Preprints.org

Article

And Justice for All. Organizational Justice – a Coherent Path to Organizational Sustainability

Ewa Sygit-Kowalkowska , Andrzej Piotrowski [*] , Aneta Chybicka , Radu Predoiu

Article

And Justice for All. Organizational Justice—A Coherent Path to Organizational Sustainability

Ewa Sygit-Kowalkowska [1], Andrzej Piotrowski [2,3,*], Aneta Chybicka [4] and Radu Predoiu [5,6]

[1] Department of Psychology, Kazimierz Wielki University, Leopolda Staffa 1 St., 85-867 Bydgoszcz, Poland; esygit@ukw.edu.pl

[2] Institute of Psychology, University of Gdańsk, Jana Bażyńskiego 4 St., 80-309 Gdańsk, Poland; andrzej.piotrowski@ug.edu.pl

[3] Institute of Pedagogy, Pomeranian University in Słupsk, Bohaterów Westerplatte 64 St., 76-200 Słupsk, Poland

[4] Institute of Psychology, University of Gdańsk, Jana Bażyńskiego 4 St., 80-309 Gdańsk, Poland; anna.chybicka@ug.edu.pl

[5] Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Teachers' Training Department, National University of Physical Education and Sports, Constantin Noica 140 St. 060057 Bucharest, Romania; radu_predoiu@yahoo.com

[6] Doctoral School of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Craiova, Alexandru Ioan Cuza 13 St. 200585 Craiova, Romania

* Correspondence: andrzej.piotrowski@ug.edu.pl

Abstract: Job characteristics shape organizational sustainability, conferring tangible benefits to employees. Job characteristics shape attitudes toward work, such as satisfaction and engagement, and are related to the well-being and health of employees. The aim of the study was to determine and describe the role of work engagement and support at work in the relation between selected job characteristics (organizational justice, job control, and role clarity) and self-rated health. The study was conducted on a sample of 368 employees representing various industries. The study used: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), Organizational Justice Survey, Coworker Support Scale, Supervisor Support Scale, Role Clarity Scale, Job Control Scale. Cantril ladder was used to measure self-rated health. The presented study established the importance of lower scores on the UWES subscale: dedication as a significant moderator of the examined correlations. In relation to the correlation: justice and its dimensions, and self-rated health, support from supervisors showed a greater effect than that from coworkers. The conducted study expands knowledge on the formation of employees' self-rated health through the sense of justice experienced within the organization. The results obtained are applicable to organizational practice. This finding highlights the importance of supporting organizational justice, which contributes to employee well-being (particularly when combined with high levels of work engagement and supervisor support) and ultimately increases organizational sustainability. Further research can be continued taking into account the limitations of the previous procedure of selecting people for the study and the measurement tools used.

Keywords: organizational justice; organizational support; work engagement; job control; role clarity; organizational sustainability; health

1. Introduction

According to the International Labor Organization, working conditions consist of, i.a., elements related to working time, wages, as well as the physical and psychosocial conditions present in the workplace [1]. These can negatively affect health and pose a threat to the proper functioning of employees [2,3]. On the basis of the research results obtained to date, it should be assumed that both the mere presence of the analyzed psychosocial characteristics of work, as well as the subjectively attributed importance to them, remain in significant correlations with most of the studied indicators of health and functioning of employees within organizations [4]. The issue of the working conditions and their correlation with health is crucial due to, i.a., the emerging new forms of work provision

(including remote work), the increasing age of labor force participation, the prevalence of chronic diseases and disabilities in society, increasing access to solutions for organizing work taking into account the health of individuals.

The definition of health taken as a *state of complete physical, mental and social well-being* makes it possible to adopt broad perspectives in scientific research, including with regard to occupational and organizational psychology (World Health Organization [WHO], 1948: p. 100) [5]. *The contribution of psychology to the development of health sciences is the application of two perspectives to the assessment of health: objective and subjective. This leads to a distinction between objective health, evidenced by medical and psychological assessment, and subjective perception of health, also known as subjective health, most often identified with a sense of well-being [6].*

As noted by Di Fabio, psychology of sustainable development is oriented towards promoting well-being and quality of life of individuals in various environments [7]. According to the definition proposed by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, sustainable work *allows people to engage and remain in a job that does not harm their physical or mental health and will last for an extended period of their working life* [8]. For this reason, it is important to study how organizations function and what consequences their functioning has for their employees.

2. Literature Review

The literature indicates that a predictor of employee health and well-being is organizational justice. The association between low organizational justice and increasing health problems is evident. However, it is indicated that the processes underlying this correlation are still not fully explained [9]. A large number of studies in this area refer to a narrow professional group namely health professionals. With regard to this professional group, it has been proven that there is a significant relationship between organizational justice and the level of burnout experienced at work [10]. This is why Macko, based on the literature, concluded that the sense of organizational justice is a subjective assessment of the level of justice principles implemented within the organization, an assessment of the quality of transactions and relationships made on the basis of perceptions about the decisions made by organization representatives, the impartiality of their methods and the treatment of those affected by these decisions [11]. To date, it has been linked in the literature to productivity, job satisfaction, motivation, work commitment, low level of turnover intention, customer satisfaction, and work performance and engagement [12]. The role of organizational justice proved essential in mitigating the negative psychological impacts of layoffs [13]. The mediating effect of organizational justice perception on the relationship between ethical leadership and workplace deviant behaviors has been proven as well [14].

A review of articles from the Web of Science, PubMed, and PsycINFO databases (2001–2021) revealed only 103 articles examining the importance of justice in shaping a perception of health, including 40 papers on mental health and 14 on physical health [15].

The characteristics of a job can include: role clarity, job control, and opportunities to obtain social support. The former occurs when work-related tasks and expectations are clear to the employee and, as the literature indicates, is significantly correlated with job satisfaction [16]. Job clarity is associated in the literature with the benefits to job performance, rather than with well-being or health. In the literature on organizational psychology, mediation models using job control and social support at work can be found. They often appear as explanatory variables. Studies in which the demands-health correlation assumes a moderation analysis using these two variables are rarer to be found [17]. Health is treated as an important resource in human work, as it positively correlates with work engagement, shapes employee well-being, also by reducing the negative effects of stress [18–20]. According to the job demands-resources model, resources are factors that support growth and allow an employee to achieve career goals. These include both a sense of job control and organizational resources [21]. To date, it has been established that excessive levels of job control can influence the progress of professional burnout, as can a lack of social support [22].

Creating sustainable workplace conditions is challenging for organizations, although it should be approached from the point of view of investing in employees, as it ultimately increases their skills

and qualifications. By shaping work environments, organizations foster their employees' work engagement, which benefits the organizations in turn [23].

Work engagement as a positive, satisfying, work-related state of mind allows to accumulate resources while performing work and, as a result, lead to an increase in physical and mental health [24]. The analyses conducted to date examined the organizational justice-engagement correlation. More complex models have shown significant indirect effects of organizational justice dimensions on work engagement [25].

The aim of this study was to determine and describe the role of work engagement and support at work in the correlation between selected job characteristics and self-rated health. The study assumed that the following job characteristics would be used as explanatory variables in the model: job control, role clarity, organizational justice.

Social support (including support from superiors and coworkers) and work engagement (collectively framed as job resources) were adopted as moderators. Self-rated health was used as the dependent variable in the study.

Based on the literature data presented above, it was assumed that:

H1: Job characteristics (job control, role clarity, organizational justice) remain correlated with self-rated health.

H2: Job resources (organizational support, work engagement) moderate the correlation between demands and self-rated health.

3. Materials and Methods

The study proper, at the stage of hypothesis formation and tool selection, was prepared based on a literature review and conducting individual interviews with 20 employees for a total of 30 hours.

