International Academic Institute for Science and Technology

International Academic Journal of Business Management
Vol. 2, No. 2, 2015, pp. 10-21.

ISSN 2454-2768

International Academic Journal of Business Management

www.iaiest.com

Predicting the type of organizational structure and organizational justice faculty members at Yasooj University

Jafar Torkzadeh[a], Alireza Farkhondezade[b]

[a] *Associate professor at Shiraz University.*

[b] *MA in educational administration and lecturer at Payam Nour University.*

Abstract

The overall objective of this study was to predict the type of dominant organizational structure and university faculty members' organizational justice. The study population included 160 university faculty members of Yasooj University, using stratified random sampling, 113 subjects were selected. The research tools included two scales: organizational structure type (Torkzadeh & Mohtaram, 2011), and organizational justice scale (Mormon and Nahof, 1993) that after estimating the validity and reliability, were distributed and collected. Results of dependent t-test showed that the hindering structure was to be the dominant structure in YASUJ University. One sample t -test results also revealed that the means of different types of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) along with the organizational justice mean of lecturers were lower than the least minimum adequacy level (Q1).

Keywords: Organizational Structure, Organizational Justice, Faculty Members, University

Introduction:

Today, all aspects of human life such as science and technology are evolving at an unprecedented pace. Organizations are obliged to carry out permanent and continuous innovation and changes in order to survive and protect their dynamism. The world is constantly changing and as Drucker indicated; the only constant issue in today's world is changing. If change and innovation would not be essential, human had still been living and remained in the early human life and perhaps the lives of the animals and no change had been acknowledged in his attitude and behavior. This would not run unless with the presence of skilled and formidable human resource, and organization is of no meaning without them. Therefore, the

main management tasks are to maintain and expand the reasonable behaviors of managers and a sense of justice in employees (seyed Javadein et al, 2008).

Hence, an appropriate organizational structure plays an important role in increasing organizational productivity, job satisfaction and the achievement of organizational goals (Canter, 1989). Organizational structure is both enabling and hindering. As Hoy and Miskel (2013) acknowledged, hindering organizational structure due to its emphasis on centralized control, the exact implementation of standards and lack of attention to the expectations and demands of learners, not only provides no suitable beds for developing members' sense of self-efficacy, but also will not achieve major goals of the University in spite of their importance. In the enabling organizational structure, while paying attention to the collaboration of individuals and providing a context regarding to innovation and creativity, issues are seen as opportunities for growth, and emphasis on flexible rules and regulations and processes are to provide confidence, motivation, commitment and the loyalty of people toward one another (Hoy and Switland, 2001; Adler and Brays 1996, Hoy and Miskel, 2013).

Accordingly, universities and higher education institutes have a duty to create an enabling atmosphere through designing enabling structures coupled with trust, equality and fairness to develop a sense of professional efficacy of lecturers. In doing so, present study attempted to predict the dominant organizational structure type of the university as well as determining lecturers' sense of professional efficacy.

Thus structure is a pattern of communications among the components of an organization (Hatch, 2008) which results in designing and building relationships, creating discipline and shaping the whole organization and also establishment and direction of the functional capabilities of the organization. Thus, structure is one of the most important factors to design the nature and quality of the entire organization; helps control the actions of members of the organization (Robbins and Judge, 2009; Aarabi, 1997). Accordingly, it can be inferred that structure can play as the members' organizational behavior locus of control. Importantly, organizational structure and processes are to have a continuous reciprocal interaction in a way that the structure affects the formation of organizational justice and organizational justice is as effective (Hall, 2002). Hence, since enabling structure enables people to feel a sort of self-efficacy, it is effective in the growth and survival of the organization and so is important for the organizational structure to be recognized and analyzed.

Organizational justice and its reasonable procedures are the main focus of organizational life (D. Kramer, 2005) and reflect the equity and ethical behavior accommodation in an organization (Keropanzano, 1997) that the misconception of it has a destructive effect on the development process since it affects the effort and motivation of the employees, weakens their morale, endeavor and activity (Alvani and Pourezzat, 2005).

