| Distributive Justice | Female | 3.15  | 1.22           | 3.13   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 100.66     | 4945.5 | 0.317 |
|                    | Male   | 3.33  | 1.13           | 3.50   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 108.98     |      |      |
| Interactional Justice | Female | 3.44  | 0.77           | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 100.41     | 4918  | 0.289 |
|                    | Male   | 3.50  | 0.89           | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 109.27     |      |      |
| Organizational Justice | Female | 3.32  | 0.78           | 3.35   | 1.20 | 4.90 | 102.87     | 5193  | 0.672 |
|                    | Male   | 3.37  | 0.79           | 3.53   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 106.41     |      |      |
| Relationships with Managers | Female | 3.37  | 0.81           | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 98.08      | 4657.5 | 0.096 |
|                    | Male   | 3.48  | 1.03           | 3.89   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 111.98     |      |      |
| Wage System | Female | 2.34  | 1.08           | 2.00   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 98.42      | 4695  | 0.114 |
|                    | Male   | 2.56  | 1.06           | 2.60   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 111.59     |      |      |
| Decision Making Process | Female | 3.14  | 0.96           | 3.22   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 98.97      | 4756.5 | 0.152 |
|                    | Male   | 3.34  | 0.91           | 3.44   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 110.95     |      |      |
| Incentive and Evaluation System | Female | 2.75  | 1.08           | 2.86   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 104.51     | 5375  | 0.998 |
|                    | Male   | 2.75  | 1.04           | 2.71   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 104.49     |      |      |
| Motivation | Female | 2.98  | 0.86           | 3.02   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 99.34      | 4798.5 | 0.182 |
|                    | Male   | 3.12  | 0.87           | 3.28   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 110.52     |      |      |

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not significantly differ by gender (p>.05). The perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores of women and men are similar to each other. According to this result, it can be said that there is no gender discrimination within the organization.

4.9. Analyses Regarding the Marital Status

The results of the normality test for the marital status variable are given in Table 4.
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by marital status (p<.05).

4.10. Comparison of Scores According to the Marital Status Variable

Comparison of scores according to the marital status variable is given in Table 5.

| Subdimension                       | Marital Status | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Median | Min  | Max  | Mean Ranks | U    | sig  |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|--------|------|------|------------|------|------|
| Procedural Justice                 | Single        | 3.25  | 0.94          | 3.29   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 104.34     | 5387.5 | 0.971|
|                                   | Married       | 3.23  | 0.91          | 3.43   | 1.29 | 4.71 | 104.65     |       |      |
| Distributive Justice              | Single        | 3.07  | 1.17          | 3.00   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 95.64      | 4508.5 | 0.038|
|                                   | Married       | 3.39  | 1.18          | 3.75   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 112.86     |       |      |
| Interactional Justice             | Single        | 3.54  | 0.81          | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 109.23     | 4926  | 0.27 |
|                                   | Married       | 3.40  | 0.84          | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 100.04     |       |      |
| Organizational Justice            | Single        | 3.35  | 0.78          | 3.35   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 103.27     | 5279  | 0.774|
|                                   | Married       | 3.34  | 0.79          | 3.45   | 1.20 | 4.90 | 105.66     |       |      |
| Relationships with Managers       | Single        | 3.44  | 0.96          | 3.67   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 103.98     | 5350.5 | 0.902|
|                                   | Married       | 3.40  | 0.88          | 3.78   | 1.00 | 4.78 | 105.00     |       |      |
| Wage System                       | Single        | 2.44  | 1.10          | 2.20   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 103.24     | 5276.5 | 0.769|
|                                   | Married       | 2.45  | 1.05          | 2.20   | 1.00 | 4.80 | 105.69     |       |      |
| Decision Making Process           | Single        | 3.28  | 0.97          | 3.33   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 106.37     | 5214.5 | 0.663|
|                                   | Married       | 3.19  | 0.91          | 3.44   | 1.00 | 4.89 | 102.73     |       |      |
| Incentive and Evaluation System   | Single        | 2.82  | 1.06          | 2.86   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 108.27     | 5022.5 | 0.378|
|                                   | Married       | 2.69  | 1.06          | 2.71   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 100.94     |       |      |
| Motivation                        | Single        | 3.08  | 0.89          | 3.20   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 106.04     | 5248  | 0.72 |
|                                   | Married       | 3.01  | 0.84          | 3.07   | 1.00 | 4.53 | 103.05     |       |      |

Table 5: Comparison of Scores According to the Marital Status Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference only in the perceived distributive justice (p <.05). The perceived distributive justice median of the married participants was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the single ones. For all other dimensions there is no difference by marital status. It can be said that the married people attach more importance to the fairness of their compensations in return for their efforts, since they have more responsibilities.

4.11. Analyses Regarding the Age Variable

The results of the normality test for the age variable are given in Table 6.
### Tests of Normality

