



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS, ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

Kürşad YILMAZ^{*a}; Yahya ALTINKURT^a

^aDumlupınar University, Faculty of Education
Kütahya/TÜRKİYE

ABSTRACT

This paper examined the relationships between the school administrators' leadership behavior and teachers' perceptions of organizational trust, and organizational justice. The sample of the survey model study consists of 271 high school teachers that working in the province of Kütahya in Turkey. Data is collected by "Organizational Trust Scale", "Organizational Justice Scale" and "Leadership Behavior Scale". Data is analyzed through descriptive statistics and Regression Analysis. The research findings show that teachers have positive perceptions about organizational trust, organizational justice and school administrators' leadership behaviors. There is a high correlation between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and perceptions of trust to administrator. There is a moderate positive correlation between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and trust in colleagues and trust in stakeholders. Supportive leadership and organizational justice are significant predictors of teachers' perceptions of organizational trust. Supportive leadership and organizational justice explain nearly two thirds of perception of trust to administrator, nearly one third of perception of trust in colleagues and nearly one fifth of perception of trust in stakeholders.

Keywords: Leadership, organizational justice, organizational trust

INTRODUCTION

Parallel with the developments of theories of administration, vital importance of human resources for organizations is gradually understood and the number of relevant studies are constantly increasing. Instead of human values in administration, which were once ignored or given secondary importance, human-centered contemporary theories to account employees' feelings, views, values, culture and needs were developed (Bursalıoğlu, 2003). According to these theories, employees' perceptions of organizational life are crucial and must be evaluated, because organizations and employees are in mutual need. In organizational life, as in social life, individuals expect their needs to be met in return for their contributions to organizations.

One of the most important needs of employees is need for trust, because trust is a binding power in interpersonal relationships. Maslow, known as the father of hierarchy of needs theory in motivation, suggests trust is the second most essential need after physiological needs, which confirms such a claim. Trust, which could be defined as individuals' beliefs in those in mutual interaction without any fear, hesitation or doubt (Lewicki, and Bunker, 1996; Meyerson, Weick, and Kramer, 1996; Mishra, 1996; Hoy, and Miskel, 2010), is an indispensable part of

* Co-Author: kursadyilmaz@gmail.com

organizational life. Particularly in educational organizations, administrator-teacher, teacher-teacher, teacher-parent, teacher-student mutual trust or mistrust perception appears to have positive or negative impacts on organizational functioning. A safe environment contributes much for organizational development and brings increased effectiveness (Lewicki, and Bunker, 1996; Cooper, and Sawaf, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

Trust is the basis of intraorganizational interaction and guides interpersonal relationships. In a safe environment, individuals make sure that they will not suffer even in daily interactions (Özdil, 2005; Memduhoğlu, and Zengin, 2010). As a result, employees do not refrain from risk taking and new ideas and behaviors (Cooper, and Sawaf, 1997; Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies, 1998). In organizations with high trust levels, an explicit organizational climate occurs, fears and uncertainties disappear, responsibilities are shared, employees tend to collaborate, conflicts and turnover rates decrease (Asanakutlu, 2007; Polat, 2009; Memduhoğlu, and Zengin, 2010). At the same time, relationships between school administrators, teachers, parents and students based on trust increase student achievement (Hoy, Tarter, and Witkoskie, 1992; Hoy, and Miskel, 2010). Employees' organizational trust is shaped according to behaviors of other individuals or groups with who they are in direct or indirect interaction in organizations.

When the related literature is reviewed, it is clear that there are different classifications of dimensions of organizational trust. In this research, dimensions of organizational trust are defined as "trust in administrator", "trust in colleagues", and "trust in stakeholders" since the purpose of research is to determine teachers' trust levels (Hoy, and Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Yılmaz, 2004, 2006, 2009; Samancı-Kalaycı, 2007). These dimensions are briefly summarized below (Yılmaz, 2009):

Trust in administrator: This dimension associates with behaviors such as teachers' trust in school administrators' honesty, fulfillment of promises by school administrators, steady teacher-administrator relationships, concerns with problems of employees and confidentiality of employees' personal and private information. *Trust in colleagues:* This dimension associates with teachers' trust in other colleagues, teachers' obvious, steady behaviors with certain commitment, teachers' beliefs in statements of colleagues and confidentiality in conversations. *Trust in stakeholders:* This dimension associates with teachers' beliefs in students, parents, work of students, support of parents, and statements of students and parents and so on.