Bearing in mind that the quality of higher education is strongly influenced by factors and conditions of internal and external environmental, the results of this study can be beneficial as follows:

- Identifying the dominant type of organizational structure governing the university and predicting its functional consequences and the out coming performances.
- Assessing organizational justice of the university
- Evaluating the professional efficacy status of faculty members
- A better understanding of the underlying factors and conditions within the University to ensure effective management of them and thus the resulting dynamics.

- Providing the necessary conditions to facilitate the university's organization's goals and missions.

In this regard the following objectives are traced:

1 – Prediction of the dominant organizational structure of the research domain.

2 - Predicting the level of organizational justice among faculty members of the University.

3 – Prediction of Organizational structure with a variety of organizational justice.

Theoretical and research background

Organizational Structure: The organizational structure is one of the most important dimensions of every organization. After the organizational objectives perhaps it could be recognized as the main part of an organization. According to pool (2002) structure is similar to an escalation and formational basis of different internal parts and external environment of the organization and is considered to be the main concept in the formation of an organization. Organizational structure is a pattern and plan of communications and interactions among various parts and components of an organization (sert and March, 2007). It identifies the relationship patterns between the components of the organization thereof; and as indicated by Hoy and Switland (2001: 2000) and Hoi and Miscall (2008 and 2005) is discussed as the context of organizational practices. Organizational structure embraces two enabling and hindering dimensions. The enabling dimension provides a condition for the staff to become formidable to respond to different systems in a dynamic way (Watts, Brad .etal 2009) while in a hindering organizational structure organization's atmosphere available to solve the organizational problems and to complete work tasks is not helpful but an obstacle (Geg, 2003), so that the type of organizational structure identified in this study is based on its hindering and enabling features; as there is a kind of dynamism in an enabling structure so people are participating more and so are more loyal the therefore will provide excellent efficiency and effectiveness for the organization. Hindering organizational structure is less flexible due to its emphasis on rules and procedures, and participation is proportionally lower, though, so people do not have much efficiency for the organization. . Hoy and Miskel (2005 and 2008), as summarizing former experts' views determined four basic elements for organizational structure, that are: formalization, centralization, context factors and processes, and thus divided organizational structure into two types of enabling and hindering that each types' feature is described as the following table (table 1).

Table 1: Characteristics of enabling and hindering organizational structures

Dimension	Enabling organizational structure	Hindering organizational behavior
formality	flexible Laws and processes, looking at problems as learning opportunities, encouraging different values, innovation, boosting confidence	Rigid and unchangeable principles and procedures, see problems as obstacles, encouraging consensus punishment of mistakes, reinforcing suspicions.
centralization	Facilitation of problem solving, improve collaboration, enhance openness, supporting members, encouraging innovation, emphasis on cooperation	Enforcement of rules (demand obedience), the emphasis on control, reinforcing mistrust and closure, Members punishment, suppression of change, emphasis on rules and bureaucracy

Process	Emphasis on participatory decision making, problem solving	Emphasis on unilateral decision making, (rules and procedures)
context	Trust between individuals, development of trust and credibility at works, integrity, (formation) of members sense of power	There is mistrust between individuals, twist the truth and spread deception, conflict, (formation) lack of a sense of power among members

Based on the table above, and, according to Hoy and Miskel (2008), in enabling educational structure, rules and regulations are to be considered as guidance for solving problems rather than a pressure factor and managers should take advantage of authority and existing mechanisms to support teachers and their subordinates rather than developing his powers.