| Age: | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | Shapiro-Wilk |
|------|---------------------|--------------|
|      | Statistic | df  | Sig. | Statistic | df  | Sig. |
| **Procedural Justice** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .135 | 25 | .200* | .954 | 25 | .304 |
| 26-30 | .121 | 77 | .007 | .963 | 77 | .025 |
| 31-35 | .108 | 51 | .189 | .964 | 51 | .124 |
| 36-40 | .170 | 17 | .200* | .915 | 17 | .123 |
| 41-45 | .212 | 14 | .089 | .927 | 14 | .273 |
| 46 or above | .150 | 24 | .172 | .969 | 24 | .649 |
| **Distributive Justice** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .164 | 25 | .080 | .949 | 25 | .232 |
| 26-30 | .126 | 77 | .004 | .928 | 77 | .000 |
| 31-35 | .205 | 51 | .000 | .922 | 51 | .003 |
| 36-40 | .188 | 17 | .113 | .880 | 17 | .032 |
| 41-45 | .191 | 14 | .177 | .945 | 14 | .490 |
| 46 or above | .106 | 24 | .200* | .965 | 24 | .556 |
| **Interactional Justice** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .148 | 25 | .162 | .947 | 25 | .216 |
| 26-30 | .160 | 77 | .000 | .933 | 77 | .001 |
| 31-35 | .200 | 51 | .000 | .915 | 51 | .001 |
| 36-40 | .182 | 17 | .136 | .901 | 17 | .071 |
| 41-45 | .174 | 14 | .200* | .950 | 14 | .559 |
| 46 or above | .154 | 24 | .200* | .952 | 24 | .297 |
| **Organizational Justice** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .129 | 25 | .200* | .947 | 25 | .215 |
| 26-30 | .085 | 77 | .200* | .968 | 77 | .051 |
| 31-35 | .141 | 51 | .013 | .945 | 51 | .020 |
| 36-40 | .177 | 17 | .160 | .901 | 17 | .069 |
| 41-45 | .171 | 14 | .200* | .962 | 14 | .757 |
| 46 or above | .132 | 24 | .200* | .970 | 24 | .677 |
| **Relationships with Managers** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .176 | 25 | .045 | .926 | 25 | .072 |
| 26-30 | .145 | 77 | .000 | .951 | 77 | .005 |
| 31-35 | .216 | 51 | .000 | .877 | 51 | .000 |
| 36-40 | .203 | 17 | .060 | .843 | 17 | .099 |
| 41-45 | .298 | 14 | .001 | .817 | 14 | .008 |
| 46 or above | .147 | 24 | .195 | .914 | 24 | .044 |
| **Wage System** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .205 | 25 | .008 | .882 | 25 | .008 |
| 26-30 | .115 | 77 | .014 | .937 | 77 | .001 |
| 31-35 | .135 | 51 | .022 | .904 | 51 | .001 |
| 36-40 | .130 | 17 | .200* | .924 | 17 | .173 |
| 41-45 | .173 | 14 | .200* | .905 | 14 | .135 |
| 46 or above | .189 | 24 | .026 | .944 | 24 | .197 |
| **Decision Making Process** | | | | | | |
| 25 or below | .164 | 25 | .079 | .931 | 25 | .091 |
| 26-30 | .092 | 77 | .172 | .962 | 77 | .022 |
| 31-35 | .114 | 51 | .093 | .943 | 51 | .016 |
| 36-40 | .149 | 17 | .200* | .894 | 17 | .054 |
| 41-45 | .165 | 14 | .200* | .934 | 14 | .352 |
Incentive and Evaluation System

| Age                | Mean | Std Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig  | Difference |
|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|-----|-----|------------|------------|------|------------|
| 25 or below        | .159 | 25            | .101   | .942| 25  | .163       |            |      |            |
| 26-30              | .104 | 77            | .039   | .969| 77  | .056       |            |      |            |
| 31-35              | .125 | 51            | .044   | .910| 51  | .001       |            |      |            |
| 36-40              | .141 | 17            | .200   | .907| 17  | .088       |            |      |            |
| 41-45              | .193 | 14            | .168   | .884| 14  | .067       |            |      |            |
| 46 or above        | .122 | 24            | .200   | .937| 24  | .142       |            |      |            |

Motivation

| Age                | Mean | Std Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig  | Difference |
|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|-----|-----|------------|------------|------|------------|
| 25 or below        | .135 | 25            | .200   | .983| 25  | .936       |            |      |            |
| 26-30              | .076 | 77            | .200   | .982| 77  | .328       |            |      |            |
| 31-35              | .082 | 51            | .200   | .959| 51  | .076       |            |      |            |
| 36-40              | .159 | 17            | .872   | 17  | .042  |          |            |      |            |
| 41-45              | .126 | 14            | .200   | .952| 14  | .585       |            |      |            |
| 46 or above        | .162 | 24            | .200   | .949| 24  | .253       |            |      |            |

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 6: Tests of Normality for Age Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by age groups (p<.05).

4.12. Comparison of Scores According to the Age Variable

Comparison of scores according to the age variable is given in Table 7.
When the table is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference only in perceived procedural justice \((p < .05)\). The median of procedural justice perception of employees in the 26-30 age group was found to be statistically and significantly higher than compared to those aged 46 or above. There is no difference by age groups in any other dimensions. The fact that young employees are open to innovations and can take risks more easily than older employees greatly affect their commitment to work. It increases the motivation of young employees, who are highly motivated when they start working, to improve their justice perception and promotion opportunities within the organization. Employees aged 46 or above have come to a certain age and attach importance to wage increases and other compensations within the organization as a result of their experience, as most of their expectations have come true compared to young employees in the 26-30 age group. Employee satisfaction decreases in those who cannot achieve the expected compensations and those who are older, feel that they are not treated fairly, and they do not have a voice in the processes compared to the employees who are newly recruited with the same status.