Employees' organizational trust levels are influenced by various variables and affect many variables (Polat, 2007). The purpose of research examined the relationships between the school administrators' leadership behavior and teachers' perceptions of organizational trust, and organizational justice. Specifically, the study examined whether, and to what extent, school administrators' leadership behavior and organizational justice predict variation in the organizational trust levels of teachers.

The term organizational justice associates with employees' perceptions of organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990, 1996; Moorman, 1991; Eskew, 1993; Altinkurt, 2010; Karademir, and Çoban, 2010). As organizational justice is employees' perception of justice in organizational distribution, procedure, and interaction, they have certain criteria in defining such a perception and use these criteria to see justice in behaviors towards them. In the literature, organizational justice is generally taken under the dimensions of "distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice". *Distributive justice* reflects employees' perceptions of distribution of sources in organizational life. *Procedural justice* is employees' perception of justice in procedures included in source distribution. *Interactional justice* highlights the quality of interpersonal relationships in organizations. Still, over the past years,

there has been a holistic approach in organizational justice studies, instead of analysis based on dimensions (Yılmaz, 2010). Colquitt, Greenberg, and Zapata-Phelan (2005) suggest that today's researchers tend to develop models or theories which attempt to discuss organizational justice in all aspects with a holistic approach. Besides, in meta analysis studies, it is highlighted that correlations between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice are not defined by research (Colquitt et al., 2001). Therefore, a holistic approach is preferred in the present study.

One of the fit factors of employees' organizational trust level is administrators' leadership behaviors. A leader is the person who affects organizational members through power and influence (Başaran, 1992; Çelik, 2003). Hence, the way leaders manage organizations or leadership behaviors absolutely affect employees' positive or negative organizational perceptions. According to House and Evans's Path-Goal theory, there are four main types of leadership behavior (Çelik, 2003). These are namely "directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership and representative leadership". In Path-Goal Theory of Leadership, directive and supportive leadership behavior levels displayed by administrators show the type of leadership. In *directive leadership*, a high level of directive behavior is observed as well as a low level supportive behavior. In *supportive leadership*, a high level of supportive behavior is observed as well as a low level of directive behavior. In *representative leadership*, a low level of supportive behavior is observed as well as a low level of directive behavior. Finally, in *participative leadership*, a high level of directive behavior is observed as well as a high level of supportive behavior (Hodgetts, and Kuratko, 1999).

Directive leadership might be considered as autocratic leadership. Leaders with such behaviors tend to observe anything that teachers do, control their activities, make decisions on their own, closely monitor teachers (Turan, 1998) and use rather legal power. Supportive leadership behavior includes creating a warm environment and considering employees' needs and preferences (Hoy, and Miskel, 2010). Supportive leadership includes task appreciation, support employees, constructive criticism, support and engagement in new ideas, and employee involvement in decision making (Yılmaz, 2002).

When the studies in the literature are reviewed, it is apparent that the relationship between organizational trust and various variables is examined. These variables are *organizational justice* (Alexander, and Ruderman, 1987; Niehoff, and Moorman, 1993; Cohen-Charash, and Spector, 2001; Günaydın, 2001; İşbaşı, 2001; Polat, 2007; Polat, and Celep, 2008; Yılmaz, Karaköse, and Altinkurt, 2009), *leadership behaviors* (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter 1990; Padsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer, 1996; Hoy, and Sabo, 1998; Pillai, Scandura, and Williams, 1999; Francisco, 2000; Arslantaş, and Pekdemir, 2007), and *organizational citizenship* (De Luga, 1995; İşbaşı, 2001; Kamer, 2001; Samancı-Kalaycı, 2007; Yılmaz, 2009). The purpose of research examined the relationships between the school administrators' leadership behavior and teachers' perceptions of organizational trust, and organizational justice. Specifically, the study examined whether, and to what extent, school administrators' leadership behavior and organizational justice predict variation in the organizational trust levels of teachers. To this end, the following questions were answered:

1. What are high school teachers' perceptions about high school administrators' leadership behaviors, organizational justice and organizational trust?
2. Are school administrators' leadership behaviors and organizational justice significant predictors of organizational trust levels of teachers?

METHOD

The research was a survey model. The research attempted to define the current relationship between the school administrators' leadership behaviors and teachers' perception of organizational justice and organizational trust.

