Introduction

Researchers studied organizational justice claim that organizational justice effects employees’ several work attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction, turnover intention, absenteeism, stress, organizational commitment, and trust [8], [17], [58], [27], [31]. Research on work alienation has also focused on its nature and predicting the antecedents and consequences of it such as isolation in organizations, organizational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, work experience and drinking behavior [5], [6], [43], [50], [42], [59]. However, any study couldn’t be found referred to the relationship between organizational injustice and work alienation. This study takes into account the perceived organizational injustice of the subject’s, and examines whether it has an effect on work alienation.

In recent years, health care industry has become a focus of research, especially in the context of hospital-based care. Many studies examined the influence of organizational justice on the attitudes and behaviors of hospital employees. Among the health care professions nurses appear to be the most discussed group by several researchers in justice context [10], [24], [47], [57], [41].

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of each of the organizational injustice dimensions on work alienation in hospitals. Health care professionals were chosen for this study for several reasons. First, health care is one of the most important, and rapidly growing industry in Turkey. Second, health care professionals have high technical skills, and loosing them may costly for a hospital. Third, it is important to increase their commitment to the hospital for the successful operation of health care services. Fourth, several complaints especially related with pay and working conditions emerged in recent years among these professionals.

1. Literature review

1.1 Organizational Injustice

Organizational justice means the extent to which employees are treated justly [21] and whether the outcomes obtained and the processes carried out are fair at workplace [31]. It defines the social interaction quality between employees at work [25], [38]. Early organizational justice literature distinguished between three types of justice as distributive, procedural and interactional justice [25], [38], [23]. Later, it was proposed that interactional justice has two subcategories, namely informational justice and interpersonal justice, and these subcategories should be considered separately [13], [14].

Distributive justice is the first justice construct and means the perceived fairness of decision outcomes such as pay, bonus or promotion employees receive in an exchange relationship with the organization [3], [8], [15], [23]. Employees create justice perceptions by gauging whether outcomes are proportional to their inputs, whether outcomes meet their expectations, and comparing their input/output ratio to those of their counterparts [17], [15]. For example, an employee will perceive a pay raise or bonus as unfair if he or she receives less money than another employee who is perceived to work at the same level [18]. In the case of something valuable is scarce, everyone can not have what she or he wants, or a negative situation can not be avoided by all, perceptions of distributive injustice may occur. Distributive justice is judged by evaluating and comparing the outcome to a standard or rule and/or to the outcome by a referent, such as a co-worker or past experience [31].

Procedural justice means most generally that how an allocation decision is made [38]. It is the perceived fairness of procedures which are the means used to determine the outcomes [3], [23], [25], [38], [39], [49] and may be just as important as the actual outcome [18]. Any violation by
a decision-maker or an organization can arouse perceptions of procedural injustice [37]. Control model of justice proposes that procedural justice provides employees with indirect influence over the decision-making process by means of process control. Process control which has also been called voice in justice literature, refers one’s possibility to express ones view during the decision-making process [20]. People want to gain favorable, the best, and the maximum personal outcomes and prefer procedures which allow them to control over input into decision-making processes [38]. When the procedures followed give them control opportunity they perceived the processes and decisions as more fair [20], [1].

Decision-making procedures allowing voice help employees to control and influence material outcomes [38], [48]. Such control can produce more favorable outcomes [25]. If a distribution of outcomes or a process satisfies certain criteria, employees believe that it is fair, and consequently, this fair procedures lead to fair distributions [8], [29]. Fair processes facilitate to acceptance of outcomes even when these are undesirable [26]. Furthermore, fair treatment reduces some of the uncertainty experienced in working life, and helps employees to predict and control future events more easily [15]. Before a decision is made concerns of all affected subgroups and individuals should be considered carefully [37], [51]. Allocation processes and procedures should be representative of all affected employees’ views, opinions, needs, and values in the process [12], [34]. The information used in a decision by management should fairly represent the views of all affected employees [47]. The procedure must guarantee that all affected parties have an opportunity to state their views and concerns [46].

