Perceptions of college of education students in Turkey towards organizational justice, trust in administrators, and instructors

Mustafa Kale

Abstract   In this research, the perceptions of college of education students in Turkey regarding organizational justice, trust in administrators, and trust in instructors were determined. In the present study, the answers to three research questions were sought. The research was done using the survey method. After choosing six universities of various sizes and from different geographical regions, 1,872 students were selected randomly as participants. As data collection instruments, "The Organizational Justice Scale", developed by Hoy and Tarter (Int J Educ Manag 18(4):250–259, 2004), and the "Student Trust in Principals" and "Student Trust in Faculty" scales, developed by Forsyth et al. (*Collective trust*, Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press, 2011), were used after being translated into Turkish. The results show that while statistically significant mean differences are found between at least two groups ($p < 0.05$), there is a high positive relationship between organizational justice and trust in both administrators and instructors.

Keywords   Organizational justice · Organizational trust · Education in Turkey

Introduction

Each organization is designed and established for a certain goal or for putting goals into practice. Just like economic, military, or political organizations, educational organizations (schools, colleges, universities, etc.,) owe their existence to the goals they have to carry out. Teachers have a special, important role within the structures that constitute educational organizations. Likewise, the quality of the teachers has the power to influence the realizable quality of education directly. Therefore, the process of teacher education is very important. In Turkey, it is the responsibility of colleges of education to train teachers.

In recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of colleges of education in Turkey. Of course, this quantitative development has not assured the high quality of education in these colleges. To increase the quality in parallel with the quantitative

M. Kale (✉)
Gazi College of Education, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: mkale@gazi.edu.tr

developments, some measures should be taken, and they should be applied at a fast pace. There are, of course, many factors that affect the quality of teachers. Some of these factors, however, are directly related to the institutions in which teachers are trained; for example, the infrastructure and the function of these institutions, the opportunities they provide to students, the quality of the administrators and instructors they have, and the administrators' and the instructors' attitudes toward students. These factors cause some perceptions to occur in students throughout the educational process and they may also influence their practice after graduation. The main perceptions that students create during their education are about organizational justice and trust. It can be argued that these perceptions should be taken seriously in order to train more qualified teachers in the colleges of education. The results of previous studies also support this argument. These studies have suggested that the organizational justice perception affects individuals' commitment to the organization, job and wage satisfaction, withdrawal behavior, organizational identification, organizational citizenship behavior, and trust in the organization (Ambrose 2002; Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001).

The relationship between organizational justice and many other variables has been dealt with in studies in Turkey and other countries. Among these variables, "organizational citizenship behaviours" (Moorman 1991; Eskew 1993; Niehoff and Moorman 1993; Tansky 1993; İşbaşı 2001; Karriker and Williams 2009; Yılmaz and Taşdan 2009; Baş and Şentürk 2011), "organizational trust" (Polat and Celep 2008; Baş and Şentürk 2011), "leadership" (Pillai et al. 1999; Arslantaş and Pekdemir 2007), "job satisfaction" (Clay-Warner et al. 2005; Dilek 2005; Eroğlu 2009), "organizational commitment" (Yıldırım 2002; İşcan and Naktiyok 2004; Dilek 2005), "values" (Altınkurt and Yılmaz 2010), and the like can be listed.

There have been many studies carried out on the issues of organizational justice and trust, but there are relatively few studies involving educational organizations and the universities within the educational organizations. In these studies, the main focus is generally on determining the perceptions of administrators or instructors. However, while there are personnel such as administrators and the instructors, there are also students. Knowing the perspectives of students, who personally go through the educational process, regarding the instructors and administrators and organizational justice and trust, is as necessary as knowing the perceptions of the administrators and the instructors.

With reference to the idea that knowing the perceptions of organizational justice and trust in the efforts of training qualified teachers is important, this study focuses on determining the level of organizational justice and trust in the instructors and the administrators (in accordance with the students' views), whether the trust in the administrators and the instructors is a precursor to organizational justice or not, and whether there are differences in terms of some demographic variables (the size and the geographical locations of the universities).