Participants

The population of the study consisted of 663 high school teachers in the province of Kütahya in the 2009–2010 academic year. Cochran's sample size formula was used to calculate the sample size and it was found that 243 individuals were needed for a 95% trust level. It was decided to receive 300 teachers' perceptions, taking a lower expected rate of return into account. The participants were randomly chosen. 280 questionnaires were returned. The rate of return for the data collection tools was 93.33%. 271 eligible data collection tools were used for analysis. Thus the sample of study consists 271 high school teachers that working in the province of Kütahya. 43.9% (n=119) of the participants were female, 56.1% (n=152) were male. The participants' ages ranged from 25 to 56. The percentage of those in the age range of 30 years and below was 15.1 (n=41), those in the age range of 31–35 years was 31.5 (n=85), those in the age range of 36–40 years was 25.5 (n=69) and those in the age range of 41 years and above was 28 (n=76). Because of the variety of branch, the participants were divided into two groups: culture course teachers (n=239) and vocational course teachers (n=32). The branch of all of teachers was considered as culture, except for those at vocational schools. The percentage of those in the experience range of 1–10 years was 36.2 (n=98), those in the experience range of 11–20 years was 43.9 (n=119), those in the experience range of 21 years and above was 19.9 (n=54). 23.6 (n=64) of the teachers were from general high schools, 30.3% (n=82) of them were from vocational high schools, and 46.1% (n=125) of them were from Anatolian-Science high schools.

Instruments

“Leadership Behavior Scale”, “Organizational Justice Scale” and “Organizational Trust Scale” were used for data collection. *Leadership Behavior Scale* was a 14 item scale which consisted of two sub-dimensions: Supportive Leadership Behavior Subscale and Directive Leadership Behavior Subscale. Leadership Behavior Scale was developed by Yılmaz (2002) and reliability and validity studies were carried out. Reliability coefficients of the scale were as follows: 0.79 for Supportive Leadership Behavior Subscale and 0.78 for Directive Leadership Behavior Subscale. The 14 items in “Leadership Behavior Scale” collectively explained 55% of total variance. The answer sheet of the scale was as follows: 1-I totally disagree, 2-I disagree, 3-I moderately agree, 4-I agree and 5-I totally agree. Increases in the subscale scores showed that administrators highly displayed leadership behavior in the related dimension.

The initial form of *Organizational Justice Scale* was developed by Hoy and Tarter (2004) and it was adapted to Turkish language by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). The scale was used by Yılmaz (2010) on high school teachers and reliability and validity studies were carried out again. Accordingly, the scale was a 10-item Likert type scale and it had a single dimension. Total variance explained by that single dimension was 53. Factor loadings of the scale items ranged from 0.39 to 0.87. A factor loading at least of 0.30 was taken as a criterion for factor analysis. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.88 (Yılmaz, 2010). The answer sheet of the scale was as follows: 1-I totally disagree, 2-I disagree, 3-I moderately agree, 4-I agree and 5-I totally agree. High scale scores showed positive perceptions of organizational justice (Hoy, and Tarter, 2004).

Organizational Trust Scale was developed by Yılmaz (2006) and reliability and validity studies were carried out. The scale consisted of three sub-dimensions (trust in administrator, trust in colleagues and trust in stakeholders) and totally 22 items. Reliability coefficients of the scale were found respectively as follows: 0.89 for Trust to Administrator Subscale, 0.87 for Trust in Colleagues Subscale, and 0.82 for Trust in Stakeholders Subscale. Total variance explained by the whole scale was 45.31% and Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.92. The answer sheet of the scale was as follows: 1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Mostly and 5-Always. Total scale scores showed the level of participants' perceptions about organizational trust at high schools. A high score from each factor showed a high feeling of trust, and a low score showed a low feeling of trust.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to explain the teachers' perceptions. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine whether administrators' leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice significantly predicted teachers' organizational trust. A correlation coefficient as an absolute value ranging from 0.70 to 1.00 was considered as a high correlation, a correlation value ranging from 0.69 to 0.30 was considered as a moderate correlation, a correlation value ranging from 0.29 to 0.00 was considered as a low correlation (Büyüköztürk, 2002).

RESULTS

In this section, the high school teachers' perceptions about school administrators' leadership behaviors, organizational justice, and organizational trust levels were taken. Then, specifically, the study examined whether, and to what extent, school administrators' leadership behavior and organizational justice predict variation in the organizational trust levels of teachers.

