The Relationship between the Instructors' Organizational Justice Perceptions and Their Hopelessness Levels

Barış Çavuş[1] and Ruhi Sarpkaya[2]

[1] *Adnan Menderes University, School of Foreign Languages, Aydın, TURKEY*

[2] *Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Administration, Aydın, TURKEY*

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels. The population of this research, designed in correlational screening model, was composed of the instructors' employed in a state university in Aegean Region, Turkey in 2015-2016 academic year and the sample was composed of 468 instructors selected via cluster sampling method. Data was collected by means of Personal Information Form, Organizational Justice Scale and Beck Hopelessness Scale. In data analysis, descriptive statistics were used in order to determine the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels; and so as to put forth the relationship between their organizational justice perceptions and hopelessness levels, Pearson Correlation coefficient was performed. Whether the instructors' organizational justice perceptions predicted their hopelessness levels was tested via Multiple Regression Analysis. According to the findings of the research, organizational justice perceptions and hopelessness levels of the instructors were at medium level. A negative significant relationship was detected between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels. As a result of Multiple Regression Analysis, it was determined that procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale were not the predictors of the instructors' hopelessness, and the only predictor of the factors of hopelessness scale was distributive justice dimension of organizational justice scale. Results of the study were discussed in line with the related literature.

Introduction

The role of education and educational organizations is an undeniable fact. From primary schools to higher education, together with how education system is and how it has got to be, the qualities, roles and competencies, perceptions and psychological states of the education practitioners are equally important. Without any doubt, every phase of education is significant in itself. However, higher education is attached a particular importance as it is the last phase of education before every individual begins their professional life. Thus, the perceptions of the instructors at universities who are the providers of education is one of the chief elements to be taken into consideration so as to be able to ensure a more effective and efficient educational organization. When the point in question is organizational effectivity and the perceptions of the instructors, one of the most significant concepts that comes to mind is "organizational justice".

Justice, which is accepted to be of the most indispensable phenomenon of the effectivity of an organization, is a concept dealing with distributive problems of the workers in an organization. By means of

[1] Corresponding author's address: Adnan Menderes University, School of Foreign Languages, Aydın/TURKEY
Telephone: 05466286660, 20562140682-132
Fax 02562140683
e-mail: baris.cavus@adu.edu.tr

"fair distribution", which probably increases the commitment of every worker to their organization, a more successful organization can be provided by supporting fair administration principles with the administrators' effective management behaviors. Workers in an organization need to be fairly appreciated and rewarded in order to be able to do their jobs with high morale and motivation, to increase their organizational commitment, and to make sense of confidence in the organization and their superiors in the organization. Such a perception of justice is called "organizational justice" (Eren, 2014). Basically, organizational justice expresses whether the workers in an organization are treated fairly or not. It is in a pursuit of the answer to the question of "How fair is the organization behavior on the workers?" (Moorman, 1991). Although there may be many variables that can affect the performance of the employees in an organization, one of the most important variables among them is undoubtedly the sense of organizational justice. If the occupation meets a fair and respectful form of behavior within the organization, if the awards are distributed in a balanced manner and if they are included in the decision-making process within the organization, their performance will probable increase (Buluç, 2015). The individuals, including the educationalists of educational institutions, tend to accept the outcomes which they negatively perceive on the condition that that they think the activities in the organization are fairly organized, they are respectively treated, the decisions are discussed and they feel their identities are appreciated (Poole, 2007).

Organizational justice as a concept is based on Adam's (1965) Equity Theory. Organizational justice, which came to light with the theory put forth by Adams, emphasizes that the perception of equity or inequity the worker feels in the work environment is directly related with the level of success and the feeling of satisfaction in the organization. According to Adams (1965), the individual cares about how they themselves or the other workers are treated and makes a comparison in return for the effort and values they add to the organization. As a result of this comparison, if the individual is convinced that the gains and what they brought in the organization do not sort together and the outcome is against them, their efficiency will decrease and they will prefer to leave the organization; and if the individual believes that there is equity, they will keep on working for the organization efficiently and peacefully. If the individual notices that the inequity continues, they will leave the organization or will be pushed to loneliness as their social interactions in the organization will be spoiled (Baş and Şentürk, 2011; Eren, 2007; Greenberg, 1990; Luthans, 1995).

The researchers who have worked more on organizational justice as a concept recently first focused on *distributive justice*, which is the fairness of the decisions given about the outcomes. Distributive justice deals with the consistency of such norms as justice and equality with the outcomes. Later on, recent studies focused on the processes and procedures related to decision making and intensified on *procedural justice*. After the two-factor organizational justice model was analyzed, *interactional justice*, which deals with the interpersonal attitudes and behaviors the workers are faced with during the processes in the organization, took its place in literature (Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007; Greenberg, 1990; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).

The impact of fair behavior of the organization on worker behaviors related to the organization has increasingly gained importance recently. In fact, the studies conducted about organizational justice and attitudes about work have moved out of analyzing justice perceptions in terms of only the distribution of the outcomes and rewards, and have begun to include researches on procedural justice in which the decisions are made and the distributions are defined (Schappe, 1998: 493). When literature is reviewed, it can be noticed that organizational justice have been studied with various concepts that can be counted as positive on behalf of the organization and the relationships with these concepts have been investigated. For example, the study of Zaman, Ali and Ali (2010) on the teachers working in the private schools of Pakistan; that of Najafi, Noruzy, Azar, Nazari-Shirkoushi and Dalvand (2011) conducted on educationalists working at different universities; and that of Malik and Naeem (2011) conducted on the academicians working at various higher education institutions in Pakistan put forth a positive significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Likewise, according to the results of the study of Masterson (2001) on the organizational justice perceptions of university instructors, they exhibit more commitment to their organizations when they are treated with organizational and procedural justice. This commitment positively increases the perceptions of the students, too. Together with organizational commitment, job satisfaction is also a concept positively related with organizational justice and these two concepts are related with each other in various studies. When justice perceptions of the workers in an