### Table 7: Comparison of Scores According to the Age Variable

| Relationships with Managers | 36-40 | 3.61 | 0.79 | 3.78 | 1.44 | 5.00 | 111.14 | 26-30 | 3.50 | 0.96 | 3.78 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 110.06 | 31-35 | 3.37 | 0.85 | 3.78 | 1.11 | 4.22 | 86.74 | 36-40 | 3.07 | 1.11 | 3.33 | 1.00 | 4.40 | 73.23 | 41-45 | 3.64 | 0.78 | 3.89 | 2.11 | 4.56 | 120.29 | >46 | 3.19 | 0.93 | 3.39 | 1.22 | 4.85 | 90.44 |
|-----------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| Wage System                 | < 25  | 3.25 | 0.93 | 2.80 | 1.00 | 3.60 | 100.70 | 26-30 | 2.52 | 1.16 | 2.40 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 107.55 | 31-35 | 2.43 | 1.17 | 2.20 | 1.00 | 4.60 | 103.08 | 36-40 | 2.26 | 0.99 | 2.20 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 95.56 | 41-45 | 2.70 | 1.06 | 2.60 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 119.32 | >46 | 2.31 | 0.82 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 99.40 |
| Decision Making Process     | < 25  | 3.18 | 0.89 | 3.33 | 1.78 | 5.00 | 98.88 | 26-30 | 3.38 | 0.93 | 3.44 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 113.05 | 31-35 | 3.21 | 0.94 | 3.44 | 1.44 | 5.00 | 103.09 | 36-40 | 3.11 | 1.23 | 3.22 | 1.00 | 4.67 | 102.97 | 41-45 | 3.55 | 0.36 | 3.56 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 121.96 | >46 | 2.79 | 0.94 | 3.06 | 1.00 | 4.11 | 76.81 |
| Incentive and Evaluation System | < 25  | 3.06 | 1.11 | 3.14 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 122.40 | 26-30 | 2.83 | 1.05 | 2.57 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 106.89 | 31-35 | 2.61 | 1.11 | 2.57 | 1.00 | 4.29 | 98.13 | 36-40 | 2.68 | 1.12 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 4.14 | 103.00 | 41-45 | 3.10 | 0.77 | 3.00 | 1.86 | 4.00 | 124.25 | >46 | 2.35 | 0.94 | 2.36 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 81.27 |
| Motivation                  | < 25  | 3.14 | 0.79 | 3.23 | 1.37 | 4.73 | 108.98 | 26-30 | 3.14 | 0.89 | 3.30 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 110.92 | 31-35 | 2.98 | 0.87 | 3.07 | 1.37 | 4.63 | 100.52 | 36-40 | 2.85 | 1.04 | 3.20 | 1.00 | 4.07 | 98.41 | 41-45 | 3.33 | 0.50 | 3.32 | 2.47 | 4.07 | 123.64 | >46 | 2.73 | 0.78 | 2.85 | 1.37 | 4.10 | 80.83 |

4.13. Analyses Regarding the Title Variable

The results of the normality test for the title variable are given in Table 8.
| Tests of Normality | Title: | Kolmogorov-Smirnov\textsuperscript{a} | Shapiro-Wilk |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                   | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Procedural Justice | Official | .121 | 58 | .034 | .965 | 58 | .045 |
|                   | Engineer | .136 | 36 | .092 | .955 | 36 | .150 |
|                   | Chief | .091 | 36 | .200* | .959 | 36 | .206 |
|                   | Technician | .163 | 14 | .200* | .951 | 14 | .583 |
|                   | Specialist | .074 | 64 | .200* | .984 | 64 | .570 |
| Distributive Justice | Official | .151 | 58 | .002 | .934 | 58 | .004 |
|                   | Engineer | .196 | 36 | .001 | .919 | 36 | .012 |
|                   | Chief | .110 | 36 | .200* | .949 | 36 | .100 |
|                   | Technician | .177 | 14 | .200* | .892 | 14 | .087 |
|                   | Specialist | .181 | 64 | .000 | .930 | 64 | .001 |
| Interactional Justice | Official | .149 | 58 | .003 | .947 | 58 | .014 |
|                   | Engineer | .152 | 36 | .034 | .939 | 36 | .049 |
|                   | Chief | .146 | 36 | .049 | .923 | 36 | .015 |
|                   | Technician | .198 | 14 | .141 | .864 | 14 | .034 |
|                   | Specialist | .129 | 64 | .010 | .948 | 64 | .009 |
| Organizational Justice | Official | .111 | 58 | .071 | .937 | 58 | .005 |
|                   | Engineer | .111 | 36 | .200* | .956 | 36 | .157 |
|                   | Chief | .121 | 36 | .200* | .948 | 36 | .092 |
|                   | Technician | .145 | 14 | .200* | .939 | 14 | .409 |
|                   | Specialist | .062 | 64 | .200* | .990 | 64 | .877 |
| Relationships with Managers | Official | .174 | 58 | .000 | .913 | 58 | .000 |
|                   | Engineer | .124 | 36 | .181 | .947 | 36 | .083 |
|                   | Chief | .190 | 36 | .002 | .901 | 36 | .004 |
|                   | Technician | .220 | 14 | .065 | .813 | 14 | .007 |
|                   | Specialist | .146 | 64 | .002 | .946 | 64 | .007 |
| Wage System | Official | .172 | 58 | .000 | .901 | 58 | .000 |
|                   | Engineer | .177 | 36 | .006 | .888 | 36 | .002 |
|                   | Chief | .116 | 36 | .200* | .943 | 36 | .061 |
|                   | Technician | .250 | 14 | .018 | .836 | 14 | .014 |
|                   | Specialist | .102 | 64 | .093 | .960 | 64 | .036 |
| Decision Making Process | Official | .154 | 58 | .001 | .919 | 58 | .001 |
|                   | Engineer | .121 | 36 | .200* | .964 | 36 | .276 |
|                   | Chief | .126 | 36 | .160 | .948 | 36 | .088 |
|                   | Technician | .215 | 14 | .079 | .836 | 14 | .014 |
|                   | Specialist | .093 | 64 | .200* | .971 | 64 | .131 |
| Incentive and Evaluation System | Official | .106 | 58 | .167 | .956 | 58 | .033 |
|                   | Engineer | .129 | 36 | .138 | .929 | 36 | .024 |
|                   | Chief | .118 | 36 | .200* | .957 | 36 | .167 |
Technician & .141 & 14 & .200* & .926 & 14 & .271 \\
Specialist & .133 & 64 & .006 & .943 & 64 & .005 \\

| Motivation | Official | .105 & 58 & .173 & .977 & 58 & .330 \\
| Engineer | .156 & 36 & .028 & .926 & 36 & .018 \\
| Chief | .086 & 36 & .200* & .961 & 36 & .227 \\
| Technician & .265 & 14 & .008 & .842 & 14 & .017 \\
Specialist & .097 & 64 & .200* & .978 & 64 & .297 \\

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 8: Tests of Normality for Title Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by title (p<.05).

