

RELATION BETWEEN THE ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTION AND WORK ALIENATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS*

Veysel Okcu¹, Mehmet Sabir Cevik², Naman Bakac³

¹ Siirt University, Faculty of Education, ^{2,3} Siirt University, Division of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics, Siirt (TURKEY)
veysel.okcu56@gmail.com

DOI: 10.7813/2075-4124.2015/7-4/B.35

Received: 16 Nov, 2015

Accepted: 08 Dec, 2015

ABSTRACT

This research has been carried to determine the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of the secondary school teachers. This research is in relational screening model. Research population is composed of 1153 teachers working in 24 secondary schools in the central district of Siirt during 2014 and 2015 school year. As the research population is small, sampling was not made and 366 of the distributed scales were found eligible for analysis. Nearly 32% of the target population provided usable data. Organizational justice scale developed by Nieoff and Moorman (1993) and Price and Mueller (1986), translated into Turkish by Yildirim (2002), and which is composed of 21 items as well as the alienation scale developed by Mottaz (1981) and adapted to Turkish by Erben (2008) and which is composed of 17 items were applied in the research. As a result of this research, it was determined that there is a negative and medium level relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of secondary school teachers. Negative and low level of relation has been identified between the distributive justice and procedural justice dimensions of organizational justice and powerlessness dimension of the work alienation among the teachers of secondary school teachers, while there is a negative and medium level of relation between the interactional justice and powerlessness dimensions. A negative and low level of relation was determined between the distributive, procedural and interactional justice and meaningfulness and self-estrangement dimensions of organizational alienation. Moreover, it was found out that interactional justice dimension of organizational justice significantly predicts the powerlessness, meaningfulness and self-estrangement dimensions of the organizational alienation.

Key words: Organizational Justice, Work Alienation, Secondary School Teachers

1. INTRODUCTION

In organizations, there are many variables increasing the effectiveness and productivity of the workers, raising the performance of the working groups and ensuring the trust, commitment, job satisfaction and interaction among the team. One of these variables is the organizational justice (1). Organizational justice means the perception of the employees regarding the fairness in the work place (2). The concept of justice which has an important place in the working life is a means of motivation for the members of the organization. While transferring their knowledge and experience to the organization, the members would like to receive the reward of their contribution in the fairest way. Workers who believe to be treated fairly in the distribution of sources, in the social relations established and in the intra-organizational processes behave in favour of the organization while the workers believing to be treated unfairly behave against the organization. Therefore, the managers of the organization should attach due importance to the establishment of the organizational justice in the distribution of sources and decision making processes stages (3). Moreover, positive perception of organizational justice by the employees of the organization is important in terms of the job satisfaction and effective functioning of the organization (4). Organizational justice trying to eliminate the problems between the administration and the employees also functions as an effective unifying mechanism. A fair administration contributes the perception of administration as legitimate by the employees (5).

When the rules are not applied equally for everybody in the organization, this causes some problems. For example, perception of unfair practices among the members of the organization leads to aggressive behaviours. For that reason, in order to eliminate the unfairness, members of the organization begin to display negative and aggressive behaviours towards their administrators, and colleagues (6). Work alienation may be cited as the most concrete example of these negative attitudes and behaviours. Work alienation occurs when the employee of the organization begins to find his work meaningless, when he is not satisfied with his relations at the work place, when he feels himself isolated, insufficient, powerless and when he perceives himself as a simple wheel of the system (7). In other words, work alienation means not being able to ensure the conditions and atmosphere revealing the value of an individual as a human such as autonomy, responsibility, social interaction and self-realization (8). As a result of work alienation, negative phenomena like job dissatisfaction, communication problems, tendency to evade responsibilities, sympathy to bureaucracy, cainophobia, kvetching, perceiving close contact with people as a burden may emerge. Depending on these, loss of creativity, mental disorders, avoiding social relations, lack of interest in life, tendency to use drugs and suicidality, irregular life style and bad relations, indifference to value judgments and norms of the society, and some principal personal characteristics like rebellion, excessive selfishness, obedience, submissiveness, compliance without any questioning and fatalist nature may be observed among the alienated people (9,10). Effect of work alienation on the worker is not limited only with these, it may also emerge as the loss of job and life satisfaction, low level of productivity, low level of motivation, intensive job stress, low level of loyalty to job and to the organization, high ratio of labour turnover, avoidance of work, indifference to job, disaffection from job and low level of organizational health perception (11).

*An oral presentation about this study was made in the "International Congress on Education for the Future" organized by the Ankara University between 13-15 May.

Organizational justice is important in terms of increasing the efficiency of the organization and preventing the work alienation, as the lack of organizational justice would hinder benefiting sufficiently from the human potential which is the most important source forming the organization. Thus, in line with the increase in the positive perception of organizational justice, the work alienation of the individuals from the organization decreases. Accordingly, the literature covers numerous researches putting forward that the organizational justice perception of the employees determine the job satisfaction (12-15), trust in organization (15-18), organizational commitment (19- 25), work alienation (1, 26-28) and individual job performance (29,30). Moreover, foreign researches reveal that various organizational factors, work environment, administration and leadership styles affect work alienation (31-34). However, it is remarkable that there is not sufficient number of studies about the relation between the organizational justice perception of employees and their work alienation in the education sector in Turkey. This research is important in terms of determining the organizational justice perception of teachers in schools, examining the effect of organizational justice on the work alienation of teachers in educational institutions, making and assessment accordingly and providing guidance to school administration in their administrative decisions and practices, based on the results of this assessment. Moreover, when the literature is reviewed, it is realized that the number of similar studies are very limited. Therefore, this research is expected to contribute to the literature by examining the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation.

1.1. Organizational Justice

For more than 30 years, organizational justice has been studied widely in the field of social- psychology and also in the organizational context by the psychologists, administrative scientists and other individuals related with the matter (35-37). The concept of organizational justice dates back to the Equity Theory of Adams. Based on the equity theory, researchers began to have interest in justice within the organization (38). Pursuant to the Equity Theory developed by John Stacey Adams in 1963, an individual compares the result he obtained as a result of his efforts with the result and efforts of the other employees in the same organization. If he perceives an inequality as a result of this comparison, he will then behave in a way to eliminate this inequality. For example, he may work less, ask for more salary, quit working, or tend to be absent more (39). Equity theory regards the organizational justice perception as a motivational element. Outputs of this theory are related with the justice approach in the organizations (40). Therefore, a good administrator realizes the conditions in which an employee may perceive inequality and takes the necessary measures (41).

Justice is a concept that is commonly used in the daily life and always mentioned in the interpersonal dialogues. This concept is discussed principally and mostly in the working environment. Matters related with the salaries, behaviours of the administrators, whether these behaviours vary among the employees, and the justice displayed by the administrators are among the topics continuously discussed (42). Justice is a subjective concept varying person to person and means the facts perceived or believed to be true by the people themselves (43). In the dictionary of Turkish Language Association, the concept of justice is defined as the compliance to rights and laws, protecting one's rights and providing the due, right thing to each person and ensuring rightness (44). Adams defined justice by emphasising the decisions of the employees taken following an assessment whether he is treated fairly in the organization or not and the comparison of themselves with their colleagues in terms of the salaries and designated positions in return of the efforts exerted (45). Therefore, justice relates with the moral and religious rules as it defines both a case and the human behaviours (46).

Organizational justice is an entire set of rules and norms concerning the distribution of the organization's sources, processes during the distribution phase, and the interpersonal behaviours required to be observed during the progress of these processes (47). Atalay defines organizational justice as the means referred by the individuals to determine whether they are treated fairly in the organization and as the way justice affects the variables relating to the work (48). According to Hubbel and Chory-Assad organizational justice is a concept related with the degree of fairness, objectivity and realistic attitude towards the employees (49). Organizational justice provides an important competitive advantage due to the accompanying commitment in employees. In order to ensure a culture of organizational justice, five administrative factors are necessary: reward systems, conflict management, layoffs, performance appraisals and organizational commitment (43). In contrast to organizational justice, organizational injustice leads to low performance and demoralization.

