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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice. The sample of the study consists of 170 teachers working in high schools in Elazığ city center. In the study, the Transformational Leadership Scale was used to determine whether school administrators exhibit transformational leadership behaviours, and the Organizational Justice Scale was used to determine teachers' perceptions of organizational justice. Pearson moment two-correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis techniques were used in the analysis of the data. According to the research findings, it was observed that school administrators frequently exhibited transformational leadership behaviours and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice were at the level of “I agree”. In general, moderate, positive and significant relationships were found between transformational leadership and organizational justice. According to the results of the regression analysis, it was determined that the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership positively and significantly predicted the formal procedures dimension of the organizational justice scale, and also idealized influence and individualized consideration dimensions of transformational leadership positively and significantly predicted the interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice scale. The research results were discussed in the relevant literature and recommendations were made.
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INTRODUCTION

Today there is an ongoing pursuit for a more effective school leadership to enhance overall school success, performance and effectiveness. Considering the fact that successful leaders are expected to foresee the path or even determine the path for their followers, Burns (1978) defined transformational or visionary leadership as a novel leadership type with a core focus on setting vision for the followers. Transformational leadership is based on the reason that ‘the leader inspires followers to be motivated to rise above and beyond current levels of achievement and performance’ (Anderson, 2017: 3). As it voices clear objectives and vision as well as motivating followers with a high motivation to work, transformational leadership has become quite popular in the last two decades (Avolio et al., 2009; Bycio et al., 1995; Sosik and Jung, 2010).

Current literature on transformational leadership in education gives an extensive definition of the term as well as exploring the characteristics of a transformational leader, the dimensions of transformational leadership, and empirical/theoretical determinations on the relationship between transformational leadership and other organizational concepts.

The definitions of transformational leadership intertwine it with other organizational factors. According to Şimşek (2013), transformational leadership entails setting new norms and vision for the school as well as making radical changes to the culture of the school. Ng (2017) attributes the importance of transformational leadership to its close connection with organizational productivity and job performance. Suifan et al. (2017) seeks the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' creativity. Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) definition
organizational justice. To this end, current research investigated the relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational justice. They found a positive and meaningful relationship between transformational leadership and organizational justice. Another research design, Tanriverdi and Pasaoglu (2014) investigated the relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational justice. They concluded that there is positive relation among the three concepts while transformational leadership directly effects on job satisfaction.

Aim of the study

This study aims at investigating any possible relationship between school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice. To this end, current research seeks answers to following research questions:

RQ1: What are the levels of school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours?
RQ2: What are the levels of teachers' perceptions of organizational justice?

organizational justice. They have full understanding that they will get the same award or promotion or be punished in the same level with the equal performance (Iscan and Naktiyok, 2004). Procedural justice is directly related to serving full decision-making process before asking employees reach any decision. In this sense, all employees require equal procedures of decision-making before any decision threshold (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut and Walker, 1975). Interactional justice is 'the interaction between the source of allocation and the people who will be affected by the allocation decision' (Moorman 1991 cited in Rai, 2013) while interpersonal justice is attributed to personality factors such as politeness, esteem and respect. Informational justice covers 'candid, adequate and detailed explanations of the application of procedures and the distribution of outcomes in a timely fashion' (Rai, 2013: 262).

Though there exist some studies on mediating role of organizational justice or interactional justice on transformational leadership in other fields (Carter et al., 2014; Gillet et al., 2013) there are few studies on how transformational leadership effects organizational justice in educational organizations (Gunes and Buluc, 2012; Tanriverdi and Pasaoglu, 2014). However, organizational justice is a popular term for leadership research. It has been investigated for other leadership types. Gunes and Buluc (2012) have designed a research to explore the relationships between transformational leadership and organizational justice. They found a positive and meaningful relationship between transformational leadership and organizational justice. In another research design, Tanriverdi and Pasaoglu (2014) investigated the relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational justice. They concluded that there is positive relation among the three concepts while transformational leadership directly effects on job satisfaction.
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Aim of the study

This study aims at investigating any possible relationship between school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice. To this end, current research seeks answers to following research questions:

RQ1: What are the levels of school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours?
RQ2: What are the levels of teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice?
RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice?  
RQ4: Do teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice predict school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours?

METHOD

This study, which investigates the relationship between school administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice, was designed in a relational research model. The dependent variables of the study are the dimensions of organizational justice; distributive justice, formal procedures and interactional justice. The independent variables of the study are the dimensions of transformational leadership; idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration.