organizations increase, their job satisfaction increases, too (Lawler, 1977; Irving, Coleman and Bobocel., 2005; Zainalipour, Fini and Mirkamali., 2010; Nojani, Arjmandnia, Afrooz and Rajabi, 2012). For example, the results of the study by Zainalipour et al. (2010) on 120 teachers working at secondary schools of Iran put forth a positive significant relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Colquitt (2001) put forward the fact that there is a positive significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational trust and all three dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice) are strong predictors of organizational trust. In the study of Hoy and Tarter (2004) conducted in educational organizations, the relationship between organizational justice and organizational trust is analyzed and according to the findings of the research, there is a strong relationship between these two concepts. Moreover, organizational citizenship is also a concept which predicts organizational justice. According to the results of the study by Moorman (1991) conducted so as to put forth the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors of the individuals working for two companies in the USA, there is a positive significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship. Likewise, as a result of the findings of the research by Taştan and Yılmaz (2008) investigating the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors of primary school teachers, a positive significant relationship is found between these two concepts. Besides, when literature is reviewed, it can also be noticed that organizational justice is studied with such negative concepts for an organization as alienation (Kasapoğlu, 2015), organizational silence (İşleyici, 2015), organizational cynicism (Özcan, 2014), school violence (Koç, Akçay and Akyol, 2016), abandonment (Wilson, 2010) and organizational exhaustion (Karaman, 2009; Li, 2014). For example, in the study of Koç et al. (2016) conducted so as to determine the organizational justice perceptions and perspectives towards violence of branch teachers in primary schools, it is revealed that there is a negative low relationship between organizational justice and school violence.

The remarkable amount of researches conducted recently, especially since 1970s and 1980s, which are also exemplified above, studied the conclusions of fair and unfair behaviors in the organization. These studies put forth the fact that various concepts such as trust, commitment, performance, organizational citizenship, job satisfaction and loyalty are positively and significantly; such concepts as alienation, organizational silence, cynicism, exhaustion, school violence and abandonment are negatively related with organizational justice. Thus, it can be concluded that when organizational justice perception is provided within an organization, various desired phenomenon which will guide and help the organization reach its goals and objectives are affected positively. From this point of view, together with the fact that how organizational justice is perceived by the instructors affects their perspective to their educational organizations, it is thought that it can also give information about their hope and hopelessness with regard to the future.

According to the cognitive theory put forth by Beck (1963), hopelessness is the basis of depression. The individuals with a dark and hopeless perspective of future have tendency for depression and they evaluate themselves, their future and the world negatively. The ones thinking that they are worthless and incompetent perceive their lives negatively because they find the incidents they encounter compelling. One of the most important symptoms of depression is pessimism and when Beck developed this theory, he emphasized the concept of hopelessness which, according to him, is vital for this concept. As a result of his research on 80 patients having psychotherapy and who have attempted to commit suicide, he found out a strong relationship between the beliefs of these individuals that their problems would never be solved out and suicide attempts. According to Beck, although there is no objective and realistic reason, these depressive patients attribute different and wrong meanings to the events they experience and believe that negative outcomes will appear. This situation is called "hopelessness" (Beck, 1963). Hopeless individuals believe that nothing occurs properly for themselves, they cannot be successful no matter how hard they try, they will never be able to reach the goals they defined in advance which are important to them, and their problems will never be solved out (Ersoy, Küçükkaragöz, Deniş and Karataş, 2010). Beck (1967) stated that more than 78% of depressive patients perceive their future negatively. This ratio is 22% in the patients who are not experiencing depression. Clinic studies show that as the complaints and depressive symptoms of the patients increase, their hopelessness increases in the same way.

When the studies conducted on hopelessness in educational organizations are analyzed, it can be understood that these studies were done especially on teenagers having education (Alverson, 2014; Hoy and Tarter, 2004; Kula, 2008; Siyahhan, Aricak and Acar, 2012), university students (Asdigian, 1993; Kılıç, Tektaş and Pala, 2014; Stockum, 1999; Lamis, Saito, Osman, Klibert, Malone and Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2014; Üngüren, 2007), preservice teachers (Ceyhan, 2004; Dinçer, Yılmaz and Keşan, 2015; Öngen, 2012; Şahin, 2009; Şengül, Güner and Altın, 2014) and teachers (Kiziroğlu, 2012; Taner, 2008; Yıldırım, 2015). Of the studies conducted in the field of education, for example, the results of the study by Üngüren (2007) on 496 tourism students having education at high schools and universities put forth a positive significant relationship between hopelessness and anxiety and it was concluded that as the anxiety levels of the students increase, their hopelessness levels increase, too. In the study conducted by Kılıç et al. (2014), hopelessness levels of state and private vocational schools were compared and it was found out that hopelessness levels of state university students were higher than private university students, and it was concluded that this stemmed from the status of income, family and educational institution factors. Negative experiences that university students encounter may lead them face problems and future anxieties, and these anxieties may push them towards hopelessness (Şahin, 2009). In the study of Şengül et al. (2014) conducted so as to put forth the hopelessness levels and future perspectives of Elementary School Math's preservice teachers, it was found out that preservice teachers with high levels of hopelessness worry more about such future expectations as unemployment and financial status. Likewise, Ceyhan (2004) concluded in his study investigating hopelessness levels of preservice teachers that the ones with low occupational expectations had higher levels of hopelessness. Together with the fact that hopelessness is not a desired phenomenon in terms of efficiency, the preservice teachers' effective preparation to professional life, improving themselves and being efficient can be related with positive future expectations. The determination of preservice teachers' future expectations and their hopelessness levels will guide the efforts of training more qualified educationalists (Ceyhan, 2004). As stated above, it can be implied that hopelessness, which expresses negative future expectations, is a significant concept for teenagers and young adults. The studies conducted and the findings obtained not only put forth the hopelessness levels of the individuals but also develops suggestions by defining the factors causing hopelessness. Even though there are studies on hopelessness levels of the teachers, the point that is missing in literature, that is ignored and thus, to be more significantly focused on and studied is to put forth and determine the hopelessness levels of the academicians, namely the instructors who work for universities that constitute the uppermost stage of educational organizations.