3.1. Data Collection

The respondents declared to be of legal age and professionally active at the time of the survey. The survey was conducted as a cross-sectional study. The survey took the form of an online questionnaire. The participants were selected at random. Participation in the study was anonymous, free of charge and voluntary. Information about the recruitment of respondents was published via Facebook and other social media. The recruitment announcement and the survey itself included information about the purpose and course of the study, information regarding consent to participate in the survey and the possibility of opting out at any time during the completion of the questionnaire. The questionnaire also included contact information of the people conducting the survey — personal information, e-mail address and the name of the institution.

3.2. Participants

Of the 368 questionnaire sets, 13 were rejected as a result of respondents failing the alertness test. In the end, 355 questionnaires sets were included in the statistical analysis (with men constituting a group of 110), covering respondents 18-76 years of age, M = 39.47, SD = 11.01. The respondents represented the following industries: education (1.7%), industry (25.9%), trade (0.8%), services (11.5%), public administration (2%), logistics (31%), finance and banking (7.6%), pharmaceutical industry (4.8%) and other industries (14.4%), 0.3% respondents had middle school education, 17.2% had high school education, 11.5% had a Bachelor's degree, 70.4% had a Master's degree, and 0.6% had a PhD.

3.3. Instruments

The following research tools were used:

(1) The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale questionnaire was used to measure job engagement, which consists of 3 subscales: vigor (6 items, e.g., "At my work, I feel bursting with energy"), dedication (5 items, e.g., "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose") and absorption (6 items, e.g., "Time flies when I am working") [26]. The respondent rated each statement on a 7-point

Likert scale, with 0 meaning "never" and 6 meaning "every day". The higher the score, the higher the work engagement and its components. The reliability of the scale as measured by Cronbach's Alpha was 0.927 for the entire questionnaire, and 0.812 for vigor, 0.849 for dedication, and 0.846 for absorption.

(2)   Macko's Organizational Justice Survey Questionnaire consists of 30 items, designed to measure perceptions of organizational justice globally and specifically: distributive justice (7 items, e.g., "The amount of pay corresponds to the level of difficulty of my tasks"), procedural justice (7 items, e.g., "Information needed to make decisions that are fair to employees is collected"), retributive justice (4 items, e.g., "Employees are not accused unfoundedly"), interactional justice from supervisors (8 items, e.g., "Management decisions are moral and ethical"), interpersonal justice from coworkers (4 items, e.g., "Coworkers treat me with respect") [27]. The respondent rated each statement on a 4-point Likert scale, with 1 meaning "No, strongly disagree" and 4 meaning "Yes, strongly agree". The higher the score, the higher the perception of overall justice and its individual dimensions. The reliability of the entire scale was 0.915 and the subscales respectively: distributive justice — 0.944, procedural justice — 0.919, retributive justice — 0.893, interactional justice from supervisors — 0.916, interpersonal justice from coworkers — 0.811.

(3)   The scale for measuring support from coworkers is a single-item tool in which the respondent rates the possibility of receiving support from coworkers. The respondents rate this statement on a scale from 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "No, strongly disagree" and 4 "Yes, strongly agree". The higher the score, the more support from coworkers an employee can count on [28].

(4)   The scale for measuring support from a manager/supervisor is a single-item tool for measuring the possibility of receiving support from a supervisor. The respondents rate the statement on a scale from 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "No, strongly disagree" and 4 meaning "Yes, strongly agree". The higher the score, the more support from the manager/supervisor the employee can count on [28].

(5)   The Role Clarity Scale is a single-item tool designed to identify whether an employee has a clearly defined professional role, meaning they know what is expected of them [28]. The respondents rate this statement on a scale from 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "No, strongly disagree" and 4 "Yes, strongly agree". The higher the score, the higher the role clarity is.

(6)   The Job Control Scale consists of a single survey item, and its purpose is to identify the level of control over one's own work [29]. The respondents rate this statement on a scale from 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "No, strongly disagree" and 4 "Yes, strongly agree". The higher the score, the higher the job control.

(7)   Cantril ladder was used to measure self-rated health [29]. The respondents rate their current level of health on a 10-point scale, from 1 meaning the lowest possible level of health to 10 being the highest possible level of health.

The questionnaire included two questions aimed to measure alertness which were placed 1/3 and 2/3 way through the questionnaire ("This question is aimed to test alertness. Its purpose was to check whether the respondents filling out the questionnaire were actually reading the questions. Please mark: 0 — never / Please mark: 1 — No, strongly disagree."). Their purpose was to check whether the respondents were actually reading the questions or just marking answers at random. Failure to indicate the correct answer (in this case it was 0 and 1) results in the rejection of the entire questionnaire filled by the given individual from the aggregate compilation of results.

3.4. Ethics

Informed consent was obtained from the respondents at the beginning of the survey, which was voluntary and anonymous. The survey was conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, the Polish Psychological Association, and was also approved by the Commission for Research Ethics at the Faculty of Psychology of Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz (opinion no: 5/13.11.2023).

3.5. Data Analysis

The calculations were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 29.0. The first step involved calculating basic measures of descriptive statistics, along with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Using A. Hayes's macro PROCESS, a number of moderation models were tested. Estimates of the models were made using bootstrap for sampling of 5000, $\alpha = 0.05$ was adopted as the significance level.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents basic descriptive statistics for the analyzed variables. In addition, using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the conformity of the data distribution to the normal distribution was checked. It was revealed that the distribution is deviated from the normal distribution for all analyzed variables, however, the deviation was not significant [30].

Table 1. Descriptive statistics including the test of distribution normality.

	M	Me	SD	Sk.	Kurt.	Min.	Max.	D	p
Health	7.09	8.00	1.85	-0.87	0.44	1.00	10.00	0.19	<0.001
Support from co–workers	3.39	3.00	0.63	-0.86	1.37	1.00	4.00	0.29	<0.001
Support from supervisor	3.32	3.00	0.76	-1.08	0.99	1.00	4.00	0.28	<0.001
Role clarity	3.25	3.00	0.76	-0.79	0.21	1.00	4.00	0.26	<0.001
Job control	3.16	3.00	0.72	-0.75	0.81	1.00	4.00	0.28	<0.001
Vigor	4.11	4.33	1.12	-0.61	-0.03	0.33	6.00	0.11	<0.001
Dedication	4.18	4.40	1.28	-0.68	-0.23	0.20	6.00	0.12	<0.001
Absorption	4.09	4.33	1.28	-0.72	-0.11	0.00	6.00	0.11	<0.001
Work engagement	4.12	4.29	1.11	-0.72	0.12	0.36	6.00	0.08	<0.001
Distributive justice	2.41	2.43	0.75	0.01	-0.63	1.00	4.00	0.09	<0.001
Procedural justice	2.78	2.86	0.69	-0.56	-0.20	1.00	4.00	0.13	<0.001
Retributive justice	3.19	3.25	0.62	-0.54	-0.25	1.25	4.00	0.12	<0.001
Interactional justice from managers	3.10	3.13	0.57	-0.93	1.18	1.00	4.00	0.15	<0.001
Interpersonal justice from coworkers	3.30	3.25	0.52	-0.66	0.67	1.25	4.00	0.16	<0.001
Organizational justice	2.96	3.00	0.48	-0.60	0.27	1.23	3.90	0.06	0.001

4.2. The Moderating Role of Work Engagement and Support for the Correlation between Role Clarity, Job Control and Organizational Justice, and Self-Rated Health

The correlations between clarity, job control and justice, and self-rated health were analyzed. It was examined whether work engagement and support played a moderating role in these correlations. All analyzed models were a good fit to the data and explained between 9% and 25% of the self-rated health variance. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of the models of the moderating role of work engagement and support for the correlation between role clarity, job control and organizational justice, and self-rated health.

