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The paper investigated perceived organizational justice and leadership styles as predictors of employee engagement in the organization. The population comprised secondary school teachers from five secondary schools that were selected and a sample size of 130 respondents were drawn. Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents. The paper employed both primary and secondary data sources. The primary data was collected using self-administered questionnaire. The structured questionnaire was culled from three different instruments namely, Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire, Organizational justice Scale and Utrecht work engagement scale. The data analysis methods used include descriptive statistics, ANOVA tests and regression analysis tests. The findings revealed that perceived organizational justice significantly predicts employee engagement and also perceived leadership styles predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers in Awka South local government area of Anambra state, Nigeria. The paper recommended that employers should ensure that; they reach out to every employee, thereby improving interpersonal relationship and fairness to note and attend to their organizational needs. This will make them feel at home with the organization, and at the same time the employee’s morale will be high enough to improve their engagement to the organization.
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INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement in recent years has become a topical issue and is often the center of debate among the top management, particularly in the public sector organizations and agencies, due to the differences in the work and leadership styles. Commitment and job performances exhibited by the new officers seem to generate mix perceptions and to some extent, disrupt the good relationship between these new officers and senior officers thus destabilizing the organizational activities. Although, these circumstances largely occur in the public sector where adequate research on employee engagement that is heavily influenced by the styles of leadership and
organizational justice are poorly executed. Nonetheless, Employee engagement is defined as a degree to which an employee would be emotionally and intellectually committed to an organization or group (Lockwood 2007).

Previous studies that are related to this topic have started gaining recognition from researchers although still relatively limited. Some organizations have been interested in the willingness of employees to dedicate themselves for leadership roles in the organization and how employees think and feel attached to their work (Kahn, 1990). It is understood that the organization wants to increase employee engagement, given that the engaged employees were willing to devote themselves fully in their work by way of a positive role and remain longer in the work (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Hence, employee engagement concerns the extent to which individuals utilize their cognitive, emotional and physical resources to perform roles associated with the job (Kahn, 1990; Xu & Thomas, 2011). Employees who feel committed and willing to engage in their work generally are the employees who possess the characteristics of energetic, fun, enjoyable, and effectiveness in carrying out their duties (Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schenider, 2008; Xu & Thomas, 2011).

Moreover, the high level of employee engagement is associated with increased return on assets, higher earnings for each employee, and better performance, greater sales growth, lower absenteeism, reduced employee turnover; lower cost than the cost of goods; and error because the products are not diminishing in quality (Salanova, Agut, and Piero, 2005; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Xu & Thomas, 2011). This can be ushered in by organizational justice, which is very crucial to leaders because when justice is advocated as a core value of an organization’s management philosophy and enacted through a set of internally consistent management practices, it can build a culture of justice, a system-wide commitment that is valuable and unique in the eyes of the employees and customers, and may ultimately lead to a competitive advantage (Van der Bank, Engelbrecht & Strumpher, 2010). It is added that justice in an organization defines the very essence of individuals’ relationship with their employers and it is required in both corporate and government organizations. It is the employees’ sense of moral propriety of how they are treated by their leaders or organization, and it is the “glue” that allows employees to work together effectively (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007).

On the other hand, Leadership style is a pattern emphasized on a certain leadership behavior or attitude which is adopted by a leader in interacting with his subordinates. It creates the climate in which people turn challenging opportunities into remarkable success (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Empirical evidence has demonstrated many times that leadership play key role in regulating team behavior and directing task execution toward satisfactory outcomes (Carte, Chidambaram, & Becker, 2006). A leadership style can also improve employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and employee enthusiasm for work (Alok & Israel, 2012). In the opinion of Aydin and Ceylan (2009), leadership builds the excitement for improvement in productivity, growth and abilities of employees by creating the perception of love, honesty and care among employees, thereby enhancing employee engagement.

However, several factors have been identified as antecedents or predictors of employee engagement, according to investigations made by some researchers such as Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), Saks (2006), McBain (2007), Shuck (2010), Ram and Prabhakar (2011), in which they found that there were a number of organizational factors and also work factors which became the driving factors in the creation of employee engagement. Organizational factors which were found positively related to employee engagement were perceived organizational support, procedural and distributive justice, reward and recognition (Saks, 2006; Ram and Prabhakar 2011), job fit,
affective commitment, and psychological climate (Shuck 2010). Another factor that drives employee engagement as identified by McBain (2007) is organizational culture. He defined organizational culture as a system of value held by members of an organization, which distinguishes the organization from other organizations.

