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Abstract: In this study, the effect of transformational leadership and procedural justice on manager trust and sustainable organizational identity is analyzed, also including the role of mediation on manager trust. First, we analyzed what the effect of transformational leadership and procedural justice on trust in the organization and sustainable organizational identity is. Secondly, we examined the mediator effect on organizational trust, in addition to the effects of transformational leadership and procedural justice on sustainable organizational identity. The sample of the study consists of 558 subjects from Turkey, 106 subjects from Azerbaijan, and 95 subjects from Kyrgyzstan—a total of 759 subjects. To analyze the collected data, we used correlation analysis, regression analyses, and ANOVA testing. For these analyses, we used the SPSS statistical software. The results indicate that transformational leadership and procedural justice positively and significantly affect manager trust. Moreover, manager trust has a positive and significant impact on creating a sustainable organizational identity. The results of the regression analyses further show that in the relationship between transformational leadership and procedural justice with sustainable organizational identity, there is a full effect of mediation on the perception of manager trust. Moreover, there is an indirect relationship among transformational leadership and procedural justice with creating a sustainable organizational identity, and this relationship is established through the perception of manager trust. The results of the study suggest that an efficient way to increase the trust of managers by employees is to increase procedural justice and to follow a transformational leadership style in the workplace. Moreover, it is expected that corporations following these strategies can sustain their organizational identity.
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1. Introduction

Organizations need powerful leaders who can motivate their employees to maintain their existence, grow, reach organizational objectives, and compete, all while delivering the perception of a sustainable organizational identity. In addition to managerial skills and experience, the reliability and fairness of managers considerably increases the credibility of the employees towards the leader and the company. A leader with transformational ability exhibits consistent behavior in all respects, such that the perception of confidence between the leader and the employee can develop [1]. Transformational leaders manage changes in organizations with this management skill and via the courage they display [2].
Consequently, this leadership style is essential for the adoption of a sustainable organizational identity and the success of the organization. Since transformational leaders effectively involve their followers in processes, they increase the confidence of the employees in the leader, organization, and themselves [3]. First, a sustainable organizational identity ensures trust [4]. Later, trust reinforces the stability of the sustainable organizational identity [5].

Recent research on transformational leadership argues that manager trust has an important role in achieving the aims of an organization [6]. In addition to this, the relationship between transformational leadership and procedural justice has also been analyzed, and a strong relationship has been established between these variables [7]. Studies in the related literature show that leaders with transformational abilities successfully influence the attitudes of employees [8,9] and increase employee job satisfaction, workplace performance, and loyalty [10,11], leading to higher trust in managers [11,12].

The leading factor among the factors affecting sustainable organizational identity is transformational identity [13], and this leadership style, with specific visions, determines the sustainable organizational identity [14]. Studies show that a sustainable organizational identity leads to trust [4], and, in an environment of trust, sustainable organizational identity will be stable and long lasting [5]. Moreover, the literature shows that organizational justice has a positive and significant effect on creating a sustainable organizational identity [13]. The studies in the literature have revealed that leaders with transformational qualities are capable of influencing the attitudes and behaviors of employees [8,9].

This study has two purposes. First, we analyze the effect of a transformational leadership style and procedural justice on organizational identity and trust in the organization. Secondly, we examine the mediating effect of organizational trust on creating a sustainable organizational identity. The literature review shows that studies on this subject are limited in number. Hence, it is believed that this study will contribute to the literature.

The paper proceeds as follows: The next section summarizes the related literature. Section 3 introduces the data and methodology. The analysis is presented in Section 4. The last section concludes the study.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Transformational Leadership

The concept of transformational leadership, which was used by Burns for the first time in 1978, is based on the principle of “raising the awareness” of the employees who follow the leader and attracting attention by the implementation of targets or results, as well as the implementation of conclusions, particularly in the political field. Bass later described the significance of transformational leadership in the 1990s and, for it to be considered as reliable by employees, describing a transformational leader as a person who defines a vision for the organization [15].

Transformational leaders should be able to recognize the judgments, needs, and beliefs of their followers and alter these when necessary, improve them with new strategies, and provide new visions [16,17]. The starting point of transformational leadership is the motivation [18] of the followers to achieve more than they would without leadership, such that the organization may continue its life and restructure its mission [19], since the environmental factors constantly develop and change. Rather than emphasizing the role of standards or power in management, transformational leadership supports the creation of visions, trust, fundamental values, continuous learning [20], and collective consciousness and purpose among employees [21].

