

Sınıfta Adalet Algısı ile Sürekli Umut Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki

Sinem TARHAN, Bartın Üniversitesi, ORCID: 0000-0001-7297-2499

Öz

Adalet kavramının okul ortamındaki yansıması olarak görülebilecek sınıfta adalet algısı öğrencilerin okula uyumlarının, gelecek planlarının, öğrenme motivasyonlarının, iyilik hallerinin, öz saygılarının güçlenmesinde ve antisosyal davranışların önlenmesinde önemli rol oynayan bir değişkendir. Bu araştırmada ele alınan diğer değişken umut ise bireylerin hayatına anlam katan, motivasyonlarını, uyumlarını, öz güvenlerini güçlendiren bir biliştir. Alanyazın incelendiğinde adalet algısı ile umut düzeyinin benzer değişkenlerle ilişkili olduğu gözlenmektedir. Bu doğrultuda çalışmanın birinci amacı sınıfta adalet ölçekleri puanları ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanı arasında katılımcıların demografik özelliklerine göre anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığı incelemek, ikincisi sınıfta adalet ölçekleri puanları ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanı arasında ne düzeyde bir ilişki olduğunu belirlemeye çalışmaktır.

Araştırmanın çalışma grubu Batı Karadeniz Bölgesinde bulunan bir il merkezindeki ortaöğretim kurumlarının 9-12. sınıflarına devam eden 507 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Çalışma grubunun tespitinde uygun örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Analiz sonucunda sürekli umut ölçeğinden alınan puanlar ile dağıtım adaleti, süreç adaleti ve etkileşim adaleti ölçeklerinden alınan puanlar arasında pozitif yönde ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkiler tespit edilmiştir. Bu doğrultuda pozitif psikolojinin önemli kavramlarından biri olan umut ile adalet algısı arasında birbirini güçlendiren bir ilişki olduğu söylenebilir. Çalışma öğrencilerin adalet algılarını ve umutlarını güçlendirmek için okullarda yapılabilecek etkinlikler üzerinde durularak tamamlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dağıtım Adaleti, Süreç Adaleti, Etkileşim Adaleti, Sürekli Umut



Inönü Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
Cilt 24, Sayı 1, 2023
ss. 99-123
[DOI](#)
10.17679/inuefd.1156799

Makale Türü
Araştırma Makalesi

Geliş Tarihi
05.08.2022

Kabul Tarihi
29.01.2023

Suggested Citation

Tarhan, S. (2023). The relationship between perception of classroom justice and dispositional hope. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 24(1), 99-123. DOI: 10.17679/inuefd.1156799

GENİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Öğretmenin iletişim becerisi, anlattığı konuya hakimiyeti, bilişsel esnekliği ve adaletli tutumu eğitimin verimli olmasında etkilidir. Örgütsel adaletin boyutları olan dağıtım ve süreç adaleti eğitime uyarlanmış (Paulsel, Chory-Assad ve Dunleavy,2005), bunlara etkileşim adaleti eklenerek sınıfta adaletin üç boyutu oluşturulmuştur (Chory (2007).

Öğrenciler açısından incelendiğinde dağıtım adaleti ödüllerin, notların ve cezaların öğrenciler arasında nasıl dağıtıldığıdır. Öğrenciler aldıkları notları, arkadaşlarının notları veya bekledikleri notlarla kıyasladıklarında, adil olup olmadığını algılayabilir (Chory-Assad ve Paulsel, 2004a), öğretmenlerinin öğrencileri değerlendirmek ve puanlamak için kullandıkları kriterleri adil ya da haksız bulabilirler (Berti, Molinari ve Speltini, 2010). Bu nedenle adalet ile birlikte rasyonellik kavramının dikkate alınması gerekir. Rasyonellik, kişiye yapılacak uygulamanın belli kurallarla önceden saptanması, kişinin keyfi bir muameleye maruz kalmamasıdır (Güriz,2001). Bu noktada süreç adaleti gündeme gelir. Süreç adaleti not vermede hangi kurallara uyulduğunu, sınavların nasıl yapıldığını, geri bildirimlerin nasıl verildiğini, sınıf kurallarının nasıl uygulandığını kapsar (Chory-Assad ve Paulsel, 2004a, Horan, Chory ve Goodboy,2010). Etkileşim adaleti ise öğretmenin öğrencilerin görüşlerini kabul etmesi, kaygılarını dikkate alması ve değer vererek öğrencilerle iletişime geçmesidir (Chory-Assad ve Paulsel, 2004a).

Dağıtım, süreç ve etkileşim adaleti ile öğrencilerin kurallara uygun davranmaları arasında pozitif bir ilişki vardır (Colquitt, 2001). Adaletsiz durumlar ise öğrencilerde öfke ve düşmanlık gibi negatif duygu ve davranışlara neden olmaktadır (Chory Assad ve Paulsel, 2004a). Yaşadıkları olaylar ne kadar olumsuz olursa olsun bireyler adaletin bir gün kesinlikle sağlanacağına inanmaya ihtiyaç duyarlar. Bu noktada adalet kadar eski ve önemli olan umut kavramı akla gelmektedir. Snyder (2002), umudu bireylerin hedeflere giden yolları üretme, bu yolları harekete geçirme ve sürekli kullanmaya yönelik algıladıkları kapasitesi olarak tanımlamıştır. Snyder (2002) umudu; amaçlar, alternatif yollar düşüncesi ve eyleyici düşünce olmak üzere üç bileşenle açıklamıştır. İnsanlar amaç yönelimlidir ve amaçlarını gerçekleştirmek için motive olurlar. Alternatif yollar düşüncesi kişinin arzulan hedefe ulaşmak için başarılı planlar yapabilme ve alternatif yollar üretebilme kapasitesine ilişkin algısıdır. Eyleyici düşünce amaca giden yolda engellerle karşılaşıldığında alternatif yollar düşüncesinin aktif olmasını sağlar. Alternatif yollar düşüncesi ise bireyin geçmişteki başarılı tecrübelerini göz önüne alarak yeni yollar bulmasına yardımcı olur (Snyder ve diğ., 1991; Snyder ve diğ. 2002).

Öğrencilerin umutlarının güçlenmesi için en etkili ortamlardan biri sınıf, en önemli faktör ise öğretmendir. Öğretmen, öğrencileri kendi amaçlarına giden yolları belirlemeleri, bu yolları kullanmaları, zorlukların üstesinden gelmeleri ve hayallerini gerçekleştirmeleri için motive eder. Öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinin adil davrandığı konusundaki öznel deneyimleri, öğrencilerin okul ortamına ilişkin algılarının olumlu olmasını sağlar (Peter ve Dalbert, 2010). Bu deneyim özellikle ergenler için çok önemlidir. Çünkü ergenler bu dönemde dünyaya bakışlarını ve sosyal haritalarını şekillendirmektedir (Resh, 2009). Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin arasındaki ilişki, hedefleri başarmak için birlikte çalıştıkları kişilerarası bir ilişkidir (Frymier ve Houser'a (2000). Öğretmenin adil oluşu ile ilgili algılar öğrencilerin becerileri, motivasyonları, çabaları, otoriteye karşı olumlu tutumları ve grupla birlikte çalışma becerileri ile yakından ilişkilidir (Chory, 2007; Chory-Assad, 2002). Adaletsizlik bireylerin çaresiz, mutsuz, umutsuz ve amaçsız hissetmelerine neden

olmaktadır. Bu nedenle öğrenci- öğretmen arasındaki ilişki ve iletişimlerde adalet algısı ve umut önemli bir belirleyicidir.

Çalışmanın Amacı

Çalışmanın iki amacı bulunmaktadır. Birincisi sınıfta adalet ölçekleri puanları ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanı arasında katılımcıların demografik özelliklerine göre anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığı incelemek, ikincisi sınıfta adalet ölçekleri puanları ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanı arasında ne düzeyde bir ilişki olduğunu belirlemeye çalışmaktır

Yöntem

Araştırma ilişkisel tarama modelindedir. Çalışma grubu Batı Karadeniz Bölgesindeki bir il merkezinde bulunan farklı ortaöğretim kurumlarının 9.,10.,11. ve 12. sınıflarına devam eden öğrencilerden oluşmaktadır. Çalışma grubunun tespitinde uygun örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri Sınıfta Adalet Ölçekleri ile Sürekli Umud Ölçeği kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Sınıfta Adalet Ölçekleri; Sınıfta Dağıtım Adaleti, Sınıfta Süreç Adaleti ve Sınıfta Etkileşim Adaleti olmak üzere üç farklı ölçekten oluşmaktadır. Eksik ve hatalı doldurulan formlar çıkarılmış ve 507 formdan elde edilen veriler analiz edilmiştir. Verilerin normal dağılım gösterip göstermediğini belirlemek için Kolmogorov-Smirnov testi yapılmış ve verilerin normal dağılım sağlamadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu nedenle analizlerde non-parametric testler kullanılmıştır (Mann Whitney-U testi, Kruskal Wallis H-testi, Spearman Sıra Farkları). Karşılaştırmalar sonrasında anlamlı bir fark çıkması sonucunda Mann Whitney U-testi ve Bonferroni düzeltmesi kullanılarak farkın kaynağı tespit edilmiştir.