Regrettably, leadership style has in the past triggered both the progress and pitfalls of every organization, institution and Nation. Hence, the style of leadership introduced by the management of any organization has either made the employees to be engaged or undedicated to the organization activities. More so, it is imperative to say that the way individual employees, perceived fairness in their workplace has also positive or negative implication on their level of work engagement. Previous studies conducted showed that less than 1 out of 5 employees is actively engaged in their work (Buckingham, 1999 & Attridge, 2009). In addition, the survey conducted in America, Europe and Japan on 656 chief executive officers showed that employee engagement is one of the top five most important challenges for management (Wah, 1999). This perhaps represents tendency for a crisis in productivity and the workers well-being (Attridge 2009). These results show that managers need to realize that the engagement level of their employees might not be as good as they think, so they need to stay updated about the present level of employee engagement in order to take appropriate action in time and not to lose productivity. Putting these into considerations, this paper sought to determine whether perception of organizational justice and leadership styles are good predictors of employee engagement.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The aim of this paper is to evaluate the relationship between organizational justice and leadership styles with employee engagement of secondary school teachers. Hence, the other specific objectives of this paper involves determining whether the perception of organizational justice predicts employee engagement amongst secondary school teachers and determining whether the perception of leadership style predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers.

Hypotheses

Two hypotheses were formulated in this paper which suggests that the perception of organizational justice does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers and the perception of leader’s style does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers. These two hypotheses are presented here in this form.

\[ H01 \text{ Perception of organizational justice does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers} \]

\[ H02 \text{ Perception of leader's style does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers} \]

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section seeks to give an overview of the concept of employee engagement, organizational justice and leadership style. The theories underscoring these variables are also discussed here.

Employee Engagement

This refers to the extent to which an employee uses all available resources to perform roles associated with the job. This implies that the employee fully takes part in all activities within his or her workplace. Khan (1990) defined employee engagement as the harnessing of the
organizational members themselves to their work role. Khan added that in the process of employee engagement, “people” employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally in role performance periods. Moreover, researchers view as having “passion for work”. Rich (2006) defined physical engagement as strong involvement of one’s physical energies towards a certain work, ranging from laziness to vigorous involvement. He stated that physical engagement varies from lethargy to vigorous participation (Rich, 2006). On the other hand, cognitive engagement is visualized as an intense focus of one’s attention on the work tasks leading to thorough absorption and resistance to disturbances (Rothbard, 2001). While emotional engagement is a dominant link with employee’s precise feelings, ideas and views about the job leading to feelings of enthusiasm and pride (Rich, 2006). These three aspects suggest that employee engagement enables the employees to associate positively with their jobs or roles on multiple levels (Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011).

Furthermore, Kravina et al. (2014) described employee engagement as vital in today’s organizations, because it involves high levels of energy, willingness and passion to perform well and to deliver above and beyond what is required of an employee. It is positively associated with job satisfaction and the physical health of employees (Schaufelli et al., 2008). Employee engagement has often been associated with positive consequences in organizations because it involves employee’s ability to identify with one’s work and the feeling of profound personal connection to the task, team and organization. The gains of employee engagement in organizations are also high productivity and profitability; the customers become more satisfied and loyal, the employees are inclined to experience positive emotions such as, happiness, joy, and enthusiasm (Bowles & Cooper, 2012; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Kravina et al, 2014). In addition, the positive organizational outcomes of employee engagement also include increased job performance, organizational commitment, work motivation, high levels of self-control, high co-worker support, and staff retention (Bakker, Albrecht & Leiter, 2011; Salanova, Agut&Peiró, 2005; Schaufelli & Salanova, 2007).

Leadership Style

According to Fiedler (1969) leadership style refers to a kind of relationship whereby someone uses his ways and methods to make many people work together for a common task. Five leadership styles are identified in modern leadership theories and they are charismatic leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, visionary leadership, and culture-based leadership (Yukl, 1994; Bass, 1990; Sashkin, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1987). Also, Tannenbanum and Schmidt (1958) identified four different types of leaders which have been most widely accepted and used. These leadership styles which center on McGregor’s Theory of X and Y assumptions are: Democratic, Autocratic, Dictatorial, and Laissez faire leadership styles. A short description of these leadership styles are discussed here.