Another explanation is offered in group-value model that voice increases feelings of inclusion, respect, and standing within a group [48]. An unfair procedure indicates that individual is a low status member within the group or the relationship between group member and the authority figure is negative [16]. Being treated by important group members in a fair manner leads to positive feelings such as feeling respected and being proud of a member of the group [21].

Interpersonal threatment is an important dimension of organizational relations. It includes interpersonal communication, truthful, courteous, and respectful behavior, appropriate, honest, and timely explanations, and respect for rights [44]. Interpersonal treatment quality is indicative of interactional justice consisting of two distinct justice dimensions. First, interpersonal justice recognizes that people are interested in both outcomes they receive and procedures carried out, and the quality of the interpersonal treatment in executing procedures [1]. It refers the degree to which authorities treat employees with sincere, polite, and respect in determining outcomes or executing procedures [1], [13], [14], [15], [32], [46], [52]. Second, informational justice refers to make honest and adequate explanations [15] which provide the information needed to evaluate structural aspects of the decision making procedures [44], [33]. Informational justice includes explanations or information as to why procedures were used or why outcomes were allocated in a specific way [14], [46], [52], shortly, how this procedures are enacted [44]. Employees review whether adequate explanations for organizational actions and decisions were made by authorities [1]. Interpersonal and informational justice focus more on the explanations and behaviors of the decision maker, however, procedural and distributive justice focus more on systemic or structural characteristics of procedures or outcomes themselves [46].

### 1.2 Work Alienation

When an employee is not able to express oneself at work due to the lost of control over the product and process of his or her labor, work alienation occurs [42]. As a result of the absence of autonomy and control in the workplace, workers may experience alienation. If the work environment cannot satisfy the needs for individual autonomy, responsibility, and achievement of the workers, it will create a state of alienation [36]. When a person is treated exclusive, differently or unfairly because of his or her group membership he or she often feels alienated and angry [22]. Organizations in which there was a lack of autonomy for the employee in the selection of tasks and not allowed enough to participate in decision making were likely to cause high degree of work alienation. There was an inverse relationship between alienation from work and participation in decision making. In the case of low participation in decision making, trainees from
a Management training program experienced work alienation [2].

Alienation at the workplace refers that employees may not be able to fulfill their social needs [45]. Alienation decreases the motivation of workers, psychologically separates them from work and acts to reduce work involvement. Alienated workers are inability to satisfy their salient needs and expectations from work [6], have a form of gap between perceptions of an objective work situation and their certain interests such as values, ideals, and desires [42]. They view their jobs instrumentally, avoid autonomy, responsibility, and higher status, and engage in nonwork pursuits. They do not care personally participation in work processes, their goal is to earn money [53].

As can be seen, this expressions is similar to control model and group value model. If employees are treated unfairly within the group relations or not given voice in the processes they may likely to experience alienation. We proposed that two dimensions of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation) are related with organizational justice, and examined this relationship in this study.

Powerlessness is the absence of control over a person’s life [5] and the inability to control employees’ work process at the workplace [59], [4]. In an alienated work environment, workers neither control the work process nor do they participate in organizational decision-making. Generally, powerlessness may have two sub-dimensions: whether the workers are free of action in the work process, and have influence on organizational decision-making [4]. The sense of powerlessness is a stable individual response to the various social contexts a person is involved in [30]. Alienated workers perceive that control is lacking over the pace and method of the work and over his or her physical movements [40]. Lack of freedom or autonomy leads to powerlessness [3], and employees are not able to use control over work activities, as a result of lack of this job autonomy [42].

According to Cognitive Appraisal Model, when an individual has been harmed by an event (for example, an unfair distribution), he/she assesses whether he/she can avoid or minimize the harm. Not to be able to deflect the harm may cause feelings of powerlessness [27]. Employees who experience high degree of powerlessness at work have lower salaries, and have less rapid advancement in the organization [11]. A lack of procedural justice may lead to feelings of diminished control, and this sense of powerlessness makes escapist coping the more accessible option to alter the source of stress [60]. Powerlessness means that one has no influence on decisions. Nursing discourse was subordinated to managerial discourse, and nurses were relatively powerless in relation to managers. Behavior of managers had the influence on powerlessness, and powerlessness had mediating effect between the behavior of managers and stress [56]. Nurses tend to avoid from feelings of powerlessness because powerlessness prevent them to solve a problem. Status and power are help nurses to resolve or ignore conflicts with doctors [55].

