



The comparison of impressionability of conflict solving strategies based on the components of organizational justice (Case study: labor and social affair organization of Qom)

Mehdi Esmaili and Mohammad Taghi Khoobroo

Public Administration, Faculty of Management, Qom College, University of Tehran, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 4 August 2013;

Received in revised form:

28 January 2014;

Accepted: 15 February 2014;

Keywords

Organizational Justice,

Five conflict management strategies.

ABSTRACT

Nowadays regarding to increasing complexity of organizations and differences in thoughts, attitudes and beliefs of individuals, there has been some conflicts in organizations as inevitable part of organizational life which should be properly identified and managed. But now what is important to resolve organizational conflicts is awareness of the five conflict management strategies and their appropriate contexts and applications in order to select the appropriate strategy for each position; not only to prevent damage to the organization, but leading them to the realization of organizational goals. Organizational Justice is an ability of managing organizational conflict. The process and outcomes of Organizational Justice includes many results such as reduction of stress, enhancing understanding and communication, increasing stability, continuity and empathy. Conflict management is to resolve disputes, teamwork, and cooperation, working with people through shared goals, etc. this is a descriptive survey which sought to identify the impact of Organizational Justice on conflict solving strategies. In this regard, this survey achieves some results in conflict solving strategies and its impressionability based on the components of emotional intelligence.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

Introduction

Today, experts believe that human resource is the most important asset of an organization so it is known as a competitive advantage. healthy relationship based on cooperation and understanding of each other among these valuable resources are the most important factors for the success of all organizations include industrial, administrative, service, education etc. (Beugre et al, 2009, p.130). Regarding to increasing complexity of organizations and differences in thoughts, attitudes and beliefs of individuals, there has been some conflicts in organizations as inevitable part of organizational life. The significant point is that inevitability of conflict doesn't mean it is negative but if it is managed well, it will be beneficial for the organization. In other words, conflict is a coin which contains positive and negative sides. So the way of dealing with it can determine its effects on organization. so undoubtedly the ability to manage and control the phenomenon of conflict in organizations is one of the most important skills that managers need it (Nelson et al, 2002, p.4). There is conflict in all human societies, sectors and administrative units and activities as an obvious fact. So we cannot find an organization where there is no conflict. However, conflicts are found in all organizations but it may be weak, strong, silent, outstanding or indistinctive. Researches also suggest that 20% of managers' time is spent for resolving organizational conflicts (Cameron et al, 2009, pp.297-298). Managers escape from conflict because of various reasons such as cultural, no venture enough, fear of change in existing organizational situation and disturbance in managing organization (Tunkenejad, 2005, p.100). So managing conflicts is necessary and its prerequisite is recognizing conflicts sources such as personality, unsociable value system, unclear job boundaries, competition for access to limited resources,

competition among groups, unhealthy relationships, interdependent tasks, time complexity, politics, ambiguous standards, organizational constraints, group decision making etc. (Robert, 2005), communication, structure, personal variables, poor communication, reward systems, value systems etc. (Eberlin, 2005, pp.16-19), educational background, geographic region, life, income, marital status etc. (Dulebohn et al, 2009, pp.140-141). After identifying sources of conflict and organizational stress, we would try to select appropriate and effective strategies to achieve growth, dynamism and organizational goals.

Understanding and managing conflict is reasonably fair and useful. Conflict can be managed by some skills such as effective communication, problem solving and negotiation. Also our ability to manage conflict management can affect the results. For managing conflict at first it should be identified and analyzed then examined the causes of it. One of the good ways of resolving and managing organizational conflict is Organizational Justice.

In the last decade of 20th century, most of the attention of researchers and scholars has been gathered around the organizational justice as an important concept and the main subject of research in organizational and industrial psychology. Equity in organization expresses the equality from ethical behavioral point of view in an organization (Yilmaz, 2009, p.130). Research findings in the organizational justice literature show that organizational justice is a significant predictor of work attitudes and behaviors (Junaidah et al, 2011, p.122) such as: organizational Entrepreneurship, job satisfaction (Yilmaz, 2009, p.132)

Tele:

E-mail addresses: ma.esmaili.2011@gmail.com

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

Research Questions

1-How Organizational Justice effects on management conflict strategies in Labor and Social Affair Organization of Qom?