Population and sample

The population of the research consists of the teachers working in high schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in the city centre of Elazig. The sample of the study consists of 170 teachers selected by simple random sampling method. 42.3% of the participants are male and 57.7% are female teachers. In terms of seniority, 43.2% are teachers with 1-5 years, 23.5% 6-10 years, 16.7% 11-15 years, 10.9% 16-20 years, and 5.7% 21 years or more.

Data collection instruments

In order to collect data in the research, the personal information form developed by the researcher, the “Transformational Leadership Scale” developed by Avolio and Bass (1995), adapted to Turkish by Çelik (2010), and the ”Organizational Justice Scale” developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım (2007) were used.

Transformational Leadership Scale: The Transformational Leadership Scale developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) and adapted to Turkish by Çelik (2010) in order to measure transformational leadership behaviours consists of 37 items. The scale has four sub-dimensions: idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration. There are 10 items in the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership, 7 items in the intellectual stimulation dimension, 10 items in the inspirational motivation dimension, and 10 items in the individualized consideration dimension. For the transformational leadership scale, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient obtained as a result of the reliability analysis performed by Çelik (2010) was .88 for the idealized influence dimension, .89 for the intellectual stimulation dimension, .92 for the inspirational motivation dimension, .92 for the individualized consideration dimension, and .92 for the whole scale. According to the statistical analysis results made in this research, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale, idealized influence .94, intellectual stimulation .91, inspirational motivation was found to be .96, individualized consideration .96, and .98 for the whole scale.

Organizational Justice Scale: The Organizational Justice Scale, developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım (2007) in order to measure the perceptions of organizational justice, consists of 20 items. The scale consists of three sub-dimensions: distributive justice, formal procedures, and interactional justice. There are 5 items in the distributive justice dimension of organizational justice, 6 items in the formal procedures dimension, and 9 items in the interactional justice dimension. Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient obtained as a result of the reliability analysis conducted by Yıldırım (2007) for the organizational justice scale is .81, for the distributive justice dimension, .89, for the formal procedures dimension, and .95 for the interactional justice dimension. According to the statistical analysis results of this study, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were found as .82 for distributive justice, .90 for formal procedures, .96 for interactional justice, and .93 for the whole scale.

Data analysis

SPSS 22.0 package program was used to analyse the data in the study. 170 scales evaluated were transferred to SPSS data for analysis. Data analysis was basically carried out in two stages. In the first stage, the data were examined in terms of missing or incorrect values and extreme values, and in the second stage, the sub-problems of the research were resolved. In the incorrect value analysis, the values that were thought to be entered incorrectly were corrected. As a result of the analysis of whether there is a multicollinearity problem among the independent variables, it was seen that the VIF values were less than 10 and the CI values were less than 30, Durbin Watson values for autocorrelation were between 1.63 and 1.96, and tolerance values were above .10. Skewness coefficient values were between -.04 and -.90 and Kurtosis coefficient values were between -.18 and 1.40, and based on these results, it was decided that there was no multi-connection problem.

In order to solve the sub-problems in the study, firstly, the arithmetic mean values of the items in each sub-scale
were determined and a score was calculated for that factor. Analyses were made on these factor scores. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to calculate the relationships between variables. However, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive levels of independent variables on dependent variables. In the interpretation of the regression analysis, standardized Beta (β) coefficients and t-test results related to their significance were taken into account. In the analysis of the data .05 significance level was taken as basis.

RESULTS

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values regarding the transformational leadership behaviours of school administrators and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice are given in Table 1.

When the distributions of school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours are examined according to the perceptions of teachers participating in the study, it is observed that school administrators frequently show transformational leadership behaviours (M = 3.59) and in terms of dimensions, the highest average is in the idealized influence dimension (M = 3.70), and the lowest average is in the inspirational motivation dimension (M = 3.43). When the distributions regarding organizational justice are examined, it was concluded that teachers' perceptions of organizational justice were at the level of agree (M = 3.64) and, in terms of dimensions, the highest average was in the interactional justice dimension (M = 3.99), and the lowest average was in the distributive justice dimension (M = 2.88).

The data related to the Pearson Moments Correlation Coefficient analysis, which was made to determine whether there are significant relationships between school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice, are presented in Table 2.

When the data in Table 2 are examined, it is seen that there is a positive, moderate, and significant relationship between school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours and teachers' perceptions of organizational justice (r = .63, p < .01).

It is seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between the idealized effect dimension of transformational leadership and the dimensions of organizational justice scale's distributive justice (r = .18, p < .05), formal procedures (r = .71, p < .01), and interactional justice (r = .62, p < .01).

It is seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between the intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership and the formal procedures (r = .67, p < .01), and interactional justice (r = .59, p < .01) dimensions of the organizational justice scale. However, there is no relationship between the intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership and the distributive justice dimension of organizational justice (r = .15, p > .05).