Bulgular

Cinsiyete göre, dağıtım adaletinde erkek öğrencilerin sıra ortalaması (290.90), kız öğrencilerden (224.80) daha yüksek olup aralarında anlamlı fark vardır ve etki büyüklüğü düşük düzeydedir ($U=23431$; $Z=-5.047$; $p<0.05$; $r=-.22$). Dağıtım adaletinde anlamlı fark erkek öğrenciler lehinedir. Kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında süreç adaleti ($U=30264$; $Z=-.874$; $p>0,05$), etkileşim adaleti ($U=31191$; $Z=-.309$; $p>0,05$) ve sürekli umut ölçeği ($U=28721$; $Z=-1.817$; $p>0,05$) puanları açısından anlamlı bir fark tespit edilmemiştir

Sınıf düzeyine göre, dağıtım adaleti ortalama puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark vardır ve etki büyüklüğü düşük düzeydedir ($X^2_{(3)}=9.392$; $p<.05$; $\eta^2=0,018$). Anlamlı farkın hangi grup ya da gruplardan kaynaklandığını bulmak için yapılan Mann-Whitney U testi sonucuna göre, 9. Sınıf ($U= 11719,5$; $p = 0,003$) ile 11 sınıf düzeyinde olan öğrenciler arasında,11. Sınıfta olan öğrenciler lehine anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur

Okul türüne göre, süreç adaleti ortalama puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark vardır ve etki büyüklüğü düşük düzeydedir ($X^2_{(5)}=26.457$; $p<.05$; $\eta^2=0,052$). Okul türüne göre, etkileşim adaleti ortalama puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark vardır ve etki büyüklüğü orta düzeydedir ($X^2_{(5)}=37.245$; $p<.05$; $\eta^2=0,073$). Anlamlı farkın hangi grup ya da gruplardan kaynaklandığını bulmak için yapılan Mann-Whitney U testi sonucuna göre; Süreç adaletinde okul türü fen lisesi olanlar lehine lisede ($U= 83.5$; $p = 0,001$), Anadolu lisesinde ($U= 2624$; $p = 0,000$), mesleki ve teknik lisede ($U= 935,5$; $p = 0,001$) öğrenim gören öğrenciler arasında anlamlı fark bulunmuştur. Etkileşim adaletinde okul türü fen lisesi olanlar lehine lisede ($U= 59$; $p = 0,000$) Anadolu lisesinde ($U= 2122$; $p = 0,000$), imam hatip lisesinde ($U= 610$; $p = 0,000$), mesleki ve teknik lisede ($U= 642$; $p = 0,000$), güzel sanatlar lisesinde ($U= 177,5$; $p = 0,000$) öğrenim gören öğrenciler arasında anlamlı fark bulunmuştur.

Analiz sonucunda sınıfta dağıtım adaleti ölçeği puanı ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanı arasındaki ilişki $r = .22$; sınıfta süreç adaleti ölçeği ile sürekli umut ölçeği arasındaki ilişki $r = .22$; sınıfta etkileşim adaleti ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanları arasındaki ilişki $r = .13$ olarak tespit edilmiştir. Sınıfta adalet ölçekleri ile sürekli umut ölçeği puanları arasında pozitif yönde ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ($p < .01$) ilişkiler saptanmıştır.

Dağıtım adaleti ölçeği beklenen adalet ve mevcut adalet olmak üzere iki alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada öğrencilerin beklenen adalet puanları mevcut adalet puanlarından daha yüksek bulunmuştur. Bu durum öğrencilerin daha iyi notlar alabileceklerini umut ettiklerini göstermektedir. Beklentinin adalet algısında önemli olduğu, öğrencilerin adaletli durumları tanımlarken mutluluk, doyum, değerli olma hissi ve umutluluk gibi pozitif duyguları kullandıkları, adaletsiz durumlardan söz ederken de öfke, üzüntü, hayal kırıklığı ve utanma gibi negatif duyguları kullandıkları belirlenmiştir.

Bu çalışmada etkileşim adaleti ile süreç adaleti arasındaki ilişki $.64$ ($p < .001$) olarak hesaplanmıştır. Öğretmen öğrenci arasındaki ilişkide adalet algısı verilen notlardan çok ilişkinin kalitesi ile değerlendirilmektedir. Öğretmenlerin iletişim becerileri; öğretimin verimli olmasında, öğrencilerin benlik algılarının desteklenmesinde ve gerek öğrenciler gerekse öğrencilerle öğretmenler arasında yaşanan çatışmaların çözümünde çok önemlidir. Benzer şekilde umut da öğrencilerin not ortalaması ve mezun olma ihtimalleri ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir. Öğrenciler öğretmenlerinden daha çok duygusal destek aldıklarında kendilerini daha keyifli, gururlu ve umutlu hissetmektedirler. Başarı duygusu öğrencilerin çeşitli öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmaları, öz düzenlemeli öğrenmeleri ve akademik performansları ile bağlantılıdır.

Tartışma ve Yorum

Öğrencilerin kendileri ve içinde yaşadıkları toplumla barışık, sorumluluk bilincine sahip bireyler olabilmeleri büyüme sürecinde adalet konusunda edindikleri bilgi ve yaşadıkları tecrübelerle bağlıdır. Evinin, okulunun ve içinde yaşadığı toplumun adil olduğunu düşünen bireylerde umutlu düşünme ve geleceğe ilişkin plan yapma becerisi gelişir.

Okullarda adaletli uygulamaları destekleyerek öğrencilerin umutlarını güçlendirmek için öğretmenlerin ve okul psikolojik danışmanlarının sözel ve davranışsal tepkilerini gözden geçirmeleri, öğrencilere rol model olmaları gerekir. Ayrıca öğrencilerine gerçekçi umutlar beslemeyi öğretmeleri, tüm uygulamalarında çocuğun yüksek yararı ilkesini göz önünde bulundurmaları gerekir.

The Relationship between Perception of Classroom Justice and Dispositional Hope

Sinem TARHAN, Bartın Üniversitesi, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7297-2499

Abstract

Classroom justice can be considered an extension of school justice and is important in reinforcing students' school adaptation, planning skills, learning motivation, well-being, and self-esteem, and deterring antisocial behaviors. Hope is cognition that brings meaning to life and enhances motivation, adaptation, and self-confidence. In the literature, justice perception and hope are correlated with similar variables.

Therefore, the first objective is to examine whether there is a significant difference between the scores on the Classroom Justice Scales and the Dispositional Hope, depending on the demographic characteristics of the participants. The second objective is to find out the extent to which there is a relationship between the results of the Classroom Justice Scales and the results of the Dispositional Hope Scale. The study sample consists of 9th and 12th grade 507 students in an urban center in the Western Black Sea region. Convenience sampling technique was utilized in the study. The analysis revealed significant results for boys and 11th grade students on distributive justice. Also, the significant result was found in favor of science high school students in interaction and procedural justice scores. Positive and statistically significant correlations were found between the scores on the Continuous Hope Scale and the scores on the distributive, procedural, and interactional justice scales, indicating a mutually reinforcing relationship between hope, a central concept of positive psychology, and justice perception. Accordingly, activities to improve students' sense of justice and to promote hope were highlighted in light of the results.

Keywords: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Dispositional Hope



Inonu University
Journal of the Faculty of
Education
Vol 24, No 1, 2023
pp. 99-123
DOI
10.17679/inuefd.1156799

Article Type
Research Article

Received
05.08.2022

Accepted
29.01.2023

Önerilen Atıf

Tarhan, S. (2023). The relationship between perception of classroom justice and dispositional hope. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 24(1), 99-123. DOI: 10.17679/inuefd.1156799

The Relationship between Perception of Classroom Justice and Dispositional Hope

The efficiency of educational processes depends largely on the quality of communication between the teacher and the student. Student opinions are important in evaluating the effectiveness of teaching in different dimensions. The teachers' communication skills, attitude towards the students, mastery of the subject they teach, efforts, cognitive flexibility, and fair attitude are influential in the effectiveness of education (Kim, Damewood, & Hodge, 2000).