The significance of the phenomenon of organizational justice in the efficiency of an organization and in achieving the goals and objectives of an organization defined in advance was proved by the studies conducted and by the findings and conclusions put forth (Akyol, 2015; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Elma, 2013; Greenberg, 1990; İşleyici, 2015; Kasapoğlu, 2015; Li, 2014; Malik and Naeem, 2011; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Yılmaz, 2010; Wasti, 2001; Wilson, 2010). As mentioned above, justice is significant not only for itself but also for its characteristic of predicting other concepts. Together with the fact that the concept of hopelessness, which has a negative meaning in definition, is an unhealthy and negative phenomenon for an organization, is an undesired matter of fact by the organizations and administrations as it predicts various unwanted concepts as anxiety, concern for the future, depression and even suicide attempt. Although both organizational justice and hopelessness concepts have been investigated separately and associated with other concepts, they haven't been studied together before and their relationship with each other hasn't been analyzed in a research. Together with the fact that organizational justice concept, which is, just like in other organizations, one of the most indispensable phenomenon of educational organizations whose output is human, and the concepts of hope and hopelessness set the basis for this study; how these concepts are perceived by the instructors working in the higher education institution which constitutes the sample of this research and how organizational justice and hopelessness are related to each other is as important as the concepts that are significant for the research. By the data obtained at the end of the research, it is aimed how the instructors perceive organizational justice and what kind of a relationship their justice perceptions are in with their hopelessness. Together with the fact that this research is thought to reveal the present situation with regard to the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels, it can thus set a course for future studies by developing suggestions in the light of the findings. Within this context, the research question of the study is *"What is the relationship between the*

instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels?". Besides, within the framework of this research question, the sub problems to be answered in the study are determined as follows:

1. What are the organizational justice perceptions of the instructors in distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice dimensions?
2. What are the hopelessness levels of the instructors in affective (feelings about future), motivational (loss of motivation) and cognitive (expectations from the future) factors?
3. What is the relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels?
4. Do organizational justice perceptions of the instructors predict their hopelessness levels?

Method

Research Model

The model of this research, which aims to examine the relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels, is causal-comparative relational screening model. Relational screening models are the research models which aim to determine the presence and/or level of covariance among two or more variables (Karasar, 2009).

Population and Sample

The population of the research was composed of 1678 instructors employed in 3 graduate schools, 12 faculties, 4 schools, 1 state conservatory and 18 vocational schools in 2015-2016 academic year of a state university located in Aegean Region in Turkey. In order to be able to determine the sample of the research, cluster sampling was used. Each academic unit of Adnan Menderes University, which is located in Aydın city, was regarded as a cluster and sample was taken randomly. So as to be able to determine the sample of the research, the table of sample size was used and it was assumed that 322 participants could represent the population of 1678 people, with an α= .05 significance level (Can, 2014). Due to the problems that could be encountered and the possible losses in the return of the scales, the sample was estimated, by taking 25% more, to be formed of 403 participants. Totally, 500 questionnaires were handed out and 474 of them were collected. Because of such reasons as incorrect or incomplete filling in, and empty papers, 6 of the questionnaires were taken out of the sample and the rest 468 questionnaires were put into evaluation. As a consequence, the return rate was calculated as 93%. Of the instructors who participated in the research, 47.2% were female and 52.8% were male; 7.4% were professors, 10.2% were associate professors, 22.9% were assistant professors, 27.6% were research assistants, 19.7% were teaching assistants and 12.2% were lecturers; and the age of the instructors ranged from 23 to 65.

Data Collection Tools

In order to collect data in the research, together with "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researcher, "Organizational Justice Scale" developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was used to determine the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and "Beck Hopelessness Scale" developed by Beck, Weissman, Lester and Trexler (1974) so as to determine the individuals' negative expectations about the future was used to define the instructors' hopelessness levels.

Organizational justice scale. Organizational Justice Scale is composed of three sub dimensions as; *distributive justice, procedural justice* and *interactional justice*. The items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 forms the *distributive justice* dimension; the items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 forms the *procedural justice* dimension; and the items 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 forms the *interactional justice* dimension of the scale. The answers given to the items of the scale which was prepared in *"Five Point Likert Scale"* are designed as *"(1) I totally disagree", "(2) I disagree", "(3) I am neutral", "(4) I agree", "(5) I totally agree"* (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). In the *distributive justice* dimension of the scale, there are statements about whether the timetable, wage, work load, rewards and the responsibilities about work are distributed fairly; in *procedural justice* dimension, there are statements about whether the workers are included in decision making process, organizational decisions are made faithfully and fairly, data collection is neutral, and the workers have the right to reject the decisions; in *interactional justice* dimension, there are statements about whether the workers are treated honestly, gently and kindly, whether the decisions are explained on time and whether the rights of the workers are respected

or not (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). Arithmetic mean score that can be received from Organizational Justice Scale varies between 1-5 and the lower the mean score is, the lower justice perception is; likewise, the higher the mean score is, the higher justice perception is. While the mean scores of the items of organizational justice scale were interpreted in this research, organizational justice perceptions were evaluated according to ±1 standard deviation scores as; *"between 1.00-2.50: low", "between 2.51-4.39: medium level"* and *"between 4.40-5.00: high"*.

In the study conducted by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), the validity of organizational justice scale was tested by confirmatory factor analysis and it was revealed that the value of 213 participants sample with 190 degree of freedom was 348.07, the ratio of Chi-square value to degree of freedom was 1.63 (good fit) and CFI (Comparative Fit Index) was 0.92 (perfect fit). According to the reliability analysis performed after the validity analysis, it was revealed that the reliability of the scale in general was 0.92. The adaptation of the scale into Turkish language, and validity and reliability analyses were made by Polat (2007) and as a result of the factor analysis, it was found that factor loads of none of the 20 items of the three-dimension-scale were under 0.45. Besides, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale with a sample group of 1281 participants was calculated as 0.96. Furthermore, it was calculated in the study that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of distributive justice dimension of the scale was 0.89, that of procedural justice dimension was 0.95, and that of interactional justice dimension was 0.90 (Polat, 2007).

In the current research, the validity of the three-dimension-pattern of organizational justice scale in instructors sample was tested by the researchers by confirmatory factor analysis. The value of 468 participants sample with 165 degree of freedom was found 682.29. When these values were correlated for the fit index, it was seen that the ratio of Chi-square value to degree of freedom was 4.13 (medium fit) and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) fit index was 0.082 (good fit). Besides, it was found that GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) was 0.87 (medium fit) and AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) was 0.84 (medium fit). It was also revealed that Standardized RMR fit index was 0.033 (perfect fit), and both NNFI (Non-Normed Fit Index) and CFI (Comparative Fit Index) were 0.99 (perfect fit). According to the results of the analysis, it can be stated that organizational justice scale has a good fit in the sample of instructors.

After the validity analysis of the three-dimension-pattern of organizational justice scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated by the researchers so as to determine the reliability of the sub dimensions of the scale and the scale in general. As a result of the analysis, it was found that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of distributive justice dimension of the scale was 0.84, that of procedural justice was 0.92, and that of interactional justice was 0.97. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale in general was found 0.97. When considered that if Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient is between "$0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.90$", the scale is "Quite Reliable" and if Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient is between "$0.90 \leq \alpha < 1.00$", the scale is "Highly Reliable" (Can, 2014), it can be stated that organizational justice scale is highly reliable in the sample of instructors. Within this context, it can be noticed that the reliability coefficient obtained from the original version and the adaptation of the scale is close to the reliability coefficient obtained from the analysis made for this research.

