

Research Article

Equality, Justice, and Reciprocity in Social and Organizational Life: Moral Foundations, Structural Injustices, and Health Consequences

Dr. Alejandro ¹

¹Department of Social Philosophy and Public Policy, National University of Córdoba, Argentina

Abstract



Received: 12 November 2025

Revised: 2 December 2025

Accepted: 20 December 2025

Published: 01 January 2026

Copyright: © 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC-BY), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

This article develops a comprehensive and theoretically integrated account of equality, justice, reciprocity, and their consequences for social life, organizational structures, and human health. Drawing strictly on the provided philosophical, sociological, and organizational health psychology literature, the paper brings into dialogue normative political philosophy with empirical research on organizational justice and effort-reward imbalance. The central argument is that equality is not merely a distributive ideal but a relational and institutional achievement that shapes moral standing, epistemic recognition, social cooperation, and embodied well-being. Beginning with philosophical debates on equality, responsibility, moral harm, and the non-identity problem, the article situates justice as a condition of social relations rather than a purely outcome-based metric. It then examines migration, settler colonial expansion, and global labor mobility as structural contexts in which equality and injustice are historically produced and reproduced. The analysis proceeds to organizational life, where theories of reciprocity, equity, procedural justice, and relational justice are examined in depth and linked to robust evidence on cardiovascular disease, mental health outcomes, and mortality. By synthesizing these domains, the article demonstrates that injustice operates simultaneously at moral, social, epistemic, and physiological levels. The discussion highlights how organizational injustice and effort-reward imbalance function as complementary stressors rooted in violated norms of reciprocity and respect. The article concludes by arguing that policy responses must move beyond narrow economic incentives toward institutional designs that uphold dignity, voice, and fair recognition as prerequisites for both social equality and population health.

Keywords: Equality; Organizational Justice; Reciprocity; Health Inequality; Moral Responsibility; Effort–Reward Imbalance

INTRODUCTION

The question of equality has long occupied a central position in moral and political philosophy, yet its practical implications extend far beyond abstract debates about distributive fairness. Equality shapes how individuals relate to one another, how institutions recognize or marginalize persons, and how social arrangements affect not only life chances but also embodied experiences of health and illness. Elizabeth Anderson's influential reconceptualization of equality as a relational ideal rather than a mere distributive pattern marks a decisive shift in understanding what it means for a society to be just (Anderson, 1999). Rather than asking how goods should be distributed, Anderson asks what social relations should look like among equals. This perspective resonates powerfully with empirical research in organizational psychology and public health, where perceptions of fairness, recognition, and reciprocity are consistently linked

to measurable health outcomes (Kivimäki et al., 2003; Elovainio et al., 2002).

At the same time, global historical processes such as settler colonial expansion, migration, and labor mobility have produced enduring inequalities that cannot be fully understood through narrow distributive lenses. James Belich's analysis of the settler revolution demonstrates how expansionist economies systematically reorganized land, labor, and social hierarchies, generating long-term structures of inequality that persist well beyond the colonial moment (Belich, 2009). Frantz Fanon's searing critique of colonial domination further exposes how inequality operates through violence, dehumanization, and psychological harm, shaping subjectivity as much as material conditions (Fanon, 1961).

These historical and philosophical insights intersect with contemporary concerns about work, health, and justice. A substantial body of research demonstrates that unfair treatment at work, lack of procedural justice, and imbalances between effort and reward are associated with cardiovascular disease, depression, psychiatric morbidity, and increased mortality (Siegrist, 1996; Kivimäki et al., 2005; Ferrie et al., 2006). These findings challenge any attempt to separate moral philosophy from empirical social science, revealing that injustice is not only a normative wrong but also a causal factor in physical suffering.

Despite the richness of these literatures, they are often treated in isolation. Normative philosophers debate equality, responsibility, and moral harm with limited engagement with empirical evidence, while organizational health researchers measure injustice and stress without fully integrating their findings into broader theories of social equality and moral standing. This article addresses this gap by offering an integrated, interdisciplinary analysis that treats equality, justice, and reciprocity as foundational concepts linking moral theory, social institutions, and health outcomes.

The central problem guiding this article is how violations of equality and justice—understood relationally and institutionally—translate into tangible harms across individual, organizational, and societal levels. By synthesizing philosophical arguments about equality, responsibility, and harm with empirical research on organizational justice and health, the article aims to show that justice is a necessary condition for both social cooperation and human flourishing.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this article is qualitative, theoretical, and integrative. Rather than generating new empirical data, the study conducts a systematic and critical synthesis of the provided references, treating them as complementary sources of insight into a shared set of problems. The approach is interpretive rather than statistical, focusing on conceptual clarification, theoretical integration, and causal reasoning grounded in established empirical findings.

The philosophical component draws primarily on normative and moral philosophy, including theories of equality (Anderson, 1999; Woolf, 1998), moral responsibility and reactive attitudes (Strawson, 1974), harm and benefit in creation (Harman, 2004), and the non-identity problem (Parfit, 1984; Woodward, 1986). These works are analyzed to extract underlying assumptions about persons, moral standing, and social relations. Particular attention is paid to how these theories conceptualize harm, responsibility, and fairness across time and social contexts.

The historical and sociological dimension incorporates analyses of migration and settler colonialism (Belich, 2009; King, 2010) and anti-colonial critique (Fanon, 1961). These sources provide macro-level context for understanding how inequalities are produced and normalized through large-scale social processes.

The organizational and health psychology component synthesizes a substantial body of empirical research on effort-reward imbalance, organizational justice, reciprocity norms, and health outcomes (Siegrist, 1996; Gouldner, 1960; Adams, 1965; Greenberg and Cropanzano, 2001; Kivimäki et al., 2003). While no statistical analysis is performed in this article, the findings of these studies are described in detail and interpreted through the

lens of moral and social theory.