Employees' perceptions regarding whether the people determining the working conditions and applying the rules are fair or not affect their attitudes and behaviours towards their jobs (50). Employees with positive perceptions related to the organization display positive behaviours while those with negative perceptions tend to behave negatively by not exerting efforts, or not trusting the organization as much before (51). The level of positive reaction towards an institution depends on the fair treatment it ensures. Therefore, professional performances, productivity, job satisfaction, commitment, motivation of the workers are closely related with the concept of organizational justice. This will cause the employee to look continuously for a fair, just and transparent environment. Also in educational institutions, both the teachers and the students may have various requests related with organizational justice. Each stakeholder of the school will display his performance, perspective and success in line with his level of justice perception (52).

1.1.1. Dimensions of Organizational Justice

Previously, the topic of organizational justice used to be studied in terms of distributive justice and procedural justice, but later on the dimension of interactional justice has also begun to be addressed (50). In recent years, organizational justice has begun to be addressed in its entirety (53). These three different dimensions of organizational justice are closely related with each other. Studies carried out revealed that there is also a close relation between the attitudes of the employees towards the organization and these three dimensions (29). In this research, organizational justice has tried to be explained on the basis of three dimensions as distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

1.1.2. Distributive Justice

Distributive justice addresses the principles regarding the distribution of rights and responsibilities to individuals in an organization (54). According to Poole, distributive justice can be exemplified as the distribution of budget, salary and rewards (55). Moreover, conditions such as rewarding the unworthy, applying very heavy or very light punishments, and failing to ensure a balance between the reward and punishment may lead to a perception of injustice among the employees (56). Acquired results such as income, premiums, promotions, and social rights may be perceived as just or unjust. Individuals compare the results they acquired with those acquired by the others. As a consequence of this comparison, members of the organization may think that they are not being treated fairly. This though will affect their attitudes and attitudes may cause a change in the behaviours. Therefore, in distributive justice, it is essential to ensure that each individual thinks to have a fair share in the distribution of the sources (6).

1.1.3. Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is the perception of the level of fairness of the processes and methods utilised in decision making (2). Moreover, procedural justice is based on taking moral and reliable decisions in the organization (57). Distributive justice focuses on the distribution of sources and the results of this distribution while the procedural justice focuses on the processes during the distribution of the sources (58). Procedural justice refers to a higher level of result than the distributive justice. In fact, this is also concluded when the turnovers of organizations are considered (59). Therefore, it is thought that procedural justice is more effective on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship (29). Besides, powerlessness of the employees and centralization in the organization negatively affect the procedural justice (60). Shaping the organizational processes such as employment, promotion, distribution of tasks based on the principles of fairness, consistency and objectivity is among the principal factors enhancing the procedural justice. Fair and consistent processes will yield objective results. If the intra-organizational methods are unfair, incorrect or differ person to person employees will think that the process is unjust (29).

1.1.4. Interactional Justice

It has been asserted that interpersonal interaction experienced by the individuals during the exercise of the processes should be taken into account in forming the justice perception of the workers and this has led to the emergence of interactional justice (61). Interactional justice was realized long after distributive and procedural justice. Today, interactional justice is the type of organizational justice that is studied mostly and is a concept that points to the nature of the inter-individual relations and humanistic aspect of the practices in an organization (17, 62). Interpersonal justice indicates employees that they are valuable and important as an individual (50). In his study Greenberg (1993) introduced new dimensions to the justice perception and divided interactional justice into two as "interpersonal" and "informational" (62). Interpersonal justice aspect reveals the level of sensitivity, kindness, seriousness, respect and value displayed towards the workers by the administrators who decide on the results. Informational justice includes information on the reasons related with the way of referring to proceedings during the decision taking or with the type of distribution of sources (63).

As a consequence, justice perceptions may be examined in three basic fields. First of these is the "reactions to the results" resulting from the distributive injustice, the second is the "reactions to the whole organization" resulting from the procedural injustice and the third is the "reactions to administrators" caused by interactional injustice (64).

1.2. Work Alienation

The term "yabancilasma" (alienation) was incorporated into Turkish as an equivalent of the French term "alene" and English term "alienation" (65). According to the dictionary of the Turkish Language Association, alienation is the individual's loss of interest in the social relations and the values of the society in which he lives, perception of these as meaningless and feeling of powerlessness and being isolated (66). This term which is mostly used for people with mental disorders refers to self-detached person (67). Similarly, in the western languages, the term alienation is used for "people with mental disorders". The reason of this is that people with mental disorders detach themselves from the society (68).

Alienation is one of the most important terms in the social sciences and bears different meanings in this field and among the theorists studying it. For example, some researchers argue that the concept of alienation has its roots in Ancient Greece and Christianity, while some believe that it is a concept of modern and industrial society (69). Radical criticisms of the industrial society from Marx to contemporary views focus on alienated employees. In the literature, alienated person is also the main subject of mass society. The concept of alienated labour is a characteristic of the modern society and this phenomenon expresses the negative aspect of the industrial order (70). Over time, the term alienation began to be used in the daily language and referred as alienation of the society, alienation of the culture, alienation of the language, alienation of the religion, alienation of the politics, self-alienation and in many other ways. All these forms of alienation emerged particularly after the transmission to the industrial society and began to be felt more intensely with the globalisation in the 21st century (71). All the circles including social scientists and management scientists are aware of the work alienation. Nobody denies the effect of this phenomenon on the social and economic atmosphere of the contemporary post-industrial society. In terms of the life standards of the employees and the efficiency of the organizations, it is vital to understand the phenomenon, its causes and consequences. It is stated that alienation is caused when the requirements of an employee from the organization such as personal control, autonomy and self-realization cannot be fulfilled. It may be argued that the modern organizations lead to alienation by eliminating the individuality with their bureaucratic structures, strict rules and regulations, official atmospheres and routine functioning (72).

Definition of the alienation differs according to the behaviours and activities of the people in their individual and social lives. For example Karl Marx defined alienation as the activities estranging people from the product of their own labour, the act of producing, the nature in which they live in and the other people (73). Aldemir defined alienation as the individual's belief regarding his degree of effect on result or the results desired to be obtained by the people in a social system while Hosgorur defined it as the state powerlessness experienced by the workers (74, 75). Accordingly, work alienation is generally a reflection of the disappointment with the professional norms and professional life (76).

As understood from these definitions, alienation is the estrangement of individuals from their own values, responsibilities, all thoughts for happiness, to the society in which it is lived and from the self (77). The loss of control of the employee over the work or the product may also lead to work alienation. Alienation hinders the social needs of workers, within the organization and leads to the thought of insufficiency by the workers regarding their ideals and values for their work (78, 79). Alienation is also observed when the employees give up or transfer their control or power over their work and sacrifice their interests and requirements. Therefore, lack of autonomy and control in the workplace may lead to alienation (80). In addition to these, Forsyth and Hoy stated that the limited opportunities within the organization to take part in the decisions in the theoretical sense, hierarchical supervision over the tasks, great number rules, and strict application of the rules also cause work alienation (81). However, Martin adopted a different approach and addressed work alienation as a concept expressing human freedom basically (82). According to Martin, administrators may not succeed in including the employee in the work thoroughly and enabling him to become a part of the work. People may not fully obey the demands of the others. Even in very difficult conditions, people find a way to ensure individual freedom and to express themselves despite the total pressure. In certain conditions, this may result in work alienation (82).