The high school teachers' perceptions about school administrators' leadership behaviors were closer to "I agree" ($\bar{x}=3.83$, $S=0.72$) in the dimension of supportive leadership and to "I moderately agree" ($\bar{x}=3.18$, $S=0.55$) in the dimension of directive leadership. The most agreed item in the dimension of supportive leadership was "School administrators set examples for the staff because of their hard work" ($\bar{x}=3.98$, $S=0.81$) and the least agreed item was "School administrators are open to teachers in need after school" ($\bar{x}=3.68$, $S=0.97$). The most agreed item in the dimension of directive leadership was "School administrators closely control teachers' activities" ($\bar{x}=3.79$, $S=0.84$) and the least agreed item was "School administrators are self opinionated leaders" ($\bar{x}=2.39$, $S=1.24$).

The participants' perceptions of organizational justice were high. The participants perceptions ($n=258$, $\bar{x}=3.89$, $S=0.81$) were closer to "I agree". The most agreed item was "School administrators respect and appreciate everyone" ($\bar{x}=4.09$, $S=0.86$) and the least agreed item was "There is no preferential treatment at school" ($\bar{x}=3.64$, $S=1.08$).

The teachers' perceptions about organizational trust were closer to "mostly" in the dimensions of trust in colleagues ($\bar{x}=3.85$, $S=0.66$), trust in administrator ($\bar{x}=3.81$, $S=0.55$), and to "sometimes" ($\bar{x}=3.54$, $S=0.66$) in the dimension of trust in stakeholders. When total trust scores were considered, the teachers' perceptions were closer to "mostly" ($\bar{x}=3.74$, $S=0.52$). The most agreed item in the dimension of trust to administrator was "I trust school administrator's honesty" ($\bar{x}=4.21$, $S=0.76$) and the least agreed item was "School administrators share personal information with teachers" ($\bar{x}=2.49$, $S=1.06$). The most agreed item in the dimension of trust in colleagues was "I trust other teachers at school" ($\bar{x}=4.08$, $S=0.76$) and the least agreed item was "I believe conversations in teachers' room are

confidential” ($\bar{x}=3.54$, $S=1.01$). The most agreed item in the dimension of trust in stakeholders was “I trust what students do” ($\bar{x}=43.72$, $S=0.784$) and the least agreed item was “Students do not cheat teachers even when they have a chance” ($\bar{x}=3.26$, $S=1.06$).

The secondary purpose of research was to examine whether, and to what extent, school administrators’ leadership behavior and organizational justice predict variation in the organizational trust levels of teachers. In the study, the sub-dimensions of organizational trust were taken as the predicted variable. Within this framework, hierarchical regression analysis was applied. In the analysis, the variables were involved in regression analysis in three groups. In the first model, the impact of school administrators’ leadership behaviors was examined, and in the second model, the impact of organizational justice perceptions was tested. In the third model, all of the variables in both models were involved in the analysis. Hierarchical regression analysis results of predictive variables of organizational trust perception are given in the tables below.

Table 1. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results of Predictive Factors of Perception of Trust in Administrator

Model	Inconstant	B	Standard Error	β	T	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
1	Constant	1.766	0.148	-	11.938	0.00	-	-
	Supportive leadership	0.613	0.029	0.807	21.127	0.00	0.79	0.79
	Directive leadership	-0.095	0.038	-0.095	-2.495	0.01	0.07	-0.15
<i>R=0.79, R²=0.63, F₍₂₋₂₆₈₎= 225.3, p=0.00</i>								
2	Constant	1.554	0.122	-	12.786	0.00	-	-
	Organizational justice	0.579	0.031	0.756	18.919	0.00	0.76	0.76
<i>R=0.76, R²=0.57, F₍₁₋₂₆₉₎=357.9, p=0.00</i>								
3	Constant	1.326	0.154	-	8.621	0.00	-	-
	Supportive leadership	0.394	0.143	0.519	9.088	0.00	0.79	0.32
	Directive leadership	-0.032	0.037	-0.032	-0.854	0.394	0.07	-0.03
	Organizational justice	0.276	0.043	0.360	6.454	0.00	0.76	0.22
<i>R=0.82, R²=0.68, F₍₃₋₂₆₇₎=186.9, p=0.00</i>								