Beck hopelessness scale. Beck, Weissman, Lester and Trexler (1974) aimed to define the hopelessness levels of the risk groups and so as to be able to put forth the hopelessness levels of the individuals quantitatively and objectively, they, as a result of a range of studies called "the measurement of pessimism", developed Beck Hopelessness Scale which determines hopelessness that is a common and serious psychopathic symptom.

The statements of the 20-item-scale are answered as "yes-no" and the results of the scale reflect negative expectations. The individual is asked to circle "yes" for the statements that are appropriate, and "no" for the ones that are inappropriate for him. For the answers to the items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 19, one point is given for each "no" answer; and for the answers to the items 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 20, one point is given for each "yes" answer. The lowest score of the scale is 0 and the highest score is 20. The total hopelessness score is the sum of the scores on the individual items. It is indicated that the higher the score of the scale is, the higher the hopelessness level of the individual is; and likewise, the lower the score is, the lower the hopelessness level of the individual is (Beck et al., 1974). Beck et al., (1974) expressed that the scale should be analyzed as three factors as; affective, motivational and cognitive. Affective factor includes

such affective associations as hope and enthusiasm, happiness, faith and good times; motivational factor includes such motivational elements as giving up, deciding not to want anything, and not trying to get something that is wanted; and cognitive factor includes anticipations regarding what life will be like in the future: dark, good things, things not working out, and vague or uncertain future. In the scale, the items 1, 5, 6, 13, 15 and 19 forms affective factor; the items 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17 and 20 forms motivational factor; and the items 4, 7, 8, 10, 14 and 18 forms cognitive factor (Beck et al., 1974). While the mean scores of the items of hopelessness scale were interpreted in this research, hopelessness levels were evaluated according to ±1 standard deviation scores as; *"between 0.00-0.99: low"*, *"between 1.00-7.99: medium level"* and *"between 8.00-20.00: high"*.

In the study conducted by Beck et al. (1974), the validity of hopelessness scale was tested by construct validity, concurrent validity and factor analysis.). As a result of the construct validity and concurrent validity of the scale, it was found that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the groups of depressive patients (*p*<.01) and this significant difference means that hopelessness scale significantly distinguished these two groups form each other. Besides, the data obtained from 294 participants were subjected to a factor analysis and as a result of the analysis, three factors were extracted; each of whose items were with a factor loading of higher that 0.50 .According to the reliability analysis performed after the validity analysis, it was revealed that the reliability of the scale in general was 0.93 (1974). The scale was translated into Turkish language by Seber (1991) and validity and reliability analyses were made by Seber, Dilbaz, Kaptanoğlu and Tekin (1993). As a result of the construct validity and concurrent validity of the scale, it was found that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of test and control groups of patients (p<.01) and this significant difference means that hopelessness scale significantly distinguished these two groups form each other. Besides, as a result of the reliability analysis, it was found that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale with a sample group of 107 participants was 0.86. In another study, by Durak and Palabıyıkoğlu (1994), it was revealed as a result of concurrent and discriminative validity that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of test and control groups of patients (p<.01) and this significant difference means that hopelessness scale significantly distinguished these two groups form each other. Besides, as a result of reliability analysis, it was found that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale with a sample group of 373 participants was 0.69, in general; that of affective factor was 0.78; that of motivational factor was 0.72; and that of cognitive factor was 0.72.

In the current research, the validity of the three-factor-pattern of hopelessness scale in instructors sample was tested by the researchers by confirmatory factor analysis. The value of 468 participants sample with 167 degree of freedom was found 543.53. When these values were correlated for the fit index, it could be seen that the ratio of Chi-square value to degree of freedom was 3.25 (medium fit) and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) fit index was 0.069 (good fit). Besides, it was tested that GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) was 0.90 (good fit) and AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) was 0.87 (medium fit). It was also detected that Standardized RMR fit index was 0.56 (good fit), and both NNFI (Non-Normed Fit Index) and CFI (Comparative Fit Index) were 0.95 (perfect fit). According to the results of the analysis, it can be stated that hopelessness scale has a good fit in the sample of instructors.

After the validity analysis of the validity of the three-factor-pattern of hopelessness scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated by the researchers so as to determine the reliability of the factors of the scale and the scale in general. As a result of the analysis, it was found that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of affective factor of the scale was 0.75, that of motivational factor was 0.70, and that of cognitive factor was 0.67. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale in general was found 0.87. When considered that if Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient is between "0.60 ≤ *α* < 0.90", the scale is "Quite Reliable" (Can, 2014), it can be stated that hopelessness scale is highly reliable in the sample of instructors. Within this context, it can be noticed that the reliability coefficient obtained from the original version and the adaptations of the scale is close to the reliability coefficient obtained from the analysis made for this research.

Data Analysis

In order to test the validity of the scales used in the research, Lisrel (Linear Structural Relations) package programme and for the analysis of the data collected, SPSS 20 (Statistical Package Program for

Social Sciences) was used. Whether the data of the research showed normal distribution was tested by means of measures of central tendency, frequency distribution bar charts, and skewness and kurtosis coefficients. As the data of the research has a value between -1 and +1 according to skewness and kurtosis coefficients, it was assumed that the data was normally distributed. Organizational justice perceptions and hopelessness levels of the instructors were analyzed by descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean scores and standard deviation). So as to be able to put forth the relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels, correlation test; and in order to test whether the instructors' organizational justice perceptions predict their hopelessness levels, regression analysis was used. The significance of the statistics obtained from the analyses was tested at .05 level.