As is seen, there are various approaches for the definition of the alienation, due to its wide scope and the historical evolution of the concept (83). Alienated people consider their work as a means and deal with actions other than work. Participation to the work processes is not important personally, and the real aim is to earn money. The work is considered as

a means which allows earning money. When the employee thinks that he is not rewarded for his education, the responsibilities he assumes in the organization, his performance, experience and knowledge, he will then focus only on earning money by carrying out his own work. Therefore, unjust distribution of the gains will affect the alienation (84).

1.3. Dimensions of Work Alienation

The concept of alienation was mostly addressed by Melvin Seeman. Seeman approached alienation from socio-psychological perspective and stated that a single definition of alienation cannot be made as it is a disorder that occurs depending on the social conditions and the emotional personality. Seeman narrowed down the concept of alienation and expressed its effects on the individual from different dimensions. According to Seeman, alienation has five dimensions (85). With the aim of separately discussing the factors related to work, Mottaz studied alienation under three headings. Mottaz's alienation scale covers the dimensions of powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement and the dimensions of normlessness and social isolation are described as indirect (peripheral) factors causing alienation. This classification of Mottaz is still up-to-date and his basic three-dimensional scale is utilised in many studies (1). All dimensions of alienation can be expressed as follows:

1.3.1. Powerlessness

Powerlessness means a condition where the individual attaches high level of importance to certain objectives but hardly expects to achieve them (86). Powerlessness is a negative psychological state emerging as a result of the occurrences and when the individual does not have any effect on them. People thinking to be powerless worry about not being able to control their future as they do not feel to have control and dominance over their work (31, 87, 88). Lack of freedom and autonomy of the workers in the organization leads to the feeling of powerlessness and as a result of this, workers would not like to take control of the work (79, 89). Feeling of inadequacy of the worker, frequent changes in the work process, failure of the worker in solving the problems, insufficient level of ability and competence for the required work, blockages before the means of influencing the administration, feeling of exclusion with regard to the provided product and service cause the feeling of powerlessness (90). Moreover, employees try to ensure a balance in terms of justice by reducing the level of their input or the output of the others. However, individuals who cannot control these conditions are expected to feel powerless. Considering to have lack of control over the incidences and feeling of being oriented by the others are among the most important indications of powerlessness (91).

1.3.2. Meaninglessness

Bayindir defines meaninglessness as the lack of meaning attributed by the individual to his work and failure to connect the self with the roles assumed while Akgun defines it as the inability to puzzle out the signs and shapes that facilitate the prediction of one's own behaviour (92, 93). In other words, meaninglessness occurs when the activities of an individual does not have any reflection in his internal life, when he partners a life readily presented to himself, and when he is passive in attributing meaning to his life. This dimension of alienation is related with the understanding perception the incidents and processes to which the individual is involved. The individual in this dimension cannot choose the best among the various alternatives (94). Factors such as the fragmented structure of the working process, not being able to see the result of the production, not understanding the whole of the work, routine and dull working which does not allow any creativity, bureaucratic obstacles, strict hierarchy, failure to access information and resources, feeling of encapsulated and absorbed by the great gap between the real and the required one (7).

1.3.3. Self-Estrangement

The process beginning with the detachment of an individual working in mass production from his product results in the failure to devote himself to work with full capacity and to benefit from creativity in his work. Later on, individual working under these conditions for another while detaches from the characteristics that render himself an individual. In his social relations, he will no longer be able to get into contact with people sincerely (95). Being alienated to his self as a result of these, the individual cannot carry out his work fondly. In other words self-estrangement means a process where the individual cannot understand internal functioning and thus focuses on external factors such as money, security, etc. and where he cannot prove himself in his work (71). Besides pointing to a condition caused by the belief of an individual that his present status is bad, self-estrangement means that the worker cannot devote himself to work, cannot involve in work, and detaches from himself because of certain considerations. From this aspect, self-estrangement or self-detachment is closely related with meaninglessness and powerlessness (96).

1.3.4. Normlessness

Normlessness is observed when the rules become ineffective, when irregular actions are taken to achieve the goals, when social norms regulating individual conduct are no longer effective as rules for behaviour, when deviated from the common standards and when individualism or instrumental attitudes are seen more frequently (97). Sometimes, there is a tendency to behave in a way not accepted by the society, as a result of isolating himself from and not being able to integrate with the generally accepted norms. From this perspective, normlessness is similar to Durkheim's concept of anomie. When people cannot integrate themselves with the society, they tend to be more individualistic and thus, several undesirable conditions began to emerge (1). Indifference of the leaders to the needs of the individuals, perception of the individuals they can achieve hardly anything in a society seeming to be disordered and irregular, detachment from the objectives of life, feeling of emptiness and nothingness, believes and considerations that one cannot trust in his personal relations for psychological and social support are among the indicators of normlessness (67).

1.3.5. Isolation

Isolation (social distance – isolated) generally means the detachment of an individual from the physical environment he lives in or the social environment he gets into contact with other people. The reasons of such detachment may be the physiological status of the individual or his social environment (7). Isolation also means the loss of the ability or possibility to get into contact with other people (98). In this dimension, the individual rejects the other employees, exerts effort to get away from any institutional effect and act on the basis of the belief that other employees do not want him. This condition has an effect that triggers intra-organizational isolation (88, 99). Isolation (social distance – isolated) may also be observed as anti-social behaviour of the individual who does not adopt the social rules and thus objects them intentionally and consciously

(100). However, isolation may be observed as the isolation of the individual from the social environment while also as the exclusion of him by the circles (101).

1.4. Relation between the Organizational Justice Perception and the Work Alienation

In today's organizations facing with a dizzying increase in competition, happiness of the workers is very important to achieve success, as this happiness is reflected in the work. When a worker is happy with his work, his happiness can also be observed in his social life (4). Therefore, a positive perception of organizational justice enables the workers to identify themselves with the organization and to be satisfied with his relations at the workplace. Accordingly, role and position of the school administrators in ensuring the organizational justice and preventing the work alienation are of vital importance.

Ceylan & Sulu and Sulu & Ceylan & Kaynak carried out two studies covering 383 health workers in Turkey (27, 28). According to the results of these two studies, it has been determined that in line with the increase in the behaviours associated with organizational justice, behaviours associated with work alienation decrease. However, both of the studies did not reveal a negative relation between the organizational justice and the work alienation. As a result of the study carried out by Gunsal on 342 bank employees to determine the relation between the organizational justice and alienation, a high level of negative relation was determined between the two variables (26). Similarly, a statistically negative relation was determined between all dimensions of the organizational justice and that of the organizational alienation. Moreover, within the scope of the research, overall organizational justice perception explains the overall organizational alienation level by 27.8%. Besides these three studies, according to the results of the study carried out by Sayu on 200 private sector employees working in various fields in Istanbul, there is a negative and low level of relation between the distributive justice and the work alienation (1). Moreover, a negative relation was identified also between the procedural justice and the sub dimensions of work alienation. Relation between the interactional justice and the powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement dimensions is found to be negative and medium level. Results of the study indicated that only interactional justice adds to powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement dimensions. Unbalanced attitudes for reward and punishment within the organization, unjust practices with regard to promotion and advancement, single sided decision-making processes, inequalities in the distribution of sources, and failure to display due importance and sensitivity to social relations may lead to powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement among the workers against the organization. In this regard, it may be stated that in cases where distributive, procedural and interactional justice is high, the perception of powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement is low.

1.5. Objective of the Research

This research has been carried to determine the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of the secondary school teachers working in the central district of Siirt during 2014 and 15 school year. Based on this main objective, the following questions have been tried to be answered:

- What is the level of organizational justice perception among the secondary school teachers?
- What is the work alienation perception of secondary school teachers?
- Is there a significant relation between the organizational justice perceptions and work alienation perceptions of the secondary school teachers?
- Is the organizational justice perception of the secondary school teachers a significant predictor of work alienation?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Model, Population and Sample

This research carried to determine the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of the secondary school teachers working in the central district of Siirt is in relational screening model. Relational screening models are research models aiming to determine the existence and/or level of covariance between two or more variables (102). In other words, correlational (relational) researches are researches carried out to identify the relation between two or more variables and to find clues regarding the cause-effect relation (103).

