

FOR REFERENCE

PREFERENCES FOR JUSTICE NORMS NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

AND
JOB SATISFACTION

by

Duygu Müderrisoğlu

B.A. in Management Department, Boğaziçi University, 1982

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Social Psychology

Bogazici University Library



39001100543985

14

Boğaziçi University

1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Doç.Dr.Hamit Fişek for his most valuable advice, guidance and the time he has spent in the pursuit of this study, which could not have otherwise been realized.

I am indebted to Dr.Ayhan Koç and Dr.Diane Sunar for their encouraging support and contributions to the study.

I would like to thank the directors of Çimentaş A.Ş., Metaş T.A.Ş., Özakat Holding, Turyağ A.Ş. and Yeni Asır Ltd.Ş., who have given their consent to apply the questionnaire and to all of the members who have participated in the interview.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
I. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	1
II. METHOD	21
A. PROCEDURE	21
B. INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT	22
C. THE SAMPLE	27
D. DESIGN	30
III. RESULTS	31
IV. DISCUSSION	37
REFERENCES	45
APPENDIX	50

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 2.1. Characteristics of the Organizations	28
TABLE 2.2. Characteristics of the Sample	29
TABLE 3.1. Perceived Justice Levels of Employees who agree and who Disagree with Their Managers on Norm Preference	32
TABLE 3.2. Managers' and Employees' Preferences of the Relevant Characteristics	32
TABLE 3.3. Perceived Justice Levels of Employees who Agree and who Disagree with Their Managers on Distribution Criteria Preferences	33
TABLE 3.4. Satisfaction Levels of Employees who Agree and who Disagree with Their Managers on Norm Preference	35
TABLE 3.5. Satisfaction Levels of Employees who Agree and who Disagree with Their Managers on Distribution Criteria Preferences	35

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction in formal organizations by investigating the application and acceptance of justice norms and distribution rules. In approaching the justice evaluations of white-collar workers, primary emphasis has been placed on preferences for norms (either equity or need) and dimensions of evaluation (status or performance characteristics) in the allocation of rewards, and on whether agreement between employees' and managers' preferences affects the employees' perceived justice and satisfaction levels. Two preference scales and a perceived justice scale were developed in order to measure the magnitude of the relation between perceived justice and agreement variables. A satisfaction scale was used to measure the employees' satisfaction levels in order to investigate the relation between perceived justice and satisfaction.

The existence of a meaningful relation between perceived justice and agreement variables, between satisfaction and perceived justice was hypothesized, however was not supported by the results. The predicted differences were not

found in the data. The failure to support the hypotheses may be the results of a number of artifacts of the study, including an overly-homogeneous sample, macro-economic conditions and lack of variance in norm preferences and levels of job satisfaction.

I. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The notion of distributive justice, first developed by the early philosopher Aristotle and later formulated into a theory by social psychologists and sociologists, is, in a broad sense, concerned with the allocation of socially valued goods among the members of a society. It focuses on the definition and functioning of justice in a particular social setting or organization where the participating members are engaged in some sort of activity or contribution for which they acquire a share in the distribution of valued goods or rewards. The established norms of the members as to who should receive what determine whether the distribution of rewards is to be defined as just, fair or balanced. The significance of each member's contribution in the allocation pattern is determined in accordance with that community's value system. Any one member can be evaluated on dimensions like education, skill, seniority—anything which is regarded as relevant in achieving the aims of the group and for which a just return is expected. The rewards, in turn, may vary from social approval, promotion or intrinsic job satisfaction to simply monetary remuneration.

Within this framework, the normative expectations of the members arising from the allocation rule(s) in that context are crucial in the various formulations of distributive justice theory.

Four basic groups of theories have been formulated in the conceptualization of distributive justice.

Homans (1961), in his analysis of social exchange, originally introduced the concept of distributive justice, in which he defined the just reward distribution as having equal reward/investment ratios for all parties so that the greater a person's investments in a exchange relation, the greater should be his reward. What he called investments are crucial in the ranking of one's self and others in a specific exchange situation. This ranking process also implies the existence of a social comparison between one self and others. He outlines the prerequisites of a just social system as follows:

"Agreement on the general principle that the ratio of contributions equal to the ratio of rewards is the least of their problems. They must also agree on what dimensions are to be held relevant to the assessment of contributions and rewards and finally how members are to be ranked along these dimensions" (Homans, 1976).

As stated above, for distributive justice to function properly, the members must reach consensus on the normative standards or evaluative criteria they wish to apply in the final allocation.

Following Homans' original approach, the majority of research has been done under the heading of equity theory which has much in common with Homans' exchange formulation of distributive justice.

According to equity theory (Adams, 1965) justice is realized by means of an equity norm which dictates that the input/outcome ratio of one party should be equal to that of others (Adams, 1976; Austin, Walster and Utne, 1976). The terms inputs and outcomes correspond to Homans' rewards and investments. The participants' satisfaction with the exchange is contingent on how equitable they perceive the distribution of rewards to be. Consequently, an individual's perception of how equitable a relation depends on his assessment of the value and relevance of the various participants' inputs and outcomes. In defining the exchange relation as equitable or not the members' comparative perceptual processes have a significant role.

Patchen's research (1961) on workers' evaluations of wages reveals the existence of such comparative processes. The workers compared their pay to that of significant others in the following pattern:

$$\frac{\text{my pay}}{\text{his/their pay}} \quad \text{compared to} \quad \frac{\text{my position on dimensions related to pay}}{\text{his/their position(s) on dimensions related to pay}}$$

The outcome of such comparisons as found by Patchen was either satisfaction or dissatisfaction with pay.

According to the equity theorists, the problem of inequity will arise if one of the parties in the exchange considers the input as relevant whereas the other does not. The second condition leading to a perception of inequity holds when the parties involved in the exchange disagree on the weight that each input should have. These two conditions are similar to what Homans has stated as the prerequisites of a just social system.

The consequences of inequity rather than the emergence of equity as a justice norm has predominated the research done by the equity theorists (Adams, 1965; Walster and Berscheid, 1976).

Adams (1976) suggests five ways of reducing inequity which are: changing one's inputs and/or outcomes, cognitively distorting one's inputs or outcomes, leaving the field, and last, changing the object of comparison.

In the third approach to the conceptualization of distributive justice, Berger and his associates (1972) explain the justice process in their status-value theory. According to this theory, individuals evaluate the distribution pattern within a referential structure where all the characteristics of the individuals and rewards are status-valued. That is, each individual and reward have specific states of a given characteristic which is evaluated in terms of its status significance. These states are considered to be either high or low.

Within this referential structure, a given state of a reward is associated with a given state of an individual characteristic on a one-to-one basis. No two rewards that differ in status value can be associated with the same individual. The individual possessing a high state of the given status characteristic should receive a reward which has high status value. Likewise, the individual possessing a low status characteristic should receive a reward possessing low status value. In other words, the characteristics of the reward and the recipient should be consistent in reference to the status value or status significance ascribed to each in that referential structure. This differentiation is required to maintain consistency or balance in the system of associations which constitute the core of the distributive justice process. It can be extracted from this theory that for an individual to evaluate a distribution as just, two conditions are required:

1. The state of the characteristic an individual possesses should be correctly associated with the state of the reward he receives. That is, these characteristics should be consistent (i.e. both should be either high or low) in terms of their status value.
2. In referring to other individuals and rewards, he should be confirmed by the fact that another individual with similar status characteristics is actually receiving the same reward.

If these conditions are met for every member, then the distribution of rewards is defined as just.

Finally, the last approach, which may be called the need theory claim that the equity theorists overgeneralize the equity principle (Lamm and Schwinger, 1980; Mikula, 1980).

Although most people today accept the prevailing equity norm of the industrial society, the need theorists' claim is that there are exceptions where the equity norm does not apply. Their proposed alternative is the need norm which demands that resources be allocated according to the recipients' economic need levels (Leventhal, 1976; Mikula, 1980).