M	Predictor	B	SE	T	p	95% CI LL	95% CI UL	R^2 for model	ΔR^2
	Job control	-0.27	0.10	-2.70	**0.007**	-0.46	-0.07	0.155	0.018
	Role clarity	-0.11	0.10	-1.06	0.290	-0.30	0.09	0.099	0.003
	Organizational justice	-0.28	0.14	-2.01	**0.045**	-0.55	-0.01	0.223	0.009
Work engagement	Distributive justice	-0.26	0.10	-2.51	**0.012**	-0.46	-0.06	0.167	0.015
	Procedural justice	-0.13	0.10	-1.32	0.186	-0.33	0.06	0.141	0.004
	Retributive justice	-0.20	0.11	-1.80	0.073	-0.42	0.02	0.156	0.008
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.11	0.11	-0.95	0.344	-0.33	0.11	0.213	0.002
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.30	0.15	-2.01	**0.045**	-0.60	-0.01	0.146	0.010
	Job control	-0.17	0.10	-1.68	0.093	-0.37	0.03	0.181	0.007
Vigor	Role clarity	0.03	0.09	0.31	0.755	-0.16	0.22	0.141	<0.001
	Organizational justice	-0.24	0.14	-1.69	0.092	-0.53	0.04	0.246	0.006
	Distributive justice	-0.30	0.10	-2.90	**0.004**	-0.50	-0.10	0.213	0.019

	Procedural justice	-0.12	0.10	-1.13	0.260	-0.32	0.09	0.174	0.003
	Retributive justice	-0.20	0.11	-1.77	0.078	-0.43	0.02	0.194	0.007
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.08	0.12	-0.69	0.487	-0.31	0.15	0.240	0.001
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.22	0.15	-1.47	0.140	-0.52	0.07	0.183	0.005
	Job control	-0.28	0.09	-3.20	**0.001**	-0.46	-0.11	0.168	0.024
	Role clarity	-0.17	0.09	-1.90	0.058	-0.35	0.01	0.113	0.009
Dedication	Organizational justice	-0.33	0.12	–0.73	**0.007**	-0.57	-0.09	0.235	0.016
	Distributive justice	-0.28	0.09	-3.14	**0.002**	-0.45	-0.10	0.180	0.023
	Procedural justice	-0.22	0.09	-2.45	**0.015**	-0.40	-0.04	0.160	0.014
	Retributive justice	-0.21	0.10	-2.16	**0.031**	-0.41	-0.02	0.167	0.011
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.15	0.10	-1.52	0.130	-0.34	0.04	0.221	0.005
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.26	0.13	-2.03	**0.043**	-0.52	-0.01	0.157	0.010
	Job control	-0.23	0.08	-2.74	**0.006**	-0.40	-0.07	0.126	0.019
	Role clarity	-0.12	0.09	-1.39	0.170	-0.29	0.05	0.057	0.005
Absorption	Organizational justice	-0.18	0.12	-1.50	0.134	-0.42	0.06	0.197	0.005
	Distributive justice	-0.13	0.09	-1.35	0.177	-0.31	0.06	0.117	0.005
	Procedural justice	-0.03	0.09	-0.31	0.755	-0.20	0.15	0.106	<0.001
	Retributive justice	-0.15	0.10	-1.46	0.145	-0.34	0.05	0.112	0.005
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.07	0.10	-0.75	0.453	-0.26	0.12	0.191	0.001
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.23	0.14	-1.74	0.082	-0.51	0.03	0.087	0.008
	Job control	-0.46	0.18	-2.53	**0.012**	-0.82	-0.10	0.167	0.015
	Role clarity	0.36	0.18	2.05	**0.041**	0.01	0.71	0.112	0.011
Support from co–workers	Organizational justice	-0.35	0.24	-1.46	0.144	-0.83	0.12	0.216	0.005
	Distributive justice	-0.34	0.19	-1.83	0.067	-0.71	0.02	0.181	0.008
	Procedural justice	-0.32	0.19	-1.67	0.096	-0.70	0.06	0.157	0.007
	Retributive justice	-0.42	0.23	-1.88	0.061	-0.87	0.02	0.155	0.008
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.25	0.20	-1.23	0.218	-0.64	0.15	0.212	0.003
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.55	0.23	-2.42	**0.016**	-1.00	-0.10	0.114	0.015
	Job control	-0.47	0.14	-3.41	**<0.001**	-0.74	-0.20	0.182	0.027
	Role clarity	0.07	0.15	0.58	0.612	-0.21	0.36	0.117	0.001
Support from supervisor	Organizational justice	-0.53	0.21	-2.58	**0.010**	-0.94	-0.13	0.213	0.015
	Distributive justice	-0.66	0.14	-4.33	**<0.001**	-0.96	-0.36	0.209	0.042
	Procedural justice	-0.27	0.16	-1.64	0.103	-0.59	0.05	0.146	0.006
	Retributive justice	-0.42	0.18	-2.39	**0.017**	-0.77	-0.07	0.159	0.014
	Interactional justice from managers	-0.12	0.16	-0.74	0.460	-0.45	0.20	0.192	0.001
	Interpersonal justice from coworkers	-0.45	0.19	-2.36	**0.019**	-0.83	-0.08	0.149	0.014

Annotation. The table presents statistics for the interaction components between M (moderator) and the predictor. The explanatory variable in the model is self-rated health.

4.2.1. Work Engagement as a Moderator

Work engagement was found to be a significant moderator of the correlation between job control, organizational justice, distributive justice and interpersonal justice from coworkers, and self-rated health.

Job control. It was found that at low ($b = 0.87$; $SE = 0.15$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.56; 1.17]) and average ($b = 0.57$; $SE = 0.14$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.30; 0.84]) levels of engagement, the correlation between job control and self-rated health was positive. Higher levels of job control were associated with higher self-rated health. For high levels of engagement, this effect was found not to be significant ($b = 0.27$; $SE = 0.20$; $p = 0.169$; 95%CI [-0.12; 0.66]).

Organizational justice. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between organizational justice and self-rated health at all levels of work engagement (low: $b = 1.75$; $SE = 0.23$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [1.30; 2.20]; average: $b = 1.44$; $SE = 0.19$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [1.06; 1.82]; high: $b = 1.13$; $SE = 0.26$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.60; 1.65]). The higher the level of organizational justice, the higher the level of self-rated health. The effect was most pronounced at low levels of work engagement and gradually decreased as the level increased.

Distributive justice. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between distributive justice and self-rated health at all levels of work engagement (low: $b = 0.97$; $SE = 0.17$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.64; 1.30]; average: $b = 0,.68$; $SE = 0.12$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.44; 0.92]; high: $b = 0.39$; $SE = 0.17$; $p = 0.023$; 95%CI [0.05; 0.72]). The higher the level of distributive justice, the higher the level of self-rated health. The

effect was most pronounced at low levels of work engagement and gradually decreased as the level increased, similar to the overall result for organizational justice.

Interpersonal justice from coworkers. It was found that at low (b = 1.16; SE = 0.23; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.71; 1.62]) and average (b = 0.83; SE = 0.18; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.48; 1.18]) levels of engagement, the correlation between interpersonal justice from coworkers and self-rated health was positive. Higher levels of this dimension were associated with higher self-rated health. For high levels of engagement, the effect was found not to be significant (b = 0.49; SE = 0.25; p = 0.052; 95%CI [-0.01; 0.99]).

Vigor acted as a moderator only for the correlation between distributive justice and self-rated health. Detailed analysis of results revealed that at low (b = 0.95; SE = 0.16; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.63; 1.27]) and average (b = 0.62; SE = 0.12; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.38; 0.85]) levels of vigor, the correlation between distributive justice and self-rated health was positive. Higher levels of this variable were associated with higher self-rated health. For high levels of vigor, the effect was found not to be significant (b = 0.28; SE = 0.17; p = 0.094; 95%CI [-0.05; 0.62]).