Özer and Demirtaş (2010) measured the organizational justice perceptions of university students in Turkey. Their study was limited to only one university. However, there are big differences between Turkish universities in terms of size, quality, characteristics of students and staff, and so on. While western Turkey includes the oldest and the biggest universities, which have well-established physical and human resources, many universities in Easterns have been founded in recent years and they have been struggling with a lack of resources. In this context, it is important to account for the size and the geographic location of the universities when investigating the students' perceptions of organizational justice and trust.

The fact that there have been few studies done in this field and that students are being ignored although they are very important components of the system made it necessary to do this research. It is considered that the awareness of the educational organizations or the

training staff about how they are perceived by their students will have contributions in terms of making up deficiencies, providing more qualified service, and approximating the organization to the goals.

It would be more useful to discuss the Turkish higher education system with a specific focus on colleges of education to give the reader an understanding of the background context in Turkey before starting the literature review section.

Higher education in Turkey

The Turkish higher education system was defined in 1981 by "The Higher Education Law", numbered 2547. According to this law, universities are bound to "The Council of Higher Education." The structures that are under the umbrella of the universities are as follows: "Colleges" that give education for 4–7 years (for instance, College of Education, College of Engineering, etc.); Vocational Schools of Higher Education that give career training for 2 years, and "The Institutes" that give postgraduate education (for instance, Institute of Educational Sciences, Institute of Science and Technology, etc.)

The Turkish higher education system has made rapid progress in recent years, at least in terms of the number of institutions. While there were 27 universities in total in 1982, the number of universities rose to 76 in 2002 (MEB 2010). In 2012, the number reached 168 (YOK 2012). As the numbers suggest, the progress in the number of universities within the last 10 years has occured at a level of 221 %. There is at least one university in each city, including the smallest cities, in Turkey. It is obligatory to take a high-stakes exam that is carried out countrywide to be able to benefit from higher education programs. Generally, the most preferred universities and the universities that accept students with the highest scores are in the central and western parts of the country, especially in three big cities; namely, İstanbul, Ankara, and İzmir.

The colleges of education that operate as formal components of the universities are the institutions that give education for 4–5 years. The quantitative development in the colleges of education took place just like the universities. While the number of colleges of education was 16 in 1988, the number increased to 54 in 2002 and to 92 in 2012. The rate of increase in the number of the colleges of education has been on the level of 170 % in the last 10 years.

Literature review

Organizational justice

Justice is perceived as an important concept by which to explore the relationships between different sides, such as individuals, social groups, organizations, and even nations (Folger and Cropanzano 1998). Since individuals, social groups, and organizations have different expectations and demands from each other, the satisfaction of these expectations and demands plays a significant role in their survival. In cases where mutual needs are not satisfied, problems arise related to justice. For example, when the expectations of individuals are not fulfilled at all or in the way they desire, they might think that they are exposed to injustice. Justice, important for individuals, is also important for organizations, as organizations are constituted by individuals who are gathered in order to provide specific needs. In this context, the term "organizational justice" has been developed to represent the fair distribution of every kind of individual and organizational outcome, award,

and punishment based on relationships within the organization (Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001).

The term "organizational justice" was derived from Adams' Equity Theory (1965). Adams (1965) tried to explain why and when workers perceive actions as justice or injustice, and how they react when they perceive an injustice (Greenberg 1990a). While the first studies that were done about organizational justice observed how the organizational practices were perceived by the workers (Greenberg 1990b), current studies try to determine the justice concept at work in the interpersonal relationships within the organization (Greenberg 1993). According to Beugre (1998), organizational justice is perceived justice between individuals and administrators and among colleagues within an organization.

Organizational justice in educational organizations

Although the organizational justice issue is not new in the administration literature (Beugre 1998; Greenberg 1996; Greenberg and Lind 2000), it is a neglected topic in educational administrations (Hoy and Tarter 2004). Greenberg and Lind (2000) defined the principles of organizational justice as follows: Principle of equity, principle of participation in the decision, principle of interpersonal justice, principle of consistency, principle of political and social equity, correction, accuracy, representation, and ethics (as cited, Hoy and Tarter 2004). Each one of these underlined principles is significantly important for a positive perception of justice in educational organizations. In Turkey, the studies carried out by Demircan (2003) and Karaeminoğulları (2006) on the instructors of universities, and the studies carried out by Özer and Demirtaş (2010) on the students of colleges of education, show that the OJ perception is at the "medium" level as well.