Regarding the subjects mentioned it can be said that organizational Structure represents the relationships among organizational components which is characterized into various shapes and types , including enabling and hindering(Hoy and Miskel, 2008), in terms of its building components as well as the existing conditions of the organization. Accordingly enabling structure could be determined through its characteristics; such as establishment of bilateral relations, trust, learning from mistakes and accepting differences. On the other hand, against is the hindering structure embracing features such as; emphasis on one-way communication, lack of trust, fear of unexpected events and errors, and mistakes punishment. Thus, it is inevitable for university managers and authorities to bear in mind the organizational structure type, to create a suitable relationship between organizational processes and existing organizational structure type.

Organizational Justice: according to Fox et al. (2001) it refers to employees' perceptions of equity and job fair behaviors. On the other hand it is related to critical processes, including: commitment, organizational behavior, satisfaction and job performance (Calcite, nu and Jackson, 2002; Kunlun, Vason and Purtrong, 2001) and it responds to people how organizations judge them understand Hosseinzadeh (2006). Therefore, a proper understanding of the of justice by the people in the organization is of basic issues, particularly for understanding organizational behavior and includes the following 3 dimensions:

Distributive justice: distributive justice represents fairness of different work outcomes such as job plans, job responsibilities and income level (Folger & Skarlicki, 2001) that will result in employees dependency to the organization (Krimer, 2005).

Procedural justice: procedural justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the procedures and processes and their assignment outcomes. (MC doll and Flicher, 2004). Procedural fairness in practice includes the enforcement of trust between management and employees (Krimer,2006).

Interactional justice: is an implication for the perceived fairness of interpersonal communications quality in organizational procedures (MC doll and Flicher, 2004) and it makes sense with members' trust to organization (Rod, 2003). is followed by Job satisfaction (Yaghubi etal. 2008) and therefore leads to employees trust and empowerment (Javadein, 2007). Hence, it could be inferred that this dimension includes perceived fairness of interpersonal communication associated with organizational procedures and interpersonal communication quality.

Mohtaram (2011), in a study to examine the relationship between Shiraz University organizational structure type and the social capital of different departments with students' satisfaction found out that from the perspective of lecturers, the dominant organizational structure of the university was hindering and social capital status of educational departments was moderate. Average satisfaction level of students at the University was lower than the desirable sufficient level (Q3) and equal to desirable minimum level of adequacy (Q2).

Moeini (2011), in her study investigated the relationship between organizational structure and power resources of managers at Shiraz University, achieved these results: 1) the dominant organizational structure at Shiraz University was enabling (Anand 2005). In her study on the enabling structure analysis and hindering concluded that enabling structure in comparison with hindering structure followed by high levels of staff compliance and less costs. Hoy and Switland's (2001) Research on the concept and measure of enabling school structures revealed that enabling structure's nature is helpful. The Mac Goygan's (2005) research, on the role of enabling bureaucracy and academic optimism in academic achievement growth suggested that the enabling structure is supportive in nature. There is also a relationship between the enabling structure and scientific optimism. Furthermore, in his study, Watts (2009), in conjunction with the enabling structure, teachers' knowledge and empowering found a significant relationship between the school enabling structure and teachers' knowledge and there was no significant relationship between the enabling structure and empowering. Taylos (2009), in his study entitled "the impact of enabling structure on internal changes within the high schools" concluded that there is a significant relationship between the enabling structure and a high level of professional development for teachers.

Methodology

This research was correlational descriptive. Variables of this research include: the type of organizational structure as independent variable and lecturers professional self-efficacy feeling as a predictive variable.

The study population consisted of all faculty members (160 employees, 153 were male and 7 female) have been working in the research field in the academic year 90-91. Sampling method used in this study was stratified random sampling and random subjects were selected according to demographic characteristics (academic rank and specialized boards). Using Cochran's formula, a sample size of 113 has been estimated. Of these, 5 subjects were females and 108 were males.