Transformational leadership is based on vision, building trust, basic values, and continuous learning, as well as long-term sustainability [20]. It creates a state where individuals are in contact with others, raising both motivation and morality in both leaders and followers [22]. Transformational leaders are highly admired, respected, and trusted by their followers, and their followers want to resemble them [23].
2.2. Procedural Justice

While the perception of procedural justice affects the behaviors and attitudes of employees to decisions taken by managers, it also strengthens the relationship between managers and employees. It consists of the perception of the methods, mechanisms, and processes, and concerns how managers treat employees [24,25]. Again, the perception of procedural justice refers to the perceptions of employees in terms of the procedures used in decision-making processes and the perception of how fair decisions are [26].

Procedural justice is of vital importance in ensuring organizational justification and focuses on the suitability of sharing processes in the organization, such as consistent behavior as well as correct and ethical decision making, without being influenced by prejudices and correcting errors that may occur [27]. Procedural justice relates the ability [28] to change a decision for the benefit of employees by using impartial information and the involvement of employees in the decision-making process, such that they can believe impartial and objective decisions are taken [29].

2.3. Manager Trust

Although there are various definitions of trust, in general terms, it signifies “relying on” something [30], having good faith for confidence and confiding words and actions [31], and the confidence acquired at the end of coherent and positive attitudes based on respect and kindness [32]. Trust is the expectation that employees will not be harmed by the behaviors of other employees, and, in fact, it is an expectation that they will benefit from them [33].

Manager trust refers to the belief of employees that their manager is honest and that their manager is as good as his/her word [34,35]. This includes the perceptions of employees about the support they will receive from managers and the belief that managers are competent enough and that they will be just and take decisions based on ethical principles [36]. It also means the belief that managers give understandable and correct answers and that managers will be fair and consistent about this [34].

2.4. Perception of Sustainable Organizational Identity

The creation of a sustainable organizational identity is still a prominent issue in management and organization studies. Sustainable organizational identity studies have focused on how organizations define themselves, what they represent for stakeholders [37], and how they play an essential role in developing and managing the behaviors and strategies of companies [38], including the guidance of the relationships of the organization with its environment [39].

Sustainable organizational identity is a concept that reveals the fundamental characteristics of an organization to its employees [40], signifying the meaning attached to how an organization is recognized and remembered [41], and it is the combination of the characteristics that make the organization meaningful and distinguish it from other organizations [42].

Employees who share the same identity and ideas with the organizations they are working in demonstrate positive and beneficial behaviors in the workplace [43]. A high perception of a sustainable organizational identity creates a psychological connection between the employee and the organization. This perception of the common identity and subsequent coordination increases the cooperation and trust between the employees, while it leads employees to make more efforts to achieve the organization’s objectives [44].

2.5. Transformational Leadership, Sustainable Organizational Identity, and Its Effects on Manager Trust

Organizational identity is effective in helping to make organization decisions [45,46]. Leaders determine the identity of the organization and create a foundation that would serve as a guide in decision-making processes [40]. Transformational leaders demonstrate behaviors such that they are the role models for their followers. Hence, the respect, trust, and admiration for them increases and their followers start to define their identity by these leaders and want to resemble them [47].
The success of transformational leaders is revealed as the ability to offer suggestions to their followers beyond their own interests and to create a mission and vision that inspire others and give them an identity [48]. A positive image of the organization, participation in positive socialization activities, charismatic and transformational leadership characteristics of managers, having positive feelings about the profession, and organizational communication are the principal factors that affect the perception of a sustainable organizational identity [13].

There are studies that argue that transformational leadership has a significant effect on the creation of a sustainable organizational identity [49–51]. Transformational leaders pay attention to their direct reports and followers [15,52] and ultimately win their admiration [53]. Transformational leaders are self-confident, and they rely on their capacity and abilities [54]. Rezaee et al. discovered a meaningful relationship between transformational leadership and sustainable organizational identity in their study, conducted on 226 workers in the petrochemical sector [55].

For success and motivation in organizations, trust mediates in the creation of an environment that enables mutual communication between employees and managers [56]. Hence, we should consider that the behaviors of managers for increasing confidence in the organization are very important [57]. Yolaç [58] discovered that the contribution of transformational leadership to manager trust is considerably high. The study was conducted on 240 people, working in different sectors in Istanbul. In the study, the behavior of the leader was observed to be the principal factor in determining trust in the manager. Childers [59] conducted a study on 84 people working in hotels and revealed that there is a positive correlation between transformational leadership and trust ($r = 0.49, p < 0.001$).