One of the elements that affects the perception of organizational justice is trust. Previous studies show a strong link between organizational justice and trust. The previous studies in different countries also indicate that the perception of OJ is related to the trust in the organization (Aryee et al. 2002; Colquitt et al. 2001). While Hoy and Tarter (2004) state that the main factor of OJ in schools is the perception of trust, Konovsky and Pugh (1994) support the idea that positive perceptions of justice in practices at schools have close relations with trust in the principles. Moreover, according to Greenberg (1990b), trust in the administration is influential in OJ perception. DiPaola and Guy (2009) suggest that there is a relationship between the OJ and the trust for workers, trust for principles and trust among colleagues. Hoy and Tarter (2004) also suggest that there is a meaningful and positive relationship between OJ and trust.

This is quite understandable, since principles such as equity, consistency, accuracy, and ethics, which constitute the concept of organizational justice, are closely associated with trust as well. Especially when educational institutions are taken into consideration, it could be said that the feeling of trust that the students feel for their instructors and administrators would affect their feelings toward organizational justice in a positive way. While examining the relationship between organizational justice and trust, it would be a good idea to uncover what trust is and how it develops.

Trust

Trust is based on a foundation of loyalty to each other, meaning that the concerns of one side cannot be formed without the trust of/in the other (Rousseu et al. 1998). Trust is the condition of being vulnerable based on one's acceptance of another's helpfulness, adequacy, honesty, and distinctness (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 1998; Tschannen-Moran 2001, 2003).

In organizations, administrators have the great responsibility of creating and sustaining a trusting environment. In schools, being educational organizations, the behaviors of both administrators and instructors are very important to form a general atmosphere of trust (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2000).

When higher education is considered, it could be said that students' trust in instructors and administrators is shaped as a result of the mutual relationships, positive efforts, and support that have been provided to them while coping with the problems arising during the process of education. Issues such as the competency of instructors and administrators, the way they handle their professions, and their consistency, openness, honesty, and willingness to help the students to overcome difficulties determine whether the students trust in their instructors and administrators or not.

Purpose of the study

This study focuses on determining university students' perceptions of organizational justice at the college of education in terms of trust in instructors and administrators (dean, associate deans, president, and chair of department), and the relationship between them. The following questions are investigated:

1.
   (a) What is the level of university students' perceptions of Organizational Justice (OJ), Student Trust in Faculty (STF), and Student Trust in Principals (STP)?
   (b) Is there a significant association between students' perception of trust in administrators and instructors and their perception of organizational justice?

2. Is there any significant difference between the size of university attended and OJ, STF, and STP?

3. Is there any significant difference in students' perceptions of OJ, STF, and STP based on the geographical region of their university?

This study will contribute to drawing a clear picture of the current situation in Turkish universities in terms of students' levels of perception of organizational justice and trust in administrators and instructors. Since the concept of size is closely related to the foundation year of the universities, two groups of universities exist. In the first group, there are institutions that have deep roots, having been founded long ago, while the universities in the second group are newly founded and less crowded. Differences in terms of size will help us understand which universities are better and what their perspectives and approaches towards the students are. The importance of examining the universities by taking their regions into consideration stems from the fact that regions show variations in terms of cultural structure and development. Moreover, determining differences in terms of regions will help us identify how these differences affect students' opinions. Determining whether there is a significant relationship between trust and organizational justice or not will help identify the things that could be done to improve the understanding of organizational justice. The findings gathered in terms of the above-mentioned variables are expected to contribute to the aim of the colleges of education about training qualified teachers.

This study has some limitations. The study is limited to six colleges of education in different universities from three regions. Hence, the results cannot be generalized to all universities in Turkey, foundation universities in particular. It should not be forgotten that each university, each college, and even each department might have a different organizational structure and many variables affecting this structure.