2-Are there any differences among conflict solving strategies based on Organizational Justice components in Labor and Social Affair Organization of Qom?

Methodology

This research is a developmental and descriptive research which is applicable from the view of aim. This study sought to describe the dimensions, characteristics, properties, constraints and deficiencies in the application of Organizational Justice in conflict solving strategies. Descriptive researches describe existing phenomena and pay attention to existing conditions or relationships, current processes or work progress. The statistical population of this study is Labor and Social Affair Organization of Qom. Based on the target population size which is 60 persons, the sample size is 41. Also the random sampling method is used. In order to gathering data, two questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire contains 50 questions which show 5 components of solving conflict strategies. The second questionnaire is Organizational Justice questionnaire of SmitherRailey and Dominique. It contains 25 questions which show 4 components of Organizational Justice but we chose 17 questions. To assess the reliability, Cronbach's alpha was used. Cronbach's alpha of the first questionnaire was 0.73 and the second was 0.81. In order to analyzing data, Independent sample T-test and Pearson Correlation test were used. The Pearson correlation formula is shown below:

$$r = \frac{\sum xy - nxy}{\sqrt{\sum x - nx^2} \sqrt{\sum y^2 - ny^2}} \quad y = \text{independent}$$

variable x=dependent variable

Regarding to regression analysis which is used for predicting an independent variable based on one or more dependent variables; in this study we use it to determine the effect of Organizational Justice on conflict resolution strategies. In this way at first we evaluate the linear or non-linear of model and then determine the regression equation as $y = \alpha + \beta x$. To compare and ranking of these variables, the Friedman test was used which is:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{12}{nk(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^k - 3n(k+1)$$

Literature review

Different kind of conflict:

In the work environment, conflict is divided into two categories include Fundamental Conflict and Affective or Emotional Conflict. Some researchers divided fundamental conflict into Conflict in aim, Procedural conflict and Cognitive conflict (Tatum, 2006, p.68). Also in another category it divided into personal "interpersonal and among persons", group "intergroup and among groups" and organizational "internal and among organizations".

Conflict Management Strategy

Understanding and managing conflict is reasonably fair and useful. Conflict can be managed by some skills such as effective communication, problem solving and negotiation (Mayer, 2000, p.91). Also our ability to manage conflict management can affect the results. For managing conflict at first it should be identified and analyzed then examined the causes of it. After identifying conflict and its components; choosing appropriate style is a key point in conflict management (Fayazi, 2003, p.109). There are five main styles of conflict management:

Collaboration:

It refers to trying for characterizing interests or concerns of persons. It often refers to the method or situation of the "solving problem" (Camero, 2009, p.29). If the conflicting parts desire to fully meet the interests of all parts; and seek a solutions to providing mutual benefits; this style was used (BazazJazayeri, 2008, p.80). However, people are willing to work together and also they considered the interests of others. Using this method will reduce bad feelings, increase persons' commitment and allow people to know each other. The disadvantages of this method are time wasted and weaken the power and energy of the people (Fayazi, 2003, p.109). But the main advantage of this style is its lasting effect because it addresses the fundamental issues instead of paying attention to symptoms (Rezaeian, 2011, p.146). In this style people show a good spirit of cooperation and are determined to achieve their desired. So the strategy of both parts is "win-win".

Competitions:

It refers to willingness to meet interest regardless of the issue that it will lead to a conflict with another person. When a person seeks to achieve his goals and interests regardless of its effect on other person, he competes to establish his dominance. So every person tries to use his power to resolve the conflict is in his favor (Rezaian, 2011, p.70). In this way, one person feels that a special matter is a fantastic subject for him. So he tries to get it hard with unresponsive to impairing his relationships with others (Fishr, 2007, p.19). Finally one of the opponents must accept another's viewpoint. This style will be appropriate when an uncomfortable solution must be implemented, a minor issue was existed or a deadline was approaching. This style is inappropriate in an open environment. Its main advantage is high speed and its major disadvantage is the unhappiness among employees (Rezaian, R.K Robins, 2011, p.376; Kritner and Chiniki, 2001, p.462). So when one of the persons involved in conflict is seeking to achieve his goals or advancing his interests; so he start competition and domination without considering others and this condition called "win-lose" strategy.