4.14. Comparison of Scores According to the Title Variable

Comparison of scores according to the title variable is given in Table 9.

| Subdimension          | Title   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig | Difference          |
|-----------------------|---------|------|----------------|--------|-----|-----|------------|------------|-----|---------------------|
| Procedural Justice    | Official | 3.28 | 0.88           | 3.43   | 1.00| 5.00| 106.39     | 13.74      | 0.008 | Specialist>Technician |
| Engineer              | 2.91    | 0.98 | 3.00           | 1.29   | 4.71| 83.82|            |            |      |                     |
| Chief                 | 3.34    | 0.98 | 3.43           | 1.29   | 5.00| 111.92|           |            |      |                     |
| Technician            | 2.60    | 0.94 | 2.71           | 1.00   | 4.00| 67.07|            |            |      |                     |
| Specialist            | 3.48    | 0.79 | 3.43           | 1.57   | 5.00| 118.44|           |            |      |                     |
| Distributive Justice  | Official | 3.59 | 1.05           | 3.88   | 1.00| 5.00| 122.78     | 19.61      | 0.001 | Specialist>Engineer |
| Engineer              | 2.61    | 1.19 | 2.13           | 1.00   | 5.00| 73.99|            |            |      |                     |
| Chief                 | 3.15    | 1.12 | 3.00           | 1.00   | 5.00| 98.96|            |            |      |                     |
| Technician            | 2.68    | 1.38 | 2.38           | 1.00   | 5.00| 77.32|            |            |      |                     |
| Specialist            | 3.43    | 1.12 | 3.75           | 1.00   | 5.00| 114.16|           |            |      |                     |
| Interactional Justice | Official | 3.46 | 0.83           | 3.67   | 1.00| 5.00| 104.10     | 9.07       | 0.059 |                     |
| Engineer              | 3.30    | 0.90 | 3.44           | 1.22   | 4.56| 93.43|            |            |      |                     |
| Chief                 | 3.39    | 0.94 | 3.44           | 1.00   | 5.00| 99.47|            |            |      |                     |
| Technician            | 3.11    | 0.80 | 3.33           | 1.56   | 3.89| 75.68|            |            |      |                     |
| Specialist            | 3.69    | 0.67 | 3.78           | 1.67   | 5.00| 120.22|           |            |      |                     |
| Organizational Justice| Official | 3.43 | 0.72           | 3.53   | 1.00| 4.40| 112.03     | 14.95      | 0.005 | Specialist>Technician |
| Engineer              | 3.03    | 0.84 | 3.00           | 1.50   | 4.40| 82.28|            |            |      |                     |
| Chief                 | 3.32    | 0.89 | 3.35           | 1.20   | 4.90| 104.79|           |            |      |                     |
| Technician            | 2.85    | 0.75 | 2.95           | 1.65   | 4.10| 66.11|            |            |      |                     |
| Specialist            | 3.56    | 0.65 | 3.60           | 2.05   | 5.00| 118.41|           |            |      |                     |
| Relationships with Managers | Official | 3.57 | 0.79           | 3.78   | 1.00| 5.00| 113.15     | 11.16      | 0.055 |                     |
| Engineer              | 3.14    | 1.02 | 2.94           | 1.44   | 5.00| 83.89|            |            |      |                     |
| Chief                 | 3.16    | 1.03 | 3.61           | 1.00   | 4.56| 91.79|            |            |      |                     |
| Technician            | 3.00    | 1.23 | 3.56           | 1.00   | 4.11| 91.14|            |            |      |                     |
| Specialist            | 3.69    | 0.71 | 3.78           | 1.22   | 5.00| 118.33|           |            |      |                     |
| Wage System           | Official | 2.16 | 0.92           | 2.00   | 1.00| 4.00| 89.84      | 17.63      | 0.001 | Specialist>Engineer |
| Engineer              | 2.10    | 1.05 | 2.00           | 1.00   | 4.60| 84.79|            |            |      |                     |
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational justice, wage system, incentive and evaluation system and motivation scores differ significantly by title (p <.05). The median of procedural justice of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as technician. The median of distributive justice of those working as specialist and official were found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The median of organizational justice of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as technician and engineer. The median of the wage system perception of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as official and engineer. The incentive and evaluation medians of those working as specialist were found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The motivation median of those working as specialist was found to be statistically and significantly higher than those working as engineer. The duties and responsibilities of employees who are specialists are less than those working as technicians and engineers. The expectations of engineers and technicians are higher due to the higher responsibilities and workloads brought about by their titles compared to the employees working as officials and specialists. When they compare their earnings with employees with lower titles, they start to think that distributions and processes are not fair. This shows us the difference by title in the perception of justice.