Research method

This study was conducted using a survey method in order to describe perceptions of university students of organizational justice, trust in administrators, and trust in instructors.

Participants and data collection

While assembling the sample for the study, cultural and geographical features peculiar to regions were taken into consideration. It can be said that the country is divided into three parts: "West," "Central," and "East." Turkey is a country divided into seven geographic regions: Marmara, Aegean, Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia, and Southeast Anatolia. These regions are classified using the frame of socio-economic and cultural concepts and are gathered under three regions. The regions of Marmara, Aegean, and the western Mediterranean are called "Western," the regions of the eastern Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, and the western Black Sea are called "Central," and the regions of the eastern Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia, and Southeast Anatolia are called "Eastern" (Fig. 1). Universities were also classified into three groups (Small, Medium, and Large) in terms of their size. Universities containing up to 15,000 students were considered "Small," those containing 15,000 and 30,000 students were considered "Medium," and those containing over 30,000 students were considered "Large." Two universities representing each region and size were selected using a purposeful sampling method. After selecting six universities, 1,900 junior students (third graders) and senior students (fourth graders) of the educational faculties at these universities and representing every department were included in the sample of the study in accordance with the principle of unbiasedness. The data of the study were gathered during 2010–2011 fall term by the researcher himself. In situations where he could not gather data himself, data were collected by instructors working at these universities during the classroom practices. Incompleted data collection tools were excluded from the scope of the analysis and 1,872 questionnaires were subject to analysis.

According to the data gathered, 362 of the students (19.3 %) were in universities from the "Western" of Turkey, 1,149 of them (61.4 %) were in universities from the "Central" of Turkey, and 361 of them (19.3 %) were in universities from "Eastern." There were 435 students (23.2 %) from "Small" universities, 351 students (18.8 %) from "Medium" universities, and 1,086 students (58 %) from "Large" universities.

Data collection instruments

As data collection instruments, "The Organizational Justice Scale" (OJS), developed by Hoy and Tarter (2004), and the "Student Trust in Principals" (STP) and "Student Trust in Faculty" (STF) scales, developed by Adams and Forsyth (Forsyth et al. 2011), were used. With permission from the researchers, the scales were translated into Turkish and adapted for university students. The adaptation of these scales into Turkish was carried out by the researcher during the 2010–2011 fall term in two universities. The scales were translated into Turkish by professional translators and then translated into English; then the translations were presented to eight faculty members who specialize in language-related fields for review. After receiving their suggestions, the scales were organized for university students and a Turkish language specialist looked at the grammar and meaning of the items before finalizing the surveys. Expressions in the original scales were preserved as much as possible to avoid meaning loss. For example, "Behaviors of principal is consistent" was

Fig. 1 The regions defined in this study

expressed as "Behaviors of administrators in this college are consistent" OJS, "Principal in my school is fair" was expressed as "Administrators in my college are fair" STP, and "It is easy to communicate with instructors in this school" was expressed as "It is easy to communicate with instructors in this college" STF. Reliability and validity studies of the finalized instruments were done in two different schools with 408 people.

The original OSJ scale was composed of 10 items. It was constructed as a Likert-type scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree) with 0.97 Cronbach's alpha, larger than 0.77 factor loadings and 78 % of explained total variance (Hoy and Tarter 2004). As for our reliability and validity analysis, the Kaiser Mayer Olkin (KMO) value was 0.94, and the factor loading of 10 items under the one factor ranged from 0.49 to 0.73. The total variance explained by the scale was 60.49 %, and Cronbach's alpha value was 0.93.

The original STP scale was composed of 12 items. It was constructed as a 4-point Likert-type scale from 1 (Never) to 4 (Always). Factor loadings were between 0.69 and 0.84. It explained 65 % of the total variance and its Cronbach's alpha value was 0.95 (Forsyth et al. 2011). In our reliability and validity analysis, the KMO value was 0.96 for all dimensions (openness, honesty, benevolence, competence, and reliability) gathered under one factor and the factor loading of 12 items ranged between 0.55 and 0.71. The total variance explained by the scale was 62.73 %, and Cronbach's alpha value was 0.95.