Avoidance:

In this situation, a person tends to avoid or prevent conflict (sharif, 2007, p.23). When a person discover a conflict and withdrew passively or suppress it; in this case both of the competitor make physical separation between each other and choose an area for themselves which is different from another's (Khani et al, 2005, p.19). When conflict avoidance is a good strategy that at firstly the conflict is minimal and secondly their feelings is wounded or when there is a serious gap between the final action of manager for solving conflict and the benefits that must be captured (Bazazjzayeri, 2008, p.25).

Usually this method is used when the issue was trivial, there were other important issues, involvement in the conflict would lead to damages or more information is needed before continuing conflict (Fishr, 2007, p.64). Regarding to avoiding both of opponent from conflict, this method called "lose-lose" strategy (Fishr, 2007, p.40).

Conciliation:

This is a situation that both of opponents agreed to relent about some of their requests and condone some of them in favorite of each other (Eberlin, 2008 p.329). This style from the view of assertiveness level is average and also is an attempt to partial satisfaction of the both persons involved in conflict in which apparently both of them get their rights (Cameron, 2009, p.29). **Conciliation** is used when both of opponents have valuable things but agree to lose some of them in order to arrive at a consensus. This way is used by managers and workers

through negotiation, collective contract or new employment contract. This method is useable when strength was equal, taking appropriate solutions was complex and difficult and when there was not enough time (Bazazjazyeri, 2008, p.25). It should be noted that people often remember what they lose than what they gain so this may cause pessimism (Reid, 2004, p.241).

Compromises:

In this style a person is willing to give concessions to the other. This is due to that the other person has a higher organizational level. This is a way in which one person wants to calm the other person so he preference the opponent's interests in order to maintain their relationships. In fact, one of the opponents ignores his interests in favorite another (Katz, Denial, 2005, p.15). Many believe that having a good friendly relationship is more important than anything else. The focus of this style is maintaining personal relationships with others. However, by this method, we may lose our personal credit and influence. This option is useful when the subject is not important for one of the opponents or he plans to address more important issues (Bazazjazyeri, 2008, p.25). The main advantage of this style is encouraging collaboration. Its major disadvantage is resolving conflict temporarily not fundamentally. This style is not suitable for solving complex or crucial problems (Tunkenejad, 2005, p.32). Since one person withdraw in favorite of another, this strategy called "lose-win".

Organizational Justice

Justice is a key issue for understanding organizational behavior (Bos, 2002, p866). During the past 25 years, the study of fairness has received major research attention from a variety of disciplines, including economics, psychology, law, and organizational science (Dulebohn et al, 2009, p141) described organizational justice as "a dominating theme in organizational life" (Elanain, 2010, p6). Much of this attention to justice is because of the important work-related consequences that have been linked to employees' perceptions of fairness within organizational contexts (Johnson et al, 2006, p175), such as job satisfaction, organizational Entrepreneurship, and organizational-citizenship behaviors (Olkkonen & lipponen, 2006, p204). There has also been considerable interest in examining the antecedents of justice perceptions in the hopes of promoting fairness in organizations. It is generally agreed that work-related outcomes, the procedures that determine those outcomes, the provision of voice and explanations, and the respect and dignity that is received from others all have a significant impact on the content and magnitude of fairness perceptions (Johnson et al, 2006, p175). Explaining the special significance that the concept of justice has taken in organizations, Greenberg (1996) coined the term organizational justice, which refers to individuals' perceptions of fairness in organizations (Hoy & Tarter, 2004, p250). As indicated by Schminke et al. (1997), the fundamental concept underpinning both ethics and organizational justice is fairness, which influences people's judgment about right and wrong (McCain et al, 2010, p995), Fair treatment is something that employees who invest their time and energies in an organization "expect" (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005, p1041)

In fact, organizational justice scholars use the terms fairness and justice interchangeably. For these scholars, fairness is an important yardstick that employees use to assess outcomes distribution, formal procedures, or interpersonal treatment in organizations (Beugre, 2009, p129).