Dedication acted as a moderator for 6 correlations: between job control, organizational justice and its 4 dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, retributive justice and interpersonal justice from coworkers, and self-rated health.

Job control. Detailed analysis of results revealed that at low (b = 0.88; SE = 0.15; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.58; 1.18]) and average (b = 0.52; SE = 0.14; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.24; 0.79]) levels of dedication, the correlation between job control and self-rated health was positive. Higher levels of job control were associated with higher self-rated health. For high levels of dedication, the effect was found not to be significant (b = 0.16; SE = 0.20; p = 0.435; 95%CI [-0.24; 0.55]).

Organizational justice. The analysis revealed significant correlations between organizational justice and self-rated health for all moderator levels (low: b = 1.81; SE = 0.23; p < 0.001; 95%CI [1.36; 2.26]; average: b = 1.39; SE = 0.19; p < 0.001; 95%CI [1.01; 1.77]; high: b = 0.97; SE = 0.26; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.45; 1.49]). The higher the level of organizational justice, the higher the level of self-rated health.

Distributive justice. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between distributive justice and self-rated health at low (b = 1.06; SE = 0.16; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.68; 1.33]) and average (b = 0.65; SE = 0.12; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.41; 0.89]) levels of dedication. The correlation between the variables was positive. Higher levels of distributive justice were associated with higher self-rated health. For high levels of dedication, the effect was found not to be significant (b = 0.30; SE = 0.17; p = 0.079; 95%CI [-0.03; 0.63]).

Procedural justice. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between procedural justice and self-rated health at low (b = 0.89; SE = 0.16; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.57; 1.22]) and average (b = 0.61; SE = 0.14; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.34; 0, 0]) moderator levels. The correlation between the variables was positive, indicating that with a higher level of procedural justice, the level of self-rated health increased. For high levels of dedication, the effect was found not to be significant (b = 0.33; SE = 0.20; p = 0.093; 95%CI [-0.06; 0.72]).

Retributive justice. The analysis revealed significant correlations between retributive justice and self-rated health for all moderator levels (low: b = 1.03; SE = 0.19; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.66; 1.40]; average: b = 0.75; SE = 0.15; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.46; 1.05]; high: b = 0.48; SE = 0.21; p < 0.021; 95%CI [0.07; 0.89]). The higher the level of retributive justice, the higher the level of self-rated health.

Interpersonal justice from coworkers. Significant correlations were found between interpersonal justice from coworkers and self-rated health for all levels of dedication (low: b = 1.18; SE = 0.24; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.71; 1.64]; average: b = 0.84; SE = 0.17; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.49; 1.18]; high: b = 0.50; SE = 0.25; p < 0.046; 95%CI [0.01; 0.98]). The higher the level of interpersonal justice from coworkers, the higher the level of self-rated health, with the most pronounced correlation between the variables occurring at low levels of dedication.

Absorption was a significant moderator of the correlation between job control and self-rated health. Detailed analysis of results revealed significant correlations between job control and self-rated health for all moderator levels (low: b = 1.04; SE = 0.16; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.73; 1.35]; average: b = 0.74; SE = 0.13; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.48; 1.01]; high: b = 0.44; SE = 0.19; p < 0.018; 95%CI [0.07; 0.81]). The

higher the level of job control, the higher the level of self-rated health, with the most pronounced correlation between the variables occurring at low levels of absorption.

4.2.2. Support from Coworkers as a Moderator

Support from coworkers acted as a moderator for the correlation of job control, role clarity and interpersonal justice from coworkers, and self-rated health.

Job control. The analysis of results revealed significant correlations between job control and self-rated health for all moderator levels (low: $b = 0.94$; $SE = 0.16$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.63; 1.25]; average: $b = 0.65$; $SE = 0.13$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.39; 0.91]; high: $b = 0.37$; $SE = 0.18$; $p < 0.047$; 95%CI [0.01; 0.73]). The higher the levels of job control, the higher was the level of self-rated health. The strongest correlation between the variables occurred at low moderator levels and gradually decreased as the moderator level increased.

Role clarity. Significant correlations were found between role clarity and self-rated health for average ($b = 0.39$; $SE = 0.13$; $p = 0.002$; 95%CI [0.14; 0.64]) and high ($b = 0.61$; $SE = 0.18$; $p = 0.001$; 95%CI [0.26; 0.96]) levels of support from employees. These correlations were positive, meaning that the higher was the role clarity, the higher was the self-rated health. At low levels of support, the correlations between variables were found to be insignificant ($b = 0.17$; $SE = 0.16$; $p = 0.294$; 95%CI [−0.14; 0.48]).

Interpersonal justice from coworkers. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between interpersonal justice from coworkers and the level of self-rated health at low ($b = 0.79$; $SE = 0.23$; $p = 0.001$; 95%CI [0.34; 1.24]) and average ($b = 0.44$; $SE = 0.21$; $p = 0.035$; 95%CI [0.03; 0.86]) moderator levels. The correlation between the variables was positive, meaning that with higher levels of justice analyzed, the level of self-rated health increased. For high levels of support from cworkers, the effect was found not to be significant ($b = 0.11$; $SE = 0.27$; $p = 0.696$; 95%CI [-0.43; 0.64]).

Support from supervisor acted as a moderator for correlations: between job control and organizational justice along with its 3 dimensions: distributive justice, retributive justice and interpersonal justice from coworkers, and self-rated health.

Job control. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between job control and self-rated health at low (b = 0.82; SE = 0.15; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.52; 1.12]) and average (b = 0.46; SE = 0.14; p < 0.001; 95%CI [0.19; 0.74]) moderator levels (support from supervisors). The correlation between the variables was positive, indicating that with a higher level of job control, the level of self-rated health increased. For high levels of support from supervisors, the effect was found not to be significant ($b = 0.14$; $SE = 0.19$; $p = 0.449$; 95%CI [-0.23; 0.51]).

Organizational justice. The analysis of the results revealed significant correlations between organizational justice and self-rated health for all moderator levels (low: $b = 1.71$; $SE = 0.25$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [1.21; 2.21]; average: $b = 1.30$; $SE = 0.23$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.84; 1.76]; high: $b = 0.94$; $SE = 0.30$; $p < 0.002$; 95%CI [0.35; 1.52]). The higher the levels of organizational justice, the higher was the level of self-rated health. The strongest correlation between the variables occurred at low moderator levels and gradually decreased as the moderator level increased.

Distributive justice. The analysis revealed a significant correlation between distributive justice and self-rated health at two moderator levels: low ($b = 1.09$; $SE = 0.17$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.77; 1.42]) and average ($b = 0.59$; $SE = 0.12$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.35; 0.83]). The correlation between the variables was positive, indicating that with a higher level of distributive justice, the level of self-rated health increased. For high levels of support from supervisors, the effect was found not to be significant ($b = 0.14$; $SE = 0.16$; $p = 0.377$; 95%CI [-0.18; 0.46]).

Retributive justice. A significant correlation was found between retributive justice and self-rated health at two moderator levels: low ($b = 0.87$; $SE = 0.19$; $p < 0.001$; 95%CI [0.49; 1.25]) and average ($b = 0.55$; $SE = 0.17$; $p = 0.001$; 95%CI [0.22; 0.88]), similarly to distributive justice. The regression coefficients were positive, indicating that with higher levels of retributive justice, the level of self-rated health increased. For high levels of support from supervisors as a moderator, the effect was found not to be significant ($b = 0.26$; $SE = 0.22$; $p = 0.246$; 95%CI [-0.18; 0.70]).