The fact that education is an indirect initiative has made the existence of organized structures called 'schools' obligatory (Yolcu, 2010). Accordingly, one of the subjects attracting the interest of scientists working in the fields of organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior in recent years has been organizational justice or people's perception of justice in their organizations (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The concept of justice concerns both the individual with its dimension of perception and organizations with its dimension of behavior (Tekin & Akyol, 2017). For this reason, social justice has become a central concept in most academic debates on education policies (Thrupp & Tomlinson, 2005), and the use of the concept of justice has become increasingly common in classroom evaluation studies within the framework of social psychology theories (Rasooli, DeLuca, Rasegh, & Fathi, 2019).

Paulsel, Chory-Assad, and Dunleavy (2005) have adapted distributive and procedural justice, which are the dimensions of organizational justice, to education, and Chory (2007) has created the three dimensions of justice in the classroom by adding interactional justice to these. In line with the views gathered by Rasooli et al. (2019) from various theorists, it can be said that distributive justice refers to the distribution of things distributed according to the principle of equality, equity and needs. Interactional justice defines the communication and interaction between people in the direction of respect, conformity, and honesty. Procedural justice is conceptualized by Leventhal (1980, as cited in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001) within the framework of consistency, being free from biases, precision, accuracy, representativeness, and adherence to ethical principles in the process of implementing business and transactions. In other words, procedural justice outlines the processes in which those that are dispersed (rewards, punishments, etc.) are distributed.

From students' perspective, distributive justice is how rewards, grades, opportunities to improve grades, and punishments are distributed among students. Problems with distributive justice in the classroom arise in relation to who gets the teacher's attention and who gets high marks (Deutsch, 1985, as cited in Paulsel, Chory-Assad, & Dunleavy, 2005). When students compare the grades they receive with those of their friends or the grades they expect, they can perceive whether the grades are fair or not (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a), and they may find the criteria used by their teachers to evaluate and score students fair or unfair (Berti, Molinari, & Speltini, 2010). People assess the rewards' adequacy by comparing them with their expectations, needs, and general social norms. Satisfaction with the result is determined not only by the magnitude of the results obtained but also by comparing these results with the standards taken as reference (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). In the context of teaching, a student assessing the fairness of a grade "C" may evaluate this "C" based on the grade he/she expects, the grade he/she deserves to receive, or the grades received by others (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a). Therefore, the concept of rationality must be considered along with justice. Rationality is the specification of the application to be made to the person in advance with

certain rules and that the person is not subjected to arbitrary treatment (Güriz, 2001). At this point, procedural justice takes effect. Procedural justice encompasses what rules are followed in grading, how make-up classes and exams are conducted, how the timeline/workload is distributed, how feedback is provided, how classroom rules are enforced, or what rules teachers violate (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a; Horan, Chory, & Goodboy, 2010). Procedural justice is closely related to motivation and affective learning (Chory-Assad, 2002). It can be said that students who realize that the rules are applied fairly develop a positive attitude towards school and learning, and make an effort to research and learn.

Interactional justice means that teachers' attitudes and behaviors towards their students are fair and qualified (Paulsel & Chory-Assad, 2005). In other words, the teacher accepts the students' opinions, takes their concerns into account, and communicates with them without looking down upon them (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a). Interactional fairness has been found to have a major impact on school practices, helping adolescents to adapt to school rules, prevent their antisocial behavior, and develop a positive attitude toward authority (Gouveia-Pereira et al., 2003). Otherwise, the teachers' communication with their students is described to be in an insensitive, rude, and prejudiced (gender, language, race, etc.) manner and the discrimination they make among their students are expressed as behaviors that harm the fairness of interaction (Horan, Chory, & Goodboy, 2010).

The school environment includes the interaction between classmates and the interaction between teachers, and students. The teacher's communication style and closeness are important factors affecting the social-emotional environment of the classroom (Titsworth, McKenna, Mazer, & Quinlan, 2013). Teacher justice, which students experience individually, plays a key role in their school life (Peter & Dalbert, 2010). As a result, there is a positive relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, as well as students' compliance with the rules (Colquitt, 2001).

Students' subjective experience that their teachers are behaving fairly ensures that students' perceptions of the school environment are positive (Peter & Dalbert, 2010). This experience is especially important for adolescents, because they shape their view of the world and the social maps in their minds during this period (Resh, 2009). Teachers and students have goals; the relationship between the two is interpersonal, and they work together to achieve goals. These goals' achievement depends on the teacher and student's communication and problem-solving skills (Frymier & Houser, 2000). Strong teacher and student communication positively affects success and motivation (Molinari, Speltini, & Passini, 2012). Perceptions of teacher fairness are closely related to students' skills, motivations, efforts, positive attitudes toward authority, and ability to work with the group (Chory, 2007; Chory-Assad, 2002). Perceived fairness in the school environment not only helps students adapt, but also fosters their self-esteem (Tyler, Smith, & Huo, 1996, as cited in Gouveia-Pereira, et al., 2003). Students who feel cared for tend to develop positive self-concept and demonstrate higher achievement in schoolwork, learning, goal orientation, and responsibility (Bempechat, Ronfard, Mirny, Li, & Holloway, 2013).

Unjust situations cause negative emotions and behaviors, such as anger and hostility in students (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a). It has been determined that students observe procedural injustice in their teachers three times more frequently than distributive and interactional injustice, and that they exhibit emotional responses such as anger and disappointment when they encounter unfair behaviors in the classroom (Horan, Chory, &

Goodboy, 2010). When students do not think their lecture grades, the processes in the lesson, or their teachers are fair, they indirectly attack their teachers (Chory-Assad, 2002; Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a; 2004b), act with hostility (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004b), resist the demands of their teachers (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004b; Paulsel, Chory-Assad, & Dunleavy 2005), and rate their teachers with low grades (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a). In addition, the perception that there is injustice in the classroom leads to a decline in learning motivation and to negative outcomes, such as dropping out of school (Berti et al., 2010), causing students to feel angry, painful, stressed, cheated out of their rights, deceived, weary, and ashamed (Chory et al., 2017; Horan et al., 2010).

No matter how negative the events they experience, individuals need to believe that the world is a just place, or that justice will definitely be achieved one day because belief in a just world has a harmonizing effect. There is a positive relationship between high belief in the just world and the reduction and control of anger in individuals, increasing self-esteem, strengthening well-being, life satisfaction, and positive affect. In addition, individuals with a strong belief in a just world tend to perceive their experiences as fairer and are motivated to protect themselves against threats (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2005). Belief in a just world is the foundation of the ability to engage in long-term goal-oriented behavior. Individuals want to plan, study, and obtain what they want, avoid frightening and painful events, and achieve their goals with variables they can control (Erikson, 1950; Merton, 1957, as cited in Lerner, 1980). At this point, the concept of hope, which is as old and important as justice, comes to mind. It can be said that individuals who think that they live in a fair environment or who expect justice to come true one day trust themselves and the people around them, feel valued, look at life more positively, and have stronger hopes.

Snyder (2002) defined hope as the perceived capacity of individuals to produce, activate, and continuously use the paths leading to the goals. Hope is a cognitive construct. Snyder (2002) explained hope with three components: goals, alternative pathways, and agency (willpower), and stated that people are goal-oriented and motivated to achieve their goals. The idea of alternative pathways is one's perception of his/her capacity to make successful plans and produce alternative paths to achieve the desired goal under normal or obstructive conditions (Snyder et al., 1991; Snyder et al., 2002). The motivating part of the theory of hope—agency—is the perceived capacity of the person to start using alternative paths when faced with obstacles in the process of achieving goals and to be motivated to continue his/her path (Snyder, 2002). Agency enables the idea of alternative ways to be active when obstacles are encountered on the way to the goal. The idea of alternative pathways helps the individual to find new ways by considering their successful experiences in the past. Hope enables the perception of obstacles and problems as situations to be dealt with and as learning opportunities (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). According to Erikson (as cited in Lopez et al., 2003), hope is an important element of healthy cognitive development. Hopeful thinking, a skill that can be taught and developed, is much more important to cope with difficulties, especially during the school period when children acquire new skills (Westburg & Martin, 2003).