As it is clear from Table 1, Model 1 ($R=0.79$, $R^2=0.63$, $p<0.01$) and Model 2 ($R=0.76$, $R^2=0.57$, $p<0.01$) were important predictors of the perception of trust in administrator. Model 1 individually explained 63% of the perception of trust to administrator, and Model 2 explained 57% of the perception of trust in administrator. Model 3, which was designed to see the predictive power of school administrators’ leadership behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice on trust to administrator was also significant ($R=0.82$, $R^2=0.68$, $p<0.01$). The first and the second model together explained 68% of the perception of trust to administrator. Involving organizational justice in regression analysis made a contribution of 5% to explained variance. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), relative order of importance of the predictive variables on trust to administrator was as follows: supportive leadership and organizational justice. When t test results of significance of regression analysis coefficients were considered, it was seen that both supportive leadership and organizational justice were predictors of teachers’ perception of organizational trust. However, directive leadership behavior did not have an important influence on the perception of trust to administrator. According to the obtained findings, regression equation of trust to administrator was as follows:

$$\text{Perception of Trust to Administrator} = 1.326 + 0.39 \text{ Supportive Leadership} - 0.03 \text{ Directive Leadership} + 0.28 \text{ Perception of Organizational Justice}$$

In Table 2, Hierarchical Regression Analysis results of predictive factors of perception of trust in colleagues are presented.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results of Predictive Factors of Perception of Trust in Colleagues

Model	Inconstant	B	Standard Error	β	T	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
1	Constant	2.061	0.250	-	8.237	0.00	-	-
	Supportive Leadership	0.445	0.049	0.492	9.066	0.00	0.48	0.48
	Directive Leadership	0.028	0.065	0.023	0.428	0.67	0.13	0.02
$R=0.50, R^2=0.25, F_{(2-268)}=44.0, p=0.00$								
2	Constant	1.967	0.187	-	10.504	0.00	-	-
	Organizational Justice	0.484	0.047	0.531	10.268	0.00	0.53	0.53
$R=0.53, R^2=0.28, F_{(1-269)}=105.4, p=0.00$								
3	Constant	1.478	0.268	-	5.516	0.00	-	-
	Supportive Leadership	0.155	0.076	0.171	2.048	0.04	0.50	0.12
	Directive Leadership	0.112	0.064	0.094	1.744	0.08	0.13	0.11
	Organizational Justice	0.366	0.074	0.401	4.915	0.00	0.53	0.29
$R=0.58, R^2=0.31, F_{(3-267)}=12.3, p=0.00$								

As it is clear from Table 2, Model 1 ($R=0.50, R^2=0.25, p<0.01$) and Model 2 ($R=0.53, R^2=0.28, p<0.01$) were important predictors of the perception of trust in colleagues. Model 1 explained 25% of the perception of trust in colleagues and Model 2 explained 28% of the perception of trust in colleagues. Model 3, which was designed to see the predictive power of school administrators' leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice on trust in colleagues was also significant ($R=0.58, R^2=0.31, p<0.01$).

The first and the second model together explained 31% of the perception of trust to administrator. Involving organizational justice in regression analysis made a contribution of 6% to explained variance. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), relative order of importance of the predictive variables on trust in colleagues was as follows: organizational justice and supportive leadership. When t test results of significance of regression analysis coefficients were considered, it was seen that both supportive leadership and organizational justice were predictors of teachers' perception of trust in colleagues. However, directive leadership behavior did not have an important influence on the perception of trust in colleagues. According to the obtained findings, regression equation of trust in colleagues was as follows:

$$\text{Perception of Trust in Colleagues} = 1.478 + 0.16 \text{ Supportive Leadership} + 0.11 \text{ Directive Leadership} + 0.37 \text{ Perception of Organizational Justice}$$

In Table 3, Hierarchical Regression Analysis results of predictive factors of perception of trust in stakeholders are presented.

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results of Predictive Factors of Perception of Trust in Stakeholders

Model	Inconstant	B	Standard Error	β	T	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
1	Constant	2.220	0.258	-	8.612	0.00	-	-
	Supportive Leadership	0.421	0.051	0.464	8.323	0.00	0.45	0.45
	Directive Leadership	-0.092	0.067	-0.077	-1.381	0.17	0.02	-0.08
<i>R=0.45, R²=0.21, F₍₂₋₂₆₈₎=34.7, p=0.00</i>								
2	Constant	2.120	0.203	-	10.431	0.00	-	-
	Organizational Justice	0.364	0.051	0.398	7.115	0.00	0.40	0.40
<i>R=0.40, R²=0.16, F₍₁₋₂₆₉₎=50.6, p=0.00</i>								
3	Constant	2.055	0.287	-	7.155	0.00	-	-
	Supportive Leadership	0.339	0.081	0.373	4.183	0.00	0.45	0.25
	Directive Leadership	-0.068	0.069	-0.057	-0.986	0.32	0.02	-0.06
	Organizational Justice	0.103	0.080	0.113	1.294	0.19	0.40	0.08
<i>R=0.46, R²=0.21, F₍₃₋₂₆₇₎=23.761, p=0.00</i>								