4.15. Analyses Regarding the Income Variable

The results of the normality test for the income variable are given in Table 10.
### Table 10: Tests of Normality for Income Variable

|                      | 7501-9500 | 9501 or above |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Interactional Justice| .177      | .906          |
|                      | .196      | .906          |
|                      | .890      | .906          |
|                      | .16       | .906          |
|                      | .056      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .912      | .906          |
|                      | .914      | .906          |
|                      | .046      | .906          |
|                      | .126      | .906          |
|                      | .089      | .906          |
|                      | .952      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .946      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .046      | .906          |
|                      | .176      | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .792      | .906          |
|                      | .146      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .941      | .906          |
|                      | .16       | .906          |
|                      | .365      | .906          |
|                      | .122      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .955      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .475      | .906          |
| Organizational Justice| .126      | .906          |
|                      | .089      | .906          |
|                      | .952      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .946      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .046      | .906          |
|                      | .176      | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .013      | .906          |
|                      | .146      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .941      | .906          |
|                      | .16       | .906          |
|                      | .365      | .906          |
|                      | .122      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .955      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .475      | .906          |
| Relationships with Managers| .189      | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .834      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .000      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .013      | .906          |
|                      | .146      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .945      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .323      | .906          |
|                      | .178      | .906          |
|                      | .114      | .906          |
|                      | .925      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .139      | .906          |
| Wage System| .129      | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .941      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .001      | .906          |
|                      | .941      | .906          |
|                      | .16       | .906          |
|                      | .545      | .906          |
|                      | .178      | .906          |
|                      | .114      | .906          |
|                      | .925      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .139      | .906          |
| Decision Making Process| .125      | .906          |
|                      | .098      | .906          |
|                      | .957      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .114      | .906          |
|                      | .129      | .906          |
|                      | .002      | .906          |
|                      | .934      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .000      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .82       | .906          |
|                      | .010      | .906          |
|                      | .959      | .906          |
|                      | .42       | .906          |
|                      | .144      | .906          |
|                      | .000      | .906          |
|                      | .939      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .037      | .906          |
|                      | .966      | .906          |
|                      | .49       | .906          |
|                      | .159      | .906          |
|                      | .196      | .906          |
|                      | .100      | .906          |
|                      | .896      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .652      | .906          |
|                      | .124      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .964      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .652      | .906          |
|                      | .183      | .906          |
|                      | .136      | .906          |
|                      | .904      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .093      | .906          |
|                      | .183      | .906          |
|                      | .092      | .906          |
|                      | .903      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .055      | .906          |
|                      | .152      | .906          |
|                      | .200*     | .906          |
|                      | .935      | .906          |
|                      | .19       | .906          |
|                      | .216      | .906          |

*: This is a lower bound of the true significance.

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by income (p<.05).

### 4.16. Comparison of Scores According to the Income Variable

Comparison of scores according to the income variable is given in Table 11.
| Subdimension          | Income Range | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean | Mean | Chi-square | sig  | Difference |
|-----------------------|--------------|------|----------------|--------|-----|-----|------|------|------------|------|------------|
| **Procedural Justice**| 2500-3500    | 3.06 | 0.98           | 3.14   | 1.00| 5.00| 93.04 |      | 4.69       | 0.320|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 3.39 | 0.82           | 3.43   | 1.00| 5.00| 113.37|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501-7500    | 3.23 | 0.97           | 3.43   | 1.43| 5.00| 104.24|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 7501-9500    | 3.28 | 1.09           | 3.50   | 1.29| 5.00| 108.63|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 9500+        | 3.00 | 0.95           | 2.86   | 1.29| 4.57| 88.76 |      |            |      |            |
| **Distributive Justice**| 2500-3500    | 3.17 | 1.02           | 3.13   | 1.00| 5.00| 100.24|      | 4.56       | 0.335|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 3.25 | 1.19           | 3.63   | 1.00| 5.00| 105.69|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501-7500    | 3.10 | 1.23           | 3.00   | 1.00| 5.00| 97.62  |      |            |      |            |
|                       | 7501-9500    | 3.78 | 1.15           | 4.00   | 1.50| 5.00| 133.09|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 9500+        | 3.16 | 1.35           | 3.00   | 1.25| 5.00| 102.45|      |            |      |            |
| **Interactional Justice**| 2500-3500   | 3.36 | 0.87           | 3.56   | 1.00| 4.56| 96.86  |      | 5.09       | 0.278|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 3.49 | 0.74           | 3.67   | 1.67| 4.56| 105.15|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501-7500    | 3.59 | 0.85           | 3.78   | 1.00| 5.00| 114.47|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 7501-9500    | 3.61 | 0.94           | 3.78   | 1.78| 5.00| 116.28|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 9500+        | 3.16 | 0.87           | 3.33   | 1.56| 4.56| 82.97  |      |            |      |            |
| **Organizational Justice**| 2500-3500   | 3.22 | 0.77           | 3.30   | 1.00| 4.75| 94.58  |      | 4.15       | 0.385|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 3.41 | 0.72           | 3.40   | 1.75| 4.80| 108.65|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501-7500    | 3.37 | 0.84           | 3.45   | 1.20| 4.90| 109.04|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 7501-9500    | 3.53 | 0.78           | 3.68   | 2.40| 5.00| 116.66|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 9500+        | 3.11 | 0.85           | 2.90   | 1.75| 4.55| 86.55  |      |            |      |            |
| **Relationships with Managers** | 2500-3500 | 3.17 | 1.04           | 3.44   | 1.00| 5.00| 88.35  |      | 12.05      | 0.017|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 3.60 | 0.75           | 3.83   | 1.78| 5.00| 116.09|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501-7500    | 3.47 | 0.98           | 3.78   | 1.00| 5.00| 109.08|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 7501-9500    | 3.60 | 0.86           | 3.78   | 2.11| 5.00| 111.63|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 9500+        | 2.92 | 0.95           | 2.78   | 1.44| 4.78| 72.39  |      |            |      |            |
| **Wage System**       | 2500-3500    | 1.80 | 0.91           | 1.60   | 1.00| 4.60| 66.61  |      | 24.51      | 0.000|            |
|                       | 3501-5500    | 2.47 | 1.10           | 2.30   | 1.00| 5.00| 105.39|      |            |      |            |
|                       | 5501+        | 2.73 | 0.98           | 3.00   | 1.00| 4.00| 122.19|      |            |      |            |
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of relationships with managers and the wage system scores differ significantly by income (p <.05). The median of perceptions of relationships with managers of employees with an income between 3501-5500 was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the employees with an income of 9501 or above. The median wage system perception of employees with an income of 3501-5500, 5501-7500, 7501-9500, and over 9500 were found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to the employees with an income of 2500-3500. Looking at this table, it is possible to say that employees with an income between 2500-3500 do not get the wages they deserve for their performance and they think the wage system is unfair.