Findings

The first sub problem of the research was determined as "What are the organizational justice perceptions of the instructors in distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice dimensions?". And the second sub problem of the research was determined as "What are the hopelessness levels of the instructors in affective (feelings about future), motivational (loss of motivation) and cognitive (expectations from the future) factors?". Descriptive statistics in terms of the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics in terms of the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels

Variable	n	$\overline{X}$	ss
Distributive Justice	468	3.39	0.93
Procedural Justice	468	3.28	1.02
Interactional Justice	468	3.55	1.03
Organizational Justice	468	3.43	0.93
Affective	468	1.36	1.63
Motivational	468	1.14	1.58
Cognitive	468	1.45	1.51
Hopelessness	**468**	**3.96**	**4.12**

As seen in Table 1, the instructors who participated in the research perceive, among the dimensions of organizational justice scale, interactional justice dimension ($\overline{X}$ = 3.55, ss= 1.03) at the highest level; and this was followed by distributive justice dimension ($\overline{X}$ = 3.39, ss= 0.93) and procedural justice dimension ($\overline{X}$ = 3.28, ss= 1.02), respectively. In general, it was detected that organizational justice perceptions of the instructors was at medium level ($\overline{X}$ =3.43, ss= 0.93). It is also seen in Table 1 that the instructors who participated in the research perceive, among the factors of hopelessness scale, cognitive factor ($\overline{X}$ = 1.45, ss=1.51) at the highest level; and this was followed by affective factor ($\overline{X}$ = 1.36, ss= 1.63) and motivational factor ($\overline{X}$ = 1.14, ss= 1.58), respectively. In general, it was detected that hopelessness levels of the instructors was at medium level ($\overline{X}$ = 3.96, ss= 4.12).

The third sub problem of the research was determined as "What is the correlation between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels?" and the fourth problem was determined as "Do organizational justice perceptions of the instructors predict their hopelessness levels?". In order to be able to respond these sub problems, first, correlation test was made to detect the relationship between organizational justice and hopelessness, and then, so as to be able to determine whether the instructors' organizational justice perceptions predicted their hopelessness levels, multiple regression analysis was made. The results of Pearson Two-tailed Correlation Analysis made in order to define the relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels are given in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale had negative significant relationships with affective, motivational and cognitive factors of hopelessness scale (n= 468; p<.05). In other words, it was expected that as organizational justice perceptions of the instructors increased, their hopelessness levels decreased. When Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

Coefficients were analyzed, it could be seen that the highest relationship was between distributive justice dimension and affective factor (r=-,346; p<.05); and the lowest relationship was between interactional justice dimension and motivational factor (r=-,237; p<.05).

Table 2. The relationship between the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness levels (Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Distributive Justice	1	.688*	.711*	-.346*	-.283*	-.302*
2. Procedural Justice		1	.888*	-.271*	-.246	-.256
3. Interactional Justice			1	-.273*	-.237*	-.282*
4. Affective				1	.622*	.707*
5. Motivational					1	.592
6. Cognitive						1

*p is significant at .05 level.

The results of multiple regression analysis made in order to be able to determine whether organizational justice perceptions of the instructors predict their hopelessness levels in terms of affective factor are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The results of multiple regression analysis in terms of predicting affective factor

Variable	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	*3.501*	.282	-	12.422	.000	-	-
Distributive Justice	-.525	.110	-.300	-4.775	.000*	-.346	-.216
Procedural Justice	-.088	.153	-.055	-.575	.565	-.271	-.027
Interactional Justice	-.018	.157	-.011	-.113	.910	-.273	-.005

R=.349   R²=.122
F$_{(3-464)}$=21.453   p=.000
*p is significant at .05 level.

As seen in Table 3, it was detected that distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale were significant predictors (R=,349; R²=,122) of affective factor (F$_{(3-464)}$=21.453; p<.05). The dimensions of organizational justice scale, together, explained 12% of the variance of their hopelessness levels in terms of affective factor. According to standardized regression coefficients, relative order of significance of predictor variables on affective factor was distributive justice (β=-,300), procedural justice (β=-,055) and interactional justice (β=-,011), respectively. When significance tests of regression coefficients were taken into account, it was detected that of the predictor variables, only distributive justice (p<.05) was the significant predictor of affective factor and that procedural and interactional justice were not significant predictors of affective factor. According to the results of regression analysis, regression equation predicting affective factor is as follows:

Affective Factor= (-,525 x Distributive Justice) + (-,088 x Procedural Justice) +(-,018 x Interactional Justice) + (3.501). The results of multiple regression analysis made to determine whether organizational justice perceptions of the instructors predict their hopelessness levels in terms of motivational factor are given in Table 4.

Table 4. The results of multiple regression analysis in terms of predicting motivational factor

Variable	B	Standard Error	B	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	*2.872*	.278	-	10.317	.000	-	-
Distributive Justice	-.373	.109	-.220	-3.431	.001*	-.283	-.157
Procedural Justice	-.170	.151	-.110	-1.127	.260	-.246	-.052
Interactional Justice	.027	.155	.018	.174	.862	-.237	.008

R=.292   R²=.085
F$_{(3-464)}$=14.430   p=.000
*p is significant at .05 level.

As seen in Table 4, it was found that distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale were significant predictors (R=,292; R²=,085) of motivational factor (F$_{(3-464)}$=14.430; p<.05). The dimensions of organizational justice scale, together, explained 8% of the variance of their hopelessness levels in terms of motivational factor. According to standardized regression coefficients, relative order of significance of predictor variables on motivational factor was distributive justice (β=-,220), procedural justice (β=-,110) and interactional justice (β=,018), respectively. When significance tests of regression coefficients were taken into account, it was detected that of the predictor variables, only distributive justice (p<.05) was the significant predictor of motivational factor and that procedural and interactional justice were not significant predictors of motivational factor. According to the results of regression analysis, regression equation predicting motivational factor is as follows:

Motivational Factor= (-,373 x Distributive Justice) + (-,170 x Procedural Justice) + (,027 x Interactional Justice) + (2.872). The results of multiple regression analysis made in order to be able to determine whether organizational justice perceptions of the instructors predict their hopelessness levels in terms of cognitive factor are given in Table 5.

Table 5. The results of multiple regression analysis in terms of predicting cognitive factor

Variable	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	3.294	.265	-	12.450	.000	-	-
Distributive Justice	-.338	.103	-.208	-3.273	.001*	-.302	-.150
Procedural Justice	.044	.143	.030	.309	.757	-.256	.014
Interactional Justice	-.236	.147	-.161	-1.603	.110	-.282	-.074

R=.317   R²=.100
F$_{(3-464)}$=17.271   p=.000
*p is significant at .05 level.