One of the most effective environments for strengthening hope is the classroom, and the most important factor in strengthening students' hopes is the teacher. The teacher motivates students to identify the paths to their own goals, use these paths, overcome difficulties, and realize their dreams. School environments are appropriate to teach hope and enable children at risk, in particular to overcome their problems (McDermott & Hastings, 2000).

Observed in all areas of life, hope is one of the positive organizational behaviors according to Youssef and Luthans (2007). Büyükgöz and Kavak (2017) emphasized the concept of “psychological capital,” which reflects the positive attitude of employees towards the organization. Psychological capital, linked to the individual's positive psychological development, is expressed as a structure consisting of four components: hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and psychological resilience. Miller (2007) considered hope important for the quality of life. He emphasized that hope is an instinctive element of life, making it easier for individuals to reveal their potential by protecting them from being hurt (Miller, 1985, as cited in Akman & Korkut, 1993).

Similar to the impact of just/unjust practices on students, positive psychology programs are also crucial to students' well-being, relationships, and academic success because there is a close relationship between them. Positive psychology and the educational system based on this movement seek to develop positive emotions and thoughts that strengthen mental and physical health, such as hope, well-being, gratitude, and resilience (Waters, 2011).

In summary, injustice causes individuals to feel helpless, unhappy, hopeless, and purposeless. Therefore, perceptions of justice and hope are important determinants in student-teacher relationships and communication. In the literature, there are studies on students and teachers based on justice in the classroom. These studies address classroom justice or teacher attitudes and student aggression (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004), motivations to learn (Chory-Assad, 2002), verbal and behavioral reactions (Chory, 2010), and teacher reliability (Chory, 2007). Some studies examine students' experiences with injustice (Čiuladienė & Račelytė, 2016) and reveal injustices caused by the pedagogical inadequacy of teachers (Bempechat, Ronfard, Mirny, Li, & Holloway, 2013). Studies examining the relationship between social justice and hope in the international literature have also been encountered (McInerney, 2007; Thrupp & Tomlinson, 2005).

In the literature, there are studies on students and teachers based on justice in the classroom. These studies address classroom justice or teacher attitudes and student aggression (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004), motivations to learn (Chory-Assad, 2002), verbal and behavioral reactions (Chory, 2010), and teacher reliability (Chory, 2007). There are also studies that examine students' experiences with injustice (Čiuladienė & Račelytė, 2016) and reveal injustices caused by pedagogical inadequacy of teachers (Bempechat, Ronfard, Mirny, Li, & Holloway, 2013). Studies examining the relationship between social justice and hope in the international literature have also been encountered (McInerney, 2007; Thrupp & Tomlinson, 2005).

When the studies conducted in Turkey were examined, it was determined that the focus was on organizational justice, and teachers and administrators were chosen as the participant group (Altınkurt & Yılmaz, 2010; Baş & Şentürk, 2011; Polat & Celep, 2008; Tekin & Akyol, 2017; Titrek, 2009). The number of studies on justice in the classroom in Turkey is rather limited (Kepekcioglu, 2015; Tarhan, 2018). A review of national and international literature studies revealed that no study examined the relationship between justice and hope in the classroom. Therefore, the significance of this study is to be the first study to examine the relationship between justice and hope in the classroom. In addition, it is expected that the results of this study will draw attention to the concept of classroom justice in secondary schools and help to solve the problems encountered in the management of the classroom and classroom climate in schools.

The study has two objectives. The first objective is to examine whether there is a significant difference between the scores on the Classroom Justice Scales and the Dispositional Hope, depending on the demographic characteristics of the participants. The second objective is to determine the extent to which there is a relationship between the results of the Classroom Justice Scales and the results of the Dispositional Hope Scale. In this regard, answers were sought to the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between demographic variables (gender, grade level, school type) in secondary students' opinions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and state hope level?
2. Is there a relationship between distributive justice and the level of state hope?
3. Is there a relationship between procedural justice and the level of state hope?
4. Is there a relationship between interactional justice and the level of state hope?

Method

Research Model

This research, which examines the relationship between the perception of justice in the classroom and the level of state hope, is designed in the relational screening model. Relational descriptive model aims to determine whether there is a change between two or more variables jointly (Karasar, 2012).

Participant

The study was conducted in secondary educational institutions in an urban center in the Western Black Sea region. The participants are students attending secondary education institutions' 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades. A total of 568 students were accessed during the research study. Incomplete and incorrectly filled data collection tools and items with extreme values were excluded from the evaluation, and thus, the data obtained from 507 forms were analyzed. The convenience sampling method was used to determine the study group. Students are faced with situations such as course content, homework, exams, grades they receive at the end of projects, class rules, verbal and non-verbal reactions of teachers, etc. Since students at the secondary education level are in adolescence, they try to form a philosophy of life by thinking about issues such as rights, justice, hope for the future, future anxiety, and future plans. In this respect, the study group was formed from students attending different types of secondary education institutions. Table 1 presents demographic Information on students' gender, grade level, and school type.

Table1.
Demographic Information about participants

Variable	(f)	(%)
Gender		
Girl	283	55,8
Boy	224	44,2
Grade level		
9	168	33,1
10	115	22,7
11	171	33,7
12	53	10,5

Type of school		
High school	13	2,6
Anatolian high school	276	54,4
Imam hatip high school	75	14,8
Vocational and technical high school	83	16,4
Science high school	37	7,3
Fine arts high school	23	4,5
Total	507	100

As shown in Table 1, 283 participants were female students (55.8%), and 224 were male students (44.2%). While 168 of the students (33.1%) were in the 9th grade, 115 of them (22.7%) were in the 10th grade, 171 (33.7%) were in the 11th grade, and 53 of them (10.5%) were in the 12th grade. In addition, 13 (2.6%) of the students were high school students, 276 (54.4%) were Anatolian high school students, 75 (14.8%) were vocational and technical high school students, 37 (7.3%) were science high school students, and 23 (4.5%) were fine arts high school students.

Data Collection Tools

The study data were collected using the Classroom Justice Scales (CJS) and the Dispositional Hope Scale. The Classroom Justice Scales consists of three scales: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice

Distributive Justice Scale (DJS), developed as 14 items by Chory-Assad (2002) and then revised by Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004) and finalized into 12 items, aims to determine students' perceptions of the fairness of the grades they have received or expect to receive from a particular course. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale ranges from .69 (Chory, 2007) to .92 (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004). The construct validity of the scale adapted into Turkish was examined by confirmatory factor analysis, and it was determined that the model showed acceptable compatibility ($c^2 = 204,76$; $p = .000$; $sd = .53$; $\chi^2/df = 3.86$; RMSEA = .076; SRMR = .039; CFI = .94; GFI = .93; and TLI = .93). It was determined that the distributive justice scale exhibited a two-factor structure, the standardized factor loads ranged from .54 to .73, and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .91 (Tarhan, 2020). The reliability analysis conducted in this study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .91 for the overall scale.

Procedural Justice Scale (PJS) was developed by Chory-Assad (2002) based on the work of Hibaut and Walker (1975) and Leventhal (1980). The initial scale, which consisted of 17 items, was later revised by Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004), and a 15-item form was generated. On the scale, students are expected to evaluate the rules, lesson plans, and grading criteria that a particular teacher applies in the classroom. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale ranges from .72 (Chory, 2007) to .94 (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004). In Tarhan's (2020) study on its adaptation to the Turkish culture, it was determined that the classroom procedural justice scale exhibited a single-factor structure as in the original scale, and the fit indices were acceptable ($c^2 = 361.966$; $p = .000$; $sd = 88$; $\chi^2/df = 4,11$; GFI = .91; CFI = .92; TLI = .91; RMSEA = .079, and SRMR = .046). It was determined that the factor loads of the scale ranged from .54 to .72, and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .92. The reliability analysis conducted in this study yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of .92 for the total scale.