A socially isolated employee is not supported or helped by his or her colleagues or superiors [59]. Employees have not enough inclusion and socially acceptance at workplace [5] and perceive that they have a lack of integration with their coworkers, their occupation, or the organization they work [40]. Organizations do not equally distribute personal influence or organizational power, and do not generate equally flexible or identically rewarding interaction patterns among their members. The amount of freedom workers have to socially interact with other members affect their ability to influence the group’s functioning [43].

An organizational environment in which each employee is not equally rewarded and resources are not distributed in a fair manner, is likely to result in a sense of social isolation. Implementation of unfair procedures, not applied these procedures to everyone in same format and/or excluded employees from decision making procedures may likely to cause a sense of isolation. Furthermore, allocation processes and procedures which are not representative of affected employees’ views, opinions, needs, and values may likely to cause sense of isolation. Unfair treatment and explanations may also likely to cause employees to feel isolated from work environment and relationships.

2. Research model and hypotheses

In the light of this explanations, we expect relationships between four organizational injustice dimensions and two work alienation dimensions. In addition, two individual level variables (sector, profession) were incorporated to this study to investigate whether the perceived organizational
injustice and work alienation differentiate according to these variables. We presented the hypotheses and proposed model below (see Fig. 1).

Hypothesis 1: Employees’ perceptions of distributive injustice will be positively associated with their sense of work alienation. Specifically, employees’ perceptions of distributive injustice will be associated with their sense of (a) powerlessness, and (b) social isolation.

Hypothesis 2: Employees’ perceptions of procedural injustice will be positively associated with their sense of work alienation. Specifically, employees’ perceptions of procedural injustice will be associated with their sense of (a) powerlessness, and (b) social isolation.

Hypothesis 3: Employees’ perceptions of interpersonal injustice will be positively associated with their sense of work alienation. Specifically, employees’ perceptions of interpersonal injustice will be associated with their sense of (a) powerlessness, and (b) social isolation.

Hypothesis 4: Employees’ perceptions of informational injustice will be positively associated with their sense of work alienation. Specifically, employees’ perceptions of informational injustice will be associated with their sense of (a) powerlessness, and (b) social isolation.

3. Methodology

3.1 Procedure and Partipicants

The inspiration of this study is the complaints about working conditions, and especially pay injustice in recent years among health care professionals in Turkey. Questionnaires were created on the basis of scales obtained from literature, and distributed 700 doctors and nurses working in public and private hospitals in Istanbul via electronic mail and face to face interviews. Of the 700 distributed, 405 questionnaires returned. 28 questionnaires were excluded from the analysis because of the missing or incorrect marking. Finally, valid 377 questionnaires were analysed. Of the respondents, 66.8 percent were from public hospitals, and 33.2 percent were from private hospitals. In terms of profession, 69.8 percent of the sample consisted of doctors with the remaining 30.2 percent being nurses.

3.2 Measures

All construct items were assessed using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Distributive injustice was assessed with a 4-item scale which measured the perceived injustice related to outcomes such as pay or promotion employees received from organization. Sample item was “My outcomes doesn’t reflect the effort I have put into my work”. Procedural injustice was assessed with a 8-item scale which referred to the procedures used to arrive at outcomes. A sample item included “I am not able to express my views and feelings during those procedures”. Interpersonal injustice was assessed with a 4-item scale measuring the perceived injustice related to behaviors of the authority figure who enacted the procedure. Sample item was “He/She treats me in a polite manner”. Informational injustice was assessed with a 5-item scale measuring the perceived injustice related to ex-

![Fig. 1: Proposed Model](source: own)
planations or information given by the authority figure. Sample item was “He/She explains the procedures thoroughly”. Colquitt’s original scale items converted to negative statements in order to measure the degree of perceived injustice [13].