Charismatic Leadership

This leadership style is viewed as the most successful trait-driven style of leadership. Charismatic leaders are said to possess the vision and personality that motivates subordinates to execute that vision. As a result, this leadership style has traditionally been singled out as one of the most valued. This leadership style provides fertile ground for creativity and innovation and is often highly motivational. Having charismatic leaders in the helm of affairs in every organization always induces the member to follow such leaders. However, there is one significant problem that potentially undermines the value of charismatic leaders which is leaving the organization. Whenever a charismatic leaves an organization, such organization appears rudderless and without
direction. Their leadership is based upon strength of personality. As a result, charismatic leadership usually eliminates other competing, strong personalities. The result of weeding out the competition is a legion of happy followers, but few future leaders (Michael, 2010).

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership style is defined as the exchange of rewards and targets between employees and management (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Transactional leaders fulfill employee needs of rewards when targets are met (Bass, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Humphreys, 2002). Pounder (2002) defines this style as the transaction of needs fulfillment from both sides of the organization and employees.

**Transformational Leadership**

Avolio et al. (2009) defined transformational leadership as a system of leadership which transforms and inspires followers to perform beyond expectations while transcending self-interest for the good of the establishment that employed them. A more precise definition was given by Hurduzeu (2015) who described transformational leadership is a system of leadership which inspires individuals or employees within the organizations to work harder and to strive for the highest levels of performance. Transformational leaders change their organization’s culture by inspiring a sense of mission and purpose about the importance of the group’s work and stimulating new ways of thinking and problem solving. They inspire the individuals within the organization to achieve high performance.

**Autocratic Leadership**

Autocratic leaders are classic “do as I say” types. Typically, these leaders are inexperienced with leadership thrust upon them in the form of a new position or assignment that involves people management. Autocratic leaders retain for themselves the decision-making rights. They can damage an organization irreparably as they force their ‘followers’ to execute strategies and services in a very narrow way, based upon a subjective idea of what success looks like. There is no shared vision and little motivation beyond coercion. Commitment, creativity and innovation are typically eliminated by autocratic leadership. In the same vein, Autocratic leadership is also known as authoritarian leadership, which is characterized by individual control over all decisions and little input from group members. Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their own ideas and judgments and rarely accept advice from followers. Autocratic leadership involves absolute, authoritarian control over a group.

**Bureaucratic Leadership**

Bureaucratic leaders create and rely on policy to meet organizational goals. Policies drive execution, strategy, objectives and outcomes. Bureaucratic leaders are most comfortable relying on a stated policy in order to convince followers to get on board. In doing so they send a very direct message that policy dictates direction. Bureaucratic leaders are usually strongly committed to procedures and processes instead of people, and as a result they may appear aloof and highly change adverse. The specific problem or problems associated with using policies to lead are not always obvious until the damage is done. The danger here is that leadership’s greatest benefits, motivating and developing people, are ignored by bureaucratic leaders (Michael, 2010).
Democratic Leadership

Tannenbanum and Schmidt, (1958) describe democratic leadership as one where decision-making is decentralized and shared by subordinates. The potential for poor decision-making and weak execution is, however, significant here. The biggest problem with democratic leadership is its underlying assumption that everyone has an equal stake in an outcome as well as shared levels of expertise with regard to decisions. That is rarely the case. While democratic leadership sounds good in theory, it often is bogged down in its own slow process, and workable results usually require an enormous amount of effort.

Concept of Organizational Justice

Greenberg (1987) defined the construct of organizational justice as employee’s perception of their organization’s behaviors, decisions and actions, and how these influence the employees’ own attitudes and behaviors at work. In other words, organizational justice is a personal evaluation of the ethical and moral standings of managerial conduct (van der Bank et al., 2010). According to Cropanzano et al. (2007), this definition of organizational justice is a descriptive approach, which seeks to understand why employees view certain events as just, as well as the consequences that follow from these evaluations. Hence, justice within the organization is viewed as a subjective and descriptive concept because it captures what the individual employees believe to be right, rather than an objective reality or a prescriptive moral code. The three distinct dimensions of organizational justice are also discussed here.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to employees’ perceptions of fairness in the means and processes used to determine the amount and distribution of resources (Saks, 2006). Higher perceptions of procedural justice by employees are more likely to reciprocate with greater organizational engagement (Saks, 2006) and an employees’ positive evaluation of their supervisor (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). The basic tenet of procedural justice a voice in the development of an outcome enhances the perceived fairness in the workplace independent of the effects of its implementation (Greenberg, 2002). For example, in terms of performance appraisals, procedural variables may be more important than distributive (outcome) variables as determinants of the perceived level fairness by employees (Greenberg, 2002). An organization that provides knowledge to employees about procedures demonstrates regard for employees concerns. Decision-making processes that are unclear to employees violate procedural fairness and trust damaging the employer-employee relationship.