Interpersonal justice from coworkers. For interpersonal justice from coworkers, as with the previously discussed dimensions of justice, the correlation with self-rated health was significant only at low (*b* = 0.882; *SE* = 0.21; *p* < 0.001; 95%CI [0.41; 1.24]) and average (*b* = 0.48; *SE* = 0.19; *p* = 0.012; 95%CI [0.10; 0.86]) levels of support from the supervisor. For high levels of support, the effect was found not to be significant (*b* = 0.17; *SE* = 0.26; *p* = 0.499; 95%CI [-0.33; 0.68]). Higher levels of interpersonal justice were associated with higher level of self-rated health.

5. Discussion

The concept of justice emerged from analyses of the mechanisms of ineffective employee behavior. It is a relevant issue from the perspective of benefits for the organization as it has a scientifically proven role in the development of work engagement. However, it is a subjective construct [31].

The content that makes up the sense of justice is manifested in assessments of the practices used towards employees in the organization [32]. Its low scores can reduce productivity by negative emotions experienced among employees such as anger [33]. It has been proven, for example, that in the case of hotel staff, procedural justice influences turnover intention [34]. The results also showed that organizational justice has an important effect on sustainable employee development, builds motivation, and benefits business as a result [35–37]. Sustainable development is considered to be one of the main categories describing the modern world [38].

The main conclusion drawn from the study is that a sense of justice is important for the shaping of self-rated health among professionally active people in general. In a study of hospital medical staff and other employees, the results were the same regarding the role of justice in shaping self-rated health. It is well known that these correlations are also significant when variables such as workload, job control and social support are taken into account [39].

The broad approach to well-being in science makes it possible to conduct analyses aimed at fathoming the correlation between a sense of justice and health from various perspectives. And as studies to date have shown, procedural justice has a negative correlation with psychological distress and a positive correlation with work engagement. Furthermore, procedural justice has positive effects on organizational trust, organizational commitment. The correlation between selected dimensions of organizational justice and psychological distress was mediated by the reward at work factor [40]. It seems reasonable to conclude that if procedures in an organization are: ethical, lawful, based on facts, properly implemented, translate into employee psychological well-being [41]. At the same time, the perception of the organization as unjust is associated with an increased sense of stress and psychophysical symptoms [42]. Employees with a low sense of justice at work and working in an environment of unsupportive superiors are more likely to exhibit anti-health behaviors [43]. In view of the above, it should be considered that the presented study contributes to the current of knowledge on the positive role of the organizational justice in the shaping of employee well-being.

Employee engagement was adopted in the model as the second correlation moderator. The literature to date indicated its mediating effect, including in the correlation between organizational justice and mental health in a group of IT employees [44]. High engagement means low turnover or productivity in the organization [45] and is a "desirable condition" [46]. The positive consequences of high work engagement also translate into the state of health [47]. This can be of importance for a person's efficiency, optimal stress management, and, as a result, low absenteeism due to illness. To date, it has been established that work engagement mediated the association between emotion regulation and mental health of professionals working in long-term care institutions for older adults [48]. In longitudinal studies, work engagement predicted job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, but also mental health problems. Analyses further revealed that none of these variables could be considered only a cause or merely a consequence [49].

Both the concept of work engagement developed by Schaufeli et al. and Kahn's [50] include the vigor, dedication and absorption components providing a wealth of material for analysis of this variable [23]. The present study highlighted the importance of lower scores on the UWES subscale: dedication as a significant moderator. The sense of procedural justice in the study remained in

correlation with self-rated health, with an insignificant effect for high levels of dedication. In contrast, in the correlation interpersonal justice and self-rated health, the strongest moderating effect was revealed at low levels of dedication. Schaufeli and Bakker indicate that dedication is an emotional component of work engagement. Dedication is a sense of enthusiasm, pride, significance (a sense of honor) [26]. It is a state in which the employee cares deeply about their work, finds it important, purposeful, and at the same time inspiring and challenging. The need to achieve satisfaction was found to be directly related to work engagement, and in particular to employee dedication [51].

A variety of individual factors are known to be determinants of work engagement [52]. The analyses conducted after surveying hotel staff revealed that employees who are married, such as those who are 41 years of age and older, are more dedicated to work. At the same time, employees who do not want to lose their work environment become more engaged in their work if they receive organizational support [53]. The present analyses did not include comparisons using a breakdown of the groups studied in the model. As has been shown thus far, employee indices of sustainable employment in all age groups are related to their subjective job evaluations. Moreover, an age-supportive organizational is especially important for shaping commitment among older employees [54].

In the present study, the aim of the analyses was to determine whether organizational justice and other working conditions are in correlation with employees' self-rated health, and whether this is moderated by support. The moderator of support at work in its two forms: from coworkers and from superiors, proved to be of different significance in the presented study. In relation to the correlation of justice and its dimensions and self-rated health, support from superiors demonstrated a more frequent effect. The importance of this moderator varied, depending on its intensity. High levels of this moderator were not significant. The study was not dedicated to a selected professional group, and it is difficult to read the professional context in which support from superiors may have mattered (or not) to the subjects. It seems that the role of supervisors in teamwork is of particular importance, e.g., among medical employees of the selected hospital department, and for employees with little seniority (little professional experience) and a high sense of responsibility, e.g., soldiers [55,56] or Prison Service personnel [57]. What raises questions is that its high level does not play as much of a role as the lower level.

The significance of role clarity did not become apparent in the study despite it being documented in the literature [58]. In customer service, for example, role clarity helps build an employee's understanding of the requirements regarding their professional role [59]. Lack of role clarity has also been linked to burnout symptoms [60]. At the same time, inexperience among younger employees projects a lack of clarity about what they expect from their workplace [61]. If an employee lacks a clearly defined professional role, this can, in effect, mean that they do not know what is expected of them. In the study, the average age was 39, and this variable may have had a bearing on the analysis results obtained. It seems reasonable to investigate whether individuals with low role clarity (e.g., those starting out) and those with high role clarity (e.g., those who have been employed in a particular position for a long time) estimate their health differently, and whether the moderating effect of job resources is different in these two groups.

6. Limitations of the Study and Implications for the Future

From the point of view of sustainability, the functioning of organizations involves a broad spectrum of psychological issues. The notion of sustainable human development itself, understood by Holling (2001) as the capacity to create, test, and maintain adaptive capability, leads to viewing sustainability as a dynamic process [62]. Sustainability denotes a balance between individual and organizational needs. Sustainable careers are an important aspect which may explain, among others, job satisfaction, high well-being, and work engagement [63].

In the present study, the dependent variable was self-rated health. The Cantril ladder tool was used for this purpose, which allows only a generalized description by the respondents. Other health assessment tools allow health estimates taking into account the mental and physical aspects. Additional questions including sickness absences would provide a broader picture of the correlation.

In addition, further research with consideration of path analyses could adopt the model: organizational justice assessment ➡ self-rated health ➡ consequences for the organization. For example, it could be assumed that with low levels of justice and low levels of health, there is an increased tendency toward counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Thus far, it has been established that, in contrast to distributive justice, procedural and interpersonal justice are positively and significantly associated with CWB [64]. Organizational constraints, interpersonal conflicts and perceived injustice are stressors at work and CWB can be seen as a response to experienced tension [65].

Another aspect worth considering is the selection of respondents for the study. The sample was made up of professionally active adults. Numerous scientific studies adopt targeted selection in terms of professional groups in relation to the issue of organizational justice. It is certainly important to take into account the context resulting from the job specifics. At the same time, the selection of a comparison group allows to control to the extent to which the adopted research model indicates universal (different) tendencies between variables. Undoubtedly, a comparison with a group of people representing organizations that have introduced justice procedures and are verifying their implementation would also be an interesting project, expanding the existing knowledge in this area.