Based on the general findings established in the related literature, we developed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). The behavior of transformational leaders positively affects the perception of manager trust.

Hypothesis 2 (H2). The behavior of a transformational leader positively affects the perception of a sustainable organizational identity.

2.6. The Effects of Procedural Justice on Sustainable Organizational Identity and Trust

In a study that aimed to ascertain the effect of the perception of organizational justice on sustainable organizational identity perceptions, it was revealed that organizational justice perceptions have a significantly positive effect on employees’ perceptions of a sustainable organizational identity. Olkkonen and Lipponen [60] conducted a study on 160 employees and asserted that procedural justice affects the behavior of creating a sustainable organizational identity. It was discovered that procedural justice behaviors affect the creation of a sustainable organizational identity positively and significantly [60]. Furthermore, there are also some pieces of evidence proving that there is a significant relationship between the perceptions of justice and creating a sustainable organizational identity [61,62].

Similarly, Gülşen [63] conducted a study on 384 people and revealed a similar, powerful, and statistically meaningful relationship between procedural justice and creating a sustainable organizational identity. In this case, it was observed that the perception of procedural justice was enhanced, just like the perception of a sustainable organizational identity [63].

The perceptions of justice regarding the processes within the organization shape people’s relationship with the organization, their position within the organization, and the identity information of the organization, which helps the person to recognize themselves through the eyes of the organization, all while motivating the person to identify with the group or the organization [64]. In addition, these perceptions increase trust in managers and the organization and contribute positively to business results [24,65]. Tyler and Blader [64] also asserted in their studies that justice is influential on the creation of a sustainable organizational identity, since it affects the satisfaction of group membership.
In the studies that strive to explain the relationship between organizational justice and organizational trust, it has been revealed that organizational justice generally influences organizational trust. For example, Bidarian and Jafari [66] determined that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between organizational justice and organizational trust, and it was concluded that when justice perceptions increase, the trust in management and the organization increases accordingly. Çakar [67], in a study conducted on 224 employees from six companies operating in the manufacturing sector, discovered that procedural justice affects trust in managers both positively and meaningfully.

Based on the literature review, we derived the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** Procedural justice positively affects manager trust.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** Procedural justice positively affects the perception of a sustainable organizational identity.

### 2.7. The Effects of Manager Trust on Creating a Sustainable Organizational Identity

Trust in organizations is related to the sustainable organizational identity [68], and trust is influential in determining the sustainable organizational identity [69]. In organizations, the level of trust between employees and managers and the effectiveness of groups significantly strengthen the sustainable organizational identity perceived by individuals [70].

The level of trust between employees and managers has proven itself as an essential concept in explaining how sustainable organizational identity behaviors and trust in organizations emerge and develop [71]. Consequently, the concepts of a sustainable organizational identity and trust are extremely important for the success of organizations [5]. Nevertheless, there are few studies examining the relationship between organizational trust and a sustainable organizational identity. For example, Rousseau [68] related organizational trust with a sustainable organizational identity. On the other hand, Dumitru [72] conducted research on the relationship between trust and identity with 222 students and revealed a meaningful relationship ($r = 0.54, p < 0.05$). Similarly, Gün and Söyük [73] observed a positive and meaningful relationship between a sustainable organizational identity and manager trust in a study conducted with 396 healthcare workers ($r = 0.247, p < 0.01$). Again, Tüzün [4] revealed that the direct effect of the perceived sustainable organizational identity on organizational trust was meaningful in a study conducted with 545 people working in the financial sector ($r = 0.82, p < 0.05$).

Based the general findings established in the related literature, we developed the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 5 (H5).** Manager trust and the sustainable organizational identity are positively related.

### 2.8. Intermediate Variable Effect of Manager Trust on Creating a Sustainable Organizational Identity and Procedural Justice

The intermediate variable effect of trusting the manager in creating a sustainable organizational identity and procedural justice is reviewed here. As explained above, various studies have revealed that transformational leadership [49–51] and procedural justice [60,61,63,64] positively and meaningfully affect the creation of a sustainable organizational identity.