It is seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between the inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership and the formal procedures (r = .62, p < .01) and interactional justice (r = .54, p < .01) dimensions of the organizational justice scale. However, there is no relationship between the inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership and the distributive justice dimension of organizational justice (r = .10, p > .05).

It is seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between the transformational leadership's individualized consideration dimension and the dimensions of organizational justice scale's distributive justice (r = .16, p < .05), formal procedures (r = .67, p < .01), and interactional justice (r = .64, p < .01).

In the study, multiple regression analysis was employed between transformational leadership dimensions and organizational justice in order to predict organizational justice; and the results are given in Table 3, 4 and 5.

The results of multiple linear regression analysis for predicting teachers' perceptions of distributive justice are given in Table 3.

As seen in Table 3, the power of transformational leadership to predict the distributive justice dimension of the organizational justice scale together with the dimensions of idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration was not found statistically significant (F = 1.92, p > .05). All dimensions of transformational leadership together can explain 4% (R = .21, R2 = .04) of the change in the distributive justice dimension score.

The results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of teachers' perceptions of formal procedures are given in Table 4.

As seen in Table 4, the predictive power of the organizational justice scale with the dimensions of idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration, together

Table 1. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values regarding transformational leadership and organizational justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Idealized influence</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Individualized consideration</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational justice</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Distributive justice</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Formal procedures</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations between transformational leadership and organizational justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Idealized influence</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Individualized consideration</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational justice</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Distributive justice</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Formal procedures</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Interactional justice</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 3. Regression analysis results regarding the prediction of teachers’ perceptions of distributive justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.21, R^2 = 0.04, F = 1.92, p = 0.11.

Table 4. Regression analysis results for predicting teachers’ perceptions of formal procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.73, R^2 = 0.53, F = 46.85, p = 0.00.

Table 5. Regression analysis results on predicting teachers’ perceptions of interactional justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.66, R^2 = 0.44, F = 32.60, p = 0.00.

with the dimensions of transformational leadership, was found to be statistically significant (F = 46.85, p < .01). All dimensions of transformational leadership, together can explain 53% (R = .73, R^2 = .53) of the change in formal procedures dimension score. The idealized influence (β = .43, p < .01) dimension of transformational leadership positively and significantly predicts the formal procedures dimension of the organizational justice scale. Intellectual stimulation (β=.17, p>.05), inspirational motivation (β=.00, p < .05), and individualized consideration dimensions
(β = .17, p < .05) are not the only significant predictors of
the formal procedures dimension.

The results of multiple linear regression analysis
regarding the prediction of teachers’ perceptions of
interactional justice are given in Table 5.

As seen in Table 5, the predictive power of the
organizational justice scale for the interactional justice
dimension together with the dimensions of idealized
influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation,
and individualized consideration was found to be
statistically significant (F = 32.60, p < .01). All dimensions
of transformational leadership together can explain 44%
(R = .66, R² = .44) of the change in the interactional
justice dimension score. Idealized influence (β = .33, p
< .01) and individualized consideration (β = .43, p < .05)
dimensions of transformational leadership positively and
significantly predict the interactional justice dimension
of the organizational justice scale. Intellectual stimulation (β = .04, p > .05) and inspirational motivation (β = -.12, p < .05)
dimensions are not the only significant predictors of the
interactional justice dimension.

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, the relationship between school
administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours
and teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice was
examined. As a result of the research, it was observed
that there were moderate, positive and significant
relationships between the transformational leadership
behaviours of school administrators and teachers’
perceptions of organizational justice.

According to the results of the research, it was
observed that school administrators frequently exhibited
transformational leadership behaviours and that idealized
influence was the highest, and inspirational motivation
dimension was the least perceived dimension of
transformational leadership. This result shows that school
administrators are quite successful in influencing
teachers with their leadership behaviours. When studies
conducted in the field of education about transformational
leadership are examined (Avci, 2015; Barnett, 2005;
Buluç, 2009; Cemaloğlu, 2007; Dalgali, 2020; Dursun,
2009; Göksal, 2018; Güneş, 2011; Kahya, 2020; Yildiz,
2019), it is seen that similar results are obtained. When
viewed in terms of dimensions, Keleş (2009)’s work
differs. Keleş (2009) stated in the study that school
administrators exhibit the most individual support
behaviours and the least idealized influence behaviours.

When the findings regarding organizational justice are
examined, it is seen that teachers’ perceptions of
organizational justice are at the level of agree; and also
the interactional justice dimension in terms of dimensions
has a higher average than the other dimensions.
According to this result, teachers think that school
administrators are fair in communicating with them.