It may interesting to consider organizational sustainability from the perspective of specific sectors of the economy (e.g., industry, agriculture, services). Some definitions and concepts of organizational sustainability refer to building sustainable practices which affect response time. In the context of some specific professions (e.g., uniformed services or healthcare), response time is crucial for the health and safety of others. Thus, it seems pertinent to examine these aspects in light of organizational sustainability principles. For example, it could be examined how the relationship between sustainability and response time shapes employee quality of life [66] and whether the significant role of leaders in this process can be confirmed [67,68].

Furthermore, the analysis of objective determinants of perceptions of organizational justice (such as type and place in the organizational hierarchy), seems practically reasonable. Determining the profile of a person exposed to a sense of injustice may be important for describing the extent to which those overlooked, e.g., in the distribution of resources, are key employees in the organization. Other characteristics such as gender or marital status, job seniority have thus far made it possible to predict the intensity of the sense of justice in the organization [69]. In the study, gender differentiated the correlation, men with a higher risk of impaired health, obtained lower levels of justice and job control and higher levels of demands and effort-reward imbalance [70].

Relative to the data obtained, an interesting and important thread to continue would be to analyze the functioning and health implications in highly engaged employees. Engaged employees are mentally healthy employees [71]. At the same time, using the knowledge of engagement and workaholism, it is worth examining these forms of investing one's resources in work, with various ways of realization and various causes [72]. The experience at work is extremely different in workaholics where, the ability to recover is reduced [73].

Employee engagement so broadly analyzed to date is still a worthwhile research subject in the face of contemporary labor market problems arising from the outflow of human capital from center stage professions from the point of view of the functioning of the state: education, uniformed services and health care. There are scientific studies that have correlated work engagement and health in a group of teachers [74]. They revealed that the correlation of demands at work and ill health is mediated by burnout, that work engagement mediates the work resource-commitment correlation and that lack of resources at work-low engagement is mediated by burnout. It seems reasonable, to test the model on other professional groups indicated above, taking into account organizational justice.

Considering the above, there is a need for further studies and implementation of knowledge on sustainable career. Various modern patterns of work demand viewing this sphere of life as constantly changing according to life experience [75].

Organizational sustainability is greatly enhanced by organizational justice. Employee job satisfaction, reduced stress, and increased psychological well-being are all correlated with fairness in

organizational processes, interactions, and results [76]. Workers are more likely to be involved in their work, contribute well to the company, and stick with it during challenging times when they believe they are treated fairly at work [77–79]. Additionally, there is a negative correlation between organizational justice and the inclination to leave [80,81]. When coupled with high levels of work engagement and supervisor support, organizations that place a high priority on integrity in their interactions boost stakeholder trust and contribute to long-term sustainability [82].

The future of sustainability has an empirically validated beginning in education of young people, although it can also be implemented through workshops for adult employees of organizations [83].

7. Conclusions

In view of the research results obtained, their analysis, and based on the literature, the following can be concluded:

(1) The significance of work engagement became most pronounced at the level of dedication being one of its components. It turns out that dedication is a moderator of the impact of all measured types of justice and job control. The sense of procedural justice in the study remained in correlation with self-rated health, with an insignificant effect for high levels of dedication. In the assumed research model, dedication appeared to be more significant than the other two components of work engagement: vigor and absorption.

(2) A sense of justice is important in shaping self-rated health among professionally active people in general. The literature to date has indicated correlations between justice and employee well-being, across various occupational groups. It should be considered that the present study contributes to the current of knowledge on the positive role of organizational justice in shaping employee well-being.

(3) In view of the results obtained, it is reasonable to conclude that a stronger moderating influence is exerted by the behavior of superiors on the correlation between organizational justice and health, and it more strongly shapes self-rated health of employees than support from coworkers. Job specifics may allow the interpretation of this result.

(4) Job resources (organizational support and work engagement) did not moderate the influence of role clarity on self-rated health. Analyzing the literature, one might have expected such a moderating effect of job resources. In view of the above, it seems important to take into account the issue of job seniority and experience in the profession counted in years.

(5) A review of the literature to date revealed that it is common to select specific occupational groups for assessing the role of organizational justice in the shaping of well-being. It does not provide an overall picture of the importance of this factor and only shows the specifics of how it functions within given organizations. Continued research is relevant to changing needs in the labor market and in view of reports on the role of employee well-being in their functioning within the organization.

(6) Fostering employee well-being and welfare is related to organizational sustainability. Managing the organization such as to engender a sense of justice in the employees represents an important factor in organizational environment evaluations.

References

1. Galwas-Grzeszkiewicz, M. Warunki pracy w Polsce i Europie — przegląd wyników badań europejskich [Working conditions in Poland and Europe - an overview of European research results]. *Bezp. Pracy Nauka i Prak.* **2018**, *12*, 8–11. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0012.7786

2. Stańczak, A.; Mościcka-Teske, A.; Merecz-Kot, D. Psychosocial risks and the job activity of banking sector employees. *Med. Pr. Work Health Saf.* **2014**, *65*(4), 507–519. DOI: 10.13075/mp.5893.00055

3. Żołnierczyk-Zreda, D. The type of employment contract and employees' health and occupational functioning — The review of studies. *Med. Pr. Work Health Saf.* **2015**, *66*(4), 565–573. DOI: 10.13075/mp.5893.00221

4. Oke, A.; Dawson, P. The role of socio-cultural norms in workplace stress: An empirical study of bank employees in Nigeria. *Int. J. Manage.* **2012**, *29*(1), 314–331.

5. World Health Organization. Summary Reports on Proceedings Minutes and Final Acts of the International Health Conference held in New York from 19 June to 22 July 1946. *World Health Organization*, **1948**. Available from: https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/85573

6. Al-Shaer, E.A.; Aliedan, M.M.; Zayed, M.A.; Elrayah, M.; Moustafa, M.A. Mental Health and Quality of Life among University Students with Disabilities: The Moderating Role of Religiosity and Social Connectedness. *Sustainability* **2024**, *16*, 644. DOI: 10.3390/su16020644

7. Di Fabio, A. The psychology of sustainability and sustainable development for well-being in organizations. *Front. Psychol.* **2017**, *8*, 1534. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01534

8. Eeckelaert, L.; Dhondt, S.; Oeij, P.; Pot, F.; Nicolescu, G.I.; Trifu, A.; Webster, J. *Review of workplace innovation and its relation with occupational safety and health, Publications Office of the European Union*, 2012. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, Luxembourg. Access: 12.03.2024 https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/111807/111807.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

9. Eib, C.; Bernhard-Oettel, C.; Magnusson Hanson, L. Ei.; Leineweber, C. Organizational justice and health: Studying mental preoccupation with work and social support as mediators for lagged and reversed relationships. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2018,** *23*(4), 553–567 DOI: 10.1037/ocp0000115

10. Claponea, R.M.; Iorga, M. The Relationship between Burnout and Wellbeing Using Social Support, Organizational Justice, and Lifelong Learning in Healthcare Specialists from Romania. *Medicina* **2023**, *59*(7), 1352. DOI: 10.3390/medicina59071352

11. Macko, M. Poczucie sprawiedliwości organizacyjnej a zachowania pracowników [Sense of organizational justice and employee behawior]. *Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNS UAM*, **2009**.