Interactional Justice Scale (IJS), first developed by Chory (2007) as eight items, was later revised as seven items. The interactional justice scale is based on the students' assessment of

how fair the behavior of a particular instructor towards students is. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be .95 (Chory, 2007). Tarhan (2020) determined that the scale adapted to the Turkish culture demonstrated good fit values ($c^2 = 36.024$; $p = .001$; $sd = 13$; $\chi^2/df = 2,77$; $GFI = .98$; $CFI = .99$; $TLI = .99$; $RMSEA = .060$, and $SRMR = .019$). It was found that the factor loads of the scale ranged from .74 to .83, and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .92 (Tarhan, 2020). As a result of the reliability analysis conducted in this study, the Cronbach alpha value for the total scale was

In addition, the test-retest method was used to test the stability of the Turkish forms of the Classroom Justice Scales with respect to the properties they measure over time. A positive and significant relationship was found between both applications of the CJS. For CDJS, this relationship was calculated as $r(47) = .89$, $p < .01$, for CPJS it was $r(47) = .84$, $p < .01$, and for CIJS it was $r(47) = .87$, $p < .01$ (Tarhan, 2020). The scales of classroom distributive, classroom procedural, and classroom interactional justice are all rated as 5-point Likert items [1 (not fair at all), 5 (completely fair)]. There are no inversely rated items in the scale. A total score cannot be obtained from all three scales (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004). High scores obtained on the scales indicate that the perception of justice is strong (Paulsel, Chory-Assad, & Dunleavy, 2005).

The Dispositional Hope Scale (SHS) was developed by C.R. Snyder et al. (1991) to determine the state hope levels of individuals aged fifteen and over, and it consists of 12 items and two sub-scales. The sub-scales, called Alternative Pathways Thought and Agency Thought, are measured by four items each. In each sub-scale, one item includes expressions related to the past, two about the present, and one about the future. The remaining four items constitute filler items that are unrelated to hope. The scores obtained from the Alternative Pathways Thought and Agency Thought sub-scales are added together to achieve a total score from the Dispositional Hope Scale. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is eight, and the highest score is 64 (Lopez et al., 2000). Tarhan and Bacanlı (2015) adapted the Dispositional Hope Scale to the Turkish culture. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, two sub-dimensions were determined to be consistent with the factor structure in the original scale. The two-factor structure explained approximately 61% of the total variance. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be .83, and the KMO value was .86. With the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was supported that this two-factor model is valid. The fit indices were calculated as $GFI = .96$, $AGFI = .92$, $RMR = .08$, $NNFI = .94$, $RFI = .90$, $CFI = .96$, and $RMSEA = .077$ (Tarhan & Bacanlı, 2015). As a result of the reliability analysis conducted in this study, the Cronbach alpha value for the total scale was .70.

Data Collection

Permission for the research was taken from the Social Sciences and Humanities Ethics Committee (2020- SBB-0018) of the university where the researcher works and from the provincial Directorate of National Education. The researcher collected the data by visiting classrooms. Brief Information about the research and the researcher was given, and the idea of voluntary participation was explained. The data were obtained from students who agreed to participate voluntarily in the research.

Analysis of Data

SPSS 21.0 was utilized to analyze the research data. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was utilized to establish whether or not the data has a normal distribution. The data did not exhibit a normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov results: distributive justice scale sig. 0.000, procedural justice scale sig. 0.004, interactional justice scale sig. 0.000, and state Hope scale

sig..0.000; p 0.05). Non-parametric tests were employed in the analysis because the data did not have a normal distribution (Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis H test, Spearman rank differences). Using the Mann-Whitney U test and Bonferroni correction, the source of the difference was evaluated in light of the significant difference seen following the comparisons. In addition to calculating the statistical significance of the comparisons, the effect size was also determined. Eta squared (η^2) and r values were determined to determine the magnitude of the effect. Eta-squared (η^2) values were calculated for the Kruskal Wallis H test to determine the effect of the independent variable on each dependent variable. $\eta^2 = 0.1$ is reported as a small effect size, $\eta^2 = 0.6$ as a medium effect size, and $\eta^2 = 0.14$ as a large effect size when interpreting the Eta-squared values (Green & Salkind, 2005). The effect sizes of the correlation coefficients (r) were obtained using the Mann Whitney U test. In interpretation, there is no association between .01 and .09; a modest correlation between .10 and .29; a moderate correlation between .30 and .49; a significant correlation between .50 and .69 a very strong relationship between .70 and higher (Green & Salkind, 2005).

Findings

The study analyzed whether there is a significant difference in secondary students' opinions about distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and the degree of dispositional hope according to the variables (gender, class level, school type). The results of the comparison of participants' distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and level of dispositional hope by gender are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

Mann-Whitney U test results by gender

Scale	Group	N	\bar{X} line	Σ line	U	Z	p	r	Significant difference*
Distributive	1.Girl	283	224.80	63617	23431	-5.047	.000	-.22	*2-1
	2.Boy	224	290.90	65161					
Procedural	1.Girl	283	248.94	70450	30264	-.874	.382		
	2.Boy	224	260.39	58328					
Interactional	1.Girl	283	255.78	72387	31191	-.309	.758		
	2.Boy	224	251.75	56391					
Dis. Hope	1.Girl	283	243.49	68907	28721	-1.817	.069		
	2.Boy	224	267.28	59871					

According to Table 2, the mean rank of male students (290.90) in distributive justice is greater than that of female students (224.80), and the impact size is small ($U=23431$; $Z= -5.047$; $p<0.05$; $r = -.02$). The significant difference in distributive justice favors male students. There was no significant difference between procedural ($U=30264$; $Z= -.874$; $p>0.05$), interactional ($U=31191$; $Z= -.309$; $p>0.05$), and state hope ($U=28721$; $Z= -1.817$; $p>0.05$) variables.

The results of the comparison between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and the participants' level of dispositional hope are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Kruskal Wallis H test results by grade level

Scale	Grade level	N	Mean rank	sd	χ^2	p	Significant difference*	η^2
Distributive	1. 9th grade	168	227.86	3	9.392	.025	*11-9	.018
	2. 10th grade	115	254.33					
	3.11th grade	171	275.09					
	4.12th grade	53	268.08					

Procedural	1. 9th grade	168	259.36	3	.829	.842
	2. 10th grade	115	258.01			
	3.11th grade	171	249.90			
	4.12th grade	53	241.54			
Interactional	1. 9th grade	168	267.63	3	2.423	.489
	2. 10th grade	115	242.13			
	3.11th grade	171	248.93			
	4.12th grade	53	252.91			
Dis. Hope	1. 9th grade	168	260.18	3	1.798	.615
	2. 10th grade	115	238.24			
	3.11th grade	171	258.57			
	4.12th grade	53	253.85			
p<.05						

There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores on distributive justice based on class level, as shown in Table 3, but the impact size is low ($X^2(3)=9.392$, $p=.05$, $2=0.02$) The findings of the Mann-Whitney U test, which was carried out to determine which group or groups were responsible for the significant difference, indicate that there is a significant difference in favor of 11th. According to the findings of the Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine which group or groups the significant difference originated from, a significant difference was identified between the 9th-grade students and the 11th-grade students ($U = 11719.5$; $p = 0.003$). Grade students between 9th grade ($U = 11719.5$; $p = 0.003$) and 11th-grade students. Grade students between 9th grade ($U = 11719.5$; $p = 0.003$) and 11th-grade students. The gap is tilted in favor of students in the 11th grade.

Table 4 displays the results of the comparison between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and the participants' dispositional hope level by school type.

Table 4

Results of the Kruskal Wallis H test by school type

Scale	Type of school	N	Mean rank	sd	X^2	p	Significant difference*	η^2
Distributive	1.High school	13	222.42	5	4.477	.483		
	2.Anatolian high school	276	248.87					
	3.Imam hatip high school	75	268.46					
	4.Vocational and technical high school	83	244.44					
	5.Science high school	37	291.28					
	6.Fine arts high school	23	260.83					
Procedural	1.High school	13	224.12	5	26.457	.000	*5-1,2,4	.052
	2.Anatolian high school	276	233.78					
	3.Imam hatip high school	75	279.84					
	4.Vocational and technical high school	83	256.75					
	5.Science high school	37	356.97					

	6.Fine arts high school	23	253.70					
	1.High school	13	194.96	5	37.245	.000	*5-1,2,3,4,6	.073
	2.Anatolian high school	276	242.97					
	3.Imam hatip high school	75	255.97					
Interactional	4.Vocational and technical high school	83	241.28					
	5.Science high school	37	391.42					
	6.Fine arts high school	23	238.11					
	1.High school	13	189.35	5	3.781	.581		
	2.Anatolian high school	276	253.18					
	3.Imam hatip high school	75	249.72					
Dis. Hope	4.Vocational and technical high school	83	271.02					
	5.Science high school	37	256.96					
	6.Fine arts high school	23	248.13					

p<.05

As seen in Table 4, there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for procedural justice by school type, but the effect size is small ($X^2(5)=26.457$; $p=0.05$; $2=0.052$). There is a significant difference in interactional justice mean scores by school type, and the impact size is moderate ($X^2(5)=37.245$, $p=0.05$, $2=0.04$). According to the Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to find out which group or groups the significant difference originated from

In procedural justice, a significant difference was found in favor of those attending science high school ($U=83.5$; $p=0.001$), Anatolian high school ($U=2624$; $p=0.000$), vocational and technical high school ($U=935.5$; $p=0.001$). In interactional justice, it was in favor of those attending science high school ($U=59$; $p=0.000$), Anatolian high school ($U=2122$; $p=0.000$), imam hatip high school ($U=610$; $p=0.000$), vocational and technical high school ($U=642$; $p=0.000$), and fine arts high school ($U=177.5$; $p=0.000$).