As it is clear from Table 3, 2, Model 1 ($R=0.45$, $R^2=0.21$, $p<0.01$) and Model 2 ($R=0.40$, $R^2=0.16$, $p<0.01$) were important predictors of the perception of trust in stakeholders. Model 1 explained 21% of the perception of trust in colleagues and Model 2 explained 16% of the perception of trust in stakeholders. Model 3, which was designed to see the predictive power of school administrators' leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice on trust in stakeholders was also significant ($R=0.46$, $R^2=0.21$, $p<0.01$). The first and the second model together explained 21% of the perception of trust in stakeholders. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), relative order of importance of the predictive variables on trust in stakeholders was as follows: organizational justice and supportive leadership. When t test results of significance of regression analysis coefficients were considered, it was seen that both supportive leadership and organizational justice were predictors of teachers' perception of trust in stakeholders. However, directive leadership behavior did not have an important influence on the perception of trust in colleagues. According to the obtained findings, regression equation of trust in colleagues was as follows:

$$\text{Perception of Trust in Colleagues} = 1.478 + 0.16 \text{ Supportive Leadership} + 0.11 \text{ Directive Leadership} + 0.37 \text{ Perception of Organizational Justice}$$

DISCUSSION

The perceptions of the high school teachers included in the study about school administrators' leadership behaviors were closer to "I agree" in the dimension of supportive leadership, and to "I moderately agree" in the dimension of directive leadership. The teachers thought that school administrators displayed supportive leadership behaviors more than directive leadership behaviors. Yet, there was not a big difference between the perceptions of directive leadership behaviors and supportive leadership behaviors. Thus, they saw school administrators as neither supportive nor directive leaders. This finding was parallel to the previous research results (Yılmaz, 2002, 2004; Çankaya, and Aküzüm, 2010).

It was found that the teachers included in the study had positive perceptions about organizational justice. Similar results were obtained from the previous studies in Turkey (Ünal, 2003; Atalay, 2005; Polat, 2007; Polat, and Celep, 2008; Yılmaz, and Taşdan, 2009; Yılmaz et. al., 2009; Titrek, 2009; Yılmaz, 2010). Therefore, the research findings were similar to those from the previous studies. A positive perception of organizational justice is crucial for

organizations and employees because such a positive perception makes employees feel that they are respectable and valuable members of the organization, helps them establish compatible relationships based on trust with other employees, while injustice brings negative behaviors which hinder goal attainment (Folger, and Konovski, 1989; Beugre, 2002; Özmen, Arbak, and Özer, 2007; Tansky, 1993; Balay, 2000; İşbaşı, 2001).

The teachers included in the study had positive perceptions about organizational trust, as well. The high school teachers trusted their colleagues the most. Next, they trusted their administrators. They trusted stakeholders the least. Trust in colleagues and trust to administrator levels were high, whereas trust in stakeholders was almost moderate. The research findings were similar to those of the studies in the literature (Arslan, 2009; Çokluk, and Yılmaz, 2008; Yılmaz, 2006; Polat, 2007; Polat, and Celep, 2008; Özer et al., 2006; Samancı-Kalaycı, 2007; Yılmaz, 2009), but a study by Yılmaz (2009) was different from the others because Yılmaz (2009) attempted to define levels of organizational trust perceptions of teachers at private teaching institutions. Private teaching institutions are one of the most problematic educational organizations in Turkey (Gök, 2005). In the other studies, trust in colleagues and trust to administrator levels were generally close to one another, while in Yılmaz's (2009) study, trust in colleagues was the lowest at a moderate level. Yılmaz (2009) explained that mistrust in colleagues was caused by teachers' contract status at private teaching institutions which led to a competitive environment. It was found in the research that teachers in state high schools did not suffer from such a competitive environment and they trusted one another because of their job security in state schools. As a result, it might be suggested that job loss risk is an important factor of employees' trust perceptions. Employees' high trust to administrator is a pretty positive factor because the ways employees perceive administrators affect organizational perceptions. They may tend to generalize administrators' behaviors to organizations. Hence, trust or mistrust to administrator affects organizational trust or mistrust (Deluga, 1994; Konovsky, and Pugh, 1994; Tan, and Tan, 2000; Galford, and Drapeau, 2003; Polat, 2007; Yılmaz, 2009; Hoy, and Miskel, 2010). In this sense, school administrators have important responsibilities for creating, maintaining and improving an environment of trust in organizations. They particularly need to work through trust in stakeholders observed at lower levels because the research concluded that teachers did not always trust students and parents. This mistrust might be caused by inefficient school-parent interactions. Attempts by school administrators to involve parents in education process will contribute to improved organizational trust levels.