The dimentions of organizational justice

Early studies of justice in organizations were focused on equity theory and outcome justice. As the study of

organizational justice began to expand, the focus shifted from outcome justice (was the end result fair) to social justice (were the procedures fair and were people treated with respect). Some studies now suggest that social justice is as important as outcome justice, and there is a relationship between social justice and both managerial performance (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005, p1042)

In general, organizational justice can be categorized into two broad areas called "structural justice" and "social justice". Structural justice refers to the structural elements of the organization that allow for employee involvement in decision making and provide for the fair distribution of outcomes. Social justice, by contrast, refers to the employee's perceptions that the organization openly shares information with them and cares about their well-being. Some readers may be familiar with the distinction between procedural and distributive justice. The structural/social justice categories used in this exercise include both distributive and procedural justice, but also add the important element of interpersonal interaction – how people are treated on an interpersonal level when an organization institutes its policies and procedures (Tatum & Eberlin, 2006, p67).

There have been many classifications offered for organizational justice, but the taxonomy presented by Greenberg (1993), has received strong empirical support (Eberlin & Tatum, 2008, p311), according to Greenberg, organizational justice has generally been postulated to encompass three different components: Distributive justice, Procedural justice, Interactional justice (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004, p10)

Greenberg (1993) classified the components of organizational justice under two dimensions. The first dimension is the classical differentiation of justice focusing either on procedures or outcomes. The second dimension refers to the focal determinant (either structural or interpersonal). Greenberg argued that traditionally procedural and distributive justice dealt with structural aspects. The focus is on the environmental context within which the interaction occurs, e.g. the procedures used to determine an outcome and the perceived fairness of the final outcome. Interpersonal justice deals with the treatment of individuals, and therefore themphasis is on social determinants (Hassan & Hashim, 2011, p84).

Organizational justice has developed over the past 40 years to include distributive, procedural, and interactional theories. From these theories, researchers have come to accept a four-factor model of organizational justice, which includes distributive justice, procedural justice, and two classes of interactional justice, specifically, informational and interpersonal justice. Research suggests that these factors are distinct constructs that can, and should, be empirically distinguished from one another (Shafiepour et al, 2011, p120).

Distributive justice

Distributive justice is related to the perceived fairness outcomes (Jafari et al, 2011, p1696) such as payment and promotion (Junaidah, 2011, p125). Distributive justice focuses on the extent to which rewards and punishments are related to job performance (Nirmala & Akhilesh, 2006, p138). Approaches to distributive justice are primarily related to structural determinants. Structural determinants are rules and environmental contexts in the decision making process (Yilmaz & Tasdan, 2006, p113).

Distributiv justice stems from equity theory (Elanain, 2010, p7). According to equity theorists, individuals compare a ratio of their perceived inputs into and outcomes derived from a relationship with that of a referent other. If the ratios are equal, the individual perceives distributive justice. If the ratios are

unequal, the individual will perceive inequity (Jawahar, 2002, p813). Referring to the equity theory, employees will modify the quality or quantity of their work to restore justice. When employees perceive justice in the organization, they are less likely to seek opportunities to balance things out by increasing their own benefits at the company's expense. Additionally, when employees are treated fairly, they are "more willing to subordinate their own short-term individual interests to the interests of a group or organization" (McCain et al, 2010, p997). The logic of distributive justice is straightforward – participant satisfaction is increased when one believes that the resolution of the dispute is fair and favorable (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p150). Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) argued that distributive justice leads to organizational effectiveness (Elanain, 2010, p7).

Procedural justice

Procedural justice is concerned with one's perception of the process that determines fair pay (Till & Karren, 2011, p45). Theory and research has established that procedures are judged as fair if they are implemented consistently, without self-interest, on the basis of accurate information, with opportunities to correct the decision, with the interests of all concerned parties represented, and following moral and ethical standards (Jawahar, 2002, p813). Procedural justice towards employees is a basis for employee Entrepreneurship. Procedural justice influences individuals' perceptions of fairness in regard with pay raises and promotions as well as organizational Entrepreneurship and job satisfaction (Jafari et al, 2011, p1697).

Whereas distributive justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of outcome (the content of the decision or resolution), procedural justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of process (the steps taken to reach that decision) (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p150).