As can be seen in Table 5, it was found that distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale were significant predictors (R=,317; R²=,100) of cognitive factor (F$_{(3-464)}$=17.271; p<.05). The dimensions of organizational justice scale, together, explained 10% of the variance of their hopelessness levels in terms of cognitive factor. According to standardized regression coefficients, relative order of significance of predictor variables on cognitive factor was distributive justice (β=-,208), procedural justice (β=-,030) and interactional justice (β=-,161), respectively. When significance tests of regression coefficients were taken into account, it was detected that of the predictor variables, only distributive justice (p<.05) was the significant predictor of cognitive factor and that procedural and interactional justice were not significant predictors of cognitive factor. According to the results of regression analysis, regression equation predicting cognitive factor is as follows:

Cognitive Factor= (-,338 x Distributive Justice) + (,044 x Procedural Justice) + (-,236 x Interactional Justice) + (3.294)

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The results of the current study revealed that organizational justice perceptions of the instructors participated in the research in general and in terms of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice dimensions were at medium level. Besides, it was found that the perceptions of the instructors in terms of interactional justice dimension were relatively higher than their perceptions in terms of distributive and procedural justice dimensions. The reason for this may be the fact that the administrators are in good communication and interaction with the instructors informing the decisions they make but they are not as fair when they gather knowledge and ask about the views of the instructors during decision making process. When literature was reviewed, it was found out that the findings with regard to the instructors' organizational justice perceptions were supported by some studies and were not supported by some others. In the studies of Aydın (2015) and Uysal (2014), it was detected that organizational justice perceptions of the teachers were at medium level. Also, Yılmaz (2010) revealed that the teachers included in the study had positive opinions about organizational justice but these perceptions were not highly agreed with. However, in the studies of Batman (2015), Demircan (2003), Dündar and Tabancalı, 2012), Güneş and Buluç (2012), Kazancı (2010), Kılıç (2013), Polat and Celep (2008) and Taştan and Yılmaz (2008) done in

educational organizations, it was put forth that organizational justice perceptions of the teachers were high. Nonetheless, it should be significantly noted that these studies were done at elementary and secondary schools, not at higher education institutions. For example, in the study of Dündar and Tabancalı (2012), it was revealed that primary school teachers perceived justice at their schools as "often" fair and their justice perceptions were the highest in interactional justice dimension. Together with the fact that the number of studies conducted at universities are quantitatively less, in his study evaluating organizational justice perceptions of the instructors working at four different universities in Turkey in terms of management processes, Akyol (2013) concluded that instructors with managerial duties have high level of organizational justice perceptions and those without managerial duties have medium level of organizational justice perceptions. Thus, he emphasized that the decision makers presume that the decisions related to goals are made rationally and they reach them by using minimal effort (Akyol; 2013, 2015). However, this may lead the administrators feel they always make correct decisions on behalf of the employees. In the study of Titrek (2009), it was revealed that most deficiencies in organizational justice behaviors at schools were related to the behaviors of the administrators towards the employees. Moreover, in the study of Li (2014) conducted on the instructors working at five different universities in China, it was concluded that organizational justice perceptions of the instructors were high. Therefore, having positive organizational justice perceptions is an essential phenomenon for an organization in that it will cause the employees to consider themselves as a part of the organization, make them willingly go in their job relationships and establish relationships based on trust (Yılmaz, 2010).

It was also found that hopelessness levels of the instructors participated in the research in general and in terms of affective, motivational and cognitive factors were at medium level. Moreover, it was determined that their hopelessness levels in terms of cognitive factor was relatively higher than affective and motivational factors. In the study of Kiziroğlu (2012) done so as to investigate the hopelessness levels of form teachers in terms of their sociodemographic features, it was found out that hopelessness levels of the teachers were low. It should be especially indicated that this research was done on elementary teachers and that there were no studies in literature aiming to analyze the hopelessness levels of the instructors working at higher education institutions. The studies conducted at higher education heavily included the students studying at faculty of education; in other words, preservice teachers. In the studies of Baş (2010), Gençay and Gençay (2011), Öngen (2012), Sayar (2012), Şahin (2009) and Şengül et al. (2014), it was concluded that hopelessness levels of preservice teachers were low. When literature was reviewed, it could be argued that as hopelessness levels of the employees decreased, they would more probably exhibit more positive behaviors within the organization such as job satisfaction (Gençay and Gençay, 2011). In contrast, when their hopelessness levels began to increase, they would possibly tend to exhibit negative behaviors due to the increase in their stress levels (Ergüner-Tekinalp and Akkök, 2004), anxiety (Bayat, Erdem and Kuzucu, 2008; İpek, Derman and Sadioğlu, 2010; Tümkaya, Aybek and Çelik, 2007) and thus, they would most probably be prone to such behavioral disorders as depression (Johnson, 1992; Metalsky, Joiner, Hardin and Abramson, 1993) and even suicide attempt (Kim, Jayathilake and Meltzer, 2003; Macleod, Rose and Williams, 1993; Szanto, Reynolds, Conwell, Begley and Houck, 1998; Williams and Broadbent, 1986). That's why, it can be concluded that so as to be able to avoid such unexpected behaviors to happen within an organization, more emphasis should be put on the matter of hopelessness.

Another finding of the research was that distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice scale had negative significant relationships with affective, motivational and cognitive factors of hopelessness scale. In other words, it was expected that as perceptions of the instructors in terms of organizational justice increased, their hopelessness levels decreased. When Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were evaluated, it could be seen that distributive justice dimension of organizational justice scale had high relationships with all three factors of hopelessness scale. The reason for this could be that the fair distribution of such fundamental issues as shift, workload and timetable, which are included in distributive justice, might be considered more important by the instructors. According to the results of multiple regression analysis made in order to be able to determine whether organizational justice perceptions of the instructors in terms of distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions predicted their hopelessness levels, it was determined that of the dimensions of organizational justice scale, only distributive justice was the significant predictor of all three factors of hopelessness scale separately. Besides, it could be understood that procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice

scale were not significant predictors of affective, motivational and cognitive factors of hopelessness scale. When related literature was reviewed, together with the fact that there were no studies investigating the relationship between organizational justice and hopelessness; it was found out that there were studies concluding there was a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship (Burns and DiPaola, 2013), a negative relationship between organizational justice and burnout (Yıldırım, Ekinci and Öter, 2012), a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Malik and Naeem, 2011; Su, Baird and Blair, 2009; Wasti, 2001; Yavuz, 2010), a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational culture (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky, 2002) and a positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction (Dündar and Tabancalı, 2012; Elma, 2013; Najafi et al., 2011; Schappe, 1998; Zalinalipour et al., 2010). Furthermore, according to the multiple regression analyses of the researches by Yıldırım et al. (2012); Malik and Naeem (2011); and Schappe (1998), it was detected that the most powerful predictor was distributive justice. It was also revealed in the study of McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) that distributive justice was a more important predictor of pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. In the study of Chughtai and Zafar (2006) conducted in Pakistani university instructors, it was found that organizational justice was significantly related to organizational commitment of teacher and that distributive justice, individually was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment. Within this context, the findings of related studies can be said to be supporting the findings obtained from this research.