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice pertains to an employees’ perception of fairness in decision outcomes and resource allocation (Saks, 2006). In order to be “just”, the allocation of an outcome should be consistent with the set goals of a particular situation. The “equity rule” associated with distributive justice dictates that rewards and resources be distributed in accordance with contributions. Past research shows that distributive justice is strongly correlated with job satisfaction (Sapphire, 1998) and pay satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), which in turn can be said to be strong elements of employee engagement. An organization must be cognizant of efforts made by leadership and management to ensure that it shows legitimate concern for employees regarding the distributive outcomes that not only the employees themselves receive, but those received by their colleagues.
**Interactional Justice**

This type of justice refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment employees receive when procedures are implemented (Colquitt et al, 2001). There are four criteria for interactional justice; justification, truthfulness, respect and propriety (Colquitt, 2001). Interactional justice consists of two specific types of interpersonal treatment – interpersonal justice and informational justice (Colquitt et al, 2001). Interpersonal justice deals with how employees are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by leadership and management – those who execute procedures and outcome distribution (Colquitt et al, 2001). Informational justice focuses on the explanations and information given to employees by leadership and management that provide detail on procedures and outcome distribution (Colquitt et al, 2001).

**EMPIRICAL LITERATURE**

Many studies have been conducted in relation to organizational justice, employee engagement and leadership styles. Study conducted by Gillet, Fouquerneau, Bonnaud-Antignac, Mokounkolo, and Colombat (2013) on transformational leadership behaviors to nurses’ quality of work life and the relationship between nurses’ quality of work life and their work engagement, using cross-sectional research design. The nurses were asked to rate their supervisor’s transformational leadership style and their perceptions of distributive and interactional justice in the unit; the study revealed that distributive justice and interactional justice fully mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and nurses’ quality of work life. In addition, nurses’ quality of work life was positively related to their work engagement.

A number of empirical studies showed that employee engagement provides positive impact toward the work attitudes, work behaviors and employee performance. A Meta-analysis of around 7,939 business units involving 38 companies showed that there was a correlation between employee engagement with the work outcomes such as consumer’s satisfaction, productivity, profit, and employee turnover (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes 2002). Saks (2006) found that employee engagement had positive impact on work satisfaction, organizational commitment and Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and also negatively associated to the intention to leave. Qualitative research has showed that an engaged employee is an energetic employee and always tries to achieve the best for himself (Schaufeli and Bakker 2004).

Similar study by Liao-Holbrook (2012) examined the effects of supervisory interactional justice and supervisory procedural justice on subordinates’ work engagement. The results showed that both supervisory interactional justice and supervisory procedural justice significantly correlated with subordinate report of work engagement measured three months later. However, supplemental analysis results demonstrated that supervisory interactional justice and supervisory procedural justice had significant indirect effects on work engagement through LMX quality.

Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012) conducted a study on the impact of leadership style on organizational performance in selected Banks, in Ibadan Nigeria. The findings showed positive and negative correlation between leadership style dimensions and organizational performance. It also revealed that leadership style dimensions jointly predict organizational performance, which counted for 23% variance of performance. The study concluded that transformational and democratic leadership styles should be employed by the Banks’ management in order to wax stronger in a global competitive environment. Going further, study conducted by Suharti and Suliyanto (2012) examined whether organizational culture and leadership style are included as factors which affect employee engagement and if employee engagement is a
mediating factor for organizational culture and leadership style toward employee loyalty. The result showed that employee engagement was found to significantly affect loyalty. Besides that, the role of employee engagement was a mediating variable for the effect of organizational culture and leadership style toward loyalty also was proved in this research.