While accepting that the allocation principles are dependent upon the characteristics of the allocation situation, the need theorists hypothesize that the need norm dominates under conditions of strong interdependence and high interpersonal attraction among the recipients. The empirical results of research on allocation decisions in small groups also lead to speculation on the effects of the team-like nature of the work and politeness ritual in deciding upon the need norm (Schwinger, 1980).

In reviewing the theoretical and empirical literature on distributive justice, the evidence reveal as the existence of distribution norms according to which the members of a group hold expectations for a fair allocation of rewards or resources. It is through these norms that the distribution

pattern is defined as just or not. So far, primary emphasis has been placed on the norms of equity and need.

The norms of reciprocity and equality discussed by Leventhal (1976) and Sampson (1969) have mostly been investigated under certain conditions created in laboratory settings.

The reciprocity norm which dictates that the past favors of one should be reciprocated has not been conceived as a justice norm in certain theories of distributive justice. Rather, it was studied as a moral norm underlying all two-party relations. Blau (1964) has argued that people seek balance in their exchanges and this tendency for balance is assumed to be based on the norm of reciprocity. Reciprocity in human relations has been conceived as universal; lying at the core of interpersonal exchange (Gouldner, 1960; Aral and Sunar, 1977). Gouldner (1960) specifies the conditions where the reciprocity norm is followed as the absence of a stratified system of specific status duties. There is also evidence that reciprocity initiates and guides social interaction in the early phases of a group before differentiation starts among the members (Berkowitz and Friedman, 1967; Pruitt, 1968).

As implied by these findings, it is unlikely that the reciprocity norm will dictate the allocation in a well-stratified organization where the membership positions will hardly allow direct, two-party exchange relations.

As to the question of the application of the equality norm which demands equal allocation to all individuals regardless of merit, several research results indicate that this norm can be adopted only under certain conditions (e.g., Bales, 1950; Homans, 1961; Schwinger, 1980). If the social relationship is one of solidarity, harmony and cooperation among the members of a group, then the allocation of rewards may follow the equality norm though the actual contributions of the members are not the same.

Demands for equality have appeared time and again since the beginning of primitive societies. Equality was demanded in utopias (e.g., Thomas More) and in the socio-political movements in Europe since the Middle Ages. If, however, one makes a comparison with other justice norms (i.e. equity and need), it seems that the equality principle does not apply to the present economic systems. It is more of an ideology, at least in its claim to totality. For applying equality in an organization or a group aimed at task-completion, one has to assume beforehand that there will not be any status differentiation or struggles over status achievement.

Despite the absence of the equality norm in organizational settings, a few investigations have revealed that in some dyadic relations, the equality norm is adopted by the parties to follow a politeness ritual (Leventhal and Lane, 1970; Mikula, 1980).

In contrast to the applications of the equality and reciprocity norms, equity and need norms have been found to regulate allocation patterns in stratified organizations, work environments and task groups where maximization of group productivity is aimed, high performance is expected and where a competitive environment is dominant.

It is evident from the above investigations that organizations and groups in any society refer to justice in terms of normatively defined rules of distribution. However, the ones favored in a particular setting can be totally ignored under other conditions. The situational characteristics play a crucial role in this choice. These characteristics can be the economic and political aspects of the system, individual/class values or the specific properties of organizations, all of which interact in developing the members' norms and related expectations for a fair allocation. Past research on the application of the equity norm clarifies this situation. Equity has been found to dominate in capitalist economic systems (Sampson, 1969) and it has also been indicated that American culture favors the equity rule.

These findings, though such investigations are rare in literature, support the view that norm(s) prevailing in one context may not exist in another due to the interacting situational variables. Moreover, people in the same culture or even in the same organization, sharing the same goals, might differ in their normative standards with respect to the

functioning of distributive justice. Therefore the distinguishing characteristics of the society and organizations where the present study is carried out should be emphasized for a better definition of the scope of the research.

The private sector of Turkey where this study is undertaken has the majority of its organizations established in the 1960s. Starting up with only a few shareholders, they gradually expanded to become more differentiated and complex units of production while increasing their personnel in line with these developments. Since most of the privately owned organizations in this sector are manufacturing firms, they have a variety of organizational units. The employed personnel consists of blue-collar workers responsible for manufacturing and white-collar workers responsible for other organizational tasks, such as marketing, finance and production management. Within such a structure, the criteria of personnel recruitment can generally be defined as ability, experience and education for the white-collar employees and skill for the blue-collar employees. Following these criteria, the majority of white-collar employees in the private sector are at least high school graduates specialized in one profession or another and can be said to be better off in terms of socio-economic status when compared with the blue-collar workers. In addition, it can also be stated that the white-collar employees of the private sector have greater opportunities for social mobility, training at their jobs and for building a career.

Regarding these conditions as given by the present socio-economic system, the goal of the private sector organizations can be defined in terms of maximizing productivity and the market share which, in turn, implies a competitive environment for both the organizations and the employees holding various positions in these organizations.

Within this framework, one anticipation concerning allocation patterns may be that the members will compete for acquiring better places in the organizational hierarchy by means of performing better or contributing more in achieving the goal of the organization. Furthermore, competition may not necessarily arise for status achievement only; the members might also compete to receive a higher share in the distribution of other valued rewards which may include certain privileges, promotion, social approval or an increase in pay.

Under such conditions, it is expected that the equity norm will regulate the allocation. That is, the rewards or resources will be distributed proportionately to a measure of contribution or worth among the employees. Research investigating the norm preferences of the employees in public and private sectors of Turkey indicate that white-collar employees prefer the equity norm and blue-collar employees prefer the need norm in both sectors (Boysan, 1981). These results reveal the fact that employees in the various organizations have established normative expectations with respect to the distribution rules in their preferences for justice norms.

Moreover, it has also been found that 91 per cent of the white-collar employees in private sector prefer the performance characteristics (i.e. ability, experience, expertise and innovation) as their distribution criteria and ignore status characteristics (i.e. seniority, occupation, education and discipline) in the allocation of rewards (Boysan, 1981).

Given the majority of members in each group preferring the same norm and distribution criteria as in the above case does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the existing allocation system is normatively supported by the contributing members. That is, the employees' norm and distribution criteria preferences and the related expectations from the distribution may not be congruent to those of the allocators, that is, the managers of the employees. The managers may choose to refer to distribution criteria different from that of the employees' preferences. Each party may regard different characteristics as relevant in the distribution. In more specific terms, there might be a case where employees prefer performance characteristics whereas their manager may happen to prefer status characteristics as relevant in the allocation of rewards. Under such conditions, the employees' normative expectations remain unfulfilled which, in turn, may result in perceived injustices. Therefore the manager's final decision regarding the allocation pattern and the employees' preferences play a crucial role in the evaluations of the distribution as being just or unjust. If there is a discrepancy between these two variables, then the legitimacy of the distribution is under

dispute. The employees might cease to support the existing allocation due to the state of incongruency experienced between what is perceived to be and what is preferred. Therefore, the allocation system gains legitimacy as a function of the degree to which a common acceptance of the distribution rule(s) exists. Otherwise the employees may experience a state of distress or displeasure with the current situation. Such a state can be expressed in terms of dissatisfaction with the organizational factors external to the job, as the fairness of treatment, the quality of supervision and pay which, in turn, can be reflected in negative attitudes toward the job itself.

In explaining the causalities underlying job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction, basically three theoretical formulations have been proposed.

According to the discrepancy theory (Locke, 1969), satisfaction or dissatisfaction with some aspect of the job depends on the discrepancy between what a person perceives he is getting and what he desires. The desired amount is defined as the minimum amount to fulfill the person's current needs. The greater the discrepancy between what is perceived to be and what is desired, and the more important the thing desired, the greater will be dissatisfaction. Porter (1962), remaining within this theoretical framework, defined satisfaction as the difference between how much of something there should be and how much there actually is. This conception is basically

similar to Locke's, but the 'should be' places more emphasis on equity considerations and less on needs in evaluating the job.

Equity theory, in defining the reactions to inequity, predicts whether an employee will be dissatisfied with certain aspects of the job for which comparisons are likely to occur, such as, pay, advancement and recognition (Adams, 1965; Goodman and Friedman, 1971; Patchen, 1961). They conclude that if expectations resulting from such comparisons are not fulfilled, then dissatisfaction will occur.