Work Alienation was measured by total 15-items from two distinct study. Six-items from Leiter and nine-items used by Yang et al. were adopted to this study [59], [40]. Of the total 15 items, 4 items were removed from the scale due to the low factor loadings. Work alienation scale included dimensions of Powerlessness, and Social Isolation. Powerlessness was measured by 4 items. A sample item included “I am not allowed to express my own opinions and views on the job”. The measure of social isolation included 7 items. A sample item was “I am not able to get practical help from colleagues when difficulties were encountered”.

4. Results

We conducted the principal components analysis with a varimax rotation to investigate whether the variables were distinct constructs. In order to conclude whether the amount of data was sufficient to measure our research and adequate for the factor analysis, it was conducted “Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test” and “Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity”. To be able to perform a factor analysis it must be correlation between variables to a certain extent. If the result of Barlett’s test is lower than .05, there is a sufficient relationship between variables to conduct a factor analysis.

KMO measure of sampling adequacy varies between 0 and 1, the minimum acceptable level is .50, and the result is to be considered better as this value approaches to 1 [54].

The results of Barlett’s test of our study were .000, and significant (at the level of p< .001) for organizational injustice and work alienation. KMO results were .930 for organizational injustice, and .874 for work alienation. Therefore, results of these tests indicated that our scale was sufficient to measure the variables. As expected, each of the organizational injustice dimensions (distributive injustice, procedural injustice, interpersonal injustice, and informational injustice) were loaded onto separate factors. Total variance explained was 76.5 percent. In addition, each of the work alienation dimensions (powerlessness and social isolation) were also loaded onto separate factors. Total variance explained was 64.9 percent. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and Pearson correlations for all variables. Cronbach alpha reliabilities for all scales shown on the diagonal in parentheses were above .70, and were acceptable levels. We have proved that the scales we used for our research were all reliable.

After proving that the scales were reliable and sufficient to measure our data, we may search for the correlation analysis. As shown in Table 1, all of the organizational injustice dimensions were positively related with work alienation dimensions.

Tab. 1. Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Pearson Correlations (N= 377)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sector</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Profession</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.176**</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Informational Injustice</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.123*</td>
<td>-.154**</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.695**</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Powerlessness</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.387**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Isolation</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.174**</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p< .01, *p< .05  All significance tests are two-tailed. Sector was coded as 0= Public, 1= Private. Profession was coded as 1= Doctor, 2= Nurse. NA= Not applicable
Distributive injustice was significantly and positively associated with powerlessness ($r = .264$), and social isolation ($r = .259$) at the level .01. Procedural injustice was significantly and positively associated with powerlessness ($r = .474$), and social isolation ($r = .478$) at the level .01. Interpersonal injustice was strongly and positively correlated with powerlessness ($r = .427$), and social isolation ($r = .507$) at the level .01. Informational injustice was significantly and positively associated with powerlessness ($r = .387$, $p < .01$), and social isolation ($r = .513$, $p < .01$). The more employees’ perceived organizational injustice the greater their sense of work alienation. These results show that employees’ levels of perceived organizational injustice is a significant predictor of work alienation. In addition, sector had statistically significant relations with other study variables except powerlessness. Profession was only associated with informational injustice and powerlessness.

Sector (public and private) and profession (doctor and nurse) were included as control variables in the study to avoid making improper inferences. Preliminary analyses involving sector and profession variables were conducted prior to examining the hypotheses. We conducted Independent samples t-tests. The results showed that perceptions of organizational injustice and sense of social isolation differed according to sector. Public sector employees (respectively, $\mu = 3.51$, $SD = 1.12$; $\mu = 3.00$, $SD = .98$; $\mu = 2.06$, $SD = 1.04$; $\mu = 2.72$, $SD = 1.06$; $\mu = 2.50$, $SD = .82$). There were no differences between public and private sector employees in feelings of powerlessness ($\mu_{\text{Public}} = 2.69$, $SD = .93$; $\mu_{\text{Nurse}} = 2.56$, $SD = .92$). Perceptions of interpersonal and informational injustice, and sense of powerlessness differed according to profession. Doctors perceived more interpersonal ($\mu = 2.37$, $SD = 1.20$) and informational injustice ($\mu = 3.03$, $SD = 1.15$) than did nurses (respectively, $\mu = 2.14$, $SD = .93$; $\mu = 2.66$, $SD = .95$). However, nurses felt him/her self more powerless ($\mu = 2.82$, $SD = .94$) than did doctors ($\mu = 2.57$, $SD = .92$).