METHODOLOGY

The research approach adopted in this paper was a descriptive approach particularly using quantitative research design. The respondents in this research comprised a total of N=104 (One hundred and five) secondary school teachers in five secondary schools namely, Okpuno Community secondary school, Community secondary school, Umuokpu Awka; Community secondary school Agulu, Capital City secondary school Awka; and Community secondary school Amawbia all in Awka south local government area of Anambra State, Nigeria. The research adopted a simple random sampling due to the availability of the sample frame. The respondents consist of seventy-four (74 = 71.2%) females and fifty-six (56 = 28.8%) making it 130 respondents. The males, their age ranged from 24 – 49 years and their mean age was 34.41 with standard deviation of 7.38. The research employed three different instruments namely, Multi-factor Leadership questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio, (1989) and it comprises sixteen items, measuring the perception of transactional and transformational leadership styles, with eight (8) Items for each. The instrument used a five point scale the Likert-type response categories: (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Strongly Disagree and (5) Disagree. The second instrument was adapted from Organizational justice Scale. It was developed by Al-Zubi (2010). The scale comprises of 20-items which measure distributive, procedural and interactional justice and was based on a five-point Likert scale and responses were based on (strongly disagree-1 to strongly agree-5. Third instrument used in the study was a fifteen (15) item employee engagement scale, “Utrecht Work Engagement” It developed by Schaufeli& Bakker (2003). It measured vigor, dedication, and absorption. The response options for each item ranged from Never=0, Almost never=1, rarely=2, Sometimes=3, Often=4, Very often=5 and Always=6. In addition three socio-demographic variables such as; gender, religion and age were included in the study.

Data Collection Method

The data collection methods employed in this paper were secondary and primary data collection methods. The secondary data were collected using online database sources such as Google Scholars, Springer Link, Wiley, Science Direct, JSTOR, Emerald full text, Scopus, and EBSCO HOST to name but a few. The primary data were collected through the administration of the research questionnaire on the respondents in five different secondary schools visited. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to the respondents and obtained the names and phone numbers of some of the respondents to follow up on the completion of the questionnaires. In ensuring that the respondents completed the questionnaires, repeated call-backs were made to them.

Data Capturing and Analysis

Data was coded and captured into Microsoft Excel. The data was imported into SPSS in order for statistical analysis to take place. The proposed hypotheses were tested and analyzed using descriptive statistics, Anova and a statistical method known as simple regression analysis. This is because the researcher tested the prediction of two variables (Organizational justice and leadership styles) against one criterion variable (employee engagement).
Results and Discussions

Table 1: Illustrates the summary table of mean and standard deviation of organizational justice and leadership styles on employee engagement among secondary school teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Justice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Perception</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Perception</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** illustrates the descriptive statistics of all the respondents which indicates that N=61 of the respondents with mean score of (25.66) and a standard deviation of (SD=6.95) perceived organizational justice positively on employee engagement while N=43 of the respondents with mean score of (22.40) and standard deviation of (SD=9.43) perceived organizational justice negatively on employee engagement. The table also shows the descriptive statistics of all the respondents which indicates that N=72 of the respondents with mean score of (25.65) and a standard deviation of (SD=8.40) perceived transformational leadership style as a better or more effective style of leadership. While N=32 of the respondents with mean score of (21.28) and standard deviation of (SD=6.90) perceived transactional leadership style as less effective style of leadership. This entails that the manner in which an employee perceived what goes on in the workplace is determined by his or her level of work engagement.

Results from the Tested Hypotheses One

The result in **table 2** indicates final findings of the first hypothesis of this paper which stated that Perception of organizational justice does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers.

**Table 2: Summary Table of ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>543.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>271.52</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.02a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6359.11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6902.15</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant) Leadership styles, Organizational Justice
b. Dependent Variable : Employee Engagement

The **table 2** result of Anova test jointly showed Regression value of 543.04 with 2 degree of freedom and P-value of .02 which is less than alpha value. Since the p-value (probability) of .02 is less than 0.05, the results indicate that the overall model is statistically significant (F = 4.31, p = 0.02). Independently, the result for hypothesis 1 indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected. This illustrates that perceived organizational justice significantly predicts employee engagement among the secondary school teachers. This result is in line with the findings of Gillet, Fouquereau, Bonnaud-Antignac, Mokounkolo, and Colombat (2013) who posited in their study that distributive justice and interactional justice were found to fully mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and nurses’ quality of work life. Also, the result corroborate with
Liao-Holbrook (2012) assertions that both supervisory interactional justice and supervisory procedural justice significantly correlated with subordinate report of work engagement.