The original STF scale was composed of 12 items. It was constructed as a 4-point Likert-type scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). Factor loadings were between 0.62 and 0.85. Cronbach's alpha value was 0.90 (Forsyth et al. 2011). In our reliability and validity analysis, the KMO value of the STF scale was 0.95 for all dimensions (openness, honesty, benevolence, competence, and reliability) gathered under one factor, and the factor loading of 13 items ranged between 0.30 and 0.72. The total variance explained by the scale was 56.68 %, and Cronbach's alpha value was 0.89.

All three scales had close values to the original scale values. Considering these values, it was decided that there was no problem in using these scales translated into Turkish and adapted to university students, so data were collected by using these scales.

Data analyses

SPSS 17.0 software was used for data analysis. For the "a" item of the first research question, descriptive statistics were used. Arithmetic means for the OJ scale were determined as follows: 1.00–2.67 "Low," 2.68–4.34 "Moderate," 4.35–6.00 "High." When it comes to the STF and STP scales, the values were determined as follows: 1.00–2.00 "Low," 2.01–3.00 "Moderate," and 3.01–4.00 "High." For the "b" item of the first question, regression analysis was used; for the second and the third questions, ANOVA was used. Conducted analyses were done at the $p < 0.05$ significance level.

Results

Question 1. (a) What is the level of university students' perceptions of Organizational Justice (OJ), Student Trust in Faculty (STF), and Student Trust in Principals (STP)?

The results of the analyses and descriptive statistics results are given in Table 1. 1,872 students participated in the research. Related to the first research question, the findings show that OJ has a mean (M) of 3.50 and a standard deviation (SD) of 1.04. STF has a mean (M) of 2.64 and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.55. STP has a mean (M) of 2.62 and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.60. These means show that level of perception of organizational justice and trust in administrators and instructors were "medium" (Table 1).

Question 1. (b) Is there a significant association between students' perception of trust in administrators and instructors and their perception of organizational justice?

In order to understand whether students' trust perception of administrators was a predictor of OJ, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. Results reveal that students' trust in administrators explains 54.6 % of their perceptions of organizational justice ($R = 0.740$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.546$, $F(5, 1865) = 450.297$, $p < 0.01$). Trust in administrators has a significant positive effect on explaining organizational justice (STP: $\beta = 0.735$, $t = 46.832$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 2). Therefore, perceptions of trust in administrators is a considerably strong predictor of organizational trust.

In order to understand whether students' trust perception towards instructors was a predictor of OJ, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. According to the results, students' trust in instructors explain 41.9 % of their perceptions of organizational justice ($R = 0.648$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.419$, $F(5, 1865) = 270.233$, $p < 0.01$). Trust in instructors has a significant positive effect on explaining organizational justice (STF: $\beta = 0.637$, $t = 35.715$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 3). From these results, it is understood that trust in instructors is a predictor of organizational justice.

Question 2. Is there any significant difference between the size of university attended and OJ, STF, and STP?

Table 1 Descriptive statistics related to organizational justice (OJ), trust in instructors (STF), and trust in administrators (STP)

Scale	N	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Organizational Justice (OJ)	1,872	3.50	1.04	1	6
Student Trust in Faculty Scale (STF)	1,872	2.64	0.55	1	4
Student Trust in Principal Scale (STP)	1,872	2.62	0.60	1	4

Table 2 Results of regression regarding trust in administrators and organizational justice

Dependent variable: organizational justice

Variable	B	ShB	β	t	p	Partial	Part
(Constant)	0.125	0.074		1.689	0.091		
STP	1.286	0.027	0.735	46.832	0.000	0.735	0.735

R = 0.740, Adjusted R^2 = 0.546, F = 450.297, p = 0.000

Table 3 Results of regression regarding trust in instructors and organizational justice

Dependent variable: organizational justice

Variable	B	ShB	β	t	p	Partial	Part
(Constant)	0.286	0.092		3.119	0.002		
STF	1.215	0.034	0.637	35.715	0.000	0.637	0.637