Research Instruments

Organizational structure types scale:

To evaluate the organizational structure, organizational structure scale (Torkzadeh and Mohtaram, 1389) prepared based on the conceptual framework of Hoy Miskel (2008) prepared, is used. This measure is a Likert scale of five items and holds two dimensions: enabling and hindering. Scale of organizational structure (Torkzadeh and Mohtaram, 1389), distributed and collected among Shiraz University lecturers and faculty members for the first time. The validity and reliability of the scale was calculated using item analysis methods as (87/0- 39/0) at a significance level of (0/0001) and alpha (0/81). Due to changes in the statistical population, validity of the scale was calculated through "item analysis" and its reliability by calculating the "Cronbach's alpha coefficient", as shown in Table (3) the validity and reliability of the scale has been relatively strong.

Table 3: Calculation of reliability and validity of the organizational structure scale

Subscale	validity	reliability
Enabling Structure	0/30 -0/72 / 0/0001	0/77
Hindering structure	0/30 -0/70 / 0/0001	0/78
total score	0/30 -0/71 / 0/0001	0/77

Organizational justice Scale:

Organizational justice scale of Morman and Nihof (1993) was used order to assess the organizational justice. for assessing the validity of Organizational justice scale, item analysis and to calculate the reliability Cronbach's alpha was used and in accordance with the results reported in Table 4, all three dimensions of organizational justice has a high reliability and validity.

Table 4: Reliability and validity of organizational justice scale

Subscale	correlation coefficients and significance level	Cronbach's alpha
Procedural justice	٠/64 - ٠/ 83 / ٠/0001	٠/91
Interactional justice	٠/64 - ٠/83 / ٠/0001	٠/94
Distributive justice	٠/72-٠/77 / ٠/0001	٠/89

Data

analysis methods

Spss16 software was used for the analysis of data. Statistical methods used for each question are as followed:

1 - What type of organizational structure is prevailing in Yasooj University? (Dependent t-test)

2 - What are faculty members' attitudes toward organizational justice in Yasooj University? (One-sample t-test)

3 - Whether there is a significant relationship between organizational structure type and faculties sense of organizational justice at Yasooj University? (Multiple regression and Multivariate regression analysis)

Findings

Question 1 - Which type of organizational structure is dominant at Yasooj University?

Table 1: Comparison of the average of organizational structure types in Yasooj

Types of Organizational Structure	Average	Standard deviation	t	Degrees of freedom	.Significant level
Hindering structure	3/67	0/78	8/64	112	0/001
Enabling Structure	3/01	0/75			

This finding implies that the dominant organizational structure in terms of Yasooj University faculties' viewpoint has been hindering.

Question 2 - What are faculty members' attitudes toward organizational justice at Yasooj University?

Table 2: attitudes toward organizational justice in Yasooj University

Types of Organizational Justice	**Average**	**Standard deviation**	**Q1**	**T**	**Degree of freedom**	**.Significate level**
Procedural	2/68	0/97	7/5	-52/58	112	0/001
Interactional	2/79	1/11	11/25	-80/45		
Distributed	3/10	1/02	6/25	-32/58		

This finding implies that in Yasooj University organizational justice doesn't have much quality and desirability from faculties' point of view, and the degree of organizational justice is below the minimum acceptable level.

According to Table 3, from faculties' point of view the highest average belonged to distributive justice (3.10) and the lowest to procedural justice (2.68). The difference between the means is significant at 0/001 level.

Table 4: Bonferroni post hoc test to determine differences between the means of varieties of organizational justice from the perspective of Yasooj University faculties

Types of Organizational Justice	**Procedural**	**Interactional**	**Distributive**
Procedural			

Interactional	0.09		
Distributive	0.001	0.05	

Question 5 - Is there a significant relationship between organizational structure types and organizational justice at Yasooj University?

Table 7: The relationship between organizational structure and organizational justice Yasooj University

Types of Organizational Structure	R	R2	β	t	Significant level
Enabling Structure	0.67	0.44	0.72	9.28	0.001
Hindering structure			-0.49	-6.31	0.001

Both types of enabling and hindering structures, respectively, have negative and positive relationship with organizational justice in 0.001significant level.