Research population covers secondary school teachers working in the central district of Siirt during 2014 and 2015 school year. Research population is composed of 1153 teachers working in 24 secondary schools in the central district of Siirt during 2014 and 2015 school year. As the number of teachers included in the research population is not high, sampling was not made. Data of 787 teachers who did not want to fill in the forms or who filled in deficiently were excluded from the evaluation. Data of 366 teachers were found eligible for analysis. Thus, nearly 32% of the target population provided usable data for analysis. Personal information of the teachers who attended the research is given below:

Table 1. Personal Information of the Teachers in the Sample Group

Variable	Level	n	%
Gender	Male	229	62.6
	Female	137	37.4
Age Group	20-30 Years Old	178	48.6
	31-40 Years Old	149	40.7
	41 Years Old and Above	39	10.7
Educational Background	Bachelor's degree	278	76.0
	Master's degree	88	24.0
Seniority	1-10 Years	250	68.3
	11-20 Years	92	25.1
	21 Years and More	24	6.6
Total		366	100

As seen in Table 1, 137 (37.4%), of the teachers are female while 229 (62.6%) is male. 39 (10.7%) of the participants are 41 years old and above, while 149 (40.7%) are between 31-40 and 178 (48.6%) are between 20-30 years old. With regard to educational background, 278 (76.0%) of the teachers have bachelor's degree while 88 (24.0%) have master's degree. It has been determined that 24 (6.6%) of the participants have 21 years or more experience while 92 (25.1%) have 11-20 years' experience and 250 (68.3%) have 1-10 years' experience.

2.2. Data Collection and Analysis

Organizational justice scale developed by Nieoff and Moorman and Price and Mueller, translated into Turkish by Yildirim, and which is composed of 21 items as well as the alienation scale developed by Mottaz and adapted to Turkish by Erben and which is composed of 17 items were applied in the research (22),(104-107). Organizational justice scale is three-dimensional and its distributive justice dimension is composed of six items (questions 1 to 6), just as procedural justice dimension is composed of six items (questions 7 to 12), while interactional justice dimension is composed of nine items (questions 13 to 21). Similarly, work alienation scale is three dimensional and its powerlessness dimension is composed of six items (questions 1 to 6), while meaninglessness dimension is composed of four items (questions 7 to 10), and self-estrangement dimension is composed of seven items (questions 11 to 17). Items in both scales have been scored between a range of "strongly disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (6)" and the score frequency of the scales utilised are given below in Table 2.

Table 2. Score frequencies of the scales

Alternative	Alternative Score	Alternative Score Frequency
Strongly Disagree	1	1.00-1.83
Disagree	2	1.84-2.67
Rarely Agree	3	2.68-3.51
Slightly Agree	4	3.52-4.35
Quite Agree	5	4.36-5.19
Strongly Agree	6	5.20-6.00

In order to determine the factor structure of the organizational justice and organizational alienation scales, exploratory factor analysis was carried out. In the exploratory factor analysis, principal components analysis and orthogonal rotation technique (varimax) were applied. Accordingly, it has been determined that the organizational justice scale has a 3-factor structure. Distributive justice dimension which is the first factor explains 33.735% (eigenvalue: 7.107) (KMO=0.905; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square= 2025,739; sd=15; p < 0.001) of the variance, procedural justice dimension which is the second factor explains 23.551% (eigenvalue: 5.103) (KMO=0.890; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square = 1454,210; sd=15; p < 0.001) and the interactional justice dimension which is the third factor explains 18.886% (eigenvalue: 3.89) (KMO=0.941; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square = 4213,375; sd=15; p < 0.001).

It has also been identified that the work alienation scale has a 3-factor structure. The first factor, powerlessness dimension explains 43.752% of the variance and the related eigenvalue is 7.43 (KMO=0.807; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square = 509,095; sd=15; p < 0.001). The second factor, meaninglessness dimension explains 8.634% of the variance and the related eigenvalue is 1.46 (KMO=0.811; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square = 652,172; sd=15; p < 0.001). The third factor, self-estrangement sub dimension explains 5.992% of the variance and the related eigenvalue is 1.01 (KMO=0.878; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square = 1098,791; sd=15; p < 0.001). Moreover, it has been observed that the factor loading of the scales is above 0.50. As a result of the reliability analysis carried out with the data obtained for the research scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficients of internal consistency was .96 for the whole organizational scale while it was .91 for the whole work alienation scale. Cronbach Alfa reliability values for the dimensions of the scales are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Cronbach Alfa reliability values of the scales by dimensions

Dimension	Cronbach Alfa reliability co-efficient
Distributive justice	.94
Procedural justice	.85
Interactional justice	.97
Powerlessness	.76
Meaninglessness	.85
Self-estrangement	.86

As seen in Table 3, internal consistency of the both scales is quite reliable. Interactional justice which is a dimension of organizational justice has the highest reliability value, while the powerlessness dimension of work alienation scale has the lowest reliability value. Considering these figures, it is seen that both of the scales are valid and reliable.

Confirmatory factor analysis of the organizational justice and work alienation scales was carried out through AMOS 22 programme. As a result of the analysis, certain fit indices related to the consistency of the model with the data were examined. χ^2 , GFI, AGFI, CFI, NFI, IFI, RMSEA and AIC may be listed among the mostly used fit indices. Among these, χ^2 is sensitive to sample size and thus it should be accompanied by other indicators. In terms of fit indices, certain criteria are applied such as χ^2 /sd value should be lower than 5, GFI higher than .90, IFI and CFI higher than .95 and RMSEA lower than .06 (108),(109). Moreover, the fact that GFI, NFI, CFI and AGFI values as fit indices are higher than .90 and RMSEA value is lower than .05 indicates that the model is quite consistent with the data (110). In this research, fit indices measured with regard to the consistency of the model (NFI = .95, CFI = .94, IFI = .93, RMSEA = .054, χ^2 / sd = 124.82 / 36 = 3.46 < 5.00) points that the model is consistent.

SPSS (16.00) package programme was used for the data collected under the research, correlation between the variables and the descriptive statistical techniques (frequency, per cent, average, standard deviation) and multiple

regression analysis while the confirmatory factor analysis of the organizational justice and work alienation scales was carried out through AMOS 22 programme. In analysis, $p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .01$ levels were taken as basis.

3. FINDINGS

Descriptive statistical results displaying the relation between the organizational justice perceptions and work alienation of the secondary school teachers by the dimensions of the scales are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the relation between the organizational justice perceptions and work alienation of the teachers

Variable	N	\bar{X}	Ss
Organizational Justice	366	4.14	1.13
Distributive Justice	366	3.55	1.44
Procedural Justice	366	4.10	1.33
Interactional Justice	366	4.57	1.20
Work Alienation	366	2.88	.96
Powerlessness	366	3.62	1.01
Meaninglessness	366	2.58	1.20
Self-estrangement	366	2.41	1.12

As seen in Table 4, organizational justice perception of the participants ($\bar{X} = 4.14$, Ss = 1.13) are determined to be at "slightly agree" level while their work alienation perceptions ($\bar{X} = 2.88$, Ss = .96) are at "rarely agree" level. With regard to the dimensions of the organizational justice scale, perceptions of the teachers are at "slightly agree" level in distributive justice ($\bar{X} = 3.55$, Ss = 1.44) and procedural justice ($\bar{X} = 4.10$, Ss = 1.33) dimensions and at "quite agree" level in interactional justice ($\bar{X} = 4.57$, Ss = 1.20) dimension. In the work alienation scale, perceptions of the participants are at "disagree" level in meaninglessness ($\bar{X} = 2.58$, Ss = 1.20) and self-estrangement ($\bar{X} = 2.41$, Ss = 1.12) dimensions and at "slightly agree" level in powerlessness ($\bar{X} = 3.62$, Ss = 1.01) dimension. According to these findings, it can be said that the average of the organizational justice perceptions of the participants is high while the average of their work alienation perceptions is low. In other words, it may be deduced that the school administrators enable the teachers to feel that they are important and valuable, take decisions by consulting and explaining them which procedures are used why and how. Moreover, it can be said that the school administrators try to apply decision making methods and processes justly.