R = 0.406, Adjusted R^2 = 0.405, F = 1,275.551, p = 0.000

Table 4 ANOVA results for OJ, STF and STP according to the size of universities

		f	M	SD	df	F	p	Tamhane
OJ	1-Small	435	3.88	0.91	2	40.439	0.000*	1–2*
	2-Medium	351	3.30	1.14	1,869			1–3*
	3-Large	1,086	3.41	1.02	1,871			
STF	1-Small	435	2.84	0.48	2	40.580	0.000*	1–2*
	2-Medium	351	2.54	0.58	1,869			1–3*
	3-Large	1,086	2.59	0.54	1,871			
STP	1-Small	435	2.81	0.54	2	27.970	0.000*	1–2*
	2-Medium	351	2.53	0.62	1,869			1–3*
	3-Large	1,086	2.58	0.59	1,871			

* $p < 0.05$

Results of a one-way ANOVA conducted to understand whether there was a significant difference in OJ, STF, and STP perceptions based on the size of the university are given in Table 4. According to the ANOVA results, there is a significant difference between at least two groups for perceptions of OJ [F(2, 1869) = 40.439, $p < 0.01$], STF [F(2, 1869) = 40.580, $p < 0.01$] and STP [F(2, 1869) = 27.970, $p < 0.01$]. According to multiple comparisons (Tamhane's T2) done in order to understand among which groups there is significant difference, perceptions of OJ, STF, and STP differ for "Small," "Medium," and "Large" universities. The mean of "Small" universities [M(OJ = 3.88; STF = 2.84; STP = 2.81)] is significantly higher than the other universities in all three fields (Table 4).

Question 3. Is there any significant difference in students' perceptions of OJ, STF, and STP based on the geographical region of their university?

Results of the one-way ANOVA to understand whether there is a significant mean difference for OJ, trust STF, and STP based on the size of the universities are given in Table 5. According to the ANOVA results on perceptions related to OJ

Table 5 ANOVA results for OJ, STF, and STP based on regions of universities

		f	M	SD	df	F	p	LSD
OJ	1-Western	362	3.35	1.11	2	9.181	0.000*	1–2*
	2-Central	1,149	3.49	1.02	1,869			1–3*
	3-Eastern	361	3.68	1.03	1,871			2–3*
STF	1-Western	362	2.57	0.58	2	3.467	0.031*	1–2*
	2-Central	1,149	2.66	0.54	1,869			1–3*
	3-Eastern	361	2.66	0.53	1,871			
STP	1-Western	362	2.55	0.61	2	8.023	0.000*	1–3*
	2-Central	1,149	2.61	0.59	1,869			2–3*
	3-Eastern	361	2.73	0.60	1,871			

* $p < 0.05$

[$F(2, 1869) = 9.181$, $p < 0.01$], STF [$F(2, 1869) = 3.467$, $p < 0.05$] and STP [$F(2, 1869) = 8.023$, $p < 0.01$], there is a significant difference between at least two groups. In multiple comparison tests (LSD) employed in order to understand where the difference is among groups, it is revealed that there is a significant difference for OJ between "Western" and both "Central" and "Eastern" and between "Central" and "Eastern"; for STF, between "Western" and both "Central" and "Eastern"; and for STP, between "Eastern" and both "Central" and "Western." The means for the universities in the eastern regions [M(OJ = 3.68; STF = 2.66; STP = 2.73)] are higher than the other universities in all three fields. While going from Eastern to Western, the means diminish; in other words, perceptions towards these subjects change negatively while going from Eastern to Western (Table 5).

Discussion

According to the results of the statistical analyses, perceptions of students' OJ, STP, and STF are at the "medium" level. Previous studies (Demircan 2003; Polat and Celep 2008) carried out on this topic attained similar results. In this study, the results related to organizational justice cannot be interpreted very positively because "medium" levels of OJ, STP, and STF hint that many students cannot get their expectations fulfilled, universities are not fair enough, and administrators and instructors do not reflect adequate trust. Results of the regression analysis show that students' perceptions of trust in both administrators and instructors meaningfully explain their perceptions of OJ. Perceptions of trust in both administrators and instructors are found to be significantly related to perceptions of OJ.