Table 5 shows the correlations that were found between the scores of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice and the scores on the Dispositional Hope Scale. It also includes the arithmetic mean and standard deviation of each scale score.

Table 5.

The correlations between Classroom Justice Scales scores and Dispositional Hope Scale scores, arithmetic means, and standard deviations

	Distributive	Procedural	Interactional	Dis. Hope
Distributive	1.00			
Procedural	.51***	1.00		
Interactional	.32***	.64***	1.00	
Dis. Hope	.22***	.22***	.13**	1.00
<i>X</i>	38.52	50.56	23.26	48.90
<i>sd</i>	10.21	12.47	7.22	8.84

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

As demonstrated in Table 5, the relationship between the distributive justice scale score and the dispositional hope scale score is $r = .22$; the relationship between the procedural justice scale and the state hope scale is $r = .22$; the relationship between interactional justice and dispositional hope scale score was determined as $r = .13$. Positive and statistically significant ($p < .01$) relationships were found between the classroom justice scales and the dispositional hope scale scores.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study first examined whether there was a significant difference between the classroom justice scale scores and the dispositional hope scale scores by particular demographic characteristics. Secondly, the correlations between the mentioned instruments were identified.

By gender, a significant difference was found in favor of male students in distributive justice. In other words, male students found their grades or awards fair and sufficient. Since people judge the value of the awards considering their expectations, needs, and general social norms (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997), it can be inferred that male students' achievements draw much attention. This situation should be considered within the framework of gender stereotypes.

By grade level, a significant difference in distributive justice scores was between the 9th and 11th-grade students, in favor of the 11th-graders. It can be suggested that compared to the 9th-grade students, the 11th-grade students are more likely to appreciate the meaning of being a high school student, choosing a specific field, obeying school rules, and getting used to the course and exam procedures, which might result in distributive justice high mean scores.

By school type, a significant difference was found in procedural justice mean scores, which was in favor of science high school students. Similarly, a significant difference was found in interactional justice mean scores, again in favor of science high school students.

Science high schools receive students with the highest scores and are preferred by successful students. Expectations related to education quality and student-teacher relations are high in those schools. In this sense, it can be said that science high schools provide a democratic, egalitarian school environment where students can express their feelings and thoughts. Gouveia-Pereira et al. (2003s) indicated that students emphasized procedural and interactional justice in evaluating the fairness of teacher behavior. Besides, students expect their teachers to treat them professionally, support all students' learning, spare time for them and explicitly explain concepts (Bempechat et al., 2013). The fact that these expectations of the students in science high school are met can be the reason for the differences in interactional and procedural justice scores.

Positive and statistically significant ($p < .01$) relationships were discovered between the scores of the Classroom Distributive Justice Scale, Classroom Procedural Justice Scale, Classroom Interactional Justice Scale, and the scores of the Dispositional Hope Scale as a result of data analysis performed on students attending secondary education institutions. Accordingly, it can be said that while hope strengthens the perception of justice, the perception of justice strengthens hope.

The scale of distributive justice consists of two sub-scales: expected justice and current justice. In the study, the expected justice scores of the students were found to be higher than

the current justice scores. This finding indicating that students hope that they will get better grades is supported in the literature. It has been determined that expectation is important in the perception of justice (Cherry, Ordonez, & Gilland, 2003), students use positive emotions such as happiness, satisfaction, feeling of worthiness, and hopefulness when describing just situations, and negative emotions such as anger, sadness, disappointment, and shame when talking about unjust situations (Rasooli, DeLuca, Rasegh, & Fathi, 2019).

The commitment of teachers and students to the school is ensured in proportion to the fairness of the practices in the institution. A sense of justice creates a positive climate in the organization. It increases employees' motivation, commitment to the organization, and productivity. It is observed that the teacher who thinks that he/she is subject to an effective and fair evaluation process makes efforts to increase student success, create a positive learning climate in the school, and achieve the school's goals (Tekin & Akyol, 2017). Studies report that individuals' positive beliefs, such as optimism, hope, and self-efficacy are positively related to work engagement (Bailey & Snyder, 2007; Halbesleben, 2010; Knight, Patterson, & Dawson, 2017). Likewise, optimism and psychological resilience are important for positive organizational behavior and are linked to hope. These three concepts are important for work environments in that they include self-directed motivational processes that can have an impact on job performance and attitudes toward work (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). While loyalty to the organization increases optimism, trust, reliability, and so forth, these feelings increase loyalty to the organization in turn. The equivalent of devotion to the organization/institution/work in school can be expressed as loyalty to the class. According to the research results of Berti, Molinari, and Speltini (2010), ideal classroom justice is formed in line with the principles of communication, equality, and effort/need, whereas the emotional commitment of students decreases when they are exposed to unfair actions by their teachers.

This study calculated the relationship between interactional justice and procedural justice as .64 ($p < .001$). This finding is in line with the literature. Research reveals that procedural and interactional justice are very important in students' perception of justice (Chory, 2007; Houston & Bettencourt, 1999; Kepekçioğlu, 2015). In a study conducted to investigate the relationship between the perception of interactional justice and adolescents' evaluation of their teachers, although the grades given by the teachers were considered important, it was determined that the perception of justice in the relationship between the teacher and the student was evaluated by the quality of the relationship rather than the grades given (Gouveia-Pereira, Vala, Palmonari, & Rubini, 2003). Particularly, communications that support the self-strengthen the perception of interactional justice in individuals (Bies & Moag, 1986, as cited in Chory, 2007). According to Frymier and Houser (2000), teachers' communication skills are critical in the efficiency of teaching, supporting the students' self-perception, and resolving the conflicts between the students and the teachers. Teachers who have positive interpersonal communication are often perceived as more approachable by students. Communication that includes the dimensions of friendly relationship, affirmation, and seeking closeness is important in terms of answering students' questions, in-class relations, and developing the perception of justice in the classroom (Young, Horan, & Frisby, 2013).

Cochran-Smith (1999, as cited in McInerney, 2007) suggests that the most important goals of teacher education programs are social responsibility, social change, and social justice, while Nieto (2000, as cited in McInerney, 2007) argues that the need for equality is central to teacher training. Teachers guide and support students in school and evaluate their skills and

achievements (Molinari, Speltini, & Passini, 2013). Justice constitutes the most important point of students' education and evaluation experiences (Mazzoli Smith et al., 2018). Studies reveal the connection between students' perceptions of justice in the classroom with their academic achievements (Holmgren & Bolkan, 2014), with their commitment (Berti, Molinari, & Speltini, 2010), and motivation to learn (Chory-Assad, 2002). When students believe their teachers and grades are fair, their concerns about school decrease (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2005). Positive thoughts are closely associated with children's self-adequacy perception, increased self-esteem, life satisfaction, and strengthening their mental health (Marques, Pais-Ribeiro, & Lopez, 2009).

Similarly, hope is positively correlated with students' GPAs and the likelihood of graduation (Snyder et al., 2002). When students receive more emotional support from their teachers, they feel more joyful, proud, and hopeful (Titsworth et al., 2013). These feelings of achievement are linked to students' use of various learning strategies, self-organized learning, and academic performance (Pekrun et al., 2011, as cited in Titsworth et al., 2013). The teacher-student relationship refers to the work done collaboratively to accomplish individual goals in the classroom. The goal of both is to achieve success. Achieving the goal of success depends on their ability to negotiate and resolve conflicts. The maintenance of relationships depends on intensive communication (Bainbridge Frymier & Houser, 2000). It can be said that the perception of this communication to be fair indicates the importance of the relationship between hope and interactional justice.