3.1. Findings of the Correlation Test of the Variables

Table 5 displays the results of the correlation test carried out to determine the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of the secondary school teachers.

Table 5. Results of the correlation test regarding the relation between the organizational justice perception and work alienation of the secondary school teachers

Dimensions of the Organizational Justice	VARIABLES			
	Work Alienation	Powerlessness	Meaninglessness	Self-estrangement
Organizational Justice	-.32**	-	-	-
Distributive Justice	-	-.23**	-.16**	-.15**
Procedural Justice	-	-.28**	-.24**	-.22**
Interactional Justice	-	-.34**	-.29**	-.28**

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

According to Table 5, there is a negative and medium level relation between the organizational justice perceptions ($r = -.32$; $p \leq 0.01$) and work alienation of the secondary school teachers. When the relation between the dimensions of organizational justice and that of work alienation is examined, it has been determined that there is a negative and low level of relation between the distributive justice ($r = -.23$; $p \leq 0.01$), procedural justice ($r = -.28$; $p \leq 0.01$) and powerlessness, while the relation between the interactional justice ($r = -.34$; $p \leq 0.01$) and powerlessness is negative and at a medium level. A negative and low level of relation was identified between the meaninglessness dimension of work alienation and distributive justice ($r = -.16$; $p \leq 0.01$), procedural justice ($r = -.24$; $p \leq 0.01$) and interactional justice ($r = -.29$; $p \leq 0.01$). Moreover, the relation between the self-estrangement, another dimension of work alienation with the distributive justice ($r = -.15$; $p \leq 0.01$), procedural justice ($r = -.22$; $p \leq 0.01$) and interactional justice ($r = -.28$; $p \leq 0.01$) is negative and at a low level.

3.2. Findings of the Regression Analysis of the Variables

Table 6 displays the results of the regression analysis carried out to determine the organizational justice perception of the secondary school teachers as a predictor of work alienation.

Table 6. Results of the multiple regression analysis regarding the prediction of powerlessness dimension

Predicted Variables	Predictor Variables (dimensions of the Organizational Justice)			
	Dimensions	β (Beta)	t	p
Powerlessness	Distributive Justice	-.05	-.75	.46
	Procedural Justice	-.04	-.45	.65
	Interactional Justice	-.29	-3.60	.00**
Meaninglessness	Distributive Justice	.01	-.09	.93

$R = .341$, $R^2 = .116$ F (3-362) = 15.901,

	Procedural Justice	-.03	-.43	.67
	Interactional Justice	-.27	-3.35	.00**
$R = .293, R^2 = .086 F(3-362) = 11.356$				
Self-estrangement	Distributive Justice	.01	.19	.85
	Procedural Justice	-.006	-.08	.94
	Interactional Justice	-.28	-3.50	.00**
$R = .281, R^2 = .079 F(3-362) = 10.344$				

* $p \leq .05$ and ** $p \leq .01$

As seen in Table 6, when the results of the multiple regression analysis regarding the prediction of powerlessness dimension of work alienation are examined, a significant relation ($R = .341, R^2 = .116, F = 15.901$) is determined between the distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice variables and the powerlessness dimension of the work alienation. In Table 6, F value indicates that as a whole, the independent variables included in the regression significantly predict the dependent variable. 12% of the total variance is explained in the powerlessness dimension of work alienation with the mentioned three variables. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative order of importance of predictor variables on powerlessness is determined as interactional, distributive and procedural justice, respectively. Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis addressing the powerlessness as predictor variable, it is seen that the level of prediction in the interactional justice dimension is significant ($p \leq .01$). In other words, it may be said that the powerlessness will be observed less in line with the increase in the behaviours related with the interactional dimension of organizational justice.

As seen in Table 6, when the results of the multiple regression analysis regarding the prediction of meaningfulness dimension of work alienation are examined, a significant relation ($R = .293, R^2 = .086, F = 11.356$) is determined between the distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice variables and the meaningfulness dimension of the work alienation. In Table 6, F value indicates that as a whole, the independent variables included in the regression significantly predict the dependent variable. 9% of the total variance is explained in the meaningfulness dimension of work alienation with the mentioned three variables. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative order of importance of predictor variables on powerlessness is determined as interactional, procedural and distributive justice, respectively. Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis addressing the meaningfulness as predictor variable, it is seen that the level of prediction in the interactional justice dimension is significant ($p \leq .01$). In other words, it may be said that the meaningfulness will be observed less in line with the increase in the behaviours related with the interactional dimension of organizational justice.

As seen in Table 6, when the results of the multiple regression analysis regarding the prediction of self-estrangement, a dimension of work alienation are examined, a significant relation ($R = .281, R^2 = .079, F = 10.344$) is determined between the distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice variables and the self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation. In Table 6, F value indicates that as a whole, the independent variables included in the regression significantly predict the dependent variable. 8% of the total variance is explained in the self-estrangement dimension of work alienation with the mentioned three variables. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative order of importance of predictor variables on self-estrangement is determined as interactional, distributive and procedural justice, respectively. Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis addressing the self-estrangement as predictor variable, it is seen that the level of prediction in the interactional justice dimension is significant ($p \leq .01$). In other words, it may be said that the self-estrangement will be observed less in line with the increase in the behaviours related with the interactional dimension of organizational justice.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As a result of the research, it has been determined that the highest level of organizational justice is observed in interactional justice, which is followed by procedural justice and the lowest level is observed in distributive justice. Based on these averages, it may be concluded that the organizational justice perception of the participants is generally at a moderate level. However, researches carried out by Unal (2003), Atalay (2005), Tan (2006), Polat (2007), Polat and Celep (2008), Ugurlu (2009), Bas (2010), Kazanci (2010), Acar (2011), Erturk and Babaoglan (2011), Gunes and Buluc (2012), Sayu (2014), Yildiz (2014), Polat and Kazak (2014), revealed a high level of organizational justice perception among the participants (1, 12, 48, 111). Accordingly, it may be stated that the school administrators moderately enable the teachers to feel that they are important and valuable, take decisions by consulting and explaining them which procedures are used why and how. Similarly, it can be said that the school administrators moderately apply decision making methods and processes justly.

With regard to work alienation, the dimensions that the teachers feel the highest level of alienation are powerlessness, meaningfulness and self-estrangement dimensions, respectively. It has also been determined that the results of the researches carried out by Erjem (2005), Calisir (2006), Sayu (2014) Eryilmaz and Burgaz (2011) are similar (1, 77, 98). Considering the results of this research on the basis of this perspective, it is understood that the teachers believe that the decisions concerning themselves or their tasks are taken by other people without consulting. Moreover, it can also be stated that most of the participants do not feel any dominance over their tasks and are worried about their control over future.