The suggestions developed in the light of research findings are as follows:

- Above all, in order to be able to maximize the instructors' organizational justice perceptions working at universities, the administrators should embrace an understanding of democratic management.
- The higher organizational justice perceptions in educational organizations are, the lower such phenomenon as hopelessness is. Hence, so as to be able to maximize justice perception in educational institutions, the administrators who are the providers of justice should manage such distribution problems as timetable, shift and workload, they should be transparent in decision making and organize activities that can improve organizational culture.
- In order to be able to minimize, and even remove the hopelessness of the instructors, motivational activities should be performed effectively within the organization. To be able to provide this, the administrators should use formal and informal reward systems. Besides, the workers should be encouraged to participate in educational activities, in-service training and courses.
- Possible reasons lying beyond the instructors' organizational justice perceptions and their hopelessness can be studied deeply by means of qualitative research method.
- Further researches can be conducted in different cities, at universities in different regions or if possible, across Turkey.
- A similar research can be conducted with teachers and administrators working at elementary or secondary state schools or private schools.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2*, 267-269. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2

Akyol, B. (2013). *Üniversitelerdeki örgütsel adalet olgusunun öğretim elemanları algılarına göre yönetim süreçleri açısından değerlendirilmesi.* Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, 18 Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.

Akyol, B. (2015). Organizational justice in decision-making processes. In K. Norley, M.A Icbay,. & H. Arslan, (Eds.). *Contemporary approaches in education.* Frankfurt PL: Academic Research.

Alverson, J. R. (2014). *A model of hopelessness, belongingness, engagement and academic achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama. USA.

Asdigian, N. L. (1993). *Toward an understanding of the cognitive etiology of depressive reactions to life stressors: an evaluation of the hopelessness theory of depression.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire. USA.

Aydın, K. (2015). *İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları ile işe yabancılaşma algıları arasındaki ilişki (Uşak ili örneği).* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Uşak.

Baş, G. & Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi,* 17(1), 29-62.

Baş, L. (2010). *Öğretmen adaylarının saldırganlık ve umutsuzluk düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Zonguldak.

Batman, N. (2015). *Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algılarının iş tatmin düzeylerine etkisi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Bayat, M., Erdem, E. & Kuzucu, E. G. (2008). Depression, anxiety, hopelessness, and social support levels of the parents of children with cancer. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing,* 25(5), 247-253. doi:10.1177/1043454208321139

Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: clinical, experimental and the theoretical aspects.* New York: Hoeber Medical Division Harper and Row.

Beck, A. T. (1963). Thinking and depression: 1 idiosyncratic content and cognitive distortions. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 9,* 324-33. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1963.01720160014002

Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D. & Texler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: the hopelessness scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(6), 861-865. doi: 10.1037/h0037562

Burns, W. R. T. & DiPaola, M. F. (2013). A study of organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools. *American Secondary Education, 42*(1), 4-23.

Can, A. (2014). *Spss ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Ceyhan, A. (2004). Ortaöğretim alan öğretmenliği tezsiz yüksek lisans programına devam eden öğretmen adaylarının umutsuzluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 1,* 91-102.

Chughtai, A. A. & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied Human Resources Management Research,* 11(1), 39-64.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(3), 386-400. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E. & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34-48.

Demircan, N. (2003). *Örgütsel güvenin bir ara değişken olarak örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: eğitim sektöründe bir uygulama.* Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Dinçer, B., Yılmaz, S. & Keşan, C. (2015). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri öğretmen adaylarının mesleğe karşı algı ve umutsuzluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(1), 191-204. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04227.x

Durak, A. & Palabıyıkoğlu R. (1994). Beck umutsuzluk ölçeği geçerlilik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi,* 2, 311-319.

Dündar, T. & Tabancalı, E. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice perceptions and job satisfaction levels. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46,* 5777-5781. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.513

Elma, C. (2013). The predictive value of teachers' perception of organizational justice on job satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,* 51, 157-175.

Eren, E. (2007). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi.* İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.

Ergüner-Tekinalp, B. & Akkök, F. (2004). The effects of a coping skills training program on the coping skills, hopelessness, and stress levels of mothers of children with autism. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 26(3), 257-269. doi:10.1023/B:ADCO.0000035529.92256.0d

Ersoy E., Küçükkaragöz H., Deniş H. & Karataş E. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının umutsuzluk düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre belirlenmesi. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, (5)*4.

Gençay, S. & Gençay, Ö. A. (2011). A comparison of the life satisfaction and hopelessness levels of teacher candidates in Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews, 6*(2), 182-186.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*(2), 399-432. doi: 10.1177/014920639001600208

Güneş, A. M. & Buluç, B. (2012). İlköğretim Okullarında Dönüşümcü Liderlik ile Örgütsel Adalet Arasındaki İlişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(3), 411-437.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C.J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250-259. doi: 10.1108/09513540410538831

Irving, G. P., Coleman, D. F. & Bobocel, D. R. (2005). The moderating effect of negative affectivity in the procedural justice-job satisfaction relation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 37*(1), 20-32. doi:10.1037/h0087242

İpek, N., Derman, M. T. & Sadioğlu, Ö. (2010). The levels of anxiety and hopelessness of primary education children with speech disorders and of their parents. *İlköğretim Online*, *9*(1).

İşleyici, K. (2015). *Örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Zonguldak ili örneği.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.

Johnson, J. G. (1992). Gender and mood as mediators of the relationship between attributional style, daily life events, depression symptoms, and hopelessness. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *16*(6), 687-697. doi:10.1007/BF01175407

Karaman, P. (2009). *Örgütsel adalet algısı ile tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesine yönelik öğretmenler üzerinde bir uygulama.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kasapoğlu, S. (2015). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin işe yabancılaşma düzeyleri ile örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Kazancı, N. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarındaki yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki düzeyi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Kılıç, S., Tektaş, N. & Pala, T. (2014). Devlet ve vakıf meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin umutsuzluk düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması ve umutsuzluk düzeylerini etkileyen faktörlerin belirlenmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 18*(2), 169-186.

Kılıç, Y. (2013). *Lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet ve iş doyumu algıları arasındaki ilişki.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Kim, C. H., Jayathilake, K. & Meltzer, H. Y. (2003). Hopelessness, neurocognitive function, and ınsight in schizophrenia: relationship to suicidal behavior. *Schizophrenia Research*, *60*(1), 71-80. doi: 10.1016/S0920-9964(02)00310-9

Kiziroğlu, M. (2012). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sosyodemografik özelliklere göre umutsuzluk düzeyleri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.