Hierarchical Regression analysis was conducted to find out the relationships between organizational injustice and work alienation. Results were presented in Table 3. All hypotheses were examined by separate regression models. Demographic variables (sector and profession) were statistically controlled in the first step of regression analyses before the given organizational injustice dimension was entered in Step 2.

### Distributive Injustice Work Alienation

First hypothesis claimed that employees’ perceptions of distributive injustice would be positively associated with their sense of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation). Demographic characteristics accounted for 3 percent of the variance in powerlessness ($R^2 = .03$). When distributive injustice entered in Step 2, the amount of variance explained increased to 9 percent indicating that there was
### Tab. 3. Hierarchical Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Powerlessness</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>.249***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>.474***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.184***</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>.435***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.217***</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p< .001, **p< .01, *p< .05. All significance tests are two-tailed.

Source: own
a statistically significant relationship between distributive injustice and powerlessness ($\beta = .249$, $p < .001$). Demographic variables accounted for 3 percent of the variance in social isolation ($R^2 = .03$). When distributive injustice entered in Step 2, the amount of variance explained increased to 9 percent. Distributive injustice was a statistically significant predictor of social isolation ($\beta = .239$, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothosis 1 was supported.

- **Procedural Injustice Work Alienation**
  In hypothesis second, it was claimed that employees' perceptions of procedural injustice would be positively associated with their sense of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation). The coefficient of determination increased to 25 percent when procedural injustice entered in regression equation in Step 2. Profession and procedural injustice were accounted for 25 percent of the variance in powerlessness. The procedural injustice and powerlessness relationship was statistically significant ($\beta = .474$) at the level .001. Given the procedural injustice and social isolation relationship, when procedural injustice entered in Step 2, the amount of variance explained increased to 24 percent. It indicated that procedural injustice was significant predictor of social isolation ($\beta = .463$, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothosis 2 was supported.

- **Interpersonal Injustice Work Alienation**
  In hypothesis three it was claimed that employees' perceptions of interpersonal injustice would be positively associated with their sense of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation). When interpersonal injustice was entered into the regression equation in Step 2, the coefficient of determination increased to 21 percent. Sector and interpersonal injustice were accounted for additional 18 percent of the variance in powerlessness. Interpersonal injustice was a statistically significant predictor of powerlessness ($\beta = .435$, $p < .001$). The interpersonal injustice and social isolation relationship was also statistically significant ($\beta = .492$, $p < .001$) in step 2, and the additional 24 percent of the variation in social isolation was explained by interpersonal injustice and sector variables. Thus, Hypothosis 3 was supported.

- **Informational Injustice Work Alienation**
  In hypothesis four it was claimed that employees' perceptions of informational injustice would be positively associated with their sense of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation). The previously explained variance (3 percent) in Step 1 increased to 19 percent, when informational injustice was entered into regression equation in Step 2. There was a statistically significant relationship between informational injustice and powerlessness ($\beta = .410$, $p < .001$). The informational injustice and social isolation relationship was also statistically significant ($\beta = .505$, $p < .001$). The additional 25 percent of the variance was explained by the informational injustice and sector variables. Thus, Hypothosis 4 was supported.

### 5. Discussion

Results revealed that all of the organizational injustice dimensions had effects on each of the work alienation dimensions. Distributive injustice had an effect on powerlessness, and social isolation. But, these relationships were relatively weak. Perceived injustice relating the distribution of resources encourage people to overview whether the procedure used to determine the result is fair. When employees experienced an injustice, they examine whether this allocation decision is fair. If this process is unfair they may show negative reactions [27]. As a result, distributive injustice is not the most effective form of injustice causing powerlessness, and isolation feelings. For example, an employee who received less money or bonus than another employee who is perceived to work at the same level feel him/her self powerless to overcome this negative situation. In addition, unfair distribution of resources also cause sense of isolation among employees.