The correlation analysis of the variables carried out under the research revealed a negative and medium level relation between the organizational justice perception of the secondary school teachers and the work alienation. Moreover, in their researches, identified a negative relation between the organizational justice and work alienation (1, 26, 27). The relation between the distributive and procedural justice dimension of organizational justice and the powerlessness dimension of work alienation has been determined to be negative and low level; while the relation between the interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice and powerlessness dimension of work alienation is negative and medium level; and the relation between the distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice with the meaningfulness dimension of work alienation is negative and low level. Moreover, it has also been determined that the relation between the distributive, procedural and interactional justice dimensions of organizational justice with the self-estrangement dimension of work alienation is negative and low level. These findings conform to the expectations. Accordingly, when the school

administrators behave justly among the teachers, include them in the decision making processes and the activities of the organization, act transparently and apply a balanced reward-punishment system, more positive organizational results can be achieved. Otherwise, they may lead to detachment of the teachers from the organizational objectives, to have problems in communications, to refrain from taking responsibilities, to display less loyalty for the organization, and to become alienated to their work. Based on this perspective, it may be stated that the organizational justice perception of the teachers participated in the research is generally positive.

According to the results of the regression analysis concerning the prediction of powerlessness dimension of the work alienation, all dimensions of the organizational justice predict powerlessness at a significant level and thus explain 12% of the total variance. The analysis revealed that the interactional justice, a dimension of the organizational justice significantly predicts the powerlessness dimension of the work alienation. Accordingly, interactional justice has a significant contribution on powerlessness variable and this contribution is negative-oriented. In other words, it may be said that when the behaviours related with the interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice are observed less, this will have a stronger effect on behaviour related with the powerlessness dimension of the work alienation. Moreover, it can also be said that the behaviours related with the powerlessness dimension will be observed less when the school administrators inform teachers about the decisions and the applied practices, provide them with accurate and exact information, and display due respect and value towards them. In other words, if the school administrators consult with the teachers and do not apply pressure and have excessive control over them, the possibility to observe the feeling of powerlessness among the teachers will also be less.

According to the results of the regression analysis concerning the prediction of meaningfulness dimension of the work alienation, all dimensions of the organizational justice predict the meaningfulness at a significant level and thus explain 9% of the total variance. According to the results of the analysis, interactional justice which is a dimension of the organizational justices significantly predicts the meaningfulness dimension of the work alienation. Accordingly, interactional justice has a significant contribution on meaningfulness variable and this contribution is negative-oriented. It has been found out that there is no significant effect in other dimensions. In other words, it may be said that when the behaviours related with the interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice are observed more, the behaviours related with the meaningfulness dimension of the work alienation will be observed less. Namely, when the school administrators improve their social relations without the teachers and display due sensitivity to them, the behaviours related to meaningfulness dimension will be observed less. However, if the school administrators make teachers deal with menial tasks hindering their professional development and do not provide them with the required support in accessing the resources, the behaviours related with the meaningfulness may increase among the teachers.

According to the results of the regression analysis concerning the prediction of self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation, all dimensions of the organizational justice predict the self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation at a significant level and thus explain 8% of the total variance. According to the results of the analysis, interactional justice which is a dimension of the organizational justices significantly predicts the self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation. Accordingly, interactional justice has a significant contribution on self-estrangement variable and this contribution is negative-oriented. It has been found out that there is no significant effect in other dimensions. In other words, it may be said that when the behaviours related with the interactional justice dimension of the organizational justice are observed less, the behaviour related with the self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation will also be observed less. Moreover, if the school administrators provide information about the reasons of their decisions and the decision making processes, it may be said that the behaviours related to the self-estrangement dimension of the work alienation will be observed less. It may also be stated that school administrators ignoring the expectations and demands of the teachers and who fail to ensure an environment for the teachers to prove themselves may lead to work alienation.

5. SUGGESTIONS

As is seen, the only variable that contributes to powerlessness, meaningless and self-estrangement is interactional justice. Moreover, the variable that the interactional justice contributes mostly is the powerlessness. Findings of the research are similar to the results of the research of Sayu (1). According to Sayu, it is remarkable that only interactional justice contributes to work alienation (1). Interactional justice focuses on the healthy and discreet social relations among the people and attaches importance to the issues such as administrator's way of addressing the employees, his attitudes towards the employees, and gaining their confidence. Therefore, "besides the content, the way of saying things" is also vital. Based on the results of the study, the following suggestions may be made:

- Work may be carried out to raise awareness regarding the advantages of organizational justice and disadvantages of work alienation.
- The school administrators should take care of establishing an environment of trust among the employees in their organizations.
- The school administrators may develop mechanisms enabling the consideration of the views and expectations of the teachers in the decisions to be taken and practices to be applied.
- The reward-punishment system in schools should be balanced.
- Accountability and transparency criteria should be rendered active in schools.
- The principles of accuracy, consistency and objectivity should be taken into account in all practices in schools.
- In-service trainings as per the professional field of the teachers should be organized to enable teachers develop themselves and keep up-to-date.
- Intra-organizational information flow should be enhanced and there should be more activities to motivate and cheer up the employees.
- For the researchers, the research in question may be carried out by benefiting from the qualitative data collection means and may be applied in various educational levels.

REFERENCES

1. Sayu, P. (2014). *Orgutsel adalet ve ise yabancilasma arasindaki iliski*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

2. Acar, P. (2013). Orgutsel ogrenme, vatandaslik ve adalet. *Orgutsel davranis*. (Edt: A.C. Kirel, O. Aglargoz) Eskisehir: Anadolu Universitesi Yayinlari.
3. Cirak, S. (2013). *Ortaogretim kurumlarinda yoneticilerin davranislarinin ogretmenlerin mesleklerine yabancilasmasina etkisi*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Yeditepe Universitesi SBE.
4. Iscan, O. F., Sayin, S. (2010). Orgutsel adalet, is tatmini ve orgutsel guven arasindaki iliski. *Ankara Universitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(4).
5. Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. *Journal of Management*, Vol.26, No.3.
6. Ozdevecioglu, M. (2003). Algılanan orgutsel adaletin bireyler arasi saldirgan davranislar uzerindeki etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir arastirma. *Erciyes Universitesi IIBF Iktisadi Dergisi*, Sayi:21, 2003.
7. Elma, C. (2003). *Ilkogretim okulu ogretmenlerinin ise yabancilasmasi*. Yayinlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Ankara Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu, Ankara.
8. Blauner, R. (1964). Alienation and freedom: the factory worker and his industry. *Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964*.
9. Cevik, R. (2009). *Ilkogretim okulu ogretmenlerinin orgutsel adalet algisi*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitusu.
10. Mercan, M. (2006). *Ogretmenlerde orgutsel baglilik, orgutsel yabancilasma ve orgutsel vatandaslik*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Afyon: Kocatepe Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
11. Tutar, H. (2010). Is goren yabancilasmasi ve orgutsel saglik iliskisi: bankacilik sektorunde bir uygulama. *Ankara Universitesi SBF Dergisi*, 65 (1) 2010.
12. Unal, Z. (2003). *Ogretmenlerde is doyumu ve orgutsel vatandaslik*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Afyonkarahisar Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
13. Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J., Roman, P. (2005). Organizational justice and job satisfac-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2).
14. Eroglu, S. G. (2009). *Orgutsel adalet algilaması ve is tatmini hakkında bir arastirma*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Denizli: Pamukkale Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
15. Karakose, T., Altinkurt, Y. and Yilmaz, K. (2009). Orgutsel adaletin ogretmenlerin is doyumu uzerindeki etkileri. *Uluslararası 5. Balkan Egitim ve Bilim Kongresi*. Edirne: Trakya Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi.
16. Aryee, S., Budhwar, B.S., Chen, Z.X. (2002). Trust a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3).
17. Gunaydin, S. C. (2001). *Isletmelerde orgutsel adalet ve orgutsel guven degiskenlerinin politik davranis algisi ve isbirligi yapma egilimine etkisini inceleyen bir calisma*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Ingilizce Isletme Anabilim Dalı Orgutsel Davranis Bilimdali.
18. Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4).
19. Tang, T.L.P., Sarsfield-Baldwin, L.J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *The Educational Resources Information Center*, 71(795).
20. Dessler, G. (1999). How to earn your employees' commitment. *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol, 13 No, 2.
21. Isbasi, J. O. (2000). *Calisanlarin yoneticilerine duyduklari guvenin ve orgutsel adaletle iliskili algilamalarının vatandaslik davranisinin olusumundaki rolu, bir turizm orgutunde uygulama*, Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Antalya, Akdeniz Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
22. Yildirim, F. (2002). *Calisma yasaminda orgutse baglilik ve orgutsel adalet iliskisi*. Doktora Tezi. Ankara Universitesi, S.B.E., Psikoloji A.B.D.
23. Karabay, E. Z. (2004). *Kamuda ve ozle sektörde orgutsel adalet algisi ile orgutsel baglilik arasindaki iliskiler*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
24. Dilek, H. (2005). *Liderlik tarzlarının ve adalet algisinin; orgutsel baglilik, is tatmini ve orgutsel vatandaslik davranisi uzerine etkilerine yönelik bir arastirma*. Yayinlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Gebze: Gebze Ileri teknoloji Enstitusu Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
25. Loi, R., Hang-yue, N., Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: the mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 79 (101).
26. Gunsul, E. (2010). *Algılanan orgutsel adalet ile orgutsel yabancilasma arasinda bir iliski vebir arastirma*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi SBE, Isletme ABD.
27. Ceylan, A. & Sulu, S. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship of procedural injustice to job stress. *South East European Journal of Economics & Business November*, V.2, 65-74.
28. Sulu, S., Ceylan, A. & Kaynak, R. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship between organizational injustice and organizational commitment: Implications for healthcare professionals. *International Journal of Business and Management August*, Vol. 5, No. 8.
29. Colquitt, Jason A., Conlon, Donald E., Wesson, Michael J., Porter, Christopher O. L. H., Ng, K. Yee. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3).
30. Earley, P. C., & Lind, E. A. (1987). Procedural justice and participation in task selection: The role of control in mediating justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1148.
31. Banai, M., Reisel, W.D. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: a six-country investigation. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 4, pp.463-76. ISSN 1090-9516.
32. Sarros, J.C., Tanewski, G.A., Winter, R.P., Santora, J.C. Densen, I.L. (2002). Work alienation and organizational leadership, *British Journal of Management*, 13/4, 285-304.
33. Crank, J., Regoli, R., Hewitt, J. and Culbertson, R. (1995). Institutional and organizational antecedents of role stress, work alienation, and anomie among police executives, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 152-171.