The two-factor theory of job attitudes states that job satisfaction is qualitatively different from job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). According to this theory, job characteristics are grouped as 'dissatisfiers' or 'hygiene factors' and 'satisfiers' or 'motivators'. Dissatisfiers include pay, supervision, interpersonal relations and working conditions. Unless these needs are fulfilled the person will be dissatisfied. But these are not sufficient by themselves to cause satisfaction. The person will be satisfied if satisfiers exist also, which are certain aspects of the job, such as responsibility, recognition and advancement opportunities. An insufficient amount of satisfiers will prevent him from satisfaction, but will not result in job dissatisfaction.

It is now generally accepted that contrary to the sharp distinctions of Herzberg's theory, some job characteristics can cause both states of satisfaction. The research

evidence suggests that an adequate explanation of how job attitudes are determined requires taking interacting factors into account. That is, a person's job satisfaction depends jointly on the characteristics of the work situation which includes both the intrinsic (e.g. amount of motivation, personal growth) and the extrinsic factors (e.g. supervision, promotion, advancement).

Empirical evidence provided by various studies further specify the conditions which lead to satisfaction. Lawler (1971) states that pay is the job characteristic most likely to cause dissatisfaction. Porter (1962) found that managers who were dissatisfied with pay perceived high inequities. Goodman (1974) states that if an organization pays less than the going rate in the community for a given type of job, employees will be dissatisfied with their pay. The behavior of the immediate supervisor is another important determinant of an employee's job satisfaction. The results of various research indicate that employees are more satisfied with supervisors who are considerate and supportive than those who are indifferent (Wexley and Yukl, 1977). But these results may vary depending on the characteristics of the employees and the work situation. The amount of participation allowed and desired, definition of work roles, the characteristics of the task situation also interact in determining an employee's satisfaction.

After reviewing the relevant research on job satisfac-

tion, it is assumed that to prevent a state of dissatisfaction, the expectations of the members must be fulfilled. Since the distribution of valued rewards is regarded as the basic means in meeting these expectations, the employees' evaluations of the distribution system gains importance in determining their satisfaction. That is, the employees should be convinced on the rightness or fairness of the distribution rule(s) adopted by the organization in order to feel satisfied with their current positions and to hold favourable attitudes toward the job and organization. Unless the present allocation of valued rewards is supported by the employees, the claims for employees' satisfaction will probably not be justified.

Therefore it is theoretically hypothesized that in defining an allocation system as fair, legitimate and satisfactory, consensually established and applied distribution rules must exist. Since managers are held responsible for the actual application of the distribution rules, the concern is with the existence and level of agreement reached between the employees and their managers with respect to both parties' expectations from the distribution and how such agreement affects the employees' perceived justice and satisfaction levels.

With respect to this issue, equity theorists (Austin, Walster and Utne, 1976; Adams, 1965) state that an exchange relation can bring satisfaction if the participants reach a common agreement on how to evaluate the fairness of inputs

contributed and outcomes distributed. Homans (1961) proposes that in achieving satisfactory rates of exchange the members should set common standards by which costs, investments and rewards can be measured. In explaining the effects of distributive justice on satisfaction in work environments, Homans (1976) provides empirical evidence revealing that equal pay among different status people leads to perceived inequity and dissatisfaction. In the same manner, Fritchard (1972) demonstrates that workers under conditions of over and underpayment show more dissatisfaction than equitably paid workers.

As the above findings also suggest, members of an organization who occupy different positions should share common normative standards or adhere to the same distribution criteria in their evaluations in order for a state of perceived justice to exist.

Considering agreement on the justice norm itself as the first step to a state of perceived justice, the first hypothesis is:

1. If an employee's norm preference agrees with that of his manager, then the employee's perceived justice level will be high.

Although past research reveals that the justice norm in private sector organizations is equity, the need norm is also included in the analysis due to the possibility that

preferences for the need norm may occur in the case of employees at relatively low levels of income. Nevertheless it is expected that equity preferences will constitute the majority and that the employee's and the related manager's choices with regard to the justice norm will coincide in most of the cases.

Since agreement on the justice norm is not sufficient for assuming that the present allocation pattern is favored and supported by the employees, the second hypothesis states:

2. If an employee's preferences for distribution criteria agree with those of his manager, the employee's perceived justice level will be high.

Distribution criteria function in specifying how the dimensions of evaluation are to be related to the allocation of valued rewards, that is, in determining which contributions are to receive which rewards in the allocation. Dimensions of evaluation are defined in terms of the employee's performance and/or status characteristics. Performance characteristics are skill, innovation, experience and expertise; status characteristics are education, occupation, seniority and discipline. The rewards, in turn, are defined in terms of an increase in pay and/or advancement in the organizational hierarchy.

The prevailing distribution norm might be accepted by all parties in the organization, but the manager may apply this norm in reference to a particular distribution criterion which may or may not be congruent with the criteria preferred

by the employee. If the preferred criterion proves to be different from that of the employee's, it may result in a state of disappointment and perceived injustice on the employee's side. On the other hand, if there is no discrepancy between what is applied and what is preferred, then it can be assumed that the employee's normative expectations are fulfilled. Therefore the distribution criteria applied in the allocation of rewards or resources must be supported by the employees so that claims for the legitimacy of the existing allocation can be justified. It is only then that the employee's expectations are met and that his perceptions of the allocation will fall in the fairness category. Otherwise the anticipated outcome is perceived injustice.

Perceived injustice, as could be experienced in the above case, has been found to be a major determinant of job related attitudes in various investigations. Telly (1971), after investigating employees' perceptions of inequity pertaining to pay, supervision, advancement and social aspects of the job, has shown that perceived inequity positively correlated with turnover. Finn (1972) also provided empirical results which revealed that subjects who were inequitably treated displayed less favourable job attitudes and a higher propensity to quit their job than subjects who were treated equitably. Klein (1973), in his analysis to determine the relative predictive value of equity, expectancy and reinforcement, showed perceived equity as the strongest variable in predicting job satisfaction:

As all these findings suggest, the employee should first of all be convinced that he is being treated fairly and receiving what he deserves from the allocation. This necessitates the condition that the manager's and employee's distribution criteria do coincide. If this condition is met, it is anticipated that the employee will be satisfied by his membership position in the organization.

Considering perceived justice as one of the determinants of satisfaction the third hypothesis states:

3. If perceived justice of an employee is high, his satisfaction with the job and organization will also be high.

The testing of the hypotheses and the results will be presented in the following sections.

II. METHOD

A. PROCEDURE

In collecting the data, a survey was done in various private sector organizations. At each organization where the structured interviews were applied, the respondents were informed by the secretary of the personnel department that they were randomly selected for a study carried out by a student. The purpose of the study was then explained by the interviewer right before the interview as being a research on the workers' attitudes toward their work and their ideas about different work situations.

This individual-based procedure could not be applied in one organization due to the managers' concern on time limitations. Thus, in order to save time, groups of five selected on a departmental basis were gathered one at a time where the members were left to answer the questions by themselves in the company of the interviewer.

Besides one respondent who refused to be interviewed, the majority co-operated well; enriching the issue with a wide range of personal comments.

The whole interview consisting of 63 questions lasted between 40 to 55 minutes.

B. INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT

In constructing the scales of measurement, a pilot study was done to test the content and discriminating power of each item to be included in the final scale.

The pretest of each scale was done in the form of structured interviews with a sample of 20 white-collar employees from three private sector organizations.

Based on the calculations done over the pretest results, the items which were found to be discriminating and unbiased were included in the final interview. The interview consisted of five parts: demographic information, the norm preference scale, the distribution criteria preference scale, satisfaction scale and finally, the scale measuring workers' perceptions regarding the organization. The demographic data provided information about the respondents' family, income, education and occupational status. The norm preference scale, originally developed by Boysan (1981) was subjected to several changes in order to increase the items' discriminating power. Based on the pretest results, all of the six hypothetical cases represented in terms of a pair of stories were included in the norm preference scale. Each pair of stories described two people having the same job but where one had high economic need (i.e. represented the need norm) and the other had high

job relevant characteristics (i.e. represented the equity norm). At the end of each story, the respondents were asked to state their choices as to who should be paid higher.