Discussion and conclusions

The findings showed that the dominant organizational structure of the YASUJ University from faculties' point of view is hindering structure.

Other findings suggested that the highest average of organizational justice dimensions is related to distributive justice, then to interactional and the lowest average is also related to procedural justice. A variety of organizational justice dimensions means is also less than the minimum acceptable level (Q1).

Other findings revealed that both the enabling and hindering structures, respectively, have a significant positive and negative relationship with organizational justice. Organizational justice affects organizational structure in a way that in the cycle of cumulative causation; these two concepts together are considered as a kind of alter ego. These interactions are important so that they shape and direct the organization's activity zones and as a result are playing a role in the formation of all the activities and effectiveness of the organization (Torkzadeh, 2009). In this regard, officials are obliged to create a condition for development and change in the university in order to shape lecturers professional self-efficacy as the main and generating axis for producing science and they could do it through considering the type of organizational structure relating to organizational justice and its dimensions and eliminating the social networks of the existing function, developing a climate of trust among lecturers and modifying and improving different norms within the University.

Considering the results of this study we come to this conclusion that hindering structure cannot provide a suitable condition for faculty members' professional self-efficacy and as a result will lead to a recession in university science and education. So it is expected that university leaders in order to fulfill the educational effectiveness among other universities consider appropriate regulations, environmental contingencies along with the demands of faculty members provide the incidence of enabling structure which can help the development of the University's various departments.

Practical suggestions

1 – Bearing in mind that according to this study the dominant organizational structure of Yasooj University from faculties' point of view was hindering, it is necessary that university administrators amend the laws, to lead the university structure toward the enabling.

2 - Given that there is a relationship between organizational structure and organizational justice, university administrators require to put into consideration strengthening and cohesion of social networks, improving the space, increasing the confidence of faculty members toward each other, especially in the educational sector.

3 - According to the role of organizational justice in predicting each of its components it is needed that managers increase the extent of organizational justice and its sense in organizations through the following ways:

A) **Procedural**: to facilitate procedures and relevant laws to avoid causing members troublesome.

B) **Interactional**: appropriate and fair treatment with all stakeholders. And administrators create a friendly and peaceful atmosphere to provide organizational justice increase.

C) **Distributive**: information services and resources should be placed at the disposal of all members alike. And taking into account the native nature of the region, and according to environment circumstances, paying more attention to some members rather than the others should be avoided.

Research suggestions

1 - Investigating the relationship between organizational structure and organizational justice with Yasooj University staff and comparing the findings.

2 - Investigating the relationship between organizational structure and organizational justice from other universities lecturers' point of view.

3 – A study of the relationship between organizational structure and organizational justice predicting faculty members' job satisfaction.

4 - The use of questionnaires, along with interviews in order to improve the quality of results.

References

Adams, C. M.; Forsyth, P. B. (2006). *Promoting a Culture of Parent Collaboration and Trust : And Empirical Study : Annal Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco : CA.

Ahadi, B.; Narimani, M.; Abolqasemi, A., Asiaee, M. (2009). " a study of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, attribution style and self-efficacy and life satisfaction among employed women ", Studies of Education and Psychology, Ferdowsi University, No. 1, pp 117-127.

Ahmadi, N(2008). "Professional self- efficacy" New psychotherapy. No. 49-50, pp7-87**.**

Asghari, A, Khodapanahi, M. K, Saleh Sedghpour, B. (2008). Relationship between self empowerment and job satisfaction, Journal of Psychology, No. 12, pp 239-227.

Ashjae, A, Noori, A., Arizi, HR; Samavatyan, H. (2008). "Relationship between organizational justice and trust in the organization and management of personnel in Isfahan Steel Complex", Knowledge and Research in Applied Psychology, No. 39, pp 12-1.