Organizational trust refers to the beliefs of employees that the organization will support employees and that the words of the leaders are accurate [35] and representative of the beliefs of the parties involved for future work. Hence, past experiences provide hints about reliability [74], and as workers’ perceptions of justice regarding procedural justice increase, their confidence in managers and the organization also increase [75]. From this aspect, the concept of trust occupies an effective place in all of the results affected by organizational justice [76]. Trust in the leader is a very significant organizational variable [77] and it is declared that, first of all, it is essential to increase the perceptions of justice in order to ensure trust in the organization [78].
When procedural justice within an organization increases, it will increase the trust of employees in the manager. Hence, it is assumed that the effect of the leadership and justice dimensions is important in the formation of the perception of a sustainable organizational identity. In other words, it can be assumed that the relationship between transformational leadership and procedural justice with organizational identification is ensured by manager trust. Accordingly, organizational trust is associated with both procedural justice and transformational leadership and the creation of a sustainable organizational identity, implying that organizational trust may have an intermediate role when procedural justice and transformational leadership affect the sustainable organizational identity.

The literature review has shown that there are many studies that have analyzed the effects of transformative leadership on manager trust and the sustainable organizational identity, and the effects of procedural justice on manager trust and the organizational identity. However, there are only few studies that have analyzed the effects of transformative leadership and procedural justice together on manager trust and the organizational identity. Moreover, there is no study in the related literature that has analyzed the intermediate effect of manager trust on the effect of transformational leadership and the intermediate effect of the perception of procedural justice on manager trust and the organizational identity.

Based on the general findings established in the related literature, the following hypotheses were developed:

**Hypothesis 6 (H6).** Manager trust plays an intermediate role in the perception of a sustainable organizational identity and transformational leadership.

**Hypothesis 7 (H7).** Manager trust plays an intermediate role in the perception of a sustainable organizational identity and procedural justice.

### 3. Methodology

The data used in the present study were collected via a convenience sampling method [79] from academics working in Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Kyrgyzstan. To collect the survey data, an online surveying method was used in Turkey and a face-to-face survey method was used in Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan. According to the official 2019 statistics, the number of public universities in Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Kyrgyzstan are 129, 27, and 31, respectively. In these universities, there are 50,000 academics in Turkey [80], 12,000 in Azerbaijan [81], and 14,000 in Kyrgyzstan [82]. Based on a 95% confidence interval, the minimum number of subjects in the sample to represent the population is equal to 384. The total number of subjects used in the study (758) is much higher than that number.

For the procedural justice scale, Niehoff and Moorman [83] developed a procedural justice scale consisting of 15 questions. The Cronbach’s (1951) alpha internal consistency coefficient for the procedure justice scale was 0.952. Although this affirms that values starting from 0.70 and above can be reported to be reliable, reliability coefficients in the range of 0.65 to 0.70 were accepted as satisfactory values by Nunnally and Bernstein [84].

With regard to manager trust, for measuring the variable, a scale consisting of 8 items, developed by Nyhan and Marlow [85] and adapted by Demircan [67], was used. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient of the trust scale was 0.895.

For the transformational leadership scale, Bass and Avolio’s [86] transformational leadership scale was used. It consists of 4 dimensions that include 3 items separately, namely, the idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. In the analysis, we examined transformational leadership in one dimension. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient for the transformational leadership scale was 0.890.
For the organizational identity scale, a 5-item organizational identity scale developed by Mael and Ashforth [87] was used. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient of the organizational identity scale was 0.846. Figure 1 presents the hypotheses tested in the study.

Figure 1. Research model.

4. Results

First, we present a summary of the sample statistics of the survey participants in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample statistics.

| Country      | Gender | Title                | Total |
|--------------|--------|----------------------|-------|
|              |        | Assistant Professor  |       |
|              | Male   | 267                  | 378   |
|              | %      | 70.6                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 37.71             | 51.26 |
| Turkey       | Female | 122                  | 180   |
|              | %      | 67.7                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 35.6              | 49.2  |
|              | Male   | 43                   | 67    |
|              | %      | 64.2                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 34.4              | 48.2  |
| Azerbaijan   | Female | 24                   | 39    |
|              | %      | 61.5                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 36.3              | 50.9  |
|              | Male   | 40                   | 59    |
|              | %      | 67.8                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 33.9              | 57.2  |
| Kyrgyzstan   | Female | 22                   | 36    |
|              | %      | 61.1                 | 100   |
|              | Average age | 37                | 54.1  |