Scoring was done according to the total need/equity preferences the respondent marked. If s/he had chosen the equity norm in at least four of the six cases, then his/her preference was defined as the equity norm; otherwise as need.

In measuring the independent variable, that is, agreement between the subordinate and his manager, the norm preference score of each were compared. If both scored at least four in the same norm preference, then the subordinate was placed in the agreement category.

The distribution criteria preference scale in the third part aimed at obtaining the respondent's preferences of a distribution based on either status or performance characteristics, and whether his preferences agreed with those of his manager.

Distribution of rewards was defined in terms of either a raise in pay or advancement. Status characteristics were defined as seniority, occupation, education and discipline whereas experience, expertise, skill and innovation represented the performance characteristics.

Eight short stories were structured to obtain the respondent's preferred distribution criteria. In each, one individual possessed a high status characteristics whereas

the other ranked high in a specific performance characteristic. In four of the cases, the individual with high status characteristic was offered the reward and in the remaining four, the individual with high performance characteristic was offered the reward. The respondent was asked to state if s/he agreed with the given reward conditions. Depending on the number of affirmative answers s/he gave in each reward condition, his/her preference with respect to the two groups of characteristics was defined as either status, performance, both or no preference. If s/he agreed with at least three cases where performance characteristics were rewarded, his performance characteristics were rewarded, his preference was defined as the performance characteristics. The same scoring pattern applied to cases where status characteristics received reward. If the number of affirmative answers s/he gave in each group of reward conditions was the same, that is, equaled to either three or four, then s/he was said to prefer both groups of characteristics. If the number of affirmative answers given in each group were less than three, then s/he was said to have no preferences with respect to the presented characteristics.

In measuring the agreement between the manager's and subordinate's preferences, their scores were compared and if their final preferences coincided, the subordinate was placed in the agreement category.

This distribution criteria preference scale also

served in evaluating the perceived importance of each distribution criterion (i.e. characteristic) for the respondent. For each case the respondent agreed with, he was further asked to evaluate the presented criterion characteristic in terms of its importance level for the respondent on a five-point Likert scale. These importance scores assigned by the respondent were used in measuring his perceived justice level. Perceived justice was defined as the extent to which subordinates believe that their preferred distribution criteria are actually applied in the organization. Therefore for the eight stories representing various reward conditions, eight corresponding questions about the actual allocation conditions in the organization were structured in the last part of the interview. Scoring of perceived justice was done over the congruent answers given to these corresponding questions. That is, if the respondent's preferred characteristics in the allocation of rewards were actually rewarded in the organization, then the importance values s/he assigned to those characteristics were summed to obtain the perceived justice score of the respondent. On the contrary, if his/her preferred characteristics were not actually rewarded in the organization, then the assigned importance values were subtracted from his/her perceived justice score.

Although the scale used in measuring perceived justice was not actually an interval scale, it was treated to be so and the perceived justice scores were categorized as being high, medium and low to meet the basic assumptions of the

design. Assuming that the respondent preferred all of the eight characteristics rewarded which also received rewards in the organization and assuming that he assigned the highest importance value to all the preferences stated, maximum perceived justice score was calculated as $8 \times 5 = 40$. Likewise, assuming that s/he again preferred all of the eight characteristics as relevant in the allocation but none of which were actually applied in the organization and assuming that all preferences were assigned the highest importance value, minimum perceived justice score was calculated as $8 \times (-5) = -40$. The medium category included the perceived justice scores falling between -20 and 20. Below -20 was defined as low and above 20 was defined as high level of perceived justice. Besides the analysis of perceived justice scores in categories, the same assumption with regard to the interval-level measurement held in analyzing the overall perceived justice scores in relation to the satisfaction variable.

The satisfaction scale constituting the fourth part of the interview schedule was originally developed by Oldham and Hackman (1980), and was standardized through various pretests before using in this study. Satisfaction of the workers with respect to personal growth, supervision, co-workers, pay, job security and social satisfaction (i.e. prestige, approval) were measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied. The scale consisted of 14 items.

Satisfaction levels were also categorized as high, medium and low to meet the basic assumptions of the design applied in the analysis of the data. Assuming that the respondent ranked seven on each item, maximum satisfaction was computed as $14 \times 7 = 98$. Assuming that s/he ranked lowest - i.e. 1 on each item, minimum satisfaction was computed as $14 \times 1 = 14$. The medium category included scores falling between 73 and 39. Below 39 was defined as low and above 73 was defined as high level of satisfaction.

C. THE SAMPLE

The data was obtained from a sample of 100 white-collar workers and 25 managers drawn from the private sector. The five organizations representing the private sector were selected on a convenience basis due to the difficulty of receiving the organizations' consent for carrying out the study.

The field of specialization and personnel division of each organization is as follows:

TABLE 2.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ORGANIZATIONS

ORGANIZATIONS	NUMBER OF WHITE-COLLAR EMPLOYEES	NUMBER OF BLUE-COLLAR EMPLOYEES	TOTAL
1. Margarine/Detergent Manufacturing Firm	450	350	800
2. Cement Manufacturing Firm	60	640	700
3. Iron Manufacturing Firm	340	310	650
4. Trading Company	80	20	100
5. Newspaper Publishing Company	60	15	75

As the above figures indicate, the three manufacturing firms were relatively the biggest in size in terms of the personnel employed. Despite the differences in size, all of the organizations had a variety of departments (e.g. marketing, research, engineering, etc.) responsible for specific organizational tasks. Each department consisted of at least four employees who directly reported to the department manager on an informal basis. The department manager played the mediator's role between the employees and the general manager of the organization.

The sample consisting of white-collar employees was drawn on a departmental basis; that is, five departments from each organization were randomly chosen and from each department four employees and the department manager were selected. The total sample consisted of 100 employees and 25 managers.

In the analysis of the data, three interviews were excluded due to the high ratio of unanswered questions and thus the original sample of 100 cases was reduced to 97. Some distinct features of the selected employees and managers are demonstrated below in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

AGE	RELATIVE FREQUENCIES	
	White-Collar Employees	Managers
20-35	72.3	36.0
36-45	23.7	44.0
46-55	4.0	16.0
56-	-	4.0
EDUCATION		
Primary	4.1	-
Middle/lycée	35.0	4.0
Higher education	60.8	96.0
MONTHLY PERSONAL INCOME (in thousand TLs)		
- 50	30.9	-
51-100	52.6	16.0
101-150	14.4	24.0
151-200	2.1	36.0
201-250	-	12.0
250-	-	12.0
PERCEIVED ECONOMIC STATUS		
Wealthy	-	60.0
Upper middle	17.5	40.0
Middle	71.1	--
Lower middle	11.3	-

The figures illustrate the major differences between the employees and managers with respect to education and income levels. 96 per cent of the managers were university graduates whereas the corresponding figure for the employees was 60.8 per cent. The majority of employees' income level falls between 100 and 150 (thousand TLs) whereas the majority of managers' income level starts with 150. These differences in income were also reflected in perceived economic status.

D. DESIGN

Hypothesis 1 states that: If an employee's norm preference agrees with that of his manager, the employee's perceived justice level will be high. Agreement on norm preference which is the independent variable with two categories (i.e. agree and disagree) was crossed with perceived justice which is the dependent variable with high, medium and low levels.

Hypothesis 2 states that: If an employee's distribution criteria preference agrees with that of his manager, the employee's perceived justice level will be high. Agreement on distribution criteria preference with two categories (i.e. agree and disagree) was crossed with the three levels of perceived justice (high, medium and low).

Hypothesis 3 states that: If an employee's perceived justice level is high, his/her satisfaction with the job and organization will also be high. Pearson R coefficient was computed for the variables-perceived justice and satisfaction.