4.17. Analyses Regarding the Total Time in the Occupation Variable

The results of the normality test for the total time in the occupation variable are given in Table 12.
| the Occupation: | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------|----|------|-----------|----|------|
| **Procedural Justice** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .096 | 48 | .200 * | .963 | 48 | .135 |
| 4-7 years | .114 | 77 | .015 * | .970 | 77 | .063 |
| 8-11 years | .126 | 29 | .200 * | .921 | 29 | .032 |
| 12-15 years | .202 | 18 | .050 | .916 | 18 | .108 |
| 16 years or above | .101 | 36 | .200 * | .970 | 36 | .434 |
| **Distributive Justice** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .135 | 48 | .028 | .954 | 48 | .060 |
| 4-7 years | .184 | 77 | .000 | .914 | 77 | .000 |
| 8-11 years | .134 | 29 | .196 | .931 | 29 | .059 |
| 12-15 years | .228 | 18 | .014 * | .876 | 18 | .023 |
| 16 years or above | .120 | 36 | .200 | .955 | 36 | .146 |
| **Interactional Justice** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .124 | 48 | .064 | .955 | 48 | .064 |
| 4-7 years | .151 | 77 | .000 | .925 | 77 | .000 |
| 8-11 years | .160 | 29 | .057 | .931 | 29 | .057 |
| 12-15 years | .197 | 18 | .064 | .892 | 18 | .042 |
| 16 years or above | .143 | 36 | .061 | .960 | 36 | .208 |
| **Organizational Justice** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .101 | 48 | .200 * | .959 | 48 | .089 |
| 4-7 years | .107 | 77 | .029 | .966 | 77 | .036 |
| 8-11 years | .134 | 29 | .197 | .936 | 29 | .080 |
| 12-15 years | .102 | 18 | .200 * | .961 | 18 | .615 |
| 16 years or above | .103 | 36 | .200 | .950 | 36 | .103 |
| **Relationships with Managers** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .153 | 48 | .007 | .922 | 48 | .004 |
| 4-7 years | .155 | 77 | .000 | .949 | 77 | .004 |
| 8-11 years | .158 | 29 | .063 | .896 | 29 | .008 |
| 12-15 years | .330 | 18 | .000 | .743 | 18 | .000 |
| 16 years or above | .131 | 36 | .121 | .926 | 36 | .018 |
| **Wage System** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .102 | 48 | .200 * | .948 | 48 | .035 |
| 4-7 years | .163 | 77 | .000 | .909 | 77 | .000 |
| 8-11 years | .118 | 29 | .200 | .929 | 29 | .052 |
| 12-15 years | .134 | 18 | .200 | .919 | 18 | .124 |
| 16 years or above | .181 | 36 | .004 | .916 | 36 | .010 |
| **Decision Making Process** | | | | | | |
| 1-3 years | .131 | 48 | .038 | .959 | 48 | .088 |
| 4-7 years | .131 | 77 | .002 | .960 | 77 | .016 |
| 8-11 years | .163 | 29 | .046 | .934 | 29 | .069 |
| 12-15 years | .146 | 18 | .200 | .947 | 18 | .386 |
| 16 years or above | .185 | 36 | .003 | .939 | 36 | .047 |
### Incentive and Evaluation System

| Time in the Occupation | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig |
|------------------------|------|----------------|--------|-----|-----|------------|------------|-----|
| 1-3 years              | .096 | .200*          | .971   | 48  | .277|            |            |     |
| 4-7 years              | .104 | .039           | .943   | 77  | .002|            |            |     |
| 8-11 years             | .121 | .200*          | .933   | 29  | .067|            |            |     |
| 12-15 years            | .148 | .200*          | .923   | 18  | .147|            |            |     |
| 16 years or above      | .097 | .200*          | .938   | 36  | .043|            |            |     |

### Motivation

| Time in the Occupation | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Min | Max | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig |
|------------------------|------|----------------|--------|-----|-----|------------|------------|-----|
| 1-3 years              | .111 | .181           | .968   | 48  | .206|            |            |     |
| 4-7 years              | .115 | .014           | .959   | 77  | .013|            |            |     |
| 8-11 years             | .132 | .200*          | .954   | 29  | .238|            |            |     |
| 12-15 years            | .122 | .200*          | .969   | 18  | .781|            |            |     |
| 16 years or above      | .145 | .053           | .949   | 36  | .100|            |            |     |

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

### Table 12: Tests of Normality for Total Time in the Occupation Variable

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by total time in the occupation (p<.05).

#### 4.18. Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Occupation Variable

Comparison of scores according to the total time in the occupation variable is given in Table 13.
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not significantly differ by total time in the occupation (p>.05).