12. Özer, Ö.; Uğurluoğlu, Ö.; Saygili, M. Effect of Organizational Justice on Work Engagement in Healthcare Sector of Turkey. *J. Health Manag.* **2017**, *19*(1), 73–83. DOI: 10.1177/0972063416682562

13. Lee, S.; Hong, S.; Lee, B.G. Is There a Right Way to Lay Off Employees in Times of Crisis?: The Role of Organizational Justice in the Case of Airbnb. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*(5), 4690. DOI: 10.3390/su15054690

14. Tufan, C.; Namal, M.K.; Arpat, B.; Yesil, Y.; Mert, I.S. The Mediating Effect of Organizational Justice Perception on the Relationship between Ethical Leadership and Workplace Deviant Behaviors. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*(2), 1342. DOI: 10.3390/su15021342

15. Cachón-Alonso, L.; Elovainio, M. Organizational Justice and Health: Reviewing Two Decades of Studies. *J. Theor. Soc. Psychol.* **2022**, Article ID 3218883. DOI: 10.1155/2022/3218883

16. Kim, S. IT Employee Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector. *Int. J. Public Adm.* **2009**, *32*(12), 1070–1097. DOI: 10.1080/01900690903170303

17. Ibrahim, R.Z.A.R.; Zalam, W.Z.M.; Foster, B.; Afrizal, T.; Johansyah, M.D.; Saputra, J.; Bakar, A.A.; Dagang, M.M.; Ali, S.N.M. Psychosocial Work Environment and Teachers' Psychological Well-Being: The Moderating Role of Job Control and Social Support. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2021**, *18*(14), 7308. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18147308

18. Bakker, A.B.; Schaufeli, W.B.; Leiter, M.P.; Taris, T.W. Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress* **2008**, *22*(3), 187–200. DOI: 10.1080/02678370802393649

19. Kelloway, E.K.; Weigand, H.; McKee, M.C.; Das, H. Positive leadership and employee well-being. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* **2013**, *20*(1), 107–117. DOI: 10.1177/1548051812465892

20. Nowicka-Kostrzewska, J.; Rożnowski, B. "Personality in prison uniform". The influence of personality on building work engagement, applying job crafting strategies and well-being among prison officers. *Curr. Issues Pers. Psychol.* **2023**, *11*(4), 283–296. DOI: 10.5114/cipp.2021.110059

21. Schaufeli, W.B.; Bakker, A.B. Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2004**, *25*(3), 293–315. DOI: 10.1002/job.248

22. Tennant, C. Work-related stress and depressive disorders. *J. Psychosom. Res.* **2001**, *51*(50), 697–704. DOI: 10.1016/s0022-3999(01)00255-0

23. Perryer, C.; Jordan, C.,; Firns, I.; Travaglione, A. Predicting turnover intentions: The interactive effects of organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. *Manag. Res. Rev.* **2010**, *33*(9), 911–923. DOI: 10.1108/01409171011070323

24. Shimazu, A.; Schaufeli, W.; Kubota, K.; Watanabe, K.; Kawakami, N. Is too much work engagement detrimental? Linear or curvilinear effects on mental health and job performance. *PLoS One* **2018**, *13*, e0208684–17. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0208684

25. Mubashar, T.; Musharraf, S.; Khan, S.; Butt, T.A. Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational trust. *Cogent. Psych.* **2022**, *9*(1). DOI: 10.1080/23311908.2022.2080325

26. Schaufeli, W.B.; Bakker, A.B. UWES — Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Test Manual. *Department of Social and Organizational Psychology, Utrecht University: Utrecht, The Netherlands*, **2003**.

27. Macko, M. Poczucie sprawiedliwości organizacyjnej a zachowania pracowników [Sense of organizational justice and employee behawior]. *Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNS UAM*, **2009**.

28. Fisher, G.G.; Matthews, R.A.; Gibbons, A.M. Developing and investigating the use of single-item measures in organizational research. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2016**, *21*(1), 3–23. DOI: 10.1037/a0039139

29. Levin, K.A.; Currie, C. Reliability and validity of an adapted version of the Cantril Ladder for use with adolescent samples. *Soc. Indic. Res.* **2014**, *119*, 1047–1063. DOI: 10.1007/s11205-013-0507-4

30. George, D.; Mallery, P. IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference. *Routledge*, **2019**.

31. Zhou, H.; Ma, J. Organizational Justice and Teachers' Turnover Intention in Primary and Secondary Schools: The Importance of Sustainable Salary Management. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 13314. DOI: 10.3390/su142013314

32. Byrne, Z.S.; Cropanzano, R. The history of organizational justice: The founders speak. In *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* **2001**, *1*, 3–26. Erlbaum.

33. Robinson, S.L.; Morrison, E.W. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2000**, *21*(5), 525–546. DOI: 10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:53.0.CO;2-T

34. Edrees, HNE.; Sobaih, AEE.; Gharbi, H.; Abu Elnasr, AE. The Influences of Procedural Justice on Turnover Intention and Social Loafing Behavior among Hotel Employees. *J. Risk Financ. Manag.* **2023**, *16*(2), 75. DOI: 10.3390/jrfm16020075

35. Fatima, M.; Izhar, Z.; Kazmi, D.Z.A. Organizational Justice and Employee Sustainability: The Mediating Role of Organizational commitment SEISENSE. *J. Manag.* **2020**, *3*(3), 12–22. DOI: 10.33215/sjom.v3i3.334

36. Lee, H.-W.; Rhee, D.-Y. Effects of Organizational Justice on Employee Satisfaction: Integrating the Exchange and the Value-Based Perspectives. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 5993. DOI: 10.3390/su15075993

37. Cugueró-Escofet, N.; Fortin, M. How Should We Distribute Rewards in Social Sustainable Organizations? Investigating Individual Preferences for Justice Allocation Norms. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 1841. DOI: 10.3390/su14031841

38. Bonini, S.,; Görner, S.; Jones, A. *How companies manage sustainability: McKinsey Global Survey results*. *McKinsey Quarterly*, **2010.**

39. Elovainio, M.; Kivimäki, M.; Vahtera, J. Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health. *Am. J. Public Health* **2002**, *92*, 105–108. DOI: 10.2105/ajph.92.1.105

40. Inoue, A.; Kawakami, N.; Ishizaki, M.; Shimazu, A.; Tsuchiya, M.; Tabata, M.; Akiyama, M.; Kitazume, A.; Kuroda, M. Organizational justice, psychological distress, and work engagement in Japanese workers. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health* **2010**, *83*(1), 29–38. DOI: 10.1007/s00420-009-0485-7

41. Colquitt, J.A.; Jackson, C.L. Justice in teams: the context sensitivity of justice rules across individual and team contexts. *J. App. Soc. Psych.* **2006**, *36*, 868–899. DOI: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00047.x

42. Magnavita, N.; Chiorri, C.; Acquadro Maran, D.; Garbarino, S.; Di Prinzio, R.R.; Gasbarri, M.; Matera, C.; Cerrina, A.; Gabriele, M.; Labella, M. Organizational Justice and Health: A Survey in Hospital Workers. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 9739. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19159739

43. Kobayashi, Y.; Kondo, N. Organizational justice, psychological distress, and stress-related behaviors by occupational class in female Japanese employees. *PLoS ONE* **2019**, *14*, e0214393.

44. Sharma, P.K.; Kumra, R. Relationship between workplace spirituality, organizational justice and mental health: mediation role of employee engagement. *J. Adv. Man. Res.* **2020**, *17*(5), 627–650. DOI: 10.1108/JAMR-01-2020-0007

45. Baumruk, R. Why managers are crucial to increasing engagement. *Strat. HR Rev.* **2006**, Melcrum Publishing.

46. Macey, W.H.; Schneider, B. The meaning of employee engagement. *Ind. Organ. Psychol.* **2008**, *1*, 3–30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

47. Demerouti, E.; Bakker, A.B.; de Jonge, J.; et al. Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* **2001**, *27*, 279–286. DOI: 10.5271/sjweh.615

48. Wobeto, M.I.; Brites, R.; Hipólito, J.; Nunes, O.; Brandão, T. Emotion regulation and mental health among professionals of long-term care institutions for older adults: The mediating role of work engagement. *Health Psychol. Rep.* **2023**, *11*(2), 124–133. DOI: 10.5114/hpr/156259

49. Simbula, S.; Guglielmi, D. I am engaged, I feel good, and I go the extra-mile: Reciprocal relationships between work engagement and consequences. *J. Work Organ. Psych.* **2013**, *29*, 117–125. DOI: 10.5093/tr2013a17

50. Kahn, W.A. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Acad. Manage. J.* **1990**, *33*(4), 692–724. DOI: 10.2307/256287

51. Vandenabeele, W. Explaining public service motivation: The role of leadership and basic needs satisfaction. *Rev. Public Pers. Adm.* **2014**, *34*, 153–173. DOI: 10.1177/0734371X14521458

52. Robinson, I. Human Resource Management in Organisations. *London, CIPD*, **2006**.

53. Dalgıç, A.; Akgunduz, Y. Sosyal ve ekonomik degiş̧imin otel çalışanlarının işe adanmışlık ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi. *J. Tour. Theo. Res.* **2019**, *5*(2), 75–85.