**Results from Tested Hypothesis Two**

The result in table 3 indicates final findings of the second hypothesis of this paper which stated that Perceived leadership style does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers.

**Table 3: Summary Table of Regression Coefficient**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Styles</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

The table 3 result of regression Coefficient test for hypothesis 2 indicates Regression constant value of 32.23 with 2.87 standard errors and P-value of .00 which is less than alpha value. Since the p-value (probability) of .00 is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, (β= -2.09, t= -2.09, P˂.05) in the favor of the alternative hypothesis. This implies that perceived leadership style significantly predicts employee engagement among secondary school teachers. This result is supported by the findings of Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012) who posited that correlation of positive and negative leadership style dimensions enhances employee engagement. It was also found that leadership style dimensions jointly predict organizational performance. Ariani (2014) added that supportive leadership and employee engagement have direct positive relationship with organization citizenship behavior and employee engagement mediated the relationship between supportive leadership and organization citizenship behavior.

**DISCUSSION**

This paper focused on perceived organizational justice and leadership styles as predictors of employee engagement in the organization. The main aim of this paper is to evaluate the relationship of organizational justice and leadership styles with employee engagement of secondary school teachers in Awka South local government area of Anambra state, Nigeria. The objectives of this study have been achieved considering the findings of the research hypotheses. The first hypothesis indicates that perception of organizational justice does not predict employee engagement among secondary school teachers (β= -.137, t= -1.38, P<.05). This means that the first objective of this paper was achieved. The second objective of this paper was achieved as regards to the result hypothesis, which showed that perceived leadership style significantly predicts employee engagement among secondary school teachers (β= -2.09, t= -2.09, P<.05), forcing the null hypothesis to be rejected.

The outcome of this paper is supported by Suharti and Suliyanto (2012) who examined whether organizational culture and leadership style were included as factor that affects employee engagement. However, employee engagement was found to be a mediating variable for the effect of organizational culture and leadership style towards loyalty. In the same vein, several previous studies found that social supports such as organizational support and support from the leader have positive relationship with employee engagement (Maslach et.al. 2001; Sachs 2006). Furthermore,
Vazirani (2005) posited that employee engagement is a level of commitment and involvement of the employees toward the company and values held in the company are affected by several factors which one of them is leadership style. These point to the fact that perceived organizational justice and perceived leadership styles jointly are necessary for the health of workers and growth of any organization.

CONCLUSION

The paper investigated perceived organizational justice and leadership style as predictors of employee engagement in an organization. Having tested the two hypotheses generated in this paper, using the descriptive statistics, ANOVA and regression analysis tests, the objectives of this paper were achieved as solution to the problems identified in this research. The findings of this paper conclude that perceived organizational justice significantly predicts employee engagement among the secondary school teachers and perceived leadership style significantly predicts employee engagement among secondary school teachers. These findings were confirmed and supported with empirical literatures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has provided some crucial recommendations and suggested to private organizations, government and policy makers as well as future researchers.

- The employers should ensure that; they reach out to every employee, thereby improving interpersonal relationship and fairness to note and attend to their organizational needs. This will make them feel at home with the organization, and at the same time the employee's morale will be high enough to improve their engagement to the organization.
- Every establishment should budget and give to every employee his/her entitlement, benefits and incentives. This will enhance and maintain the well-being of the employee and therefore encourage job dedication.
- Further research should be conducted in similar topics to ascertain other factors other than organizational justice that will predict job dedication.
- Managers and human resource personnel are advised to apply the right leadership style that will enhance the morale of their employees to engage properly in the organizational activities.

LIMITATIONS

Some of the limitations encountered in the study include:

- The research limited its interest on secondary school teachers only. Thus, result from similar investigation using other workers from different professions may or may not confirm the present findings.
- The number of subjects is small therefore the generalization of the findings of the study should be taken with discretion in line with this limitation.

In line with the findings of this study; the researcher suggests that more research should be conducted using larger number of participants. Again, she proposes that some demographic variables should be added as a mediating variable so as to unravel other impacts of employee work engagement.
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