### 4.19. Analyses Regarding the Total Time in the Institution Variable

The results of the normality test for the total time in the institution variable are given in Table 14.
| Institution:                  | Smirnov² |          |          |          |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                              | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Procedural Justice           |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .072     | 78  | .200* | .977     | 78  | .168 |
| 4-7 years                    | .151     | 75  | .000  | .943     | 75  | .002 |
| 8-11 years                   | .107     | 24  | .200* | .940     | 24  | .164 |
| 12-15 years                  | .271     | 11  | .024  | .851     | 11  | .044 |
| 16 years or above            | .132     | 20  | .200* | .976     | 20  | .873 |
| Distributive Justice         |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .160     | 78  | .000  | .939     | 78  | .001 |
| 4-7 years                    | .153     | 75  | .000  | .938     | 75  | .001 |
| 8-11 years                   | .144     | 24  | .200* | .895     | 24  | .017 |
| 12-15 years                  | .219     | 11  | .147  | .898     | 11  | .173 |
| 16 years or above            | .091     | 20  | .200* | .972     | 20  | .788 |
| Interactional Justice        |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .136     | 78  | .001  | .939     | 78  | .001 |
| 4-7 years                    | .163     | 75  | .000  | .940     | 75  | .001 |
| 8-11 years                   | .170     | 24  | .072  | .933     | 24  | .113 |
| 12-15 years                  | .237     | 11  | .085  | .920     | 11  | .321 |
| 16 years or above            | .106     | 20  | .200* | .959     | 20  | .517 |
| Organizational Justice       |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .068     | 78  | .200* | .975     | 78  | .124 |
| 4-7 years                    | .143     | 75  | .001  | .951     | 75  | .006 |
| 8-11 years                   | .116     | 24  | .200* | .953     | 24  | .318 |
| 12-15 years                  | .230     | 11  | .109  | .894     | 11  | .158 |
| 16 years or above            | .132     | 20  | .200* | .947     | 20  | .322 |
| Relationships with Managers  |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .145     | 78  | .000  | .954     | 78  | .007 |
| 4-7 years                    | .172     | 75  | .000  | .931     | 75  | .001 |
| 8-11 years                   | .206     | 24  | .010  | .856     | 24  | .003 |
| 12-15 years                  | .328     | 11  | .002  | .728     | 11  | .001 |
| 16 years or above            | .193     | 20  | .049  | .898     | 20  | .037 |
| Wage System                  |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .140     | 78  | .001  | .958     | 78  | .011 |
| 4-7 years                    | .128     | 75  | .004  | .901     | 75  | .000 |
| 8-11 years                   | .184     | 24  | .035  | .892     | 24  | .015 |
| 12-15 years                  | .258     | 11  | .039  | .881     | 11  | .107 |
| 16 years or above            | .196     | 20  | .043  | .929     | 20  | .147 |
| Decision Making Process      |          |      |      |          |      |      |
| 1-3 years                    | .082     | 78  | .200* | .966     | 78  | .036 |
| 4-7 years                    | .124     | 75  | .006  | .959     | 75  | .015 |
| 8-11 years                   | .260     | 24  | .000  | .799     | 24  | .000 |
| 12-15 years                  | .220     | 11  | .142  | .846     | 11  | .038 |
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceived organizational justice, motivation and subdimension scores do not have normal distribution by total time in the institution (p<.05).

### 4.20. Comparison of Scores According to the Total Time in the Institution Variable

Comparison of scores according to the total time in the institution variable is given in Table 15.

| Subdimension       | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Median | Min   | Max   | Mean Ranks | Chi-square | sig   | Difference       |
|--------------------|--------|----------------|--------|-------|-------|------------|------------|-------|------------------|
| **Procedural Justice** |        |                |        |       |       |            |            |       |                  |
| 1-3 years          | 3.47   | 0.85           | 3.43   | 1.43  | 5.00  | 117.74     | 15.77      | 0.003 | 1>8-11          |
| 4-7 years          | 3.30   | 0.93           | 3.43   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 110.35     |            |       |                  |
| 8-11 years         | 2.77   | 0.77           | 2.79   | 1.29  | 4.43  | 74.69      |            |       |                  |
| 12-15 years        | 2.96   | 1.13           | 2.29   | 1.71  | 4.57  | 87.59      |            |       |                  |
| 16 years or above  | 2.85   | 0.71           | 2.86   | 1.57  | 4.29  | 76.00      |            |       |                  |
| **Distributive Justice** |        |                |        |       |       |            |            |       |                  |
| 1-3 years          | 3.36   | 1.14           | 3.75   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 110.86     | 2.38       | 0.667 |                  |
| 4-7 years          | 3.19   | 1.15           | 3.50   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 102.11     |            |       |                  |
| 8-11 years         | 3.10   | 1.48           | 3.00   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 101.02     |            |       |                  |
| 12-15 years        | 3.34   | 1.27           | 3.75   | 1.50  | 5.00  | 110.00     |            |       |                  |
| 16 years or above  | 2.98   | 1.03           | 3.00   | 1.25  | 5.00  | 89.80      |            |       |                  |
| **Interactional Justice** |        |                |        |       |       |            |            |       |                  |
| 1-3 years          | 3.68   | 0.74           | 3.78   | 1.22  | 5.00  | 120.36     | 14.03      | 0.007 | 1>16 or above   |
| 4-7 years          | 3.49   | 0.78           | 3.67   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 105.31     |            |       |                  |
| 8-11 years         | 3.11   | 1.02           | 3.44   | 1.00  | 4.78  | 81.85      |            |       |                  |
| 12-15 years        | 3.23   | 0.83           | 3.44   | 1.89  | 4.44  | 84.41      |            |       |                  |
| 16 years or above  | 3.13   | 0.82           | 3.17   | 1.56  | 4.33  | 77.83      |            |       |                  |
| **Organizational Justice** |        |                |        |       |       |            |            |       |                  |
| 1-3 years          | 3.54   | 0.72           | 3.55   | 1.50  | 4.90  | 118.97     | 14.04      | 0.007 | 1>16 or above   |
| 4-7 years          | 3.36   | 0.77           | 3.40   | 1.00  | 5.00  | 107.08     |            |       |                  |
| 8-11 years         | 2.99   | 0.91           | 3.00   | 1.20  | 4.40  | 81.77      |            |       |                  |
When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of relationships with managers and the wage system scores differ by the total time in the institution \((p < .05)\). The median of procedural justice perception of those who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked at the institution for 8-11 years. The interactional and organizational justice median of the employees who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked for 16 years or more. The median of the incentive and evaluation system perception of the employees who have worked at the institution for 1-3 years was found to be statistically and significantly higher compared to those who have worked for 4-7 years. The employees whose seniority has increased in the organization and who has improved themselves in their work, will contribute more to the organization with their experience and will desire to see this being reflected in their wages and status in return. According to this table, it is possible to say that the justice perception of the employee whose seniority has increased, but whose expectations are not met, has weakened.