III. RESULTS

In this section, the results obtained from the analysis of data will be presented. Starting with the distribution of norm preferences among the employees, results reveal that 89.7 per cent prefer the equity norm and 10.3 per cent prefer the need norm. Since the preference of all the managers was found to be the equity norm, 89.7 per cent of the employees agree and 10.3 per cent disagree with their managers on norm preference. To test the first hypothesis starting that if an employee's norm preference agrees with his manager's, his perceived justice will be high, Chi-square analysis was done. The cross-tabulation of the two variables is shown in Table 3.1. Although the expected values in the second row are too low, corrected Chi-square was done to test the first hypothesis.

The relationship between agreement on norm preference and perceived justice was found as insignificant. T-test was also done to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of perceived justice for the groups who agree and disagree with their managers on norm preference. But, no significant difference was found between the perceived justice

TABLE 3.1. Perceived justice levels of employees who agree and who disagree with their managers on norm preference

		Perceived Justice			
		low	medium	high	
Agreement on norm preference	Agree	3 (3.4)	61 (70.1)	23 (26.4)	87
	Disagree	0	8 (80.0)	2 (20.0)	10
		3	69	25	97

Chi-Square = .6122

with 2 d.f. not significant

scores of both groups (t-value=.56, d.f.=95). Therefore the obtained results do not support the first hypothesis. That is, there is no meaningful relation between the employees' perceived justice and agreement with the manager on norm preference.

In the case of distribution criteria preferences, 70 per cent of the employees and 52 per cent of the managers were found to prefer performance characteristics as relevant in the allocation. Preferences were categorized as status, performance, both and none of the characteristics. The percentages falling into each category are as follows:

TABLE 3.2. Managers' and employees' preferences of the relevant characteristics

	Status	Performance	both	none
	Characteristics	Characteristics		
Employees' preferences	11.3	70.0	6.2	12.4
Managers' preferences	20.0	52.0	12.0	16.0

As revealed by the figures, the distribution of preferences for relevant distribution criteria follows the same pattern among the employees and managers; that is, the most and the least preferred categories in both groups are the same.

With respect to the second independent variable which is agreement on distribution criteria preferences, 61.9 per cent of the employees agree and 38.1 per cent disagree with their managers. To test the second hypothesis stating that if an employee's preferred distribution criteria agrees with that of his manager, his perceived justice level will be high, Chi-square analysis was done. The cross-tabulation of the variables is given in Table 3.3 below.

TABLE 3.3. Perceived justice levels of employees who agree and who disagree with their managers on distribution criteria preferences

		Perceived Justice			
		low	medium	high	
Agreement on distribution criteria preference	Agree	3 (5.0)	40 (66.7)	17 (28.3)	60
	Disagree	0	29 (78.3)	8 (21.6)	37
		3	69	25	97

Chi-square= 2.6913

with 2 d.f. not significant

Since the results do not support the second hypothesis, it is concluded that there is no significant relation between agreement on distribution criteria preference and the level of perceived justice. The t-test results (t-value=.76, d.f.= 95) further lead to the conclusion that there is no significant

difference between perceived justice scores of the groups who agree and who do not.

Finally, to test the third hypothesis which states that if the perceived justice level of an employee is high, his satisfaction will also be high, Pearson R was computed. The correlation between perceived justice and satisfaction was found to be .0664 in the total sample of employees. Since the association between the two variables is insignificant, the third hypothesis is not supported, either. Although it was found that the level of satisfaction did not correlate with the level of perceived justice in the organization, the existence of a direct relation between satisfaction and agreement on norm and distribution criteria preferences was questioned. Therefore, each agreement variable is separately crossed with the levels of satisfaction. Although satisfaction was originally treated in three levels defined as low, medium and high, since there was only one case at the low level of satisfaction, it was added to the medium category and resulting in only two categories (medium and high) for the satisfaction variable. The cross-tabulation of agreement on norm preference and satisfaction is given in Table 3.4.

The relation between agreement on norm preference and satisfaction is not significant. When the relation between agreement on distribution criteria preferences and satisfaction is considered, the results (see Table 3.5) are in the same direction.

TABLE 3.4. Satisfaction levels of employees who agree and who disagree with their managers on norm preference

		Satisfaction		
		medium	high	
Agreement on norm preference	Agree	42 (48.3)	45 (51.7)	87
	Disagree	4 (40.0)	6 (60.0)	10
		46	51	97

Chi-square= .02625 with 1 d.f. not significant

TABLE 3.5. Satisfaction levels of employees who agree and who disagree with their managers on distribution criteria preferences

		Satisfaction		
		medium	high	
Agreement on distribution criteria preferences	Agree	26 (43.3)	34 (56.7)	60
	Disagree	20 (54.1)	17 (45.9)	37
		46	51	

Chi-square= .6688 with 1 d.f. not significant

As far as the results are concerned, there are no meaningful relations between perceived justice and agreement variables. Moreover, satisfaction is not related to any of these variables, either.

Besides the analyses done to test the relationships between the variables, a few control measures were taken. Controlling for the employees' income level, agreement

variables were separately crossed with perceived justice and satisfaction; but the relationships between the crossed variables still remained insignificant at each income level.

The second control was introduced with respect to the consensus reached in the department and two groups were distinguished. The departments in which each member and the manager had the same preferences constituted the first group and the departments where such consensus was not established constituted the second group. This control variable was crossed with perceived justice and satisfaction. The results revealed that the consensus reached among the members of a department did not affect their perceived justice or satisfaction levels, either.

IV. DISCUSSION

In investigating the distributive justice processes in formal organizations, the present study has focused on the existing application patterns and acceptance of the justice norms and distribution rules. Equity and need represented the justice norms that the allocation systems under question were likely to follow. Distribution rule was defined in terms of the association between dimensions of evaluation (i.e. performance and status characteristics) and the rewards to be distributed in the organization.

The concern was with the members' preferences as to how a distribution rule should function and whether the preferences were congruent with the actual allocation pattern. By inquiring the employees' and the allocators' justice norm and distribution criteria preferences, the study aimed at predicting whether a state of agreement with the allocator affected the perceived justice and satisfaction level of the employee.

In investigating the relations between perceived justice, satisfaction and agreement variables, a methodological problem

was faced due to the lack of variance in the dependent and independent variables. That is, the employee sample did not show sufficient variance with respect to satisfaction and perceived justice variables. The lack of variance in the measurements taken for these variables can be explained by referring to certain characteristics of the organizations where the study was undertaken. The structural properties, the prevailing distribution patterns and the characteristics of the employees in these organizations were very similar, Job descriptions, hierarchical patterns, departmental segregation and various task requirements did not show any remarkable differences, either. All of the companies had well established structures with high levels of capital and resources which enabled them to implement enriched incentive plans compared to the prevalent standards in their sectors. Consequently, the employees in the selected organizations could be said to hold more advantageous positions with respect to the going rate of earnings, fringe benefits and the prevailing working conditions in the community.

Under such similar conditions, the equity norm which was found to dominate the distribution in all the organizations was preferred by 87 per cent of employees, which is a high ratio compared to previous findings indicating this ratio to be 69 per cent (Boysan, 1981). Since the properties of organizations in both studies were more or less the same, the difference in ratios might be due to a change in the

economic conditions. In both studies, those who preferred the need norm were found to have higher levels of economic need compared to those who preferred the equity norm. Moreover, respondents who preferred the need norm in the present study had relatively low levels of education, had spent longer years in the organization, and worked at jobs which required no specialization.

However, none of these conditions affected perceived justice level of the employees preferring the need norm because they were gratified in the first place by maintaining their present positions, for they were aware of the fact that they did not possess the characteristics valued in the organization. Secondly, throughout the years spent in the organization, these employees had established friendly relations with their head managers. These relations extended outside the organization; assisting the employee with various kinds of economic support. Therefore, domination of the current allocation system by the equity norm did not lead to any justice concerns among the employees preferring the need norm; or even if it did, the outcome was not a state of perceived injustice.

Consequently, due to the treatment received by these employees and due to the lack of variance in the distribution of norm preferences, the results revealed that agreement on the justice norm did not affect the perceived justice and satisfaction levels of the employees. No significant diffe-

rences were found with respect to perceived justice and satisfaction levels of employees who preferred different norms.