Table 2 presents a summary of the statistics, including the N (number of observations), mean, standard deviation, and F-values.
Table 2. N, mean, standard deviation, and F-values of the participants.

| Variables                     | Country       | N  | Average    | Standard Deviation | F-Value |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----|------------|--------------------|---------|
| **Organizational Identity**   | Azerbaijan    | 106| 4.4792     | 0.47704            | 68.970 **|
|                               | Kyrgyzstan    | 95 | 4.1747     | 0.49357            |         |
|                               | Turkey        | 558| 3.5321     | 0.94859            |         |
| **Transformational Leadership**| Azerbaijan    | 106| 3.9191     | 0.60770            | 67.599 **|
|                               | Kyrgyzstan    | 95 | 4.1639     | 0.50614            |         |
|                               | Turkey        | 566| 3.1880     | 0.99125            |         |
| **Manager Trust**             | Azerbaijan    | 106| 4.0566     | 0.54306            | 68.109 **|
|                               | Kyrgyzstan    | 95 | 4.2692     | 0.53202            |         |
|                               | Turkey        | 566| 3.3329     | 0.95952            |         |
| **Procedural Justice**        | Azerbaijan    | 106| 3.9447     | 0.51671            | 59.334 **|
|                               | Kyrgyzstan    | 95 | 4.0549     | 0.67478            |         |
|                               | Turkey        | 567| 3.1888     | 0.99262            |         |
| **Age**                       | Azerbaijan    | 102| 28.2059    | 5.63641            | 33.910 **|
|                               | Kyrgyzstan    | 95 | 34.1684    | 10.94343           |         |
|                               | Turkey        | 555| 36.0324    | 8.93311            |         |

**p < 0.01.

The F-value represents whether there are differences among the countries studied. The F-value test results are significant for all variables presented in Table 2. This shows that for the organizational identity variable, Azerbaijan differs from the two other countries. For the transformational leadership, procedural justice, and manager trust variables, Kyrgyzstan differs from the two other countries. Lastly, for the age variable, Turkey differs from the two other countries.

In Table 3, the factor load and percentage explanation are presented. Principal component analysis revealed four factors, as we expected. The scale items were sufficiently loaded with relevant factors. The principal component analysis explained 62.632% of the total variance.

Table 3. Factor load and explained variance values.

| Question Number | Factor Load | Question Number | Factor Load | Question Number | Factor Load | Question Number | Factor Load |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| p1              | 0.575       | mt1             | 0.675       | t1              | 0.605       | o13             | 0.747       |
| p2              | 0.596       | mt2             | 0.588       | t11             | 0.578       |                 |             |
| p3              | 0.638       | mt3             | 0.596       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p4              | 0.638       | mt4             | 0.638       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p5              | 0.638       | mt5             | 0.595       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p6              | 0.638       | mt6             | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p7              | 0.638       | mt7             | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p8              | 0.638       | mt8             | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p9              | 0.638       | mt9             | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p10             | 0.638       | mt10            | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p11             | 0.638       | mt11            | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p12             | 0.638       | mt12            | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| p13             | 0.638       | mt13            | 0.588       |                 |             |                 |             |
| **Variance Explained by the Factor:** | 23.877% | **Variance Explained by the Factor:** | 14.320% | **Variance Explained by the Factor:** | 13.807% | **Variance Explained by the Factor:** | 10.636% |

Total variance explained: 62.639%
The scale averages, standard deviations, internal consistency values, and correlation values of the variables used in the study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation analysis.

| Variables                        | Average | St Dv. | 1    | 2    | 3    |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------|------|------|------|
| 1. Procedural Justice            | 3.401   | 0.973  | 0.952 | -    | -    |
| 2. Manager Trust                 | 3.548   | 0.973  | 0.723 ** | 0.895 | -    |
| 3. Perception of Transformational Leadership | 3.409   | 0.975  | 0.764 ** | 0.695 ** | 0.890 |
| 4. Organizational Identity       | 3.475   | 0.923  | 0.372 ** | 0.397 ** | 0.365 ** | 0.846 a |

** Correlation is significant at a 0.01 probability level. a The internal reliability coefficient of the variable (Cronbach’s alpha value). ** p < 0.01.

When the correlations between variables were considered, it was comprehended that the variable that shared the highest correlation with procedural justice was transformational leadership in the positive sense. There is a positive and meaningful correlation between these two variables at a 0.764 probability level. Furthermore, the mean and standard deviation of the variables are presented in Table 4.