Based on the size of the universities, there is a significant difference detected for OJ, STP, and STF. For each field, "Small" universities have more positive perceptions than both "Medium" and "Large" universities. Small populations of students in small schools have more opportunities to communicate with both instructors and administrators, which may strengthen informal relationships and enable the instructors and administrators to spend more time on students and to help them more. By these actions, students' perceptions of OJ and trust might be affected positively. In large universities, the large number of students makes these types of relationships more difficult. For instance, 41 % of the students in Gazi University, a university located in the developed and central part of Turkey, evaluated the instructors as "poor" or "very poor" in terms of communication

inside and outside the class; 32.8 % did the same evaluation in terms of fair assessment of student achievements (GÜ 2001). According to the results of the study carried out by Aydın and Karaman-Kepenekçi (2008) to determine the ideas of school principles on OJ, school principals share the thought that it is much harder to provide OJ in big schools. This situation verifies the low OJ and trust in big universities found in the present study.

According to the regions where the universities exist, there is a significant difference detected between "Western" institutions and both "Central" and "Eastern" institutions and between "Central" institutions and "Eastern" institutions for OJ. In terms of OJ, universities in all three regions have different levels of perceptions. The results suggest that the perception of OJ is changing positively while going from west to east. There is a significant level of difference between universities located in "Eastern" institutions and in "Central" and "Western" institutions for STP, and between universities located in "Western" institutions and in "Central" and "Eastern" institutions for STF. This difference favors universities located in "Eastern." While moving from "Western" to "Eastern," perceptions of trust in both administrators and instructors increase. University students in "Eastern" have higher and more positive perceptions not only toward OJ but also toward trust than students in other regions. However, this result is not an expected one. The expected result was that the students of colleges of education in the western universities had higher perceptions of OJ, STP, and STF because these universities are in much better condition. There may, however, be many personal, cultural, and economic reasons for these results.

In Turkey, admission of students to a university is determined by a central examination. Students who perform best in this exam have the opportunity to select the best universities in the country and get an education there. However, students whose scores are either moderate or lower tend to prefer universities in the same region where they reside, considering the ease of transportation and education expenses, and the opportunity to be admitted to universities with low scores. For instance, 77.9 % of the students who preferred Yüzüncü Yıl University (located in "Eastern") in 2008 live in the same region (YYÜ 2008). The reason that students have a more positive perception of universities in the Eastern region may be that students who reside this region prefer universities in the East. Among the students of Gazi University, the fact that the ones who live in villages and towns have a more positive point of view than the ones coming from big cities (GÜ 2003) also supports this idea. It can also be argued that the expectations of students with low scores taken from the high-stake exams may be lower than those who got higher scores. Students may expect to have more qualified service when studying in the most developed universities which are located in Western and Central Turkey. When this expectation level is kept high, the service provided for them might be perceived as insufficient. For instance, students of Gazi University find certain things to be insufficient. The percentages are as follows: 55.4 % are not happy with college buildings, 48.1 % think the library is insufficient, 67.7 % are not content with sports services, 66.2 % believe that computer services are not sufficient, 46.7 % want more professional practice opportunities and 63.5 % think that there should be more scientific, social, and cultural activities.

Conclusion

The present study mainly focuses on identifying the perceptions of university students regarding organizational justice, trust in instructors and administrators. According to the results of the statistical analyses, perceptions of students' on organizational justice, trust in instructors and administrators are at the "medium" level. Results of the regression analysis

show that students' perceptions of trust in both principals and instructors meaningfully explain their perceptions of organizational justice. Perceptions of trust in both administrators and instructors are found to be significantly related to perceptions of organizational justice. A significant difference is observed between the perceptions of trust in organizational justice, principals and instructors based on the size and the region of the universities. It is revealed that the mean scores of students' perceptions are higher in small universities compared to large ones. In a similar way, higher scores are found in western universities compared to eastern universities.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (vol 2* (pp. 267–299). New York: Academic Press.

Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2010). Değerlere göre yönetim ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisinin ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre incelenmesi [Examining the relationship between management by values and organizational justice by secondary school teachers perceptions].]*Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice], 16*(4), 463–484.

Ambrose, M. L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 803–812.