With respect to the second agreement variable, that is, agreement on the relevant distribution criteria or dimensions of evaluation, in 63 cases the employees' and managers' choices coincided whereas the remaining 34 showed disagreement with their managers. The majority of preferences were for performance characteristics, specifying ability, expertise and experience as the relevant dimensions of evaluation. In the case of status characteristics, seniority and education were the most preferred dimensions. In fact, these preferred characteristics were also perceived as relevant by the managers in the actual allocation of rewards. Though it was hypothesized that the existence of such agreement between the allocators' and employees' choices would lead to high levels of perceived justice, this hypothesis was not supported by the results. These findings can be subject to alternative explanations.

A straight forward explanation could be made by regarding the results as reflecting the actual situation and state that there exists no relation between perceived justice and agreement on the relevant distribution criteria.

Secondly, the employees might regard the mediating role of their department manager as irrelevant in evaluating the final allocation situation, that is, they might attribute the

cause of perceived justice or injustice absolutely to a third party-the manager-in-chief with whom they have no direct relations. Consequently, the agreement reached within the department would not affect the state of perceived justice.

A third explanation could be given with respect to the content of justice comparisons employees make. Since expectations from a distribution are formed within a referential structure consisting of numerous participants, distinguishing the nature of these comparisons is of primary importance in exploring the justice evaluations of the members. The perceived justice scale used in this study included only the dimensions of evaluation as the objects or criteria of comparison in employees' justice evaluations. By doing so, the scale aimed at measuring the extent to which an employee's reward expectation with respect to a certain characteristics or dimension is fulfilled in the allocation of rewards. The dimensions were presented in a broad fashion where in each case one individual possessed a high state of the given performance characteristic and the second individual possessed a high state of the given status characteristic. The respondent was left to choose one of the presented characteristics as being relevant in the allocation of rewards specific to that situation. However, his/her evaluations of the given pair of characteristics might vary in different task situations which might require different states of these characteristics. Moreover, the respondent's expectation states for these characteristics might also vary depending on how different levels

or states of the given characteristics are combined in each case. Considering these possibilities, it is reasonable to suggest that the respondents might have restricted their answers to a single level of the given pair of characteristics which was high in each case. The variety of expectation states with respect to different task situations and different states of the given characteristics were not included in measuring perceived justice due to the difficulties of quantification faced in explicating such reward expectation conditions. Consequently, how employees referred to such comparisons of rank on a certain dimension (e.g. expertise, innovation, etc.) in relation to their reward expectations and whether these comparisons led to positive or negative evaluations of the allocation were not reflected in their perceived justice scores. Therefore, the fulfillment of expectations by actually rewarding the preferred dimensions of evaluation, as revealed in the agreement cases, could have remained insufficient in predicting the perceived justice levels of employees, which did not vary much anyway.

Following these paths of reasoning, the nonsignificance of the results regarding the second hypothesis could be explained.

In a similar fashion, the ambiguity of perceived justice scores as to whether they represent overall justice evaluations, might partially account for the lack of a meaningful relation between perceived justice and satisfaction.

This lack of relationship can be interpreted differently by assuming the presence of other factors intervening in employees' satisfaction with their jobs and the organization. As revealed by the results, 55 per cent of the employees had high and 45 per cent had medium levels of satisfaction. Since those with low levels of perceived justice and those who had relatively low levels of income also showed medium or high satisfaction, the assumption that factors other than justice evaluations affect employees' satisfaction gains support.

As it became apparent throughout the interviews, these factors lay in employees' references to external conditions ruling the private sector and in their comparisons with other organizations. Considering the current unemployment rate, their satisfaction with the positions they have attained is justified in the first place. They expressed strong beliefs in their organizations in terms of a generalized acceptance that the alternative positions available in other organizations did not promise better outcomes or working conditions. This leads to the conclusion that the referential structure does not lie within the organization, instead it is established with reference to the characteristics of other organizations. That is, an employee evaluates the outcome s/he received in the past and likely to receive in the present organization with reference to what comparison persons in other organizations receive, and these comparisons often lead to satisfac-

faction with the present job and organization.

Under such conditions, concerns regarding the process of distributive justice within the organization have a minor influence compared to the influence of external conditions in determining employees' satisfaction. In evaluating the current allocation, they compare what they receive with what people holding similar positions in other organizations receive in that community, and these comparisons result in satisfaction with the present conditions. The justness of the current allocation system in the organization remains as of secondary importance. It may further be concluded that even if they have formulated a concept of distributive justice, it remains ambiguous in the majority of cases and fails to predict any state of perceived justice.

As far as the results are concerned, it is concluded that the hypotheses gained no support. The aim to uncover some features of the normative structure underlying distributive justice evaluations in various organizations was partially achieved. Although the basic characteristics of the normative structure were distinguished in the statements of preference for justice norms and dimensions of evaluation, the possible outcomes of a consensus reached on the normative standards remained unclear due to the reasons stated. It is concluded that the employees' state of agreement with the managers and present allocation rules did not relate to their perceived justice and satisfaction levels in the present study, and the question remains for further investigation by future research.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J.S. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965, Pp. 267-299.
- Adams, J.S. and Freedman, S. Equity theory revisited: Comments and annotated bibliography. In L. Berkowitz and E. Walster (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976. Pp. 43-56.
- Aral, S.O. and Sunar, D.G. Interaction and justice norms: A cross cultural comparison. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1977, 101, 175-186.
- Austin, W., Walster, E. and Utne, M.K. Equity and the law: The effect of a harmdoer's "Suffering in the act" on liking and assigned punishment. In L. Berkowitz and E. Walster (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976. Pp. 163-189.
- Bales, R.F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1950.

Berger, J., Zelditch, M., Jr., Anderson, B. and Cohen, B.P.

Structural aspects of distributive justice: A status value formulation. In J. Berger et al. (eds.), Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. 2, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972. Pp. 119-246.

Berkowitz, L. and Friedman, P. Some social class differences in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 217-225.

Blau, P.M. Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Boysan, Z. Preference for justice norms. Unpublished master thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1981.

Finn, R.H. and Lee, S.M. Salary equity: Its determination, analysis and correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 283-292.

Goodman, P.S. An examination of referents used in the evaluation of pay. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 12, 170-195.

Goodman, P.S. and Friedman, A. An examination of Adam's theory of inequity. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, 16, 271-288.

Gouldner, A.W. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 161-179.

- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. Work Redesign. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1980.
- Herzberg, F. Work and Nature of man. Cleveland: World Press, 1966.
- Homans, G.C. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Hartcourt, Brace and World, 1961.
- Homans, G.C. Commentary. In L. Berkowitz and E. Walster (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976. Pp. 230-244.
- Klein, S.M. Pay factors as predictors to satisfaction: A comparison of reinforcement, equity and expectancy. Academy of Management Journal, 1973, 16, 598-610.
- Lamm, H. and Schwinger, T. When are needs taken into consideration in allocation decisions? An investigation of distributive justice. Unpublished manuscript, Universität Mannheim: SFB 24, 1979.
- Lawler, E.E. Pay and organizational effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.
- Locke, E.A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.
- Leventhal, G.S. and Lane, D.W. Sex, age and equity behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 312-316.

- Leventhal, G.S. The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz and E. Walster (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976, Pp. 92-131.
- Mikula, G. Justice and Social Interaction. Bern: Huber, 1980.
- Patchen, M. The choice of wage comparison. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961.
- Porter, L.W. Job attitudes in management: Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375-384.
- Pritchard, R.D., Dunnette, M.D. and Jorgenson, D.O. Effects of perception of equity and inequity on worker performance and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 75-94.
- Pruitt, D.G. Reciprocity and credit building in a laboratory dyad. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 143-147.
- Sampson, E.E. Studies of status congruence. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1969. Pp. 225-270.
- Schwinger, T. Just allocations of goods: Decision among three principles. In G. Mikula (Ed.), Justice and Social Interaction. Bern: Huber, 1980.

Telly, C.S., French, W.L. and Scott, W.G. The relationship of inequity to turnover among hourly workers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, 16, 164-172.