The level of hope and optimism contributes to the maintenance of individuals' positive expectations and social well-being (Gallagher & Lopez, 2009). Goals, which are one of the fundamental components of hope, are important for the success of the individual's personal change efforts and for seeing life as meaningful. Goal setting is central to life coaching and is the foundation of successful self-regulation. Individuals choose personal goals from various life areas and work toward achieving these goals (Green, Oades, & Grant, 2006). These goals strengthen individuals' efforts for personal development and change, well-being, and life satisfaction (Sheldon, Kasser, Smith, & Share, 2002). A high level of association has been observed between justice and life satisfaction (Cherry, Ordonez, & Gilliland, 2003). Individuals who find their lives more meaningful have higher motivational energy to achieve their goals (Tetley, 2010), possess stronger problem-solving skills (Orlich, 2004), and attain higher academic achievement (Onwuegbuzie & Snyder, 2000). Similarly, hope strengthens individuals' problem-solving and coping strategies (Chang, 1998; Green, Oades, & Grant, 2006; Peterson & Byron, 2008) and increases academic achievement.

It has been determined that empowerment-based coaching programs implemented in the school increase students' hope and commitment to school (Madden, Green, & Grant, 2011); students who can find various paths toward their desired goals, have the necessary faith to move toward their goals, establish strong ties with their schools have high life satisfaction (You, Furlong, Felix, Sharkey, & Tanigawa, 2008), and students with high levels of hope have high psychological adaptation and participation in school work (Marques, Lopez, Fontaine, Coimbra, & Mitchell, 2015). There are studies that examine the relationship between hope, optimism, and psychological resilience (Coutu, 2002; Youssef, & Luthans, 2007). High levels of hope are positively related to individuals' perception of themselves educationally and socially (Onwuegbuzie, 1998), satisfaction from life and academic work (Chang, 1998), and positive self-esteem. In contrast, they are negatively related to symptoms of depression (Snyder et al., 1997).

In this respect, there are findings that hope-enhancing interventions in schools increase well-being, physical activity, and academic success and reduce risky behaviors (Griggs, 2017).

In the process of growth and development in young individuals, three levels in gaining social justice awareness are mentioned: individual, social, and global. *Individual awareness* is the individual's self-identification with positive and healthy concepts. *Social awareness* is young people's awareness of how the social and economic conditions in the context they live in affect their identities. In contrast, *global awareness* is their being aware of how the pressures applied to affect the lives of others and their contribution to social justice practices that oppose these pressures (Cammarota, 2011). The ability for students to become individuals who are at peace with themselves and the society they live in and who are aware of their responsibilities depends on the knowledge and experiences they have gained about justice during their growth. People who believe that their home, school, and society are fair develop the ability to think hopefully and plan for the future because a fair environment supports the idea that individuals will be rewarded for their work.

In addition, the traditional perspective of giving information and transferring culture in schools is being replaced by learning to learn, using information, and developing critical thinking skills. In line with these changes, the roles of teachers are also changing, and teachers who assume the role of knowledge transmitter expert are replaced by leading teachers who guide students (Gümüşeli, 2001). How the students perceive the teacher's verbal and non-verbal messages plays an important role in the evaluation of the teacher's educational work. The teacher's communication skills, attitude towards the student, subject knowledge, organizational skills, enthusiasm, justice, flexibility, and encouragement are defined as variables closely related to the teaching effectiveness (Kim, Damewood, & Hodge, 2000). In other words, the ability of students to benefit from the educational process depends on the teacher's pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of the field, the reward-penalty system, and his/her ability to present these to the students in a just manner.

In psychological counseling and guidance studies to be carried out with young people, it should be explained that hoping is not just waiting, but setting correct and realistic goals to reach the hoped-for point, making efforts, and continuing on the path by producing alternatives in the face of obstacles. In this way, students can be supported to have realistic hopes, take steps to realize their hopes, and work for a just society because young people feel that they can contribute to improving the lives of others when positive changes occur in their own lives (Cammarota, 2011).

In order to promote fair practices in schools and thus strengthen students' hopes, teachers need to review their verbal and behavioral responses and be good role models for students. They also need to teach their students to have realistic hopes, taking into account the principle of the best interests of the child in all their practices. In like manner, in our age, school counselors are expected to strive to remove systemic barriers to students' academic success and to play a key role in the change and development process of the school (House & Sears, 2002). If a school counselor contributes with his/her own knowledge and skills to the shaping of a practice or a decision made in school, he or she has acted as a leader in that occasion according to the distributive approach (Gronn, 2002; Harris, 2008). As a result, it is believed that the increased visibility and influence of school psychological counselors will encourage fair practices in schools. In this study, the relationship between interactional justice and hope was weaker than the relationships between other classroom justice dimensions and hope. The reasons for

this may be examined. It is possible to investigate the antecedents of the perception of personal and organizational justice.

Statement of Interest

There is no potential conflict of interest.

Information on Financial Support

The author (s) did not receive any financial support for research, authorship, and / or publication of this article.

Ethical Approval

Permission for this study was obtained from Bartın University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee (18.03.2020- 2020- SBB-0018)

References

- Akman, Y. ve Korkut, F. (1993). Umut ölçeği üzerine bir çalışma. *H.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9, 193-202.
- Altinkurt, Y. ve Yılmaz, K. (2011). Değerlere göre yönetim ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisinin ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 16 (4), 463-484
- Bailey, T. C. & Snyder, C. R. (2007). Satisfaction with life and hope: a look at age and marital status. *The Psychological Record*, 57, 233-240.
- Bainbridge Frymier, A. & Houser, M., L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education*, 49 (3), 207-219
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248940159_The_teacher-student_relationship_as_an_interpersonal_relationship
- Baş, G. ve Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17 (1), 29-62.
- Bempechat, J., Ronfard, S., Mirny, A., Li, J., & Holloway, S. D. (2013). She always gives grades lower than one deserves: A qualitative study of Russian adolescents' perceptions of fairness in the classroom. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 7, 169-187.
- Berti, C., Molinari, L. ve Speltini, G. (2010). Classroom justice and psychological engagement: Students' and teachers' representations. *Social Psychology Education*, 13, 541-556. DOI 10.1007/s11218-010-9128-9
- Büyükgöze, H. ve Kavak, Y. (2017). Algılanan örgütsel destek ve pozitif psikolojik sermaye ilişkisi: Lise öğretmenleri örneğinde bir inceleme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 23(1), 1-32. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2017.001
- Cammarota, J. (2011). From hopelessness to hope: social justice pedagogy in urban education and youth development. *Urban Education* 46 (4) 828-844.
- Chang, E. C. (1998). Dispositional optimism and primary and secondary appraisal of a stressor: Controlling for confounding influences and relations to coping and psychological and physical adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(4), 1109-1120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.4.1109>
- Cherry, B. Ordonez, L.D & Gilliland, S.W. (2003) Grade expectations: the effects of expectations on fairness and satisfaction Perceptions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 16, 375-395.
- Chory, R., M. (2007). Enhancing student perceptions of fairness: the relationship between instructor credibility and classroom justice, *Communication Education*, 56 (1), 89-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520600994300>
- Chory-Assad, R. M. (2002). Classroom justice: Perceptions of fairness as a predictor of student motivation, learning, and aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, 50, 58- 77.
- Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004a). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education*, 53, 253-273.
- Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004b). Antisocial classroom communication: Instructor influence and interactional justice as predictors of student aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, 52, 98- 114.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2011). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86 (2), 278-321, doi:10.1006/obhd.2001.2958.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3-56). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Coutu, D. L. 2002. How resilience works. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(3): 46-55.

- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (12, 317–372). London: Wiley.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261286563_Progress_in_Organizational_Justice_Tunneling_Through_the_Maze
- Dalbert, C., & Stoeber, J. (2005). The belief in a just world and distress at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 8, 123–135.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher- student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education*, 49, 207- 219.
DOI: 10.1080/03634520009379209
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379209>
- Gallagher, M. W. & Lopez, S.J (2009). Positive expectancies and mental health: Identifying the unique contributions of hope and optimism, *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4 (6), 548-556. DOI: 10.1080/17439760903157166
- Green , L.S., Oades, L.G. & Grant, A.M (2006) Cognitive-behavioral, solution focused life coaching: Enhancing goal striving, well-being, and hope, *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1 (3), 142-149, DOI: 10.1080/17439760600619849
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760600619849>
- Gouveia-Pereira, M., Vala, J.,Palmonari, A. & Rubini, M. (2003). School experience, relational justice and legitimation of institutional. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 18 (3), 309-325.
- Green, S.B. & Salkind, N.J. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: analyzing and understanding data* (4th edition). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Griggs, S. (2017). *The relationship between hope, core self-evaluations, emotional well-being, sexual risk taking, substance use, and academic performance in freshman university students*. University of Massachusetts Medical School. Graduate School of Nursing Dissertations. DOI: 10.13028/wznj-v475.
https://escholarship.umassmed.edu/gsn_diss/49
- Groon, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly* 13, 423–451
- Gümüşeli, A.,İ. (2001). Çağdaş okul müdürünün liderlik alanları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 28 (28), 531 - 548
- Güriz, A. (2001). Adalet kavramının belirsizliği. İçinde Betül Çotuksöken (Edt.) *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye’de Öğretim ve Araştırma Alanı Olarak Felsefe*, (315-330. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.
- Halbesleben, J. R. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 8(1), 102-117.
- Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: according to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46 (2), 172-188
- Holmgren,J.L. & Bolkan,S. (2014) Instructor Responses to Rhetorical Dissent: Student Perceptions of Justice and Classroom Outcomes, *Communication Education*, 63(1), 17-40, DOI: 10.1080/03634523.2013.833644
- Horan, S.M., Chory, R.M. & Goodboy, A.K. (2010). Understanding students’ classroom justice experiences and responses. *Communication Education*, 59 (4), 453- 474.
- Houston, M.B. & Bettencourt, L.A. (1999). But that’s not fair! an exploratory study of student perceptions of instructor fairness. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21(2), 1999 84-96
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel
- Kepekcioglu, E. S. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarının inanılabilirliği algısı ve sınıfta adalet algısı arasındaki ilişki (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.

- Kim, C., Damewood, E. ve Hodge, N. (2000). Professor attitude: Its effect on teaching evaluations. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(4), 458-473, DOI: 10.1177/105256290002400405.
- Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the effectiveness of work engagement interventions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 792–812. doi:10.1002/job.2167
- Lerner, M.J. (1980). The belief in a just World a fundamental delusion. Springer https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4899-0448-5_2
- Lopez, S. J., Snyder, C. R. and Pedrotti, J. T. (2003). Hope: many definitions, many measures. In S. J. Lopez and C.R. Snyder (Eds), *Positive psychological assessment a handbook of models and measures* (91-106). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Madden, W., Green, S. & Grant, A.M. (2011). A pilot study evaluating strengths-based coaching for primary school students: Enhancing engagement and hope. *International Coaching Psychology Review*. 6 (1), 71-99.
- Marques, S. C., Lopez, S. J., Fontaine, A. M., Coimbra, S., & Mitchell, J. (2015). How much hope is enough? Levels of hope and students' psychological and school functioning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52(4), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21833>
- Marques, S. C., Pais-Ribeiro, J. L., & Lopez, S. J. (2009). Validation of a Portuguese version of the Children Hope Scale. *School Psychology International*, 30, 538–551.
- Mazzoli Smith, L., Todd, L. & Laing, K. (2018). Students' views on fairness in education: the importance of relational justice and stakes fairness, *Research Papers in Education*, 33(3), 336-353, DOI: 10.1080/02671522.2017.1302500
- McDermott, D. ve Hastings, S. (2000). Children: Raising future hopes In *Handbook of Hope Theory Measures and Applications*. C.R. Snyder (Edt) 185-198. USA: Academic press
- McInerney, P. (2007) From Naive Optimism to Robust Hope: Sustaining a commitment to social justice in schools and teacher education in neoliberal times, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (3), 257-272. DOI: 10.1080/13598660701447213
- Miller, J. F. (2007). Hope: A construct central to nursing. *Nursing Forum*, 42 (1), 12-19.
- Molinari, L., Speltini, G ve Passini, S (2013). Do perceptions of being treated fairly increase students' outcomes? Teacher–student interactions and classroom justice in Italian adolescents, *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 19 (1), 58–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.748254>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. and Snyder, C. R. (2000). Relations between hope and graduate students' coping strategies for studying and examination-taking. *Psychological Reports*, 86, 803-806.
- Orlich, K., A (2004). *The relationship between hope, appraisal, and coping: student differences in response to subject differences in response to subject matter and exam format*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.
- Paulsel, M.L. , Chory-Assad, R.M. & Dunleavy, K.N. (2005). The Relationship between Student Perceptions of Instructor Power and Classroom Justice. *Communication Research Reports*, 22 (3), 207-215
- Peter, F. & Dalbert, C. (2010). Do my teachers treat me justly? Implications of students' justice experience for class climate experience. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 35, 297–305.
- Peterson, S. J., Byron, K. (2008). Exploring the role of hope in job performance: Results from four studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 785–803. doi:10.1002/Job.492 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/job.492>
- Polat, S. ve Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven , örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim yönetimi*, 14 (2), 307-331.

- Rasooli, A., DeLuca, C., Rasegh, A., & Fathi, S. (2019). Students' critical incidents of fairness in classroom assessment: an empirical study. *Social Psychology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2019.1593105>
- Resh, N. (2009). Justice in grades allocation: Teachers' perspectives. *Social Psychology of Education*, 12, 315–325.
- Reyna, C. And Weiner, B. (2001). Justice and utility in the classroom: an attributional analysis of the goals of teachers' punishment and intervention strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93 (2), 309-319
- Sheldon, K. M., Kasser, T., Smith, K., & Share, T. (2002). Personal goals and psychological growth: Testing an intervention to enhance goal attainment and personality integration. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 5–31.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, (4), 249–275.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C. and Harney, P. (1991). The will and ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60 (4), 570-585.
- Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H. S., Cheavens, J., Pulvers, K. M., Adams, V. H., & Wiklund, C. (2002). Hope and academic success in college. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4):820-826.
- Tarhan, S. (2020). Adaptation of the scales of justice in the classroom into Turkish. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 9(3), 501-514.
- Tarhan, S. (2018). Turkish secondary education students' perceptions of justice and their experiences of injustice. *Journal of Education and Learning*; 7(2), 247-260.
- Tarhan, S. ve Bacanlı, H. (2015). Sürekli Umut Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness and Well-Being*, 3 (1), 1-14 <http://www.journalofhappiness.net/>
- Tekin, Y. F. ve Akyol, B. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin değerlendirme sürecinde örgütsel adalete ilişkin görüşleri üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 23(1), 165-193. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2017.006
- Tetley, J. (2010). An investigation of self-authorship, hope, and meaning in life among second-year college students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The George Washington University, Washington.
- Thrupp, M. & Tomlinson, S. (2005). Introduction: education policy, social justice and complex hope'. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31 (5), 549–556.
- Titrek, O. (2009). Okul türüne göre okullardaki örgütsel adalet düzeyi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Drgisi*, 6 (2), 551-573
- Titsworth, S., McKenna, T.P., Mazer, J.P. & Quinlan, M.M (2013). The bright side of emotion in the classroom: do teachers' behaviors predict students' enjoyment, hope, and pride?. *Communication Education*, 62 (2), 191-209 . DOI: 10.1080/03634523.2013.763997.
- Waters, L. (2011). A review of school-based positive psychology interventions. *The Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 28 (2), 75–90 . DOI 10.1375/aedp.28.2.75
- Westburg, N.G. and Martin, D. (2003). The relationship between a child's hope, a parent's hope and student-directed, goal-oriented academic instruction. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 42, 152-164.
- Yolcu, H. (2010). Sınıf yönetimini etkileyen etmenler. İçinde Celal Gülşen (Ed.) Kuram ve uygulamada sınıf yönetimi, (21-60). Ankara: Anı.
- Young, L.E., Horan, S.M. & Frisby, B.N. (2013). Fair and Square?: An examination of the relationships among classroom justice and relational teaching messages. *Communication Education* 62 (4). doi: 10.1080/03634523.2013.800216 Available from: digitalcommons.butler.edu/ccom_papers/48/

- You, S., Furlong, M.J. ,Felix, E., Sharkey,J.D. &Tanigawa,D. (2008). Relations among school connectedness, hope, life satisfaction, and bully victimization. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 446-460.
- Youssef, C.M. & Luthans, F. (2007), Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience, *Journal of Management*, 33 (5), 774-800.

İletişim/Correspondence

Doç. Dr. Sinem TARHAN
tarhansinem@gmail.com