Operating within a structural framework, Leventhal and his associates (1980) identified six procedural rules against which fairness of procedures may be evaluated. These rules are (a) consistency rule— allocation procedures should be consistent across persons and over time; (b) bias suppression rule— personal self-interest in the allocation process should be prevented; (c) accuracy rule—decisions must be based on accurate information; (d) correctability rule—opportunities must exist to enable decisions to be modified; (e) representativeness rule—the allocation process must represent the concerns of all recipients, and (f) ethicality rule—allocations must be based on prevailing moral and ethical standards.

Procedural justice is, therefore, concerned primarily with the extent to which structural features of decision making (allocation process) facilitate employee voice, appropriateness of criteria, and the accuracy of the information used to arrive at a decisional outcome (Aryee et al, 2004, p3).

A vast amount of research has indeed shown that the direct effect of distributive justice on people's reactions at the workplace is influenced by procedural justice. In fact, there is converging evidence that the effects of procedural justice are most strongly observed when outcomes are unfavorable. Whereas favorable outcomes may generally satisfy people, unfavorable outcomes elicit a greater need for explanation and thus focus people's attention more strongly on the procedures used to arrive at the outcome. Accordingly, with unfavorable outcomes, procedural justice will have a greater impact on people's responses to the decision (Cremer, 2005, p5)

Interactional justice

Perceived interactional justice depends on employees' reaction to the manner in which their direct supervisors carry out formal procedures (McCain et al, 2010, p995). Interactional

justice is defined as the quality of interaction that an individual receives during the enactment of organizational procedures (Jafari et al, 2011, p1696) and concerns the human aspect of organizational practices (Yilmaz & Tasdan, 2006, p114). Greenberg (1993) has argued that interactional justice should be divided into two distinct components, informational justice and interpersonal justice (Till & Karren, 2011, p46). These two subcategories of informational and interpersonal justice overlap considerably; however, research suggests that they should be considered separately, as each has differential effects on justice perceptions.

Informational justice focuses on the enactment and explanation of decision making procedures. Research suggests that explanations about the procedures used to determine outcomes enhance perceptions of informational justice. Explanations provide the information needed to evaluate the structural aspects of the process and how it is enacted; however, for explanations to be perceived as fair they must be recognized as sincere and communicated without ulterior motives, based on sound reasoning with logically relevant information, and determined by legitimate rather than arbitrary factors (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p151).

Interpersonal justice reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities. The experience of interpersonal justice can alter reactions to decision outcomes, because sensitivity can make people feel better about an unfavorable outcome. Interpersonal treatment includes interpersonal communication, truthfulness, respect, propriety of questions, and justification, and honesty, courtesy, timely feedback, and respect for rights (Till et al, 2011, p110).

Although related (even highly so in some cases), procedural justice and interactional justice are often viewed as distinct constructs. Whereas procedural justice involves the fairness of the organization's formal structures and procedures, the enactment of those procedures is covered by interactional justice. Thus, it is conceivable that, although the formal procedures of one's organization are judged as fair, interactional justice is deemed low because an unscrupulous boss is charged with executing them (Johnson et al, 2006, p178).

Findings and conclusions

The correlation and regression:

We used the regression equation to investigate the significance relationship between Organizational Justice (as independent variables) and conflict management strategies (as dependent variable) based on data obtained from the questionnaires. In this investigation at first we determined the correlation coefficient in which the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are examined. Based on Pearson Correlation the results can be summarized in Table 2.

The results show that there is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and conflict management strategies such as collaboration, competition, avoidance and conciliation in which the collaboration strategy has the most numeric value and the competition has the lowest numeric value.

1. There is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and collaboration strategy
2. There is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and competition strategy
3. There is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and avoidance strategy
4. There is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and conciliation strategy

Table 1. The main kind of conflict

Different kind of conflict		Meaning
fundamental	Conflict in aim	Mismatch in priorities
	Procedural conflict	Inconsistent among approaches and process
	Cognitive conflict	Incompatibility of ideas
Affective or Emotional		Inconsistency in information
Among persons		the expected role of persons are not proportional to their values and beliefs
Interpersonal		Individuals with different characteristics, attitudes, perceptions, views and goals that is inconsistent with the goals and ideas of others
Intergroup		Conflict of some persons or all of the them in a group
among groups		Conflict among groups or teamwork or other part of organization
Organizational conflict		Conflict spread more and more among different groups so affect organization
Conflict among persons		It is related to collaboration between individuals and its reason is lack of clear policies and goals of each group
Conflict among groups		Unilateral decisions and lack of attention of managers to needs of the lower levels
Conflict among group and organization		Often conflicts among organization occur in market position that companies are demanding more market share

Table 2: analyzing the hypotheses of first question of research

result	A or R (H_0)	Pearson Correlation	hypotheses
Positive and significant correlation	Rejection of H_0	0/797	Sub hypothesis 1
Positive and significant correlation	Rejection of H_0	0/208	Sub hypothesis 2
Positive and significant correlation	Rejection of H_0	0/754	Sub hypothesis 3
Positive and significant correlation	Rejection of H_0	0/525	Sub hypothesis 4
Positive and significant correlation	Rejection of H_0	0/322	Sub hypothesis 5

Table 3. checking if the relationship between independent variable and the dependent variable in hypothesis 1 is linear

sig	F	Mean Square	f	Sum of Squares	
0.004	1.11	1.108	2	1.108	Regression
		1.03	37	37.862	Residual
			39	38.970	Total

Table 4. checking if the relationship between independent variable and the dependent variable in hypothesis2 is linear

sig	F	Mean Square	F	Sum of Squares	
0.117	0.41	0.318	2	0.318	Regression
		0.99	37	38.625	Residual
			39	38.970	Total

Table 5. checking if the relationship between independent variable and the dependent variable in hypothesis3 is linear

sig	F	Mean Square	F	Sum of Squares	
0.006	1.01	0.985	2	0.867	Regression
		0.97	37	36.945	Residual
			39	34.910	Total

Table 6. checking if the relationship between independent variable and the dependent variable in hypothesis4 is linear

sig	F	Mean Square	f	Sum of Squares	
0.000	0.02	1.332	1	1.332	Regression
		0.96	39	37.638	Residual
			40	38.970	Total

Table 7. checking if the relationship between independent variable and the dependent variable in hypothesis5 is linear

sig	F	Mean Square	f	Sum of Squares	
0.003	0.02	1.905	1	1.905	Regression
		0.94	39	37.962	Residual
			40	39.047	Total

Table 8. Some applications of Organizational Justice in the conflict strategies

Applications of emotional intelligence	Strategy
Combining solidarity insights, optimism, commitment to the vote, support and learning, teamwork and collaboration	Collaboration
Competitive ethic, organizational health, rapid and decisive action and tendency to using opportunities, leadership change	Competition
Find the main issue, resolved more effective, chance of finding benefit, understanding their strengths and weaknesses	Avoidance
Social Credit, learning from mistakes, solving personality conflict, emotional self-control	Compromise
Identify the both side, flexibility in dealing with changes, responsiveness and meet efficiency, negotiation effectiveness	conciliation

5. There is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and compromise strategy

Since for determining the regression equation, it should be demonstrated that the regression is linear, so at first we check the linearity of the relationship.

As table3 shows $F=1.11$ and $\text{sig}=0.004$. Since the significance is less than 0.05 so the hypothesis H_0 is rejected and we can claim that this regression is linear. In the following the regression equation is estimated:

So the regression equation is:(relationship between ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE and collaboration) $y = 2.554 + 1.47x$

As table4 shows $F=0.41$ and $\text{sig}=0.117$. Since the significance is more than 0.05 so the hypothesis H_0 is accepted and we can claim that the regression model is not linear therefore the regression equation cannot be estimated.

As table 5 shows $F=1.01$ and $\text{sig}=0.006$. Since the significance is less than 0.05 so the hypothesis H_0 is rejected and we can claim that this regression is linear. In the following the regression equation is estimated:

So the regression equation is:(relationship between ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE and avoidance)

$$y = 2.476 + 0.129x$$

As table 6 shows $F=0.02$ and $\text{sig}=0.000$. Since the significance is less than 0.05 so the hypothesis H_0 is rejected and we can claim that this regression is linear. In the following the regression equation is estimated:

So the regression equation is:(relationship between ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE and conciliation) $y=2.500+0.136x$

As table7 shows $F=0.02$ and $\text{sig}=0.003$. Since the significance is less than 0.05 so the hypothesis H_0 is rejected and we can claim that this regression is linear. In the following the regression equation is estimated:

So the regression equation is:(relationship between ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE and compromise) $y=2.112+0.47x$

This research which is applicable in the statistical population and other organization has concluded that there is a significant relationship between Organizational Justice and conflict solving strategies. The regression equation was fitted for everyone. In response to the second question; the four dimensions of Organizational Justice are ranked in every strategy.