Baharifar, A.; Javaheri Kamel, M. (2010). A study of the organization Ethical implications (the study of organizational justice, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior), Journal of Police Human Development. Issue 28, pp 95-118.

Barati, H. (2009). Simple and multiple correlation between organizational justice and job performance in Esfahan Steel Company. Management Landscape, No. 33, pp9-28.

Colqitt, J. A.; Conolon, D. E.; Wesson, M. J.; Porter, C. O. L. H.; Ng, k.Y. (2001). Justic at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*,Vol. 86, Iss. 3, pp.425-445.

Colqitt, J. A.; Noe, R. A,; Jackson, C. L. (2002). Justice in Teams: Antecedents and Consequendes of Procedural Justice Climate. *Personel Psychology*,Vol. 55, Iss. 1, pp,83-109.

Cremer D, Dijk E. (2006). Undermining Trust and Cooperation: The Paradox of Sanctioning Systems in Social Dilemmas. *J Exp Soc Psychol*. Vol. 42, pp: 62-147.

Cremer, D. (2005). "Procedural and Distributive Justice Effects Moderated by Organizational Identification". *Journal of Managerial Psycholo*gy, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp: 4-13.

Daft, R. (1995). *Structural Theory and Organizational and Design. Translated Into Persian by Ali parsian and Seyed Mohammad Ali . Cultural Research* .Office Press & the Educational in Persian.

Day, R.; Allen, T. D. (2004)." The Relationship Between Career Motivation and Self-Efficacy With Protegé Career Success". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 64, pp:72–91.

Fournier, William H. (2008). *Communication Satisfaction, Interactional Justice, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Staff Perceptions in a University Environment*. The Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University .

Gardner, G.; Dyne, L. V.; Pierce, J. L. (2004) "The Effects of Pay Level on Organization-Based Self-Esteem and Performance", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol . 77, PP: 307–322.

Ghafouri Varnoosfaderani, M.R; Golparvar, M. (2009). Exploring the relationship between the organizational justice components and organizational commitment of employees of Isfahan city hall. Psychological Studies Al-Zahra University Psychology and Educational Sciences department, No. 4.

Gholipour, A, Fattahi, M.; Pirannejad, A. (2007). Review of elite Immigration in educational institutions Rahyaft, No. 40.

Golparvar, M., Nadi, MA (2009). Examining the relationship between cultural values and equity and organizational justice, job satisfaction and turnover, Journal of Cultural Research, No. 9, pp 228-207.

Hosseinzadeh, A., Nasseri, M. (2007). Organizational justice. Tadbir, No. 190, pp 18- 23.

Hoy, W. D.; Miskel, C. (2013). *Educational Administration* U.S.A.Mc Grow Hill.

Hoy, W. D.; Miskel, C. (2013). *Educational Administration*. U.S.A.Mc Grow Hill.

Hoy, W. K. (2003). An Analysis of Enabling and Mind School Structures: Some Theoreticalresearch. And Practical. Consideration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, NO. 41, PP:87-108.

Hoy, w. K.; Seweetland, S.R.; Smith, P.A. (2002). Designing Better schools: the Meaning and Nature of Nnabling School Structure Educational Administration Quarterly ,Vol. 37, No. 3, pp:296-321.

Hoy, W.; Miskel, C. (2013). *Educational Administratio*. U. S. A: Mc Graw Hill.

Hoy,W.; Dipaola , M. (2007). *the essential ideas for the reform of American school challotie ,NC: in formatting age publishing INC*.

Iranzade, S, Asadi, N. (2009). Exploring the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior and job satisfaction of Ardabil University staff. Beyond Management, No. 10, S75-43.

Kaiser Zadeh, N., Hossein Pour, M. (2009). A study of the effectiveness of cognitive information processing teaching to increase the students self-efficiency components. New Findings of Psychology, Issue 17, pp 124-111.

Karimzade Shirazi, M.; Razavie, A., Kaveh, MH (2008). Relationship between quality of life and self-efficacy of employed teachers of Shahrekord city, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, No. 1, pp 28-35.