34. Ramaswami, S.N., Agarwal, S. and Bhargava, M. (1993). Work alienation of marketing employees: influence of task, supervisory and organizational structure factor, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21/3, 179-193.
35. Blakely, G., Andrews, M., & Moorman, R. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 20 (2), 259-273.
36. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
37. Trevino, L. & Weaver G. (2001). Organizational justice and ethics program "follow-through": Influences on employees' harmful and helpful behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(4), 651-671.
38. Erkus, A., Turunc, O. and Yucel, R. (2011). Orgutsel adalet ve orgutsel baglilik arasindaki iliskilerde icel ve dissal tatminin aracilik rolu: bankacilik sektorunde bir arastirma. *Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi IIBF Dergisi*, 6 (1) : 245-270.
39. Baraz, B. (2012). Yoneltme. *Yonetim Bilimi I*. (Edt: S. Besler, O.Oktal) Eskisehir Anadolu Universitesi Yayinlari.
40. Ozkalp E., and Kirel C. (2013). Orgutsel adalet, orgutsel baglilik ve isten uzaklasma davranislari. *Orgutsel davranis*. Bursa: Ekin Yayin ve Dagitim.
41. Asan, O. (2007). Motivasyon. *Yonetim ve Organizasyon*. (Edt: S. Guney) Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.
42. Kahraman, U. (2014). *Ilkokullarda performans yonetimi uygulamalari ve ogretmenlerin orgutsel adalet algisi arasindaki iliski*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Usak: Usak Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Egitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Egitim Yonetimi Bolumu.
43. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., Gilliland, E. R. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*.
44. TDK (2015). *Turk Dil Kurumu Guncel Turkece Sozluk*. www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&arama=gts&guid=TDK.GTS.54d350fd72f251.64706994 (Erisim Tarihi: 05.02.2015).
45. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp 267-299), New York: Academic Press.
46. Titrek, O. (2009). Okul turune gore okullardaki orgutsel adalet duzeyi. *Uluslararasi Insan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2), 551-573.
47. Cakmak, K. (2005). *Performans degerlendirme sistemlerinde orgutsel adalet algisi ve bir ornek olay calismasi*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Isatanbul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
48. Atalay, I. (2005). *Orgutsel vatandaslik ve orgutsel adalet*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Afyon, Kocatepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
49. Hubbel, A. P.,Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Motivatingfactors: perceptions of justiceand their relation ship with manager organization altrust. *Communication Studies*. Vol. 56, Iss. 1, pp. 47-70. ISSN 1051-0974.
50. Altinkurt, Y. (2013). Orgutsel adalet. *Yonetimde yeni yaklasimlar*. (Edt: H.B.Memduhoglu, K. Yilmaz)Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
51. Altinkurt, Y., Yilmaz, K. (2010). Degerlere gore yonetim ve orgutsel adalet iliskisinin ortaogretim ogretmenlerinin algilarina gore incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi Dergisi*: 16:4, 2010.
52. Toremen, F., Tan, C. (2010). Egitim orgutlerinde adalet: kavramsal bir cozumleme. *Dicle Universitesi Ziya Gokalp Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 14 (2010).
53. Yilmaz, K. (2010). Devlet ortaogretim okullarinda gorev yapan ogretmenlerin orgutsel adalet algilari. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 10 (1) 2010.
54. Balcı, A. (2010). *Aciklamali egitim yonetimi terimleri sozlugu*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
55. Poole, W. L. (2007). Organizational justice as a framework for understanding union management relations in education, *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(3), 725-748.
56. Trevino, L. K. (1992). The social effects of punishment in organizations: A justice perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 8, 365-378.
57. Chan, M. (2000). Organizational justice theories and landmark cases. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8(1):68-88.
58. Celik, O. T. (2011). *Ilkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin ve ogretmenlerinin orgutsel adalet algilari ile is doyumlari arasindaki iliski*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Konya: Selcuk Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu.
59. Muzumdar, P. (2012). Influence of interactional justice on the turnover behavioral decision in an organization. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, 5, 31-41.
60. McCardle, J. G. (2007). *Organizational justice and workplace deviance: The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida.
61. Yurur, S. (2008). Orgutsel adalet ile is tatmini ve calisanların bireysel ozellikleri arasindaki iliskilerin analize yönelik bir arastirma. *Suleyman Demirel Universitesi IIBF Dergisi*, 13 (2), 2008.
62. Ozmen, O. N. T., Arbak, Y., Ozer, P. N. (2007). Adalet verilen degerin adalet algilari uzerindeki etkisinin sorgulanmasına iliskin bir arastirma. *Ege Akademik Bakis Dergisi*, 7(1) 2007.
63. Aktas, E. (2010). *Performans degerlendirme sistemlerinin orgutsel adalet algisi uzerine etkisi*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
64. Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z.S., Bobocel, D. R., Rup, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Vol. 58.
65. Gokirmak, M. (2012). Siyasal yabancilasma ve yeni toplumsal hareketler. *Siyaset sosyolojisi*. (Edt: A. Y. Sarıbay), Eskisehir. Anadolu Universitesi Yayinlari.
66. TDK (2015). *Turk Dil Kurumu Guncel Turkece Sozluk*. www.tdk.gov.tr/ index.php?option=com_gts&arama = gts & guid=TDK.GTS.54d3759ed3c663.20845868 (Erisim Tarihi: 06.02.2015).
67. Fettahlioglu, T. (2006). *Orgutlerde yabancilasmanın yonetimi: Kahramanmaraş özel isletmeve kamu kuruluslarında karsilastirmali bir arastirma*.Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Kahramanmaraş Sutcu imam Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