Multiple regression analysis was performed to test the hypotheses of the research. In the regression analysis performed in Table 5, while manager trust was the dependent variable, the independent variables were procedural justice and transformational leadership. Based on the results of the regression analysis, we have strived to reveal the relative effect of the independent variable on the dependent variables.

Table 5. Regression analysis, showing the effect of transformational leadership and procedural justice on manager trust.

| Independent Variables               | Azerbaijan | Kyrgyzstan | Turkey |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------|
|                                     | β          | t          | β      | T      | β      | t      |
| Transformational Leadership         | 0.321      | 3.252 **   | 0.507  | 3.953 ** | 0.277  | 6.754 ** |
| Procedural Justice                  | 0.407      | 4.122 **   | 0.409  | 3.193 ** | 0.526  | 12.832 ** |
|                                     | F 41.023 ** | 8.109 **   | 47.932 ** |
|                                     | R² 0.443   | 0.150      | 0.567  |
|                                     | Adjusted R² 0.433 | 0.131      | 0.565  |

** p < 0.01.

According to the results in Table 5, all three models were significant (F = 41.023, p < 0.01; F = 8.109, p < 0.01; F = 47.932, p < 0.01).

When the variables in the model were reviewed, we observed that transformational leadership (β = 0.321, p < 0.01; β = 0.507, p < 0.01; β = 0.277, p < 0.01) and procedural justice (β = 0.407, p < 0.01; β = 0.409, p < 0.01; β = 0.526, p < 0.01) had a positive effect on the manager trust variable for all three countries.

In the table, the beta coefficient (β) presents the average change in the dependent variable when there is a one-unit change in the independent variable. For example, in Model, the beta coefficient of transformational leadership in Azerbaijan indicates that the one-unit change in the transformational leadership scale leads a 0.321-unit change in manager trust. The beta coefficients for both transformational leadership and procedural justice were positive for all three countries. While the beta coefficient for transformational leadership was the highest for the Kyrgyzstan sample (0.507), the beta coefficient for procedural justice was highest for the Turkey sample (0.526). The R² value in Model was highest for the Turkey sample (0.567), indicating that the explanatory power of the independent
variables (transformational leadership and procedural justice) is highest for the Turkey sample. It shows that changes in the independent variables explain a 56.7% change in the manager trust variable. Lastly, the F-value in Model shows that the established model is significant in terms of explaining changes in the manager trust variable.

Hypotheses 1 and 3, which predict that transformational leadership will positively affect manager trust and that the perception of the procedural justice will positively affect manager trust, respectively, were accepted.

In the regression analysis performed in Table 6, the sustainable organizational identity is the dependent variable, while the independent variable is manager trust. Based on the results of the regression analysis, we have strived to reveal the relative effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

**Table 6.** Regression analysis, showing the effect of manager trust on the sustainable organizational identity.

| Independent Variable | Azerbaijan | Kyrgyzstan | Turkey |
|----------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Manager Trust        | β          | t          | β      | t      | β      | t      |
|                      | 0.380      | 4.181 **   | 0.295  | 2.974 ** | 0.297  | 7.328 ** |
| F                    | 17.504 **  | 8.846 **   | 53.7 ** |
| R²                   | 0.144      | 0.087      | 0.088  |
| Adjusted R²          | 0.136      | 0.077      | 0.086  |

**p < 0.01.

All three models presented in Table 6 were significant (F = 17.504, p < 0.01; F = 8.846, p < 0.01; F = 53.7, p < 0.01).

When the variables in the model were reviewed, manager trust was found to have a positive effect on the organizational identity variable (β = 0.380, p < 0.01; β = 0.295, p < 0.01; β = 0.297, p < 0.01). Hence, Hypothesis 5, which predicts that the perception of manager trust positively affects the organizational identity, was accepted.