The research also examined the relationships between teachers' perceptions of organizational trust and school administrators' leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice. In the study, the sub-dimensions of organizational trust were taken as the predicted variable. There was a high correlation between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and trust to administrator. There was a moderate positive correlation between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and trust in colleagues and trust in stakeholders. Supportive leadership and organizational justice were important predictors of teachers' perceptions of organizational trust. Supportive leadership and organizational justice explained nearly two thirds of the perception of trust to administrator, nearly one third of the perception of trust in colleagues and nearly one fifth of the perception of trust in stakeholders. When the literature is reviewed, it is accepted that there is an important relationship between supportive leadership and trust (Padsakoff et al., 1996; Francisco, 2000; Yılmaz, 2004) and between organizational justice and trust (Alexander, and Ruderman, 1987; Greenberg, 1990; Pillai et al., 1999; Cohen-Charash, and Spector, 2001; Hoy, and Tarter, 2004; Polat, 2007). In the study, relative order of importance of the predictive variables on trust to

administrator was as follows: supportive leadership and organizational justice. The order of trust in colleagues and trust in stakeholders was as follows: organizational justice and supportive leadership. However, directive leadership behavior did not have an important influence on organizational trust perceptions. Generally, teachers do not want school administrators to display authoritative behaviors. Authoritative behaviors of administrators do not affect teachers' perceptions of organizational trust in a positive way. On the other hand, supportive leadership behaviors increase employees' organizational trust and commitment (Bennis, 1999; Kolamaz, 2007). Educational organizations, by nature, are organizations where administrators need to display supportive leadership behaviors. Such organizations are loose organizations and employees' educational backgrounds are high and similar. Supportive leadership behaviors are eligible for those with high educational backgrounds. It is a fact that directive leadership behavior is not effective in these organizations (Çelik, 2003), which is also confirmed by the research results. In addition, role-model behaviors of teachers and administrators in interactions based on democratic values in these organizations which aim to attain desirable behaviors are needed. In particular, school administrators, as supportive leaders, need to become leaders who appreciate efforts, help teachers, explain reasons of criticisms and make constructive criticisms (Yılmaz, 2002, 2004). Increases in school administrators' such behaviors will contribute to improved organizational justice perceptions and bring higher organizational trust because employees' perceptions of organizational trust are rather affected by administrators' behaviors (Hoy, and Tarter, 2004; Polat, 2007) and followers of leaders contribute to organizations when and if they trust administrators (Hoy, and Miskel, 2010).

In order to generalize the research results, similar studies in different countries, provinces and regions are needed. Consequently, the obtained findings could be compared to those of further research. Also, further studies on relationships between leadership behaviors rather than supportive leadership behaviors and directive leadership behaviors and organizational trust, organizational citizenship, organizational justice and organizational culture are needed.

REFERENCE

- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 177-198.
- Altinkurt, Y. (2010). Örgütsel adalet. In H. B. Memduhoğlu & K. Yılmaz (Eds.), *Yönetimde yeni yaklaşımlar* (ss. 275-290). Ankara: Pegem A.
- Arslan, M. M. (2009). Technical and industry vocational high school teachers' organizational trust perceptions. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5(2), 274-288
- 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, 261-286.
- Asunakutlu, T. (2007). Güven, kültür ve örgütsel yansımaları. In R. Erdem & C. Ş. Çukur (Eds.), *Kültürel bağlamda yönetsel-örgütsel davranış* (ss. 231-265). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Atalay, İ. (2005). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel adalet* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyonkarahisar.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Başaran, İ. E. (1992). *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri*. Ankara: Kadioğlu.
- Bennis, W. (1999). *Bir lider olabilmek*. (Çev: U. Teksöz). İstanbul: Sistem.
- Beugré, C. D. (2002). Understanding organizational justice and its impact on managing employees: An African perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(7), 1091-1104.

- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2003). *Eğitim yönetiminde teori ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Çankaya, İ. H., & Aküzüm, C. (2010). İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin iletişim kurma düzeyleri ile yöneticilerinin destekleyici liderlik rolleri arasındaki ilişki. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14, 49-57.
- Çelik, V. (2003). *Eğitimsel liderlik*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- 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.
- Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, Ö., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel güven hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 14(54), 211-233.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3-56). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com.tr/books>.
- Cooper, R., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Liderlikte duygusal zekâ*. (Çev: A. Ayman & B. Sancar). İstanbul: Sistem.
- Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 315-326.
- Eskew, D. E. (1993). The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 185-194.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
- Francisco, M. J. J. (2000). *Transformational leader behaviors: Its impact on follower satisfaction, trust, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors* (Unpublished master thesis). Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines. Retrieved from http://media.wiley.com/assets/461/93/lc_jb_francisco_070703.pdf.
- Galford, R., & Drapeau, R.S. (2003). The enemies of trust. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(2), 88-95.
- Gök, F. (2005) Üniversiteye girişte umut pazarı: özel dershaneler. *Eğitim, Bilim ve Toplum Dergisi*, 11, 102-109.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Günaydın, S. C. (2001). *İşletmelerde örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven değişkenlerinin politik davranış algısı ve işbirliği yapma eğilimine etkisini inceleyen bir çalışma*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Hodgetts, R. M., & Kuratko, D. F. (1999). *Management*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi*. (Çev. Edt: S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. (1998). *Quality middle schools: open and healthy*. CA, Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 250-259.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: the omnibus t-scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26, 38-45.
- İşbaşı, J. (2001). Çalışanların yöneticilerine duydukları güvenin ve örgütsel adalete ilişkin algılamalarının vatandaşlık davranışı oluşumundaki rolü. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 51-73.
- Kamer, M. (2001). *Örgütsel güven, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkileri* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Karademir, T., & Çoban B. (2010). Sporum yönetsel yapısında örgütsel adalet kuramına bakış. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 48-62.
- Kolamaz, C. (2007). *Destekleyici ve geliştirici liderlik yaklaşımlarının örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: new relationships and realities. *Academy of Management View*, 23(3), 438-458.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Zengin, M. (2010). Örgütsel güven. In H. B. Memduhoğlu & K. Yılmaz (Eds.), *Yönetimde yeni yaklaşımlar* (ss. 275-290). Ankara: Pegem A.
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 166-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Mishra, A. (1996). Organizational response to crisis. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 261-287). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 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.
- Özdil, K. (2005). *İlköğretim okullarında güven ve örgütsel iklim arasındaki ilişki* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Özer, N., Demirtaş, H., Üstüner, M., & Cömert, M. (2006). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven algıları. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(1), 103-124.
- Özmen, Ö. N. T., Arbak, Y., & Özer, P. S. (2007). Adalete verilen değer in adalet algıları üzerindeki etkisinin sorgulanmasına ilişkin bir araştırma. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 7(1), 17-33.
- 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.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142

- Polat, S. (2007). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli.
- Polat, S. (2009). *Örgütsel güven*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Polat, S., & Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 54, 307-331.
- Samancı-Kalaycı, G. (2007). *Örgütsel güven ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyon.
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, C. S. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and Psychology Monographs*, 126(2), 241-260.
- Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 195-207.
- Taşdan, M., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales' adaptation to Turkish. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 33(150), 87-96.
- Titrek, O. (2009). Employees' organizational justice perceptions in Turkish schools. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(5), 605-620.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1988). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 334-352.
- Turan, S. (1998). *A study of organizational commitment in human organizations* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio University, Ohio.
- Yılmaz, E. (2006). *Okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik özellikleri ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Yılmaz, K. (2002). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik davranışlarıyla öğretmenlerin öğrenci kontrol yaklaşımları ve öğrencilerin okul yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin algıları arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Yılmaz, K. (2004). Okul yöneticilerinin destekleyici liderlik davranışları ile okullardaki güven arasındaki ilişki konusunda ilköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(8), 117-131.
- Yılmaz, K. (2006). Güven ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 69-80.
- Yılmaz, K. (2009). Özel dersane öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(59), 471-490.
- Yılmaz, K. (2010). Devlet ortaöğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 10(1), 579-616.
- Yılmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 108-126.
- Yılmaz, K., Karaköse, T., & Altinkurt, Y. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel güven ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişki. In H. Asutay (Ed.), *Uluslararası 5. Balkan Eğitim ve Bilim Kongresi* (ss. 319-322). Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi.