

## **Research Article**

### **Can Work Engagement Be Viewed from the Perspective of Organizational Justice? A Research on Academics**

*İşe Adanmaya Örgütsel Adalet Perspektifinden Bakılabilir mi? Akademisyenler Üzerine Bir Araştırma*

**Emine ÇETİNEL**

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi

İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi

Uluslararası Ticaret ve Finansman Bölümü

[eminecetin@karatekin.edu.tr](mailto:eminecetin@karatekin.edu.tr)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5957-5886>

Makale Geliş Tarihi	Makale Kabul Tarihi
19.09.2023	16.12.2023

#### ***Abstract***

Work engagement, a concept that has attracted the attention of researchers in recent years, is considered as one of the key factors for organizational success. In this context, it can be said that determining the key factors that cause the emergence of work engagement behavior in employees is important for both academics and practitioners. Therefore, this study was conducted to find an answer to the question of whether organizational justice is an effective factor on work engagement in the context of Türkiye. Within the scope of the research, data were collected from 399 academics working in state and foundation universities in Türkiye and these data were analyzed. As a result of the analyses, it was understood that organizational justice perception positively affects work engagement with all its sub-dimensions, but this effect is at a low level. Accordingly, it is possible to say that more research should be conducted within the scope of the literature in order to determine the key factors that are effective in the emergence of work engagement behavior.

**Keywords:** Work Engagement, Vigor, Dedication, Absorption Organizational Justice.

#### ***Öz***

Son yıllarda araştırmacıların ilgisini çekmeye başlayan bir kavram olan işe adanma, örgütsel başarı için kilit faktörlerden biri olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışanlarda işe adanmanın ortaya çıkmasına sebep olan anahtar faktörlerin belirlenmesinin hem akademisyenler hem de uygulamacılar için önem arz ettiği söylenebilir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, örgütsel adalet algısının işe adanma üzerinde etkili bir faktör olup olmadığı sorusuna Türkiye bağlamında cevap bulmak amacıyla düzenlenmiştir. Araştırma kapsamında Türkiye’de eğitim ve öğretim faaliyetlerine devam eden devlet ve vakıf üniversitelerinde görev yapan 399 akademisyenden veri toplanmış ve analiz edilmiştir. Yapılan analizler sonucunda örgütsel adalet algısının işe adanma davranışını tüm alt boyutları ile birlikte pozitif yönde etkilediği ancak bu etkinin düşük düzeyde olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Buna göre işe adanma davranışının ortaya çıkmasında etkili olan anahtar faktörlerin belirlenebilmesi için literatür kapsamında daha fazla araştırma yapılması gerektiğini söylemek mümkündür.

**Anahtar Kelime:** İşe Adanma, Enerjik Olma, Adanma, Özdeşleşme, Örgütsel Adalet.

#### **Önerilen Atıf /Suggested Citation**

Çetinel, E., 2023, Can Work Engagement Be Viewed from the Perspective of Organizational Justice? A Research on Academics, *Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi Dergisi*, 58(4), 3595-3614.

## 1. Introduction

Employees' attitudes and behaviors within the organizational structure have been a subject of interest for researchers and practitioners for many years. In this context, it can be said that numerous studies have been conducted to understand an individual's attitudes and behaviors towards their coworkers, job and the organization which they belong to. When these studies are examined, it is observed that researchers had been particularly focused on the weaknesses of humans and attempted to shed light on issues that could be problematic within the organizational structure. However, this perspective has changed, especially since the early 21st century and the positive psychology movement, which focuses on individuals' strengths rather than weaknesses, has begun to stand out in the literature. And, one of the research topics that emerged as an extension of the positive psychology movement in the field of organizational behavior literature is the phenomenon of work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 465; Tamta and Rao, 2017, p. 1582; Toth et al., 2020, p. 596). When we look at organizational behavior literature, it is observed that researchers have focused on the phenomenon of burnout rather than work engagement for many years (Schaufeli et al., 2009). In other words, the positive psychology movement has led researchers to shift their attention from burnout to work engagement, which is the polar opposite of burnout in the spectrum of organizational behavior (Albro and McElfresh, 2021, p. 2). In this context, it can be said that the concept of work engagement has offered a new and different perspective on understanding the behaviors and attitudes of employees in the organizational behavior literature.

Following Kahn's (1990) initial conceptualization the phenomenon of work engagement has been the subject of numerous studies. When examining research conducted in this context, it is noteworthy that researchers consider work engagement as a key variable for organizational success (Bayasgalan and Gerelkhuu, 2016, p. 59; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 629; Wen et al., 2019, p. 1001). Accordingly, work engagement, which is suggested to serve as a critical driving force to enhance job performance, is acknowledged as a vital tool for business success (Kashyap et al., 2022, p. 162). Furthermore, it is evident that work engagement behavior, which emerges from employees' physical, cognitive, and emotional dedication to their work, not only has an impact on organizational performance but also plays a crucial role in the well-being of individuals in their professional lives. Hence, it can be said that identifying the factors leading to the emergence of work engagement, which brings about such positive outcomes for organizations and employees, is a question that researchers and practitioners need to address. In this context, this study aims to determine whether organizational justice is an influential factor on academics' work engagement. The study consists of three sections. The first section conceptually examines the phenomenon of work engagement. The second section focuses on the concept of organizational justice and its relationship with work engagement. Third section presents the research findings aimed at establishing whether there is a relationship between the two concepts. The results obtained in the study are discussed in the conclusion section.

## 2. Work Engagement

Following Kahn's (1990) study, who is considered as the academic father of the work engagement, the issue of work engagement has been a subject of intense interest in the organizational behavior field. Within this framework, numerous studies have offered various definitions of work engagement (Arefin et al., 2019; Ghosh et al., 2014; Kashyap et al., 2022). However, it is observed that researchers often refer to Kahn's (1990) definition when defining work engagement. According to Kahn (1990, p. 694), work engagement is defined as "the harnessing of organizational members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances." Another frequently encountered definition of work engagement in the literature is provided by Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 465), which characterizes work engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption." According to this definition, work engagement does not focus on any particular object, event, individual or behavior but rather refers to a more enduring and pervasive emotional state (Saks et al., 2022, p. 21; Adil and Khan, 2020, p. 32).

Work engagement is generally considered as a three-dimensional concept within the literature. In this regard, the state referred to as "physical dedication" by Kahn (1990) signifies high energy and resilience characterized by an individual's desire and ability to exert effort in their work (Deepa, 2020, p. 316;

Kashyap et al., 2022, p. 162; Mazetti et al., 2021, p. 6; Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 465). Therefore, "vigor" can be defined as an emotional state characterized by mental flexibility, perseverance in the face of challenges and a willingness to put in effort while working (Lyu, 2016, p. 1361). Researchers suggest that employees with physical energy will be willing to make extra effort and demonstrate determination to succeed in any situation. Therefore, it is possible to think that this physical energy that employees direct towards their jobs will directly affect the performance results (Deepa, 2020, p. 316). The second dimension of work engagement behavior, termed emotional engagement by Kahn (1990), is defined as the individual's strong involvement in their job and experiencing a sense of importance, enthusiasm, pride and challenge in relation to their job. "Dedication" which is the second dimension of work engagement behavior and termed as self-dedication by Kahn (1990), is defined as the individual's strong involvement in their work and experiencing a sense of importance, enthusiasm, pride and challenge in relation to their work. Lastly, "absorption", called as cognitive engagement by Kahn (1990), involves an individual concentrating on her/his work to the extent that she/he becomes engrossed in it, irrespective of the passage of time (Deepa, 2020, p. 316; Lyu, 2016, p. 1361; Mazetti et al., 2021, p. 6; Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 465; Sharoni et al., 2015, p. 34; Weiss and Zacher, 2022, p. 3). Of course, employees can become involved in their work in different ways such as physically, cognitively, or emotionally. In this context, the point that distinguishes work engagement from other types of behaviors is that the individual uses her/his physical, cognitive and emotional energy not separately but in coordination with each other to provide full job performance (Rich et al., 2010, p. 620). This situation also opens the door for highly engaged individuals to be more motivated to work harder and more efficiently compared to those with lower levels of work engagement and that applies even in the face of challenges or threats to their well-being. In other words, it is possible to assume that engaged employees will be motivated to expend energy and go beyond the prescribed job duties to fulfill their work-related tasks, even in the face of difficulties or threats to their well-being (Roberts and Davenport, 2002, p. 21; Warr and İnceoğlu, 2012, p. 129).

It is possible to classify the individual and organizational outcomes of work engagement into three groups: "performance-based outcomes", "outcomes involving extra role behavior" and "outcomes that increase the employees' life quality". When looking at performance-based outcomes, it is seen that the research results support the thesis that work engagement has a strong positive effect on both individual and organizational performance (Bayasgalan and Gerelkhuu, 2016; Chen et al., 2014; Haynie et al., 2016; Pham-Thai et al., 2018; Rich et al., 2010; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Toth et al., 2020; Weiss and Zacher, 2022). In addition to performance-based outcomes, work engagement also brings about outcomes involving extra-role behavior in employees. So much so that, it can be said that one of the most common outcomes of work engagement in the literature is employees exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior (Adil and Khan, 2020; Albrow and McElfresh, 2021; Chen et al., 2014; Haynie et al., 2016; Saks et al., 2022). Finally, work engagement is seen as a factor that enhances employees' life quality both in their work and personal lives. Indeed, research results indicate that work engagement increases employees' job satisfaction levels and engaged employees experience higher levels of social functioning and life satisfaction (Arefin et al., 2019; Arslan and Demir, 2017; Bayasgalan and Gerelkhuu, 2016; Haynie et al., 2016; Mazetti et al., 2021; Saks et al., 2022; Wen et al., 2019). In summary, it is possible to say that work engagement leads to many positive outcomes for both businesses and individuals.

Due to the fact that the positive effects of work engagement make itself felt in a very wide scope, work engagement has been the subject of numerous studies in the literature aimed at identifying the antecedents of work engagement. When examining results of these studies, it becomes apparent that both personal and environmental factors contribute to the development of work engagement in individuals. Accordingly, research within the literature reveals the presence of positive relationships between personal traits such as extraversion and self-efficacy and work engagement (Sharoni et al., 2015, p. 35; Mazetti et al., 2021, p. 22). Studies trying to find an answer to the question of whether environmental factors affect work engagement behavior state that factors classified in two categories, namely job demands and job resources, cause individuals to display work engagement behavior. Accordingly, while factors related to social support, supervisory coaching, performance feedback and professional development opportunities are called job resources; job demands can be defined as physiological or psychological required by multidimensional nature of the job. Research indicates that

job demands tend to lead to serious negative organizational outcomes, one of them is burnout. Conversely, job resources that enable employees to cope with the challenging aspects of their work and promote their development are considered the primary drivers of work engagement (Adil and Khan, 2020, p.34; Chen et al., 2014, p. 23; Mazetti et al., 2021, p. 3; Schaufeli et al., 2009, p. 898; Weiss and Zacher, 2022, p. 3). Indeed, research results also highlight positive relationships between work engagement and job resources such as high-performance work systems (Arefin et al., 2019), empowerment (Alhozi et al., 2021; Arefin et al., 2019), career development (Adil and Khan, 2020; Lee and Eissenstat, 2018; Roberts and Davenport, 2002) and managerial support (Adil and Khan, 2020; Lee and Eissenstat, 2018). In this context, organizational justice is also considered a significant job resource that plays a crucial role in individuals' development of work engagement (Sharoni et al., 2015).

### **3.Organizational Justice**

Organizational justice refers to the rules and social norms that determine how performance-based outcomes such as rewards and punishments should be distributed in an organization, what procedures are used to make such distribution decisions and how individuals are treated in interpersonal relationships. In this context, employees' perceptions of these rules and norms shape their beliefs about whether they are being treated fairly in the workplace and these perceptions also influence their emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses (Deepa, 2020, p. 317; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631). Within the scope of the literature, it is seen that the phenomenon of organizational justice is frequently examined as a three-dimensional concept as distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020, p. 703; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 319; Mubashar et al., 2022, p.2). Accordingly, distributive justice is a concept that reflects employees' perceptions of whether decisions regarding the distribution of benefits among organizational members, such as salaries, compensations and promotions, are balanced with the time and effort they think they give to the organization (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020, p. 704; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 623; Tamta and Rao, 2017, p. 1582). Procedural justice, the second dimension of organizational justice, can be defined as employees' perceptions of fairness regarding the methods, mechanisms and processes used in the decision-making and implementation stages of the organization (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020, p. 703; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631). Research shows that individuals attach particular importance to decision-making procedures and when they perceive these procedures as fair, they exhibit less negative emotion toward the outcome, even if the outcome is unfavorable (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631). The third dimension of organizational justice is interactional justice, which focuses on whether employees feel that they are treated fairly in their interactions with their managers and colleagues (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020: 703). Accordingly, practices such as taking into account the opinions of employees, eliminating discrimination, fair implementation of decisions, feedback and open communication stand out as important factors affecting individuals' perceptions of interactional justice within the organization (Sharoni et al., 2015: 37). This is because, beyond concerns about the distribution of benefits such as wages, compensation, promotions or procedures, whether individuals are treated with respect and dignity by other members of the organization is also an important indicator of justice (Ghosh et al., 2014). In this context, it can be said that interactional justice is concerned with the human aspect of organizational practices and therefore focuses on the communication process between the source and recipient of justice (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 636; Tamta and Rao, 2017, p. 1582).

Since organizational justice is the determinant of the social exchange relationship between the organization and employees, it has direct and significant effects on the dynamics of the working environment (Deepa, 2020, p. 320). For this reason, organizational justice perception is considered as an important factor affecting employees' attitudes and behaviors towards the organization and the job and consequently impacting individual and organizational performance. (Deepa, 2020, p. 318; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631-636; Haynie et al., 2016, p. 889). In accordance with this, the perception of organizational justice or injustice arouses the desire in employees to reciprocate what they receive from the organization in a way that the organization can perceive. Therefore, employees who perceive unjust treatment by the organization despite their efforts, time and energy expenditure, tend to reduce their efforts along with feelings of anger, resentment and disappointment; while employees who perceive they receive fair compensation for their efforts are more likely to increase their contributions within the organization through higher levels of engagement. For this reason, it is accepted that organizational justice is highly likely to elicit extra role behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior in

employees (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020, p. 704; Lyu, 2016, p. 1362). Organizational justice also creates positive effects on individual and organizational performance by establishing a work environment in which individuals feel secure. Accordingly, it is clear that the sense of security that a fair workplace offers to employees will increase their belief that they can express themselves without fear of negative consequences for their self-image, status or career (Deepa, 2020, p. 321; Lyu, 2016, p. 1362). Indeed, it is possible to say that in such a positive work environment, employees' efforts to fulfill their job responsibilities and achieve organizational goals will increase, leading to improved job performance and their work attitudes will be positively influenced (Haynie et al., 2016, p. 889). As a matter of fact, studies conducted within the scope of the literature reveal findings showing that perceived organizational justice in the workplace leads to positive attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction (Fatt et al., 2010; Özel and Bayraktar, 2018; Qureshi et al., 2016; Zainalipour et al., 2010), organizational commitment (Ajala, 2015; Kumar et al., 2009; Qureshi et al., 2016) and motivation (Kumar et al., 2009; Sutanto et al., 2018). Finally, it is stated that work engagement is another positive result of organizational justice.

In the context of the literature, it is noteworthy that two perspectives have emerged to explain how organizational justice affects work engagement. The first approach explaining the relationship between the two concepts is based on the social exchange theory. According to the social exchange theory, when individuals receive fair treatment, they respond to this treatment by engaging in behaviors that are desirable for the other party. Therefore, reciprocity rule is valid in social exchange theory. In this direction, organizational justice acts as a source that activates reciprocity behavior in employees. Because the climate of justice prevailing in the organization will, on the one hand, create the perception that the business cares about the welfare of the employees and values their contributions; and on the other hand, it will motivate employees to fulfil their roles in the organization in a better way in return for the justice environment offered by the organization. Thus, the social exchange between employees and the organization will be completed (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 641; Haynie et al., 2019, p. 30; Lyu, 2016, p. 1359). According to the researchers, the second reason why organizational justice triggers work engagement is the positive psychological climate that organizational justice creates in the business such as security and meaningfulness. Apparently, organizational justice climate will create a sense of psychological safety in employees, leading to the perception that the organization desires what is best for them. In such an organization, employees will have no concerns that their trust or efforts could be misused in any way or that they might suffer harm from the organization. From this perspective, it is possible to believe that employees who are free from concerns about misuse or harm will be dedicated to their work physically, cognitively, and emotionally (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 641; Haynie et al., 2016, p.892; Lyu, 2016, p. 1361). As a matter of fact, the studies conducted within the scope of the literature and revealing that organizational justice triggers work engagement in employees support this view (Bizri and Hamieh, 2020; Deepa, 2020; Ghosh et al., 2014; Haynie et al., 2016; Haynie et al., 2019; Köse and Uzun, 2018; Lyu, 2016; Malik et al., 2023; Palabıyık et al., 2023). However, at this point, it is necessary to point out that despite the research findings revealing positive relationships between organizational justice and work engagement, the results obtained in the literature regarding the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement contradict each other. For example, while the studies conducted by Deepa (2020) and Lyu (2016) revealed strong positive relationships between all dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement, in the study conducted by Ghosh et al. (2014), the researchers concluded that there was a positive relationship between only distributive justice and interactional justice with work engagement. Similarly, Haynie et al. (2016) have also found a positive relationship between only distributive justice and work engagement among the dimensions of organizational justice. In summary, although there are many studies supporting the positive relationship between organizational justice and work engagement in the literature, it is possible to say that there is uncertainty about which dimensions of organizational justice led to the emergence of work engagement.

#### **4. Methodology**

In this section of the study, the aim, scope, data collection instrument, and findings of the research conducted to establish the relationship between organizational justice and work engagement have been presented.

#### 4.1. Aim of the Study

Work engagement is a concept that has emerged as a result of the positive psychology movement that has influenced the field of organizational behavior in recent years. In this context, it is also supported by numerous studies within the literature that work engagement leads to many positive effects both at the individual and organizational levels. In fact, it would not be entirely wrong to say that work engagement is considered one of the key variables for organizational success (Bayasgalan and Gerelkhuu, 2016, p. 59; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 629; Wen et al., 2019, p. 1001). Therefore, it would be a meaningful effort for both practitioners and researchers to understand the mechanisms that enable the emergence of work engagement in employees. In this context, this study is designed to answer the question of whether organizational justice, which is considered one of the antecedents of work engagement within the literature, is an effective factor on academics' work engagement levels in the context of Türkiye. Within the scope of the research, it is also aimed to examine the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and the sub-dimensions of work engagement. As previously mentioned, research conducted in the literature has produced conflicting results regarding the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement. Therefore, contributing to filling this gap in the literature constitutes another aim of our research. Thus, the hypotheses of the study have been formulated as follows:

**H1.** Organizational justice will positively affect employees' level of work engagement

**H2.** Distributive justice will positively affect employees' level of work engagement and the sub-dimensions of work engagement such as being vigor, dedication and absorption.

**H3.** Procedural justice will positively affect employees' level of work engagement and the sub-dimensions of work engagement such as being vigor, dedication and absorption.

**H4.** Interactional justice will positively affect employees' level of work engagement and the sub-dimensions of work engagement such as being vigor, dedication and absorption.

#### 4.2. The Scope of the Research

The population of the study consists of academics working in state and foundation universities in Türkiye. The questionnaire form was sent via e-mail to the academics whose contact information was obtained from the web pages of the universities. Within the scope of the research, 399 academics participated in the research by filling out the questionnaire form. In this context, the sample of the research consists of 399 academics working in state and foundation universities continuing their education and training activities in Türkiye. The data collection phase was carried out after the ethics committee permission obtained on 07.09.2022.

#### 4.3. Data Collection Instrument

A questionnaire was used as a data collection tool in the study. Accordingly, questionnaire used in the study consists of three parts. The first part of the questionnaire consists of five questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants including gender, age, marital status, title and tenure. The second part of the questionnaire includes the "Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)" developed by Schaufeli et al. (2006) and adapted into more than 40 languages, including Turkish. The third part of the study consists of "Organizational Justice Scale" developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and adapted into Turkish and validity and reliability analyses were conducted by Yıldırım (2007).

#### 4.4. Results

Within the scope of the research, data analysis was carried out using SPSS 20 Statistical Package Program. In this context, Cronbach's Alpha, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and linear regression analysis were performed respectively to determine the participants' perceptions of organizational justice and work engagement levels and to test the relationships between the two variables.

The "Work Engagement Scale" used in the study consists of a total of 17 items and three dimensions. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the scale and its sub-dimensions, which include 6

items for the "vigor" dimension, 5 items for the "dedication" dimension, and another 6 items for the "absorption" dimension, are provided in Table 1:

**Table 1. Work Engagement Scale Reliability Analysis Results**

Factors	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Vigor	6	,873
Dedication	5	,910
Absorption	6	,881
<b>WORK ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>,936</b>

The second scale used in the study, the "Organizational Justice Scale", consists of a total of 20 items and three dimensions. Accordingly, "distributive justice" dimension consists of 5 items, "procedural justice" dimension consists of 6 items and "interactional justice" dimension consists of 9 items. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the organizational justice scale and its sub-dimensions are as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Organizational Justice Scale Reliability Analysis Results**

Factors	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Distributive Justice	5	,855
Procedural Justice	6	,921
Interactional Justice	9	,965
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>,961</b>

When Tables 1 and 2 are examined, it is observed that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for both scales are above 0.80. As it is known, as the Cronbach's alpha coefficient approaches 1, it is concluded that the internal consistency of the items in the scale is high (Kula Kartal and Mor Dirlik, 2016, p. 1870). Therefore, it can be said that the scales used in the research are highly reliable.

Table 3 provides the results of the frequency analysis for the participants. According to this, 59.1% of the participants are "male", 34.6% are in the "31-40 age" range, and 69.2% are "married". Furthermore, the analysis revealed that 29.3% of the participants hold the title of "Assist. Assoc." and 40.6% have a "1-5 years" tenure in their current organization.

**Table 3: Frequency and Percentages for Participants**

Variable	Category	n	%
<b>Gender</b>	Female	163	40,9
	Male	236	59,1
<b>Age</b>	20-30	72	18
	31-40	138	34,6
	41-50	102	25,6
	51-60	65	16,3
	61 and more	22	5,5
<b>Marital Status</b>	Single	123	30,8
	Married	276	69,2
<b>Title</b>	Research Assistant	106	26,6

	Lecturer	9	2,3
	Research Assistant Dr.	21	5,3
	Lecturer Dr.	11	2,8
	Assist. Assoc.	117	29,3
	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	67	16,8
	Prof. Dr.	68	17,0
<b>Tenure</b>	1-5 years	162	40,6
	6-10 years	82	20,6
	11-15 years	54	13,5
	16-20 years	28	7
	21 years and more	73	18,3
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>399</b>	<b>100</b>

Descriptive statistics of the scales used in the study are given in Table 4. When the table is analyzed, it is seen that the participants' level of work engagement is quite high. Accordingly, while the general average of employees' work engagement is 3.990, it is noteworthy that the "dedication" dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the work engagement scale, has the highest average with 4.235. It is also possible to say that employees' perceptions of organizational justice are at a moderate level. Accordingly, it is noteworthy that the general organizational justice perception level of the employees is 2,910. The dimension of "interactional justice" has the highest mean among the other dimensions with a mean of 3,027.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics**

(n=399)	Min.	Max.	$\bar{x}$	S	Skewness	Kurtosis
Vigor	1.00	5.00	3,9808	,75052	-,807	,543
Dedication	1.00	5.00	4,2356	,87422	-1,273	1,185
Absorption	1.00	5.00	3,7962	,88283	-,774	,082
<b>Work Engagement Scale</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>3,9906</b>	<b>,72556</b>	<b>-1,008</b>	<b>,951</b>
Distributive Justice	1.00	5.00	2,9569	,92630	-,334	-,440
Procedural Justice	1.00	5.00	2,6959	,98274	,021	-,734
Interactional Justice	1.00	5.00	3,0273	,99324	-,301	-,599
<b>Organizational Justice Scale</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2,9103</b>	<b>,86764</b>	<b>-,204</b>	<b>-,448</b>

Table 4 also includes the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the variables. As it is known, skewness and kurtosis values between -2 and +2 are interpreted as the data set has a normal distribution and it is considered appropriate to apply parametric test techniques in data analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). As can be seen in the table, the skewness and kurtosis coefficients for the data set used in the study are between -2 and +2. Therefore, correlation analysis was performed to reveal the relationships between the variables.



**Table 5: Correlation Analysis Results for the Relationship between Variables**

(n=399)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>1.Organizational Justice</b>	1							
<b>2.Distributive Justice</b>	,733**	1						
<b>3.Procedural Justice</b>	,920**	,524**	1					
<b>4. Interactional Justice</b>	,955**	,560**	,854**	1				
<b>5. Work Engagement</b>	,282**	,318**	,232**	,231**	1			
<b>6.Vigor</b>	,343**	,336**	,281**	,306**	,862**	1		
<b>7.Dedication</b>	,293**	,303**	,249**	,248**	,880**	,691**	1	
<b>8.Absorption</b>	,124**	,204**	,095*	,072	,869**	,586**	,637**	1

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

As it is known, the correlation coefficient takes values between -1 and +1, and the closer the results are to  $\pm 1$ , the stronger the relationship is considered to be. A value of 0 (zero) is interpreted as "no relationship" (Can, 2019, p. 369). When Table 5 is examined, it can be seen that there is a weak positive relationship between organizational justice and work engagement ( $r=0.282$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). The strongest relationship among the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement is found to be between organizational justice and vigor, which also indicates a weak relationship ( $r=0.343$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). Another notable point in the table is that distributive justice has the strongest relationships with work engagement and its sub-dimensions. Accordingly, it is possible to say that there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and work engagement ( $r=.318$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) and its sub-dimensions of vigor ( $r=.336$ ;  $p<0,01$ ), dedication ( $r=.303$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) and absorption ( $r=.204$ ;  $p<0,01$ ), although it is still at a weak level. While there is a weak positive relationship between procedural justice and work engagement ( $r=.232$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) and vigor ( $r=.281$ ;  $p<0,01$ ), it is noteworthy that the relationship between procedural justice and absorption dimension ( $r=0,95$ ;  $p<0,05$ ) is significant only at 0,05 significance level. The strongest relationship between interactional justice and work engagement and its sub-dimensions emerges in the dimension of vigor ( $r=0.306$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). However, no relationship could be detected between interactional justice and absorption.

**Table 6: Regression Analysis Results on the Relationship Between Variables**

$R^2=,080$ $Adjusted R^2=,077$ $F=34,359$ $p=,000$				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Organizational Justice	,236	,282	5,862	,040
<b>Dependent Variable: Work Engagement</b> $y=0,282x+0,236$				
$R^2=,117$ $Adjusted R^2=,115$ $F=52,856$ $p=,000$				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Organizational Justice	,297	,343	7,270	,041
<b>Dependent Variable: Vigor</b> $y=0,343x+0,297$				
$R^2=,086$ $Adjusted R^2=,084$ $F=37,340$ $p=,000$				

Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Organizational Justice	,295	,293	6,111	,048
<b>Dependent Variable: Dedication</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>y=0,293x+0,295</b></span>				
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,015      Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,013 <i>F</i> =6,183 <i>p</i> =,013				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Organizational Justice	,126	,124	2,487	,051
<b>Dependent Variable: Absorption</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>y=0,124x+0,126</b></span>				

As is known, there are several different methods to determine the explanatory power of a regression model. One of these is looking at the  $R^2$  value, which expresses the percentage of the independent variable explaining the variance on the dependent variable. Accordingly, the closer it is to  $R^2$ , which has a value between 0 and 1, the higher the explanatory power of the model can be considered (James et al., 2019, p. 70). Accordingly, it is possible to say that the results of the regression analysis reveal the results of the weak positivity between organizational justice and work engagement. As can be seen in Table 6, the ANOVA test results indicate that the model is generally significant ( $F=34.359$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and it is determined that organizational justice explains 7.7% of the variance in work engagement. In other words, it is possible to say that organizational justice perception has a significant effect on the participants' level of work engagement. According to the other analysis results given in the table, organizational justice positively affects employees' vigor ( $R^2=11.5\%$ ;  $F=52,856$ ;  $\beta=,343$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), dedication ( $R^2=8.4\%$ ;  $F=37,340$ ;  $\beta=,293$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and absorption ( $R^2=1.3\%$ ;  $F=6,183$ ;  $\beta=,124$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). Therefore, it is possible to say that the perception of organizational justice positively affects work engagement with all its sub-dimensions. In other words, Hypothesis 1 has been accepted.

**Table 7: Regression Analysis Results on the Effect of Distributive Justice on Work Engagement**

<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,101      Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,099 <i>F</i> =44,511 <i>p</i> =,000				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Distributive Justice	,249	,318	6,672	,037
<b>Dependent Variable: Work Engagement</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>y=0,318x+0,249</b></span>				
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,113      Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,110 <i>F</i> =50,361 <i>p</i> =,000				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Distributive Justice	,272	,336	7,097	,038
<b>Dependent Variable: Vigor</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>y=0,336x+0,272</b></span>				
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,092      Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,089 <i>F</i> =40,093 <i>p</i> =,000				
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Distributive Justice	,286	,303	6,332	,045
<b>Dependent Variable: Dedication</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>y=0,303x+0,286</b></span>				
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,042      Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =,039 <i>F</i> =17,274 <i>p</i> =,000				

Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Distributive Justice	,195	,204	4,156	,047
<b>Dependent Variable: Absorption</b>				<b>y=0,204x+0,195</b>

Table 7 summarizes the results of the regression analysis conducted to reveal the effect of distributive justice on work engagement behavior and its sub-dimensions. According to the ANOVA test results, although it shows that the model is generally significant ( $F=44.511$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), it indicates that distributive justice explains only 9.9% of the variance in work engagement. In other words, while distributive justice has a significant impact on participants' work engagement levels, it can be said that this effect is relatively low. The analysis results also reveal that distributive justice has a positive and significant impact on vigor ( $R^2=11\%$ ;  $F=30.361$ ;  $\beta=0.336$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), dedication ( $R^2=8.9\%$ ;  $F=40.093$ ;  $\beta=0.303$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), and absorption ( $R^2=3.9\%$ ;  $F=17.274$ ;  $\beta=0.204$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). Therefore, it is possible to say that distributive justice positively influences work engagement with all its sub-dimensions, and in this context, Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

**Table 8. Regression Analysis Results on the Effect of Procedural Justice on Work Engagement**

$R^2=,054$	$Adjusted R^2=,051$	$F=22,496$	$p=,000$	
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Procedural Justice	,171	,232	4,743	,036
Dependent Variable: Work Engagement			$y=0,232x+0,171$	
$R^2=,079$	$Adjusted R^2=,077$	$F=34,022$	$p=,000$	
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Procedural Justice	,215	,281	5,833	,037
Dependent Variable: Vigor			$y=0,281x+0,215$	
$R^2=,062$	$Adjusted R^2=,060$	$F=26,314$	$p=,000$	
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Procedural Justice	,222	,249	5,130	,043
Dependent Variable: Dedication			$y=0,249x+0,222$	
$R^2=,009$	$Adjusted R^2=,006$	$F=3,589$	$p=,059$	
Independent Variable	B	$\beta$	t	Std. Error
Procedural Justice	,085	,095	1,894	,045
Dependent Variable: Absorption			$y=0,095x+0,085$	

The results of the regression analysis conducted to examine the impact of procedural justice on work engagement and its sub-dimensions are presented in Table 8. When the table is examined, it is observed that the model is generally significant ( $F=22.496$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), and procedural justice explains 5.1% of the variance in work engagement. Therefore, it is possible to say that the perception of procedural justice has a positive and significant impact on participants' levels of work engagement. According to the other

analysis results provided in the table, procedural justice also positively influences employees' vigor ( $R^2=7.7\%$ ;  $F=34.022$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and dedication ( $R^2=6\%$ ;  $F=26.314$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). However, no relationship was found between procedural justice and absorption ( $R^2=0.6\%$ ;  $F=3.589$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p>0.05$ ). In this context, it can be said that Hypothesis 3 is partially accepted.

**Table 9: Regression Analysis Results on the Effect of Interactional Justice on Work Engagement**

$R^2=,053$	$Adjusted\ R^2=,051$	$F=22,297$	$p=,000$	
<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Interactional Justice	,168	,231	4,722	,036
<b>Dependent Variable: Work Engagement</b>				<b>y=0,231x+0,168</b>
$R^2=,094$	$Adjusted\ R^2=,091$	$F=41,084$	$p=,000$	
<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Interactional Justice	,231	,306	6,410	,036
<b>Dependent Variable: Vigor</b>				<b>y=0,306x+0,231</b>
$R^2=,061$	$Adjusted\ R^2=,059$	$F=25,971$	$p=,000$	
<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Interactional Justice	,218	,248	5,096	,043
<b>Dependent Variable: Dedication</b>				<b>y=0,248x+0,218</b>
$R^2=,005$	$Adjusted\ R^2=,003$	$F=2,078$	$p=,150$	
<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Interactional Justice	,064	,072	1,441	,044
<b>Dependent Variable: Absorption</b>				<b>y=0,072x+0,064</b>

Finally, it was examined whether there is an effect of interactional justice on work engagement behavior and its sub-dimensions and the results of the regression analysis are summarized in Table 9. As can be seen in the table, as a result of the ANOVA test, it was determined that the model was generally significant ( $F=22,297$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and the rate of explanation of interactional justice on work engagement was 5.1%. In other words, it is possible to say that interactional justice has a positive and significant impact on work engagement. The table also shows that interactional justice has a significant positive effect on the vigor ( $R^2=9.1\%$ ;  $F=41.084$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and dedication ( $R^2=5.9\%$ ;  $F=25.971$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) dimensions. However, the model regarding the impact of interactional justice on the absorption was rejected ( $R^2=0.3\%$ ;  $F=2.078$ ;  $\beta=$ ;  $p>0.05$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is partially accepted.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

In recent years, it has been observed that a perspective focusing on employees' strengths rather than their weaknesses has come to the forefront in the organizational behavior literature. This perspective, which emerged under the influence of positive psychology, has introduced important concepts to the field of organizational behavior, one of which is work engagement. Work engagement, which is defined as the use of individuals' physical, cognitive and emotional assets to fulfill their job roles, is generally regarded as a three-dimensional phenomenon within the literature, consisting of vigor, dedication and absorption. Research results show that high levels of work engagement lead to positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, professional success, high organizational and individual performance levels (Albro and

McElfresh, 2021; Chen et al., 2014; Lyu, 2016; Roberts and Davenport, 2002). As a matter of fact, considering that employees with high levels of work engagement involve their physical, cognitive, and emotional selves in their job-related tasks and responsibilities, it is clear that these employees will not only strive to perform their duties to the best of their abilities but will go beyond that. Therefore, it is possible to say that employees with high levels of engagement will be more willing to participate in activities that go beyond the limits of their duties.

In light of this information, it can be said, work engagement is an employee behavior that brings many positive outcomes for both employees and organizations. Therefore, identifying the factors that influence work engagement will be a meaningful effort for both practitioners and researchers. Consequently, within the scope of this study, it is aimed to find an answer to the question of whether organizational justice is an effective factor on the work engagement levels of academics in the context of Türkiye. As known, organizational justice is a set of rules and social norms that determine how performance-based outcomes should be distributed among employees in a workplace, what are the procedures used in making such distribution decisions and how individuals are treated in interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, it is stated that organizational justice, which is a three-dimensional concept including distributive, procedural and interactional justice, is an important business resource that is also effective in individuals' development of work engagement (Sharoni et al., 2015). However, when looking at the research conducted within the literature, conflicting results are encountered regarding the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement. In this context, another aim of this study was to contribute to filling this gap in the literature by revealing the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational justice and work engagement. The questionnaire form was sent via e-mail to academics working in state and foundation universities in Türkiye and 399 academics responded. In other words, the sample of the study consists of 399 academics working in state and foundation universities in Türkiye which continue their education and teaching activities. The data obtained were analyzed using SPSS 20 Statistical Package Program.

The analyses conducted within the scope of the research have revealed that participants' level of work engagement is quite high. Accordingly, while the overall average of the employees' work engagement was 3.990 and also it was determined that the dedication, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the work engagement scale, had the highest average with 4.235. As mentioned earlier, dedication is defined as an individual's strong involvement in their work and experiencing enthusiasm, pride, and challenge related to their job. Therefore, based on the analysis results, it is possible to say that participants are physically, cognitively, and emotionally focused on their jobs and experience enthusiasm, pride, and challenge related to their work. According to the analyses, it was also seen that the participants' organizational justice levels were at a medium level. Therefore, it is possible to say that although their perceptions of organizational justice are at a medium level, the participants have high levels of work engagement. Indeed, the results of the regression analysis conducted to determine the relationships between the two variables also show that organizational justice positively influences work engagement in all sub-dimensions. In this context, while H1 hypothesis is accepted, it should be noted that the relationships between the two variables are positive but weak. Similarly, it has been determined that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, generally have a positive but weak effect on work engagement and its sub-dimensions, except for the effect of procedural justice and interactional justice on absorption. Therefore, no relationship was found between procedural justice and absorption and between interactional justice and absorption. Thus, while H2 hypothesis is accepted, H3 and H4 hypotheses are just partially accepted.

As mentioned earlier, social exchange theorists argue that work engagement behavior emerges as a result of the mutual interaction between the organization and the employees in response to the justice environment offered by the organization. Accordingly, it is suggested that the prevailing justice climate within the organization will motivate employees to perform their roles in a better way. In this context, the finding that organizational justice and its sub-dimensions have a significant positive effect on work engagement confirms this assumption. Therefore, it is possible to say that the justice climate existing in the organization will increase the level of work engagement of employees. In this context, it can be suggested that businesses that want to increase their employees' work engagement levels should work to create a fair organizational climate. However, at this point, it should be underlined that although the

analyses reveal positive relationships between the variables, the fact that this effect is quite low reveals that factors other than organizational justice are also effective in the emergence of work engagement behavior. In other words, although organizational justice is one of the antecedents of work engagement, it is not the only and primary precursor. In this context, it is possible to say that although the justice climate prevailing in the organization will positively affect employees' work engagement, this effect would remain at a limited level. As Saks et al. (2022) state, work engagement is a multidimensional motivational state that involves the simultaneous transfer of one's full and complete self and personal resources to a role performance compared to other employee attitudes and behaviors (Saks et al., 2022, p.21). In addition, within the scope of the literature, it is argued that work engagement is predominantly a job-oriented concept and should be distinguished from the concept of organizational engagement that develops under the influence of organizational conditions (Kang and Sung, 2019, p.153). Therefore, it can be thought that work engagement may also emerge in the context of individual qualities and values such as extraversion, self-efficacy, proactive personality, locus of control rather than organizational factors such as organizational justice like in this study. Of course, it can be also argued that not only individual qualities but also other organizational factors such as leadership style, career development, staff empowerment programs and managerial support, as revealed in many studies within the scope of the literature, may also reveal work engagement behavior in employees. In other words, work engagement is a complex concept that emerges under the influence of many individual and organizational factors and it cannot be claimed that there is a single factor that triggers work engagement in employees. Therefore, even though a positive and significant relationship between organizational justice and work engagement has been identified in this study, it is clear that more research should be conducted within the scope of the literature on which factors influence work engagement.

## References

- Adil, M. S. and Khan, U. (2020). Antecedents of Cognitive Job Engagement and Its Effect on Teacher Performance: Moderating Roles of Occupational Stress and Mentoring. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 8 (1), 31-59. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0812008103>
- Ajala, E. M. (2015). The Influence of Organisational Justice on Employees' Commitment in Manufacturing Firms in Oyo State, Nigeria: Implications for Industrial Social Work. *African Journal of Social Work*, 5(1), 92-130.
- Akduman, G., Hatipoğlu, Z. and Yüksekbiçgili, Z. (2015). Medeni Durumuna Göre Örgütsel Adalet Algısı. *Uluslararası Akademik Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1 (1), 1-13.
- Albro, M. and McElfresh, J. M. (2021). Job Engagement and Employee-organization Relationship Among Academic Librarians in a Modified Work Environment. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47 (2021), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102413>
- Alhozi, N., Hawamdeh, N. A. and Al-Edenat, M. (2021). The Impact of Employee Empowerment on Job Engagement: Evidence from Jordan. *International Business Research*, 14 (2), 90-101.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. and Yıldırım, E. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS uygulamalı*. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Arefin, Md. S., Alam, Md. S., Islam, Md. R. and Rahaman, M. (2019). High-performance Work Systems and Job Engagement: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment. *Cogent Business and Management*, 6 (1), 2-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1664204>
- Arslan, E. T. and Demir, H. (2017). İşe Angaje Olma ve İş Tatmini Arasındaki İlişki: Hekim ve Hemşireler Üzerine Nicel Bir Araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 24 (2), 371-389. <https://doi.org/110.18657/yonveek.335232>
- Bayasgalan, T. and Gerelkhuu, T. (2016). The Impacts of Organizational Justice Ad Culture, Knowledge Management and Employee Engagement on Employee's Job Satisfaction: The Case of Supportive Service Officers. *Mongolian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 19 (03), 56-65.
- Bizri, R. M. and Hamieh, F. (2020). Beyond the “give Back” Equation: The Influence of Perceived Organizational Justice and Support on Extra-role Behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28 (3), 699-718. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2019-1838>

- Can, A. (2019). *SPSS ile Bilimsel Araştırma Sürecinde Veri Analizi*. Pegem Akademi.
- Chen, C.Y., Yen, C.H. and Tsai, F. C. (2014). Job Crafting and Job Engagement: The Mediating Role of Person-Job Fit. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 21– 28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.10.006>
- Deepa, S.M. (2020). The Effects of Organizational Justice Dimensions on Facets of Job Engagement. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 23 (4), 315-336. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-05-2019-0066>
- Fatt, C. K., Khin, E. W. S. and Heng, T. N. (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction: The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2 (1), 65-72.
- Ghosh, P., Rai, A. and Sinha, A. (2014). Organizational Justice and Employee Engagement: Exploring the Linkage in Public Sector Banks in India. *Personnel Review*, 43 (4), 628-652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2013-0148>
- Haynie, Jeffrey J., Mossholder, Kevin W. and Harris, Stanley G. (2016), Justice and Job Engagement: The Role of Senior Management Trust. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 889–910. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2082>
- Haynie, J. J., Flynn, C. B. and Baur, J. E. (2019). The Organizational Justice-job Engagement Relationship: How Social Exchange and Identity Explain This Effect. *Journal Of Managerial Issues*, XXXI (1), 28-45
- James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning: with Applications in R*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), 692-724.
- Kang, M. and Sung, M. (2019). To Leave or Not to Leave: The Effects of Perceptions of Organizational Justice on Employee Turnover Intention via Employee-organization Relationship and Employee Job Engagement. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 31 (5-6), 152-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2019.1680988>
- Kashyap, V., Nakra, N. and Arora, R. (2022). Do “Decent Work” Dimensions Lead to Work Engagement? Empirical Evidence From Higher Education Institutions in India. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46 (1/2), 158-177. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2020-0127>.
- Köse, A. and Uzun, M. (2018). The Relationship Between Work Engagement and Perceived Organizational Justice. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 24 (3), 483-528. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2018.012>
- Kula Kartal, S. and Mor Dirlik, E. (2016). Geçerlik Kavramının Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Güvenirlikte En Çok Tercih Edilen Yöntem: Cronbach Alfa Katsayısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(4), 1865-1879.
- Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A. and Ran, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 24-37. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n9p145>
- Lee, Y. and Eissenstat, S.H.J. (2018). An Application of Work Engagement in the Job Demands–Resources Model to Career Development: Assessing Gender Differences. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 29 (2), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21310>
- Lyu, X. (2016). Effect of Organizational Justice on Work Engagement with Psychological Safety as a Mediator: Evidence from China. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 44 (8), 1359-1370. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2016.44.8.1359>.

- Malik, A., Shahwar, M., Amin, M. and Shahid, M. N. (2023). The Mediating Role of Work Engagement on The Relationship Between Job Security, Organizational Justice, Job Embeddedness and Turnover Intention of Pakistan's Textile Industry. *Current Trends in Law and Society*, 3(1), 12–31. <https://doi.org/10.52131/ctls.2023.0301.0012>
- Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Work Engagement: A Meta-analysis Using the Job Demands-Resources Model. December 2021, 1-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988>.
- Mubashar, T., Musharraf, S., Khan, S. and Butt, T. A. (2022). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Role of Organizational Trust. *Cogent Psychology*, 9(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2022.2080325>
- Niehoff, B. P. and Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.2307/256591>
- Özel, A. and Bayraktar, C.A. (2018). Effect of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction. In: Calisir, F. & Camgoz Akdag, H. (Eds) *Industrial Engineering in the Industry 4.0 Era. Lecture Notes in Management and Industrial Engineering* (pp. 205-218). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71225-3\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71225-3_18)
- Pham-Thai, N. T., McMurray, A. J., Muenjohn, N. and Michael, M. (2018). Job Engagement in Higher Education. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 951-967. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2017-0221>
- Qureshi, H., Frank, J., Lambert, E. G., Klahm, C. and Smith, B. (2016). Organisational Justice's Relationship With Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment Among Indian Police. *The Police Journal*, 90 (1), 2-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X16662684>
- Palabıyık, N., Yıkılmaz, İ. and Sürücü, L. (2023). Ways to Promote Employee Work Engagement in Healthcare Organizations: Servant Leadership and Organizational Justice. *İktisadi İdari Ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8, 153-166. <https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.1339209>
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A. and Eean, R. C. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (3), 617-635
- Roberts, D. R. and Davenport, T. O. (2002). Job Engagement: Why It's Important and How to Improve It. *Employment Relations Today*, 29 (3), 21-29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.10048>
- Saks, A. M., Gruman, J. A. and Zhang, Q. (2022). Organization Engagement: A Review and Comparison to Job Engagement. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 9(1), 20-49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-12-2020-0253>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., Bakker, A. B. (2002)., Burnout and Engagement in University Students: A Cross-national Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(5), 464-481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. and Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-national Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. and Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How Changes in Job Demands and Resources Predict Burnout, Work Engagement, and Sickness Absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 893–917. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.595>
- Sharoni, G., Shkoler, O. and Tziner, A. (2015). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 34-48.
- Sutanto, E.M., Scheller-Sampson, J. and Mulyono, F. (2018). Organizational Justice, Work Environment and Motivation. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 19 (2), 313-322.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Ma: Pearson.



- Tamta, V. and Rao, M. K. (2017). Linking Emotional Intelligence to Knowledge Sharing Behaviour: Organizational Justice and Work Engagement as Mediators. *Global Business Review*, 18(6), 1580–1596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917713087>
- Toth, I., Heinänen, S. and Nisula, A. M. (2020). Personal Resources and Knowledge Workers' Job Engagement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(3), 595-610. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2019-1830>
- Warr, P. and İnceoğlu, İ. (2012). Job Engagement, Job Satisfaction, and Contrasting Associations With Person–Job Fit. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 129-138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026859>
- Weiss, M. and Zacher, H. (2022). Why and When Does Voice Lead to Increased Job Engagement? The Role of Perceived Voice Appreciation and Emotional Stability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 132, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103662>
- Wen, X., Gu, L. and Wen, S. (2019). Job Satisfaction and Job Engagement: Empirical Evidence From Food Safety Regulators in Guangdong, China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208 (2019), 999-1008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.089>
- Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş Doyumu ile Örgütsel Adalet Arasındaki İlişki. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 62(1), 253-278. [https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder\\_0000002016](https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000002016)
- Zainalipoura, H., Fini, A. A. S. and Mirkamali, S. M. (2010). A Study of Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction Among Teachers in Bandar Abbas Middle School. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5 (2010), 1986–1990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.401>

**Araştırma Makalesi**

**Can Work Engagement Be Viewed from the Perspective of Organizational Justice? A Research on Academics**

*İşe Adanmaya Örgütsel Adalet Perspektifinden Bakılabilir mi? Akademisyenler Üzerine Bir Araştırma*

**Emine ÇETİNEL**

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi

İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi

Uluslararası Ticaret ve Finansman Bölümü

[eminecetinel@karatekin.edu.tr](mailto:eminecetinel@karatekin.edu.tr)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5957-5886>

**Genişletilmiş Özet**

Çalışanların örgütsel yapı içindeki tutum ve davranışları uzun yıllardır araştırmacı ve uygulamacıların ilgisini çeken bir konu olmuştur. Bu bağlamda bireyin çalışma arkadaşlarına, işine ve üyesi olduğu örgüte yönelik tutum ve davranışlarını anlamak amacıyla sayısız çalışma yapıldığını söylemek mümkündür. Söz konusu çalışmalara bakıldığında araştırmacıların özellikle insanın zayıf yönlerine odaklandıkları ve örgütsel yapı içinde sorun teşkil edebilecek konulara açıklık getirmeye çalıştıkları görülmektedir. Ancak bu bakış açısı özellikle 21. yüzyılın başlarından itibaren değişmeye başlamış ve araştırmacıların insanın zayıf yönlerinden ziyade güçlü yönlerine odaklandıkları pozitif psikoloji akımı literatürde öne çıkmaya başlamıştır. Örgütsel davranış literatüründe pozitif psikoloji akımının bir uzantısı olarak ortaya çıkan araştırma konulardan biri de işe adanma olgusudur (Schaufeli vd., 2002, s. 465; Tamta and Rao, 2017, s. 1582; Toth vd., 2020, s. 596). Örgütsel davranış literatürüne bakıldığında araştırmacıların uzun yıllar boyunca işe adanma davranışına değil tükenme olgusuna odaklandıkları görülmektedir (Schaufeli vd., 2009). Bir diğer ifadeyle pozitif psikoloji akımı araştırmacıların dikkatlerini tükenmişlik olgusundan, tükenmişlik olgusunun örgütsel davranış spektrumundaki kutupsal karşıtı olan işe adanma davranışına çevirmelerine neden olmuştur (Albro and McElfresh, 2021, s. 2). Bu bağlamda işe adanma olgusunun örgütsel davranış literatüründe çalışanların davranış ve tutumlarını anlamaya yönelik yeni ve farklı bir bakış açısı sunduğunu söylemek mümkündür.

İşe adanma kavramı ilk defa Khan (1990) tarafından ele alınmıştır. Buna göre işe adanma, Kahn (1990, s. 694) tarafından “örgüt üyelerinin benliklerini iş rolleri için kullanmaları ve bireylerin fiziksel, bilişsel ve duygusal varlıkları ile rol performanslarını gerçekleştirmek üzere çaba göstermeleri” olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Enerjik olma, adanma ve özdeşleşme olmak üzere üç boyut altında incelenen işe adanma olgusu Khan (1990)’ın ortaya attığı teori kapsamında daha sonra pek çok çalışmaya konu olmuştur. Bu kapsamda yapılan çalışmalara bakıldığında ise araştırmacıların işe adanma olgusunu örgütsel başarının anahtar değişkenlerden biri olarak nitelendirdikleri dikkat çekmektedir (Bayasgalan and Gerelkhuu, 2016, s. 59; Ghosh vd., 2014, s. 629; Wen vd., 2019, s. 1001). Buna göre iş performansını artırmak için kritik bir itici güç olarak hizmet ettiği ile sürülen işe adanma davranışı, araştırmacılar tarafından işletme başarısı için hayati öneme sahip bir araç olarak kabul edilmektedir (Kashyap vd., 2022, s. 162). Bunun da ötesinde çalışanların yaptıkları işe fiziksel, bilişsel ve duygusal olarak odaklanmaları ile ortaya çıkan bir davranış olması nedeniyle işe adanmanın sadece işletme performansı için değil aynı zamanda bireylerin çalışma hayatlarında iyi olma hali üzerinde de önemli bir olgu olduğu dile getirilmektedir. Nitekim araştırma sonuçlarına bakıldığında, işe adanma davranışın

çalışanların iş tatmini düzeylerini artırırken işe adanmış çalışanların sosyal işlevsellik ve hayat tatmini düzeylerinin yükseldiğini işaret eden sonuçlar ile karşılaşilmektedir (Arefin vd., 2019; Arslan ve Demir, 2017; Bayasgalan ve Gerelkhuu, 2016; Haynie vd., 2016; Mazetti vd., 2021; Saks vd., 2022; Wen vd., 2019). Özetle, işe adanmanın hem işletmeler hem de bireyler için pek çok olumlu sonuç doğurduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Bu bilgiler ışığında örgütler ve çalışanlar için böylesi pozitif sonuçları beraberinde getiren işe adanmanın ortaya çıkmasına neden olan faktörlerin neler olduğu sorusu cevaplanması gereken bir soru olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu bağlamda örgütsel adalet de bireylerin işe adanma davranışı geliştirmelerinde etkili önemli bir iş kaynağı olarak değerlendirilmektedir (Sharoni vd., 2015). Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, örgütsel adaletin akademisyenlerin işe adanma davranışı üzerinde etkili bir faktör olup olmadığını belirlemek amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Örgütsel adalet kavramının kaynağı, bireylerin gösterdikleri çabalar karşılığında elde ettikleri ödüllerin adil olup olmadığına ilişkin algılarına vurgu yapan Adams'ın Eşitlik Teorisi'ne dayanır (Akdoğan vd., 2015, s. 3; Deepa, 2020, s. 317). Buna göre örgütsel adalet, bir işletmede ödüller ve cezalar gibi performansa dayalı sonuçların nasıl dağıtılması gerektiğini, bu tür dağıtım kararlarını vermek için kullanılan prosedürlerin neler olduğunu ve bireylerarası ilişkilerde kişilere nasıl davranıldığını belirleyen kurallar ve sosyal normlar olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Bu bağlamda çalışanların söz konusu kural ve normlara ilişkin algıları iş yerinde kendilerine adil davranılıp davranılmadığına ilişkin inançlarını oluştururken duygusal, bilişsel ve davranışsal tepkilerine de kaynaklık eder (Deepa, 2020, s. 317; Ghosh vd., 2014, s. 631). Literatür kapsamında örgütsel adalet olgusunun sıklıkla dağıtım, işlem ve etkileşim adaleti olmak üzere üç boyutlu bir kavram olarak incelendiği görülmektedir (Bizri ve Hamieh, 2020, s. 703; Ghosh vd., 2014, s. 319; Mubashar vd., 2022, s. 2). Yapılan çalışmalar örgütsel adaletin işe adanma davranışını tetiklediği tezini destekleyen sonuçlar ortaya koymaktadır (Bizri ve Hamieh, 2020; Deepa, 2020; Ghosh vd., 2014; Haynie vd., 2016; Haynie vd., 2019; Köse ve Uzun, 2018; Lyu, 2016). Ancak bu noktada örgütsel adalet ile işe adanma arasında pozitif yönlü ilişkiler ortaya koyan araştırma bulgularına rağmen literatür kapsamında örgütsel adaletin alt boyutları olan dağıtım adaleti, işlem adaleti ve etkileşim adaleti ile işe adanma arasındaki ilişkilere ilişkin elde edilen sonuçların birbirleriyle çeliştiğine de değinmek gerekmektedir. Örneğin; Deepa (2020) ve Lyu (2016) tarafından yapılan araştırmalar örgütsel adaletin tüm boyutları ile işe adanma arasında pozitif ilişkiler ortaya koyarken Ghosh vd., (2014) tarafından yapılan araştırmada araştırmacılar sadece dağıtım adaleti ve etkileşim adaleti ile işe adanma arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğu sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Benzer şekilde Haynie vd. (2016) ise örgütsel adalet boyutlarından sadece dağıtım adaleti ile işe adanma arasında pozitif bir ilişki ortaya koyan sonuçlara ulaşmışlardır. Özetle, literatür kapsamında örgütsel adalet ile işe adanma arasında pozitif yönlü ilişkiyi destekleyen çok sayıda araştırma olmasına rağmen örgütsel adaletin hangi boyutlarının ne gibi mekanizmalar aracılığı ile çalışanlarda işe adanmanın ortaya çıkmasına sebep olduğu konusunda bir belirsizlik olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Bu bağlamda literatürdeki bu boşluğun doldurulmasına katkıda bulunmak araştırmanın bir diğer amacını oluşturmaktadır.

Araştırmanın evrenini Türkiye'de eğitim ve öğretim faaliyetlerine devam eden 129 devlet ve 75 vakıf olmak üzere toplam 288 üniversitede görev yapan akademisyenler oluşturmaktadır. Yükseköğretim Kurulu'nun (YÖK) web sitesinden elde edilen bilgilere göre Türkiye'deki 208 yükseköğretim kurumunda 184.566 öğretim elemanı görev yapmaktadır (<https://www.yok.gov.tr/Sayfalar/Haberler/2023/yuksekogretimde-yeni-istatistikler.aspx>, Erişim Tarihi: 10.12.2023). Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak anket kullanılmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında hazırlanan anket formu üniversitelerin web sayfalarından iletişim bilgileri elde edilen akademisyenlere e-posta yolu ile gönderilmiştir. Araştırma kapsamında 399 akademisyen anket formunu doldurarak araştırmaya katılmışlardır. Bilindiği üzere 0,05 anlamlılık düzeyi ve ,05 örneklem hatasında 100.000'den büyük olan evren büyüklüklerinde yeterli örneklem büyüklüğü 384 olarak kabul edilmektedir (Altunışık vd., 2010, s. 135). Bu bağlamda örneklemin evreni temsil etme gücünün yeterli olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Araştırmada kullanılan anket üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. Anket formunun birinci bölümü cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, unvan ve çalışma süresi olmak katılımcıların demografik özelliklerini belirlemeye yönelik beş sorudan oluşmaktadır. Anket formunun ikinci bölümünde Schaufeli vd. (2006) tarafından geliştirilen ve yazarlara ait resmi web sitesinde Türkçe de dahil olmak üzere 40'tan fazla dile uyarlanmış olarak sunulan "İşe Adanma Ölçeği" yer almaktadır. Çalışmanın üçüncü bölümünü ise Niehoff ve Moorman (1993) tarafından geliştirilen ve Yıldırım (2007)

tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanarak geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizleri yapılan “Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeği” oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma kapsamında veri analizleri SPSS 20 İstatistik Paket Programı kullanılmak suretiyle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu bağlamda katılımcıların örgütsel adalet algıları ve işe adanma düzeylerini tespit etmek ve iki olgu arasındaki ilişkileri test etmek amacıyla sırasıyla Cronbach’s Alpha, tanımlayıcı istatistikler, korelasyon analizi ve doğrusal regresyon analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Araştırma kapsamında yapılan analizler katılımcıların işe adanma düzeylerinin oldukça yüksek olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Buna göre çalışanların genel işe adanma ortalaması  $\bar{x}=3,99$  iken işe adanma ölçeğinin alt boyutlarından olan “adanma” boyutunun  $\bar{x}=4,23$  ile en yüksek ortalamaya sahip olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Buna göre işe adanmanın alt boyutu olan adanma, bireyin işine güçlü bir şekilde dahil olması ve işiyle ilgili coşku, gurur ve meydan okuma duygusu yaşaması olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla analiz sonuçları çerçevesinde katılımcıların işlerine fiziksel, bilişsel ve duygusal olarak odaklandıklarını ve işleriyle ilgili coşku, gurur ve meydan okuma duygusu yaşadıklarını söylemek mümkündür. Yapılan analizlere göre katılımcıların örgütsel adalet algı düzeylerinin ise  $\bar{x}=2,91$  olduğu görülmüştür. Buna göre örgütsel adalet algıları orta düzeyde olmasına rağmen katılımcıların işe adanma düzeylerinin yüksek olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Nitekim örgütsel adaletin işe adanma üzerindeki etkisini tespit etmek üzere yapılan regresyon analizi sonuçları da örgütsel adalet algısının işe adanma davranışını tüm alt boyutları ile birlikte pozitif yönde etkilediğini ortaya koymuştur. Bu bağlamda H1 hipotezi kabul edilmekle birlikte iki değişken arasındaki ilişkilerin pozitif yönlü ancak zayıf ilişkiler olduğu ( $r=,282$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) olduğu görülmüştür. Benzer şekilde örgütsel adaletin alt boyutları olan dağıtım, işlem ve etkileşim adaletinin de işe adanma ve alt boyutları üzerinde işlem adaleti ve etkileşim adaletinin özdeşleşme boyutu üzerindeki etkisi hariç olmak üzere genel olarak pozitif yönlü zayıf etkisi olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Buna göre işlem adaleti ile özdeşleşme boyutu ve etkileşim adaleti ile yine özdeşleşme boyutu arasında ise herhangi bir ilişki tespit edilememiştir ( $r=,072$ ;  $p<0,01$ ). Dolayısıyla H2 hipotezi kabul edilirken H3 ve H4 hipotezi ise kısmen kabul edilmiştir.

Çalışma kapsamında örgütsel adalet ve alt boyutlarının işe adanma üzerinde pozitif yönlü anlamlı etkiye sahip olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte yapılan analizlerin değişkenler arasında pozitif yönlü ilişkiler ortaya koymasına rağmen örgütsel adaletin işe adanma davranışını etkileme gücünün düşük düzeyde gerçekleşmesi nedeniyle işe adanmanın ortaya çıkmasında örgütsel adalet dışında başka faktörlerin de etkili olduğu açıktır. Sonuç olarak, araştırmacılar tarafından örgütsel başarının anahtar değişkenlerden biri olarak nitelendirilen işe adanmanın hangi faktörlerin etkisiyle ortaya çıktığına ilişkin literatür kapsamında daha fazla araştırma yapılması gerektiğini söylemek mümkündür.