In Table 7, we analyzed the effect of a transformational leadership style on creating a sustainable organizational identity. For all three countries, the effect of a transformational leadership style on a sustainable organizational identity was positive and significant (β = 0.204, p < 0.05; β = 0.175, p < 0.05; β = 0.279, p < 0.01). As a result, Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

**Table 7.** Regression analysis, showing the effect of transformational leadership on the organizational identity.

| Independent Variable | Azerbaijan | Kyrgyzstan | Turkey |
|----------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Transformational Leadership | β          | t          | β      | t      | β      | t      |
|                      | 0.204      | 2.130 *    | 0.175  | 2.001 * | 0.279  | 6.840 ** |
| F                    | 4.535 *    | 2.451 *    | 46.7 ** |
| R²                   | 0.042      | 0.077      | 0.078  |
| Adjusted R²          | 0.204      | 0.075      | 0.279  |

**p < 0.01; * p < 0.05.

Table 8 presents the analysis of the effect of procedural justice on the sustainable organizational identity. For all three countries, the beta coefficient of procedural justice was positive and significant (β = 0.169, p < 0.05; β = 0.101, p < 0.05; β = 0.302, p < 0.01). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was accepted.
Table 8. Regression analysis, showing the effect of procedural justice on the organizational identity.

| Independent Variable | Azerbaijan | Kyrgyzstan | Turkey |
|----------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Procedural Justice   | 0.169      | 0.101      | 0.302  |
|                      | 2.630 *    | 1.974 *    | 7.463 **|
| F                    | 3.064 *    | 1.546 *    | 55.6 **|
| R²                   | 0.029      | 0.065      | 0.091  |
| Adjusted R²          | 0.169      | 0.063      | 0.302  |

** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05.

Table 9. The intermediate variable effect of the manager trust variable on the effect of the procedural justice and transformational leadership variables on the organizational identity.

| Independent Variables | Azerbaijan | Kyrgyzstan | Turkey |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Procedural Justice    | −0.120     | −0.909     | 0.135  |
|                       | −0.061     | −0.437     | 1.958  |
| Transformational Leadership | 0.019 | 0.184 | −0.014 | −0.100 | 0.084 | 1.357 |
| Manager Trust         | 0.387      | 3.601 **   | 0.294  |
|                       | 2.710 **   | 0.142      | 2.316 *|
| F                     | 6.075      | 3.073 *    | 21.951 |
| R²                    | 0.152      | 0.092      | 0.106  |
| Adjusted R²           | 0.127      | 0.062      | 0.101  |

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

5. Conclusions and Discussion

In this study, the effect of administrative perception on sustainable organizational identity was examined in comparison with cases from Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkey. In the scope of the research, transformational leadership, procedural justice, and manager trust were selected as the administrative perception parameters and the effect of these concepts on the sustainable organizational identity was reviewed, together with the intermediate variable effect of the manager trust variable on the sustainable organizational identity. Overall, 558 people from Turkey, 106 people from Azerbaijan, 95 people from Kyrgyzstan participated in the study. Thus, the sample consists of 759 people in total.

Primarily, the effect of transformational leadership and procedural justice on the sustainable organizational identity perception was analyzed. The model was significant for all three countries (F = 41.023, p < 0.01; F = 8.109, p < 0.01; F = 47.932, p < 0.01). When the variables in the model were examined, there was a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and manager trust (β = 0.321, p < 0.01; β = 0.507, p < 0.01; β = 0.277, p < 0.01) for all three countries. The
When employees believe that their organization applies procedural justice, their trust in their manager was found that there was a significant effect of manager trust on a sustainable organizational identity. In other words, the relationship between transformational leadership and procedural justice perceptions on a sustainable organizational identity is generally at the same level and is significant. In addition, the effect of manager trust on the sustainable organizational identity has been examined, where there was no significant difference between the three countries, and it was remarked that the hypotheses were affected significantly and were affected in the same way. The intermediate variable effect presented in the last part of the study was different in the three countries. The intermediate effect of manager trust on the effect of transformational leadership and the perception of procedural justice on a sustainable organizational identity was examined, and it was found that there was a significant effect for all three models. However, the Azerbaijan (β = 0.387, p > 0.01) and Kyrgyzstan (β = 0.394, p > 0.01) samples presented a more robust full mediator effect in comparison to Turkey’s sample (β = 0.142, p > 0.05). It can be stated that due to a rigorous discipline regime, the effect of management is still more present there.

The established findings in the study suggest that, in order to maintain a sustainable organizational identity and to increase manager trust, two important and efficient methods are to build procedural justice and to follow a transformational leadership style. However, there are several prominent limitations of this study. The study included only three countries and the number of samples was limited. In the study, a sector-based sample was analyzed. Accordingly, it will be essential to conduct the research by including several variables with a sector-based sample. Furthermore, demographic factors, as well as the impact of working and environmental conditions, should be taken into consideration in future studies.
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