Koç, M., Akçay, C. & Akyol, B. (2016). Organizational justice perceptions and views on violence of branch teachers working in primary schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(10), 105-117. doi:10.11114/jets.v4i10.1756

Kula, E. (2008). *Endüstri meslek lisesi öğrencilerinin umutsuzluk düzeyleri ve saldırganlık durumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Lamis, D. A., Saito, M., Osman, A., Klibert, J., Malone, P. S. & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2014). Hopelessness and suicide proneness is U.S. and Japanese college students: depressive symptoms as a potential mediator. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*(5), 805-820. doi: 10.1177/0022022113519853

Lawler, E. E., III. (1977). Reward systems. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work: behavioral science approaches to organizational changes*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

Li (2014). Building affective commitment to organization among Chinese university teachers: the roles of organizational justice and job burnout. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability Journal*, 26, 135-152. doi: 10.1007/s11092-014-9192-3

Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Malik, M. E. & Naeem, B. (2011). Impact of perceived organizational justice on organizational commitment of faculty: empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business, 1*(9), 92-98.

Masterson, S. S. (2001). A trickle-down model of organizational justice: relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 594-604. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.594

McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes: distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 626-637. doi: 10.2307/256489

MacLeod, A. K., Rose, G. S. & Williams, J. M. G. (1993). Components of hopelessness about the future in parasuicide. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *17*(5), 441-455. doi: 10.1007/BF01173056

Metalsky, G. I., Joiner, T. E., Hardin, T. S. & Abramson, L. Y. (1993). Depressive reactions to failure in a naturalistic setting: a test of the hopelessness and self-esteem theories of depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *102*(1), 101-109. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.102.1.101

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, normative commitment to the organization: a metaanalysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 60*(3), 1-33. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845

Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Azar, H. K., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. R. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: an empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management, 5*(13), 5241-5248. doi: 10.5897/AJBM10.1505

Nojani, M. I., Arjmandnia, A. A., Afrooz, G. A. & Rajabi, M. (2012). The study on relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in teachers working in general, special and gifted education systems. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 2900-2905. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.586

Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(3), 527-556. doi: 10.2307/256591

Öngen, D. E. (2012). The relationship between hopelessness and sensation seeking in secondary school teacher candidates. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 3021-3025. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.002

Özcan, E. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Polat, S. & Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 54*(1), 307-331.

Polat, S. (2007). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki.* Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Poole, W. L. (2007). Organizational justice as a framework for understanding union-management relations in education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*(3), 725-748.

Sayar, B. (2012). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile umutsuzluk ve boyun eğici davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Schappe, S. P. (1998). Understanding employee job satisfaction: the importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 12*(4), 493-503). doi: 10.1023/A:1025007307058

Seber, G., Dilbaz, N., Kaptanoğlu, C. & Tekin, D. (1993). Umutsuzluk ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenirliği. *Kriz Dergisi, 1*(3), 139-142.

Seber, G. (1991). *Beck umutsuzluk ölçeğinin geçerliği ve güvenirliği üzerine bir çalışma*. Doçentlik tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi, Psikiyatri Anabilim Dalı, Eskişehir.

Siyahhan, S., Arıcak, O. T. & Acar, N. C. (2012). The relation between bullying, victimization and adolescents' level of hopelessness. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 1053-1059. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.02.011

Stockum, R. W. (1999). *An analysis of the proposed subtype: hopelessness depression.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University Faculty of the College of Education.

Su, S., Baird, K. & Blair, B. (2009). Employee organizational commitment: the influence of cultural and organizational factors in the Australian manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Human Resources Management, 20*(12), 2494- 2516. doi: 10.1080/09585190903363813

Szanto, K., Reynolds, C. F., Conwell, Y., Begley, A. E. & Houck, P. (1998). High levels of hopelessness persist in geriatric patients with remitted depression and a history of attempted suicide. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 46*(11), 1401-1406. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.1998.tb06007.x

Şahin, C. (2009). Eğitim fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin umutsuzluk düzeyleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*, 271-286.

Şengül, S., Güner, P. & Altın, A. (2014). The hopelessness levels of 3[rd]grade elementary mathematics preservice teachers and their perspectives about future. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 718-721. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.286

Taner, D. (2008). *Öğretmenlerin umutsuzluk düzeyi ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişki.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Taştan, M. & Yılmaz, K. (2008). Örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel adalet ölçeklerinin Türkçeye uyarlanması. *TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 33*(150), 87-96.

Titrek, O. (2009). Employees' organizational justice perceptions in Turkish schools. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 37*(5), 605-620. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2009.37.5.605

Tümkaya, S., Aybek, B. & Çelik, M. (2007). A prediction of hopelessness and state-trait anxiety levels among teacher candidates before the KPSS exam. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 7*(2), 967-974.

Uysal, M. (2014). *Genel liselerde görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet konusundaki algıları: Altındağ ilçesi örneği..* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Üngüren, E. (2007). *Lise ve üniversitelerde turizm eğitimi alan öğrencilerin umutsuzluk ve kaygı düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi: Antalya'da bir uygulama.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.

Wasti, S. A. (2001). Örgütsel adalet kavramı ve tercüme: bir ölçeğin Türkçe'de güvenirlik ve geçerlik analizi. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1,* 33-50.

Williams, J. M. & Broadbent, K. (1986). Autobiographical memory in suicide attempters. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95*(2), 144-149. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.95.2.144

Wilson, T. A. (2010). *Workplace aggression behaviors, organizational justice, and intention to leave among u.s. telecommunications workers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lynn University.

Yavuz, M. (2010). The effects of teachers' perception of organizational justice and culture on organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(5), 695-701.

Yıldırım, B. (2015). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin umutsuzluk düzeyleri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Okan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Yıldırım, M. C., Ekinci, A. & Öter, Ö. M. (2012). Eğitim müfettiş yardımcılarının örgütsel adalet algılarının mesleki tükenmişlik düzeylerine etkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 45*(1), 327-345.

Yılmaz, K. (2010). Secondary public school teachers' perceptions about organizational justice. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10*(1), 603-616.

Zaman, G., Ali, N., & Ali, N. (2010). Impact of organizational justice on employees outcomes: an empirical evidence. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(1).

Zainalipour, H., Fini, A. A. S. & 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,* 1986-1990. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.401