Katozian, Naser. (2008)," Justice and human law", *journal of law , faculty of law and political science*, No 3.

Khatibi, A, Asad, H; Hamidi, M, Seif Panahi, J. (2011). A study of organizational justice Components in Olympic and Paralympic academy. Sports Management, No. 10, pp 65-84.

Kim, S.; Mone, M. A.; Kim, S. (2008)." Relationships Among Self-Efficacy, Pay-For-Performance Perceptions, and Pay Satisfaction: A Korean Examination". *Human Performance*, Vol. 21, pp: 158–179.

McDowall, A.; Fletcher, C. (2004). "Employee Development: an Organizational Justice Perspective" , *Personnel Review*. Vol.33, No.1, pp: 8-29.

Mecaiagan, L. (2005). *The Role of Enabling Bureaucracy and Academic of Timism Academic a Chevement Growth* ". Dissertation of PHD Ohio State University.

Moeni Shahraki, H. (2011). The relationship between the structure types and power resources of the staff of Shiraz University. Shiraz: Shiraz University, Master's thesis.

Mohtaram, M. (2011). Examining the relationship between organizational structure and departments social capital, with students' academic satisfaction at Shiraz University. Structural equation model. Shiraz: Shiraz University, Master's thesis.

Mohyeldin, A.; Suliman,T. (2007). "Links Between Justice, Satisfaction and Performance in the Workplace: A Survey in the UAE and Arabic Context", *Journal of Management Development*. Vol. 26, pp: 294-311.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship Between Organization Justice and Organization Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*.Vol. 76, N.6, pp: 845-855.

Moradi Chalshtry, MR, Hamidi, M, Sajjadi, N. Kazemnejad, A, Jafari, A., Moradi Chalshtry, J. (2009). Relationship between transformational-transactional leadership styles and organizational justice and presenting a model in Physical Education organization of Islamic Republic of Iran, Sport Management, No. 2, pp 96-73.

Moradmand, R., Karimi, F. (2009). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of the organizational structure with their level of job stress in Isfahan high schools, Journal of Educational Leadership and Management Branch of GARMSAR, Issue 2, pp 145-125.

Nasimi, S. (2011). Examining the relationship between organizational justice and staff professional self-efficacy at Shiraz University. Shiraz: Shiraz University, Master's thesis.

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*. Vol. 36, pp: 527-556.

Nooranesaa', R.; Saghaei, A . Samimi yas, F. (2007). Measuring customer satisfaction in order to identify opportunities for improvement in Higher Education Research Services, Research and Planning in Higher Education, Issue 49, pp 97-119.

Poulos, F. (2004) , *Techers Perception Of Procedural Fairness: Their Impact On Techers Efficacy And Commitment*, University Of Connecticut.

Raminmehr, H. (2009). Investigating the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. change management research, No. 2, pp 65-89.

Shekari, Ghulam Abbas, Zabihi, MR, Edalati, R. (2011). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment of employees at the credit and financial institution in the city of Mashhad, Mashhad University website.

Tylas, J. D. (2009). The Impact of Enabling School Structures on the Degree of International School Change as Reassurance by the Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Dissertation PHD, Virginia Common Wealth University.

Vaeezi, R., Sabzikaran, E. (2010). Relationship between organizational structure and employee empowerment in Oil Production and Distribution Company of Tehran, Research of Change Management, Vol II, No. 3.

Yaghoobi, M.; Sqayyan, S.; Gorgy, H.; Norouzi, M., Rezaei, F. (2009). The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the staff of selected hospitals of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Journal of Health Management Research, No. 35, pp 32-25.

Yazdani, HR, Kazemi Najaf Abadi, M., Salimi, G. (2010). Examining the mediating role of spirituality in the relationship between organizational justice and spiritual implications, Business Administration Outlook, No. 3, pp 133-117.