54. van Dam, K.; Van Vuuren, T.; Kemps, S. Sustainable employment: the importance of intrinsically valuable work and an age-supportive climate. *I. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2017**, *28*(17), 2449–2472. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2015.1137607

55. Kasemaa, A.; Säälik, Ü. Personality predicting military morale and the role of positive and negative affectivity. *Curr. Issues Pers. Psychol.* **2023**, *11*(4), 269-282. DOI: 10.5114/cipp/156046

56. Piotrowski, A.; Boe, O.; Rawat, S.; Deshpande, A.P. Organizational climate, organizational support and citizenship behavior in the army. *Scien. J. Military Univer. Land Forc.* **2020**, *52*, 698–713. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.3964

57. Sygit-Kowalkowska, E.; Piotrowski, A.; Boe, O.; Rawat, S.; Minic, J.; Predoiu, A.; Predoiu, R.; Vazne, Ž.; Fernate, A.; Malinauskas, R.; et al. Evaluation of Work Mode and Its Importance for Home–Work and Work–Home Relationships: The Role of Resilience, Coping with Stress, and Passion for Work. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 14491. DOI:0.3390/ijerph192114491

58. Subhash C. Kundu, Sandeep Kumar, Kusum Lata. Effects of perceived role clarity on innovative work behavior: a multiple mediation model. *RAUSP Manag. J.* **2020**, *55*(4), 457–472. DOI: 10.1108/RAUSP-04-2019-0056

59. Bush, R.F.; Busch, P. The relationship of tenure and age to role clarity and its consequences in the industrial salesforce. *J. Pers. Sell. Sales Manag.* **1981**, *2*(1), 17–23.

60. Örtqvist, D.; Wincent, J. Prominent consequences of role stress: A meta-analytic review. *Int. J. Stress Manag.* **2006**, *13*, 399–422. DOI: 10.1037/1072- 5245.13.4.399

61. Robertson-Smith, G.; Markwick, C. Employee Engagement: A Review of Current Thinking. Brighton, Institute for Employment Studies, **2009**.

62. Holling, C. Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems. *Ecosystems* **2001**, *4*, 390–405. DOI: 10.1007/s10021-001-0101

63. Heijden, B.V.D.; Vos, A.D. *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Careers: Research Handbooks in Business and Management series*, **2015**. Edward Elgar Publishing.

64. Adugna, K.; Birhanu, B.; Kebede, A.; Abraham, G.; Asefa, Y.; Gezahign, M.; Gunja, G.; Gelana, B. The Relation Between Organizational Justice and Counter-Productive Work Behavior Among Health Care Professionals in Jimma Zone Public Health Institutions. *J. Healthc. Leadersh.* **2022**, *14*, 119–130. DOI: 10.2147/JHL.S365129

65. Fox, S.; Spector, P.E.; Miles, D. Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2001**, *59*(3), 291–309. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803

66. Rahman, M.; Wahab, S.A.; Latiff, A.S.A. Definitions and Concepts of Organizational Sustainability: A Literature Analysis. *Soci. Sus.* **2022**, *4*, 21–32. DOI: 10.38157/ss.v4i2.496

67. Goehrig, R. The role of leadership in building high performing, sustainable organizations. *Gov. Fin. Rev.* **2008**, *24*, 6–14.

68. Hind, P.; Wilson, A.; Lenssen, G. Developing leaders for sustainable business. *Int. J. Bus. Soc.* **2009**, *9*, 7–20.

69. Ghasi, N.C.; Ogbuabor, D.C.; Onodugo, V.A. Perceptions and predictors of organizational justice among healthcare professionals in academic hospitals in South-Eastern Nigeria. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* **2020**, *20(1)*, 301. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-020-05187-5

70. Kivimäki, M.; Ferrie, J.E.; Head, J.; Shipley, M.J.; Vahtera, J.; Marmot, M.G. Organisational justice and change in justice as predictors of employee health: the Whitehall II study. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* **2004**, *58*, 931–937. DOI:10.1136/jech.2003.019026

71. Schaufeli, W.B.; Taris, T.; Le Blanc, P.; Peeters, M.; Bakker, A.; De Jonge, J. Maakt arbeid gezond? Op zoek naar de bevlogen werknemer [Can work produce health? The quest for the engaged worker]. *De Psycholoog* **2001**, *36*, 422–428.

72. Hakanen, J.; Peeters, M. How Do Work Engagement, Workaholism, and the Work-to-Family Interface Affect Each Other? A 7-Year Follow-Up Study. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2015**, *57*(6), 601–609. DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000000457
73. Sonnentag, S. Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2003**, *88(3)*, 518–528. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518
74. Hakanen, J.J.; Bakker, A.B.; Schaufeli, W.B. Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *J. Sch. Psychol.* **2006**, *43(6)*, 495–513. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001
75. Bal, P. M.; Matthews, L.; Dóci, E.; McCarthy, L.P. An ideological analysis of sustainable careers: identifying the role of fantasy and a way forward. *Career Dev. Int.* **2021**, *26*, 83–101. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-05-2020-0114
76. Greenberg, J.; Colquitt, J.A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Justice*; Psychology Press: New York, **2013**.
77. Masterson, S.S.; Lewis, K.; Goldman, B.M.; Taylor, M.S. Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2000**, *43*(4), 738–748. DOI: 10.2307/1556364
78. Lee, S.; Hong, S.; Shin, W.-Y.; Lee, B.G. The Experiences of Layoff Survivors: Navigating Organizational Justice in Times of Crisis. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*(24), 16717. DOI: 10.3390/su152416717
79. Eisenberger, R.; Rockstuhl, T.; Shoss, M.K.; Wen, X.; Dulebohn, J. Is the employee–organization relationship dying or thriving? A temporal meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2019**, *104*(8), 1036–1057. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000390
80. Tekleab, A.G.; Takeuchi, R.; Taylor, M.S. Extending the chain of relationships among organizational justice, social exchange, and employee reactions: The role of contract violations. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2005**, *48*(1), 146–157.
81. Chang, Y.; Kim, C.; Yoo, J. Does Justice Matter? Evaluating the Usefulness of Commitment and Innovative Work Behavior as a Predictor of Turnover Intention of Korean Employees. *Sustainability* **2024**, *16*(3), 1054. DOI: 10.3390/su16031054
82. Gond, J.P.; El Akremi, A.; Swaen, V.; Babu, N. The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2017**, *38*(2), 225–246. DOI: 10.1002/job.2170
83. Moceri, D.C.; Elias, M. J.; Fishman, D.B.; Pandina, R.; Reyes-Portillo, J. A. The urgency of doing: Assessing the system of sustainable implementation model via the Schools Implementing Towards Sustainability (SITS) Scale. *J. Community Psychol.* **2012**, *40*, 501–519. DOI: 10.1002/jcop.21477