68. Tatar Canbay H., Tatar, T. (2014). Yabancilasma ve egitim. *Egitim sosyolojisi*. (Edt: M. C. Ozdemir) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
69. Valadbigi, A. (2014). The study of the elements of work alienation: a case study of the urmia white cement factory, western azarbayjan province, iran. *asian Social Science Vol. 7, No. 6, June*.
70. Seeman, M. (1967). On the personal consequences of alienation in work. *American Sociological Review. Vol. 32, No. 2 (Apr., 1967), pp. 273-285*.
71. Oflluoglu, G., Buyukyilmaz, O. (2008). Yabancilasmanin teorik gelismisi ve tarihsel surec icinde farkli alanlarda gorunimleri. *Kamu-Is Dergisi, 10(1) 2008*.
72. Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Work alienation: an integrative approach hard cover. *April 15, 1982, Praeger Publishers, Pp 1-5*.
73. Yildirim, T. (2009). *Ilkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin kisisel ve orgutsel deger uyumunun orgutsel adanma ve yabancilasma uzerine etkisi*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Usak Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
74. Aldemir, C. (1983). Yoneticilerin guc tipleri ile ise yabancilasma ve is doyumunu arasindaki iliskiler. *AMME Idaresi Dergisi, 16(1), 1983*.
75. Hosgorur, V. (1997). *Egitim is gorenlerrinin orgutsel tutumlari (Samsun Ili MerkezOrtaogretim Okullari Ornegi)*. Yayimlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
76. Aiken, M. & Hage, J. (1966). Organizational alienation: a comparative analysis, *American Sociological Review, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Aug., 1966), pp. 497-507*.
77. Eryilmaz, A. (2010). *Lise ogretmenlerinin orgutsel yabancilasma duzeyi*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Egitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Egitim Yonetimi, Teftisi, Planlama ve Ekonomisi Bilim Dalı.
78. Nasuridin, A. M., Ramayah, T., Kumaresan, S. (2005). Organisational stressors and job stressamong managers: the moderating role of neuroticism. *Singapore Management Review. Vol. 27, Iss. 2, pp. 63-79. ISSN0129-5977*.
79. Mendoza, M. J. S., Lara, P. Z. M. (2007). Theim pact of work alienation on organizational citizen ship behavior in the canary islands. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis. Vol. 15, Iss. 1, pp. 56-76. ISSN 1934-8835*.
80. Kanungo, R. N. (1983). Work alienation: a pancultural perspective. *International Studies of Management and Organization, Vol. XIII, No.1-2*.
81. Forsyth, P. B., Hoy, W. K. (1978) Isolation and alienation in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 14, No. 1*.
82. Martin, J. (2005). *Organizational behaviour and management*. pp.1-5, Thomson Learning.
83. Atas, O., Ayik, A. (2013). Ogretmen adaylarinda okula yabancilasma. *International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 8(8) Summer 2013*.
84. Shepard, J. M. (1970). Functional specialization, alienation, and job satisfaction. *Industrial & LaborRelationsReview, Vol. 1*.
85. Simsek, H., Balay, R., Simsek, A.S. (2012). Ilkogretim sinif ogretmenlerinde mesleki yabancilasma. *Egitim Bilimleri Arastirmalari Dergisi Uluslararası E-Dergi, 2 (1) 2012*.
86. Avci, M. (2012). Egitimde temel bir sorun: yabancilasma. *Ataturk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 16 (3)*.
87. Bacharach, S.B., Aiken, M. (1979). Theimpact of alienation, meaninglessness, andmeritocracy on supervisorand subordinate satisfaction. *Social Forces. Vol. 57. Iss. 3*.
88. Eryilmaz, A., Burgaz, B. (2011). Ozel ve resmi lise ogretmenlerinin orgutsel yabancilasma duzeyleri. *Egitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 36(161) 2011*.
89. Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in theworkplace: therole of organization alin justice. *Organizational Behaviorand Human Decision Processes. Vol. 89, Iss. 1, pp. 947-965. ISSN 0749-5978*.
90. Minibas, J. (1993). *Yabancilasma Kavraminin incelenmesi ve banka sektorune yonelik bir arastirma*. Yayimlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Istanbul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
91. Okes, D., Westcott, R. T. (2001). *The Certified Quality Manager Handbook*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: ASQ Quality Pres.
92. Bayindir, B., (2002). *Ortaogretim dal ogretmenlerinin meslege yabancilasmalari ile ogretme-ogrenme surecindeki davranislari arasindaki iliski*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Eskisehir: Anadolu Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu.
93. Akgun, E. (1999). *Orgutlerde catisma ve yabancilasma sorunlarının yonetiminde etkili bir arac olarak yonetime katilma*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Istanbul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
94. Kilcik, F. (2011). *Ilkogretim okullarında gorev yapan ogretmenlerin ise yabancilasma duzeylerine iliskin algilari (Malatya Ili Ornegi)*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Malatya: Inonu Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu.
95. Uysaler, A. L. (2010). *Orgutsel yabancilasmanin orgutsel baglilik, is tatmini ve isten ayrilma egilimi ile baglantisi ve yabancilasma yonetimi*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Gebze: Gebze Yuksek Teknoloji Enstitusu Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitusu Isletme Anabilim Dalı.
96. Yeniceri, O. (2009). *Orgutlerde catisma ve yabancilasma yonetimi*. IQ Kultur Sanat Yayıncılık, 1. Baskı, Istanbul.
97. Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review, V. 24, N.6., 783-791*.
98. Calisir, I. (2006). *Ilkogretim okulu ogretmenlerinin ise yabancilasmasi*. Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
99. Ozbek, M. F. (2011). Orgut icerisindeki guven ve ise yabancilasma iliskisinde orgute uyum saglamanin araci rolu. *Suleyman Demirel Universitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Fakultesi Dergisi, 16(1) 2011*.
100. Temel, C. (2010). *Beden egitimi ogretmenlerinin ise yabancilasma duzeylerinin cesitli degiskenler acisindan incelenmesi*. Yayimlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Bolu: Abant Izzet Baysal Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

101. Yilmaz, S., Sarpkaya, P. (2009). Egitim orgutlerinde yabancilasma ve yonetimi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2) 2009.
102. Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
103. Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, O.E., Karadeniz, S., Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
104. Nieoff, BP., Moorman, M. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, V.36, N.3, 527-56.
105. Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1986). Handbook of Organizational Measurement, Marrshfield, MA: Pitman.
106. Mottaz, C. J. (1981). Some determinants of work alienation. *The Sociological Quarterly*, V.22., 515-529.
107. Erben, G.S. (2008). *Effects of perceived employment opportunities, peer support, exhaustion and work alienation on the relationship between perceived job characteristics and acomparative study between lean and traditional production contexts*. Doktora Tezi. Marmara Universitesi, S.B.E, Ingilizce Isletme A.B.D, Orgutsel Davranis Bilim Dalı.
108. Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PIRELIS and SIMPLIS:Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Hillsdale: Lawrens Erbaum Associates.
109. Joreskog, K. and Sorborn, D. (1993). *Lisrel 8: Structural equation modelling with the SIMPLIS command language*. USA:Scientific Software International, Lincolnwood.
110. Hu, L. T. and Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut off criteria for fit indexes in covariances structure analysis:conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structual Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
111. Tan, C. (2006) *Ilkogretim okullarında gorev yapan ogretmenlerin orgutsel adalet konusundaki algilari (Elazig il ornegi)* YayinlanmamisYukse Lisans Tezi. Firat Universitesi.