Communication and interaction between administrators
and teachers may indicate that the school will be
successful in reaching its goals. The findings obtained
from studies on teachers’ perceptions of organizational
justice (Altahayneh et al., 2014; Altninkurt and Yilmaz,
2010; Atar, 2017; Ertürk, 2011; Güngörmez, 2014; İren,
2015; Kılıç, 2013; Kızılkaya, 2016; Özmen et al., 2007;
Titrek, 2009; Uğurlu, 2009; Yazıcıoğlu and Topaloğlu,
2009) are consistent with the findings of this study.

When the findings regarding the correlation between
school administrators’ transformational leadership
behaviours and teachers’ perceptions of organizational
justice were evaluated, a positive, moderate and
significant relationship was found between
transformational leadership and organizational justice.
In addition, it has been observed that there are positive
significant relationships between the dimensions of
idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational
motivation, and individualized consideration of
transformational leadership and the dimensions of formal
procedures and interactional justice of organizational
justice. Significant relationships were found between the
distributive justice dimension of organizational justice and
the idealized influence and individualized consideration
dimensions of transformational leadership; however, no
significant relationship was found between distributive
justice and intellectual stimulation, and inspirational
motivation. These findings show that school
administrators’ transformational leadership behaviours
increase teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice.
This finding coincides with the results of various studies
examining the relationships between transformational
leadership and organizational justice. Asgari et al. (2008)
found meaningful relationships between transformational
leadership behaviours and the distributive, operational,
and interactional justice dimensions of organizational
justice in the studies in which they examined the
relationships between transformational leadership
behaviours, organizational justice, leader-member
exchange, perceived organizational support, trust in
management, and organizational citizenship.

Deschamps, Rinfret, Lagace, and Prive (2016) examined
how transformational leaders affect the motivation of their
followers through organizational justice in healthcare
institutions, and they concluded that there are significant
relationships between transformational leadership and all
dimensions of organizational justice in their study, in
which 253 health institution managers participated. Gillet,
Fouquereau, Bonnaud-Antignac, Mokounkolo and
Colombat (2013) investigated the mediating role of
organizational justice in the relationship between
transformational leadership and the quality of work life of
nurses, and in their study, in which 343 nurses
participated, they concluded that there were positive
relationships between transformational leadership and
distributive justice and interactional justice. Güneş and
Buluç (2012) examined the relationship between
transformational leadership and organizational justice in educational institutions, and in their study with 350 teachers, they concluded that there is a high level of positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational justice. Khoshnejad Firouz et al. (2015), in their study examining the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational justice from the perspective of staff working in rehabilitation clinics in Ahvaz hospitals, found that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between the components of transformational leadership and organizational justice, and transformational leadership and interactional justice. They concluded that they had a higher level of relationship than others.

Moradi et al. (2009), in their study examining the relationship between transformational / transactional leadership and organizational justice among police officers. Rokhman and Hassan (2011), in their study examining the relationships between transformational leadership, organizational justice, and work outcomes, concluded that there are significant positive relationships between transformational leadership and operational justice.

As a result of the regression analysis conducted to determine whether transformational leadership predicts organizational justice, the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership positively and significantly predicts the formal procedures dimension of the organizational justice scale, the idealized influence and individualized consideration dimensions of the transformational leadership predicts interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice scale. These results show that managers' transformational leadership behaviours within the organization can positively affect their judicial behaviour. Deschamps, Rinfret, Lagace, and Prive (2016) found that transformational leadership affects all dimensions of organizational justice in their study with health institution managers. Güneş and Buluç (2012) concluded that the dimensions of idealized effect (attributed), suggestive motivation, and intellectual stimulation of transformational leadership are significant predictors of organizational justice. Hanif and Endang (2018), in their study examining the effects of transformational leadership, organizational justice, trust, and organizational commitment against employee performance, found that transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational justice and employee performance, but not on organizational commitment and strength. Khoshnejad Firouz, et al. (2015), as a result of the regression analysis, determined that individual attention and intellectual stimulation, which are components of transformational leadership, have a significant relationship with organizational justice. In his study with police officers, Osborn (2018) concluded that transformational leadership predicts operational justice, interactional justice, and organizational justice.

Research results show that school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours affect teachers' perceptions of organizational justice. It can be said that school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours can have important effects on ensuring organizational justice within the organization. The following suggestions can be made in the context of the research results: School administrators should be encouraged to exhibit transformative leadership behaviours. Since there are not enough studies in the literature, quantitative and qualitative studies can be conducted at various levels of educational institutions on the relationship between transformational leadership and transformational justice.
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