References

1. BazazJazayeri, S. A. (2008) Conflict management skills, Tadbir Journal, Issue 86.

2. Beugre, Constant D. (2009). Exploring the neural basis of fairness: A model of neuro-organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110, 129–139.

3. Bos, Kees van den (2002). Assimilation and contrast in organizational justice: The role of primed mindsets in the psychology of the fair process effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 866–880.

4. Cameron, Kim, Wethen, David (2009) Conflict management, translated by Alvani SM, Hassan Danayifard, Researching and Management Training Institute of Karaj, first edition .

5. Cremer, David De (2005). Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20 (1), 4-13.

6. Dulebohn, James H. & Conlon, Donald E. & Sarinopoulos, Issidoros & Davison, Robert B. & McNamara, Gerry (2009). The biological bases of unfairness: Neuroimaging evidence for the distinctiveness of procedural and distributive justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110, 140–151.

7. Eberlin, Richard J & Tatum, B Charles (2005). Organizational justice and decision making: When good intentions are not enough. *Management Decision*, 43 (7/8), 1040-1048.

8. Eberlin, Richard J & Tatum, B Charles (2008). Making just decisions: organizational justice, decision making, and leadership. *Management Decision*, 46 (2), 310-329.

9. Elanain, Hossam M Abu (2010). Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes in a non-Western context of the UAE. *Journal of Management Development*, 29 (1), 5-27.

10. FayaziMarjan, 2003, conflict management, Tadbir journal, number 141.

11. Fishr, Roger And William Ury 2007, Getting Toyes: Negotiating Agreement With Out Giving In New York: Penguin

12. Hassan, Arif and Hashim, Junaidah (2011). Role of organizational justice in determining work outcomes of national and expatriate academic staff in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21 (1), 82-93.

13. Hoy, Wayne K. & Tarter, C. John (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18 (4), 250-259.

14. Jafari, Parivash & Shafiepour motlagh, Farhad & Yarmohammadian, Mohammad Hossein (2011). Designing an adjusted model of organizational justice for educational system in Esfahan City (Iran). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1696–1704.

15. Johnson, Russell E. & Selenta, Christopher & Lord, Robert G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet: Consequences for the organization and its members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99 , 175–201.
16. Katz, Denial (2005) “Approaches To Managing Conflict” In *Power And Conflict In Organizations*, Ed. Robert L.Kahn And Elise Boulding, New York.
17. Mayer, B. S. (2000). *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner's Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
18. McCain, Shiang-Lih Chen & Tsai, Henry & Bellino, Nicholas (2010). Organizational justice, employees’ ethical behavior, and job satisfaction in the casino industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22 (7), 992-1009
19. Nelson, Dobral And Jame Scampbell Quick (2002), *Understanding Organizational Behaviour: A multimedia Approach* 1st Edition, Ohio South Western.
20. Olkkonen, Maria-Elena & Lipponen, Jukka (2006). Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100 , 202–215.
21. Reid, D.A., Pullins, E.B., Plank, R.E. and Buehrer, R.E. (2004), *Measuring Buyers’*
22. Rezaeian, A. (2011) *Managing negotiation* (Advanced Organizational Behavior), Samt publication.
23. Robbins, Stephen (2006) *theory of organization* (structure, design, application), translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani, H. Danayifard, Saffar publication, Fourteenth Edition.
24. Tatum B. Charles & Eberlin, Richard J. (2006). Organizational justice and conflict management styles: Teaching notes, role playing instructions, and scenarios. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 17 (1), 66-81
25. Till, Robert E. & Karren, Ronald (2011). Organizational justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26 (1), 42-57.
26. Tunkenejad, Mandani (2005) *New theory on conflict management*, Tadbir Journal, No. 162.
27. Yilmaz, K. & Tasdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Educational Administration*, 47 (1), 108-126.