Arslantaş, C. C., & Pekdemir, I. (2007). Dönüşümcü liderlik, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemeye yönelik görgül bir araştırma, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1.

Aryee, S., Budwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(3), 267–285.

Aydın, İ., & Karaman-Kepenekçi, Y. (2008). Principals' opinions of organizational justice in elementary schools in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(4), 497–513.

Baş, G., & Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice], 17*(1), 29–62.

Beugre, C. D. (1998). *Managing fairness in organizations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J., & Roman, P. (2005). Organizational justice and job satisfaction: A test of three competing models. *Social Justice Research, 18*(4), 391–409.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278–321.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425–445.

Demircan, N. (2003). Örgütsel güvenin bir ara değişken olarak örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: Eğitim sektöründe bir uygulama. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Dilek, H. (2005). Liderlik tarzlarının ve adalet algısının; örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatminive örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerine etkilerine yönelik bir araştırma. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze,Türkiye.

DiPaola, M. F., & Guy, S. (2009). The impact of organizational justice on climate and trust in high schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 19*, 382–405.

Eroğlu, Ş. G. (2009). Örgütsel adalet algılaması ve iş tatmini hakkında bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli, Türkiye.

Eskew, D. E. (1993). The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*(3), 185–194.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications

Forsyth, P. B., Adams, C. M., & Hoy, W. K. (2011). *Collective trust*. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenberg, J. (1990a). Looking fair versus being fair: Managing impressions of organizational justice. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*(1), 111–157.

Greenberg, J. (1990b). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*(2), 399–432.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the work place*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greenberg, J., & Lind, E. A. (2000). The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application. In C. L. Cooper & E. W. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 72–107). Malden, MA: Blackwell Press.

GÜ, (2001). Üniversite gençliği 2001, Üniversite gençliğinin sosyo-kültürel profili üzerine bir alan araştırması, Gazi Üniversitesi örneği, G.Ü. İletişim Fakültesi basımevi, Ankara.

GÜ, (2003). *Türk üniversite gençliği araştırması, üniversite gençliğinin sosyo-kültürel profili*, Ankara.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management, 18*(4), 250–259.

İşbaşı, J. Ö. (2001). Çalışanların yöneticilerine duydukları güvenin ve örgütsel adalete ilişkin algılamalarının vatandaşlık davranışının oluşumundaki rolü. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1*(1), 51–73.

İşcan, Ö. F., & Naktiyok, A. (2004). Çalışanların örgütsel bağdaşımlarının belirleyicileri olarak örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel adalet algıları. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 59*(1), 181–201.

Karaeminoğulları, A. (2006). Öğretim elemanlarının örgütsel adalet algıları ile sergiledikleri üretkenliğe aykırı davranışlar arasındaki ilişki ve bir araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi.

Karriker, J. H., & Williams, M. L. (2009). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediated multifoci model. *Journal of Management, 35*(1), 112–135.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 656–669.

MEB, (2010). *Cumhuriyet döneminde Türk milli eğitim sistemindeki gelişmeler*, Ankara.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), 845–855.

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(3), 527–556.

Özer, N., & Demirtaş, H. (2010). Students' perceptions regarding the fairness of learning environment in faculty of education. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 38*, 126–145.

Pillai, R., Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (1999). Leadership and organizational justice: similarities and differences across cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*(4), 763–779.

Polat, S., & Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 14*(54), 307–331.

Rousseu, D. M., Sitkin, S. M., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 393–405.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*(3), 195–207.

Tschannen-M, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(4), 308–331.

Tschannen-M, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship in schools: Transformational leadership and trust. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in learning and organizing schools* (pp. 157–179). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Tschannen-M, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*(4), 334–352.

Tschannen-M, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 547–593.

Yıldırım, F. (2002). *Çalışma yaşamında örgüte bağlılık ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisi.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye.

Yılmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(1), 108–126.

YOK, (2012). Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu. http://www.yok.gov.tr/content/view/527/222/lang,tr/. Accessed 25 May 2012.

YYÜ, (2008). *2007–2008 öğretim yılı faaliyet raporu*. Van.