Walster, E., Berscheid, E. and Walster, G.W. New directions in equity research. In L. Berkowitz and E. Walster (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976. Pp. 1-38.

Wexley, K.N. and Yukl, G.A. Organizational behavior and personnel psychology. Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1977.

APPENDICES

Aşağıda kendinizle ilgili sorular verilmiştir. Lütfen cevaplandırın.

- 1- Yaşınız:
- 2- Evli misiniz?: EVET ___ HAYIR ___
- 3- Bakmakla yükümlü olduğunuz kimse varmı? (varsa kaç tane olduğunu da lütfen belirtin) EVET ___ HAYIR ___
- 4- Eğitim durumunuz nedir?
 1. Yok
 2. İlkokulu bitirmemiş
 3. İlkokul mezunu
 4. Ortaokulu bitirmemiş
 5. Ortaokul mezunu
 6. Liseyi bitirmemiş
 7. Lise mezunu
 8. Üniversite veya dengi bir yüksek okul mezunu (mezun olduğunuz dalı söyleyiniz)
- 5- Şu andaki göreviniz nedir?: _____
- 6- Kaç yıldır bu işte çalışıyorsunuz?: _____
- 7- Başka yerlerde çalıştınız mı?: EVET ___ HAYIR ___
- 8- Çalıştığınız yılların toplamı?: _____
- 9- Net aylık geliriniz nedir?: _____
- 10- Ailenize giren toplam aylık gelir nedir?: _____
- 11- Ailenizde başka çalışan var mı?: EVET ___ HAYIR ___
- 12- Sizin görüşünüze göre aileniz ekonomik bakımdan şu genel grupların hangisine dahildir?
 1. Zengin
 2. İyi halli
 3. Orta halli
 4. Orta altı
 5. Fakir

Aşağıda 6 tane kısa hikayecik verilmiştir. Bunlar çeşitli işyerlerinde çalışan kişileri anlatmaktadır. Her bir durum için size okunurken siz de elinizdeki kağıttan takip ediniz ve durumun okunması bittikten sonra sorulacak soruyu size en uygun geldiği şekilde cevaplayınız.

1. İLHAN

30 yaşında Gazetecilik Yüksek Okulu mezunu bir muhabirdir. 15 senelik iş tecrübesi vardır. Gazetecilik üzerine fazladan eğitim görmemiş, kendisine iş olarak verilenin dışına çıkmayan bir muhabirdir. İlhan evlidir ve biri 5 yaşında, diğerleri ilkokula giden 3 çocuğu vardır. Evi kiradadır ve arabası yoktur. Evde kendisinden başka çalışanı olmadığı gibi başka bir geliri de yoktur.

OKTAY

40 yaşında ve Gazetecilik Yüksek Okulu mezunu olan Oktay haber ajansı müdürü olarak çalışmaktadır ve 23 senelik iş tecrübesi vardır. 2 sene İngiltere'de gazetecilik uzmanlık okulumu bitirmiş, yenilikleri görebilen, 1 ödül almış bir gazetecidir. Evli ve lisede bir çocuğu olan Oktay'ın kendi evi ve arabası vardır. Karısı sekreter olarak çalışmakta, sahip olduğu başka bir evden kira almaktadır.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha yüksek ücret almalı?

Neden:

2. SEVİM

45 yaşında İktisat Fakültesi mezunu bir maliye uzmanıdır ve 17 senelik bir eğitimden geçmiştir. Bir bankada müdür yardımcısı olarak çalışan Sevim, yabancı dil bilen ve verimin yükseltilmesine katkısı olan bir kişidir. Evli ve 2 çocuk sahibidir. Çocuklarından biri lisede diğeri üniversitede okumaktadır. Kocasını ticaretle uğraşmakta, biri yazlık, diğeri kışlık 2 evleri ve arabaları bulunmaktadır. Sevim'in başka bir yerden geliri yoktur.

MUSTAFA

30 yaşında ticaret lisesi mezunu, 11 senelik eğitimden geçmiş, uzmanlığı olmayan ve yabancı dil bilmeyen bir banka vazedardır. Evli olan Mustafa'nın 2'si küçük diğeri ilkokulda 3 çocuğu vardır. Karısı çalışmamakta ve kirada oturmaktadırlar. Arabaları olmadığı gibi başka bir yerden gelirleri de yoktur.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha fazla ücret almalı?

Neden:

3. GÜLTEN

35 yaşında, ilkokuldan ayrılma bir fabrika işçisidir. Şu anda çalıştığı fabrikada 4 yıldır çalışmaktadır ve başka iş tecrübesi yoktur. Evli ve 3 çocuğu olan Gülten'in kocası alkolik ve işsizdir. Evleri 2 oda ve kiradır. Bir çocukları lisede okumakta olan ve diğeri mobilyacıda çırak olan Gülten'in buzdolabı ve çamaşır makinası yoktur ve televizyon taksidi ödemektedir.

FATMA

45 yaşında, lise mezunu ve fabrika paketleme servisinde şeftir. 10 yıl başka yerlerde çalışmış ve 8 yıldır da bu fabrikada çalışmaktadır. Kendilerine ait olan evleri 3 odalıdır. Çocukları ortaokulda okumaktadır. Buzdolabı, çamaşır makinası ve televizyonu olan ailenin başka yerden geliri yoktur.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha fazla ücret almalı?

Neden:

4. AHMET

33 yaşında, meslek lisesi mezunu ve 15 yıllık iş tecrübesine sahip bir torna ustabaşısıdır. Çok iş çıkaran, görevinin üstüne çıkan, yenilikleri görüp uygulayan ve kendisinden birşeyler katan bir kişidir. Evli olan Ahmet'in çocuğu yoktur ve anne-babası ile beraber oturmaktadır. Babası da çalışan Ahmet'in kardeşi yoktur ve oturdukları ev kendilerine aittir. Başka bir gelirleri yoktur.

SELİM

25 yaşında, ilkokul mezunu, 10 senelik iş tecrübesi olan çekişirdekten yetişme bir tornacıdır. Yapması gerektiği kadarı yapar ve işin diğer yönleriyle ilgilenmez. Evli ve biri bebek diğeri 3 yaşında 2 çocuğu olan Selim'in karısı çalışmamakta ve evde yaşlı bir annesi bulunmaktadır. Evi kira olan Selim'in başka bir geliri yoktur.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha fazla ücret almalı?

Neden:

5. OSMAN

44 yaşında, üniversite mezunu ve ihtisas sahibidir. Fabrikada mimar-mühendis olarak çalışmaktadır ve 10 yıllık iş tecrübesi vardır. Yabancı bir şirkette de müşavirlik yapan Osman, yaratıcı ve atılgan bir kimsedir. Evlidir ve 2 çocuğu da özel okulda okumaktadır. Karısı mimar olarak çalışan Osman'ın arabası ve 3 dairesi vardır. Borçları yoktur ve şirketten ek geliri, ayrıca 2 evlerinden gelen kira vardır.

NURİ

29 yaşında ve teknik üniversite mezunudur. Fabrikada mühendis olarak çalışmaktadır. 3 yıllık iş tecrübesi vardır. Başka bir yerde ek iş yapmamaktadır. Kendisinden pek birşey katmayan ve risk almayan bir kişidir. Evlidir. Biri bebek diğeri 5 yaşında 2 çocuğu olan Nuri'nin duyma güçlüğü olan çocuğu zorunlu olarak özel okula gitmektedir. Karısı çalışmamakta ve evleri kiradır. Eşya taksidi ödeyen Nuri'nin başka yerden geliri yoktur.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha fazla ücret almalı?

Neden:

6. AYŞE

36 yaşında meslek okulu mezunudur ve 10 senelik iş tecrübesi vardır. Hastanede laborant olarak çalışır. Yabancı dil bilmez. Yavaş fakat doğru olarak çalışır. Kocasından boşanmış olan Ayşe'nin 2 çocuğu vardır ve anne-babası ile beraber oturmaktadır. Evleri kiradır ve borcu vardır. Babasının emekli maaşı olan Ayşe'nin başka bir yerden geliri yoktur.