### 4.21. Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis results are given in Table 16.
| Dimensions                  | Mean | Std. | 1   | 2                  | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   |
|-----------------------------|------|------|-----|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Procedural                  | 3.24 | 0.92 |     |                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Distributive                | 3.23 | 1.18 | 0.593* |                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Interactional               | 3.46 | 0.82 | 0.606** |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Organizational              | 3.34 | 0.78 | 0.891** | 0.735** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Manager Relation            | 3.41 | 0.91 | 0.664** | 0.494** | 0.823** |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Wage System                 | 2.44 | 1.07 | 0.426** | 0.512** | 0.752** | 0.764** |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decision Making             | 3.23 | 0.94 | 0.542** | 0.608** | 0.520** | 0.380** | 0.520** |     |     |     |     |
| Incentive and Evaluation    | 2.75 | 1.05 | 0.615** | 0.665** | 0.788** | 0.477** | 0.477** |     |     |     |     |
| Motivation                  | 3.04 | 0.86 | 0.668** | 0.520** | 0.641** | 0.589** | 0.589** |     |     |     |     |

Table 16: Correlation Analysis Regarding the Relationship Between Organizational Justice Perception and Motivation

According to the analysis, procedural justice has a moderate positive correlation with relationships with managers \((r = 0.62, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system \((r = 0.43, p <0.01)\), a high level of positive correlation with decision making \((r = 0.70, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system \((r = 0.54, p <0.01)\), and a moderate positive correlation with motivation \((r = 0.67, p <0.01)\).

Distributive justice has a moderate positive correlation with relationships with managers \((r = 0.49, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system \((r = 0.51, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with decision making \((r = 0.61, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system \((r = 0.52, p <0.01)\), and a moderate correlation with motivation \((r = 0.62, p <0.01)\).

Interactional justice has a high level of positive correlation with relationship with managers \((r = 0.75, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system \((r = 0.38, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with decision making \((r = 0.70, p <0.01)\), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system \((r = 0.69, p <0.01)\), and a moderate correlation with motivation \((r = 0.75, p <0.01)\).
making \( r = 0.67, p < 0.01 \), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system \( r = 0.58, p < 0.01 \), and a high level of correlation with motivation \( r = 0.70, p < 0.01 \).

Organizational justice has a high level of positive correlation with relationships with managers \( r = 0.76, p < 0.01 \), a moderate positive correlation with the wage system \( r = 0.52, p < 0.01 \), a high level of positive correlation with decision making \( r = 0.79, p < 0.01 \), a moderate positive correlation with incentive and evaluation system \( r = 0.66, p < 0.01 \), and a high level of correlation with motivation \( r = 0.80, p < 0.01 \).

4.22. Regression Analysis

- **H1**: Organizational justice perceptions of the employees have a positive effect on motivation.

Results of the regression analysis are given in Table 17.

| Independent Variable          | Motivation |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Constant                     | 0.044      |
| Organizational Justice       | 0.898      |
| Score                        |            |
| 
| **F**                        | 403.329    |
| Model \( p \)                | 0.000      |
| \( R^2 \)                    | 0.662      |

Table 17: Regression Analysis

Regression coefficients have been tested with t statistics, and perceived organizational justice \( p < 0.01 \) was found to be statistically significant in the regression equation that explains motivation. One-unit increase in perceived organizational justice score leads to a 0.898-fold increase in motivation. Perceived organizational justice has a statistically significant effect on motivation.

As a result of the regression analysis, the explanatory coefficient \( R^2 \), which is the percentage of the independent variable explaining the model was found to be 0.662. The regression equation that was found to be statistically significant is as follows.

Motivation = 0.044 + 0.898 (Perceived organizational justice)

5. Conclusion

In this study, based on the organizational justice and motivation scale, whether the organizational justice perceptions of the aviation sector employees with distinctive demographic characteristics have an effect on their motivation has been examined.

When the correlation analysis we applied to determine the direction and degree of the relationships between the variables was evaluated according to the hypotheses, the hypothesis that 'perceptions of organizational justice and sub-dimensions of aviation sector employees have an effect on organizational motivation' has been accepted.

When the correlation analysis between organizational justice and motivation was examined, it was found that interactional justice was the sub-dimension that affects motivation the most, and participation in the decision-making process had the highest effect on employee motivation.

Multiple regression analysis test was used to examine the effects of organizational justice dimensions on motivation level. According to the results of the regression analysis, the perceived organizational justice has a statistically significant effect on motivation. One-unit increase in perceived organizational justice score leads to a 0.898-fold increase in motivation. According to the results obtained in the research, as the perception of justice within the organization improves, the motivation of the employees also increases.

As a result, in the study, organizational justice and motivation have been examined and the effect of organizational justice perception on motivation has been investigated. According to the results obtained in the research, as the perception of justice within the organization improves, the motivation of the employees also increases. The strong or weak perception of justice affects the motivation of the employee. In order for organizations to have a long life, to gain competitive advantage, and to become an employer brand, they must first adopt an organizational culture that values the employees and be built on these foundations. Employees should be given duties and responsibilities that are commensurate with their skills and training. It is important that the compensations in return for the assigned duties and responsibilities are fairly distributed. Employees should be promoted in line with their abilities and have a voice in decision-making regarding organizational processes. It should be ensured that the employees embrace the purpose of the organization as their own and that there is a healthy communication with managers and colleagues during these processes.
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