The relationship between procedural injustice and each of the work alienation dimensions were relatively stronger. Because, according to Control Model of justice, decision-making procedures giving process control opportunity (voice) helps employees to control and influence material outcomes, and to obtain more favorable outcomes. When employees have not the possibility of such a control they will not be able to affect decisions, in turn outcomes, and will feel themselves powerless. In addition, if the concerns, views, needs, and opinions of an employee are not considered in a decision making process, sense of isolation may likely to arise. According to group-value model voice increases feelings of inclusion, respect,
Powerlessness may have possible negative consequences of several job attitudes and behaviors of employees such as increased turnover, absenteeism or destructive behaviors. Ambrose et al. stated that individuals who has a sense of powerlessness may engage in destructive behaviors such as sabotage to increase sense of control [3]. As Greenberg and Barling stated job insecurity reflects the perceived powerlessness to keep control over one’s job, and is likely to result in anxiety and stress, intent to leave, and decreased job satisfaction, commitment, and trust in company. Sense of powerlessness may cause to the use of aggression to get back control [28].

The results indicate that managers must pay attention to employees’ perceptions of organizational injustice. Employees who perceive that procedures are fair will be more likely to have a sense of control and lower social isolation feelings. Consequently, they will be more likely to have positive attitudes and behaviors toward organization or/and managers. These results support the importance of employee participation and control in decision-making processes. Managers should allow employees to provide information to the decision maker before a decision is made (input opportunity) [47]. In addition, accurate and open communication environment, and regular feedback must be provided to employees by managers. Control is associated with fairness and reward, and helps nurses to work according to their values and to develop a healthy, sustaining worklife [41]. To allow nurses to participate in decision-making, to provide them autonomous and empowered behavior, communication, collaboration and openness in relations with other employees increased job satisfaction, improved the quality of care, and facilitated the recruitment and retention [7]. Furthermore, doctors and nurses comprise of the majority of a hospital’s staff and they have high training costs. Therefore, for example, to understand which antecedents influence their turnover intentions is important for hospital supervisors [19].

Empowerment may be effective to overcome the sense of powerlessness. According to Kanungo empowerment is a dealienating strategy in feelings of powerlessness among subordinates [35]. Empowerment and control allows employees to be more certain of the relationship between their efforts (inputs) and outcomes such as pay or promotion [9]. Beecroft et al. also stated...
that empowerment is likely to cause increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and empowered individuals are likely to feel more control over their work [7]. In this respect, future studies should be conducted to find out organizational injustice, work alienation and empowerment relationship. As a result of the doctors and nurses heavy work load, we were unable to collect a large number of surveys. Therefore, future study should be conducted on another work environments and/or professions.
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ABSTRACT

ORGANIZATIONAL INJUSTICE AND WORK ALIENATION

Adnan Ceylan, Seyfettin Sulu

Organizational justice is argued to be related to several work attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction, turnover intention, absenteeism, organizational commitment, workplace aggression, job stress, and managerial and organizational trust. A great deal of research also addressed work alienation in different research areas such as organizational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and work experience and drinking behavior. However, any study couldn’t be found examined the organizational injustice and work alienation relationship.

This paper aims to measure the relationship between perceptions of organizational injustice and work alienation. Four dimensions of organizational injustice were examined: distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational injustice. For this study, two dimensions of work alienation namely powerlessness, and social isolation were addressed. Organizational injustice and work alienation relationship was examined among health care professions (doctors and nurses) in Turkey. Because health care sector has been one of the most important, and rapidly growing industry, and several complaints especially related with pay and working conditions have emerged in recent years among these professionals. It is hypothesized that organizational injustice will cause work alienation and tested these relationships in a sample of 377 health care professionals from public and private hospitals in Istanbul. The results revealed that each of the organizational injustice dimensions were associated with work alienation dimensions. Distributive injustice had the weakest relationship with both powerlessness and social isolation. Procedural injustice was the strongest predictor of powerlessness, but the strongest predictor of social isolation was informational injustice. The theoretical and practical implications of this results were discussed below.

Key Words: distributive injustice, interpersonal injustice, informational injustice, procedural injustice, work alienation.
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