YAVUZ

42 yaşında ve Kimya Fakültesi mezunudur. 18 yıllık iş tecrübesi vardır ve hastanede kimyager olarak çalışır. Yabancı dil bilen ve yenilikleri takip eden, hızlı ve iyi çalışan biridir. Evlidir ve çocuğu yoktur. Karısı kimyager olarak çalışmaktadır. Oturdukları ev kendilerine aittir. Arabası olan Yavuz'un borcu yoktur. Bir dairelerinden de kira almaktadırlar.

Soru: Tanımlanan bu 2 kişiden sizce hangisi daha fazla ücret almalı?

Neden:

Aşağıda belirtilen her durumda bir kuruluştaki çalışan çeşitli kişilerin özellikleri hakkında bazı bilgiler verilerek her durum için ikişer soru sorulmuştur. Birinci soruda belirtilen duruma katılıyorsanız 'evet'i, katılmıyorsanız 'hayır'ı işaretleyiniz. Eğer cevabınız hayır ise ikinci soruyu yapmayın, 'evet' ise ikinci soruya geçip sizce uygun olan numarayı işaretleyiniz.

1- Osman 13 yıldır aynı işte çalışmaktadır. Kemal işe başladığı bir yıl içinde fırsatları değerlendirme ve yenilikleri görüp, uygulama özellikleri ile tanınmış, bu yönde işine çok katkısı olmuştur. Yöneticiler, aynı işte çalışan bu iki kişiden Osman'ın terfi etmesini planlar.

1. Bu fikre katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Osman'ın belirtilen özellikleri terfi etmesinde sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

2- Lise mezunu olan Veli yetenekli ve verimli çalışan biridir. Aynı işi yapan Yusuf bu konuda yüksek eğitim görmüştür. Veli daha fazla ücret alır.

1. Veli'nin daha yüksek ücret almasına katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Veli'nin belirtilen özellikleri daha yüksek ücret almasında sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

3- Mustafa deęişik yerlerde pazarlamacı olarak çalıştıktan sonra işin inceliklerini iyi öğrenmiş ve tecrübeleri sayesinde başarısı artmıştır. Mustafa ile aynı işi yapan Turgut bu kuruluştta daha uzun süre çalışmıştır. Yöneticiler Mustafa'nın terfi etmesini planlar.

1. Bu fikre katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Mustafa'nın belirtilen özellikleri terfi etmesinde sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli.

4- Mesleğinde uzmanlaşan Erhan gerektiğinde amirinden farklı görüşlerle hareket edebilen bir kimsedir. Aynı işte çalışan Cem kendisinden istenileni yapar, işin diğer yönleriyle ilgilenmez. Erhan'ın aldığı ücret daha yüksektir.

1. Erhan'ın daha yüksek ücret almasına katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Erhan'ın belirtilen özellikleri daha yüksek ücret almasında sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

5- Lise mezunu olan Mehmet işinde yaratıcı ve yeniliklere açıktır, fırsatları iyi değerlendirir. Aynı işte çalışan Ali bu konuda yüksek eğitim görmüştür. Yöneticiler Mehmet'in terfi etmesini planlar.

1. Bu fikre katılıyor musunuz?

Evet___ Hayır___

2. Mehmet'in belirtilen özellikleri terfi etmesinde sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

6- Kerim önemli ve saygın bir mesleğe sahiptir. Aynı kuruluştaki daha basit bir işte görevli olan Hüseyin uzmanlığı ve başarıları ile tanınır. Kerim daha yüksek ücret almaktadır.

1. Kerim'in daha yüksek ücret almasına katılıyor musunuz?

Evet___ Hayır___

2. Kerim'in belirtilen özellikleri daha yüksek ücret almasında sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

7- Lise mezunu olan Erol personel yönetimi konusunda çok tecrübelidir. Cemal bu konuda yüksek eğitim görmüştür. Yöneticiler Cemal'in terfi etmesini planlar.

1. Bu fikre katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Cemal'in belirtilen özellikleri terfi etmesinde sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

8- Sedat kendisinden bekleneni aynen yapar. Gerekli görse bile direktiflerin dışına çıkmamak için kendi görüşlerine yer vermez. Aynı bölümde çalışan Can zaman zaman beklenenin dışına çıkar ve doğru bildiğini yapar. Sedat'ın aldığı ücret daha yüksektir.

1. Sedat'ın daha yüksek ücret almasına katılıyor musunuz?

Evet ___ Hayır ___

2. Sedat'ın belirtilen özellikleri daha yüksek ücret almasında sizce ne kadar önemlidir?

1. Çok az önemli
2. Az önemli
3. Orta derecede önemli
4. Çok önemli
5. Çok fazla önemli

Aşağıdaki her soruda işinizi belirtilen niteliği açısından ne derece tatminkar bulduğunuz sorulmuştur. Her tatmin derecesi için bir numara verilmiştir. Her soruda sizce uygun olan numarayı söyleyiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
hiç tatminkar değil	tatminkar değil	az tatminkar	fikrim yok	Oldukça tatminkar	tatminkar	çok tatminkar

- ___ 1- İş güvenliği
- ___ 2- Aldığım ücret ve ek ödenekler
- ___ 3- İşimde kendimi geliştirme ve yetiştirme olanakları
- ___ 4- Çalışma arkadaşlarım
- ___ 5- Amirimin bana gösterdiği saygı ve adil tutum
- ___ 6- Yapılmaya değer bir şey ile uğraştığım inancı
- ___ 7- Çalışma ortamında yeni kişiler tanıma fırsatı
- ___ 8- Amirimin sağladığı destek ve rehberlik
- ___ 9- Kuruluşa olan katkılarımın karşılığını almam
- ___ 10- İşimi yürütürken bağımsız çalışma olanakları
- ___ 11- Bu kuruluşun geleceğine olan güvenim
- ___ 12- Çalışırken yardımlaşma olanakları
- ___ 13- İşimde beni daha istekle ve azimle çalışmaya yönlendiren faktörler
- ___ 14- Genel olarak amirlerimin tutumu

Bu bölümde çalıştığınız kuruluş ile ilgili bazı sorular vardır. Lütfen cevaplayınız.

1- Terfi edebilmek için kuruluşta uzun süreyle çalışmış olmak gerekir.

Evet___ Hayır___

2- Yetenekli ve verimli çalışmasıyla kendini kuruluşta ispat eden bir kimsenin aldığı ücret daha yüksektir.

Evet___ Hayır___

3- Konusunda diğerlerine göre daha tecrübeli olan bir kimsenin terfi etme olasılığı daha fazladır.

Evet___ Hayır___

4- Uzman olarak bilinen kişiler daha yüksek ücret almaktadırlar.

Evet___ Hayır___

5- Yeniliklere açık, fırsatları değerlendiren ve yaratıcı özellikleri ile kuruluşta göze çarpanlar çok gecikmeden terfi ederler.

Evet___ Hayır___

6- Mesleklerin ücret dağılımında önemli bir yeri vardır, önemli olarak nitelendirilen mesleğe sahip olanlar farklı ücret uygulaması görürler.

Evet___ Hayır___ .

7- Üniversite veya dengi bir yüksek okuldan mezun olmayanların kuruluşta yükselme şansı yoktur.

Evet___ Hayır___

8- Kendisinden bekleneni aynen yapan bir kimse, gerektiğinde amirinden farklı görüşlerle harekete daha kıyasla ücret, prestij ve diğer ödüller açısından daha kazançlı durumdadır.

Evet ___ Hayır ___

9- Ücret dağılımında çalışanların ihtiyaçları gözönünde tutulur.

Evet ___ Hayır ___

10- Maddi açıdan zor durumda olanlar, ücret, ikramiye ve diğer ek ödeneklerden daha geniş ölçüde yararlanabilmektedirler.

Evet ___ Hayır ___

11- Ek ödenek ve ücretler çalışan kişinin kuruluşa olan katkısıyla orantılıdır.

Evet ___ Hayır ___

12- Ücret dağılımı, kıdem, yetenek, tecrübe, eğitim düzeyi, uzmanlık gibi özelliklere göre yapılır.

Evet ___ Hayır ___