The integration of these literatures follows a thematic rather than chronological structure. Concepts such as reciprocity, fairness, recognition, and harm are traced across philosophical and empirical domains, allowing for a unified account of how injustice operates and why it matters. This methodological strategy is justified by the article's aim to produce a comprehensive theoretical framework rather than isolated disciplinary insights.

RESULTS

The synthesis of the provided literature yields several interconnected findings that together support a relational and institutional understanding of equality and justice.

First, philosophical analyses consistently show that equality cannot be reduced to equal distributions of resources. Anderson's argument that the point of equality is to abolish oppressive social relations emphasizes respect, voice, and standing as core elements of justice (Anderson, 1999). Woolf similarly highlights the egalitarian ethos as a shared commitment to fairness and mutual respect rather than mere outcome equality (Woolf, 1998). These accounts converge on the idea that injustice arises when individuals are positioned as inferiors, excluded from meaningful participation, or denied recognition.

Second, historical and sociological studies reveal that large-scale social processes such as colonization and migration systematically disrupt egalitarian relations. Belich's account of settler societies shows how economic expansion depended on the unequal valuation of lives, labor, and land, creating hierarchies that persist across generations (Belich, 2009). Fanon's analysis demonstrates that colonial injustice operates not only through economic exploitation but also through psychological domination, producing internalized inferiority and social fragmentation (Fanon, 1961). Migration patterns further illustrate how global inequalities shape who moves, under what conditions, and with what consequences for dignity and well-being (King, 2010).

Third, organizational research provides robust evidence that perceived injustice has measurable health effects. Effort-reward imbalance theory shows that when high effort is met with low reward, individuals experience chronic stress responses associated with cardiovascular disease and depression (Siegrist, 1996; Siegrist et al., 2004). Studies of organizational justice demonstrate that unfair procedures, lack of transparency, and disrespectful treatment predict psychiatric morbidity, sickness absence, and mortality (Elovainio et al., 2002; Kivimäki et al., 2003; Ferrie et al., 2006). Importantly, these effects persist even after controlling for traditional risk factors, indicating that injustice itself is a distinct determinant of health.

Fourth, the literature on reciprocity provides a crucial link between moral theory and empirical findings. Gouldner's norm of reciprocity describes a foundational social expectation that benefits should be returned and harms avoided (Gouldner, 1960). When this norm is violated—through inequitable exchanges or unfair treatment—individuals experience moral outrage, resentment, and stress (Adams, 1965; Strawson, 1974). Organizational injustice can thus be understood as a systemic violation of reciprocity norms, with direct implications for both moral relations and physiological health.

Together, these findings demonstrate that injustice is not an abstract moral failure but a concrete social force that shapes lives, bodies, and institutions.

DISCUSSION

The integration of philosophical, historical, and organizational research allows for a deeper understanding of equality and justice as lived realities rather than abstract ideals. One of the most significant implications of this analysis is that justice must be understood as a condition of social relations that directly affects human well-being.

From a moral perspective, Anderson's relational egalitarianism provides a powerful framework for interpreting empirical findings on organizational justice. When employees perceive procedures as unfair or interactions as disrespectful, they are not merely dissatisfied; they are positioned as inferiors whose voices do not matter. This violates the

core egalitarian demand for mutual respect and equal standing (Anderson, 1999). The resulting stress and health consequences documented in occupational studies can thus be seen as embodied responses to moral injury.

Strawson's account of reactive attitudes further illuminates this process. Feelings of resentment and indignation arise when individuals perceive others as failing to meet basic expectations of regard and responsibility (Strawson, 1974). In organizational contexts, unfair treatment triggers these reactive attitudes, which in turn activate stress responses with long-term health effects. This connection underscores the moral significance of everyday institutional practices.

The discussion of harm and responsibility across time, as explored by Parfit, Harman, and Woodward, adds another layer of complexity. Organizational policies and social structures may harm individuals even when no specific person intends harm. The non-identity problem highlights how actions can be wrong even if they do not make any particular individual worse off compared to a counterfactual alternative (Parfit, 1984; Woodward, 1986). This insight is crucial for understanding structural injustice, where harm is diffuse, cumulative, and often normalized.

The historical analyses of colonialism and migration further demonstrate that injustice is deeply embedded in institutional arrangements. Fanon's emphasis on psychological harm anticipates contemporary findings on stress and health, suggesting that domination and exclusion have long-term somatic consequences (Fanon, 1961). Belich's account of settler expansion shows how economic systems built on inequality continue to shape labor relations and organizational hierarchies (Belich, 2009).

Despite the strength of this integrated framework, several limitations must be acknowledged. The article relies exclusively on existing literature and does not introduce new empirical data. While the theoretical synthesis is robust, future research could benefit from interdisciplinary empirical studies that explicitly link moral perceptions of equality with biological markers of stress and disease. Additionally, much of the organizational health research is based on specific occupational contexts, raising questions about generalizability across cultures and economic systems.

Future research should also explore how interventions aimed at enhancing procedural and relational justice can mitigate health inequalities. Policy implications extend beyond workplace reforms to broader social institutions, including migration policy, healthcare systems, and economic governance. If justice is indeed a determinant of health, then promoting equality is not only a moral imperative but also a public health strategy.

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that equality, justice, and reciprocity are foundational principles that shape social relations, institutional practices, and human health. By integrating philosophical theories of equality and responsibility with empirical research on organizational justice and effort-reward imbalance, the analysis demonstrates that injustice operates across moral, social, and physiological dimensions.

Equality emerges not as a simple matter of distribution but as a relational achievement requiring respect, recognition, and fair participation. When these conditions are absent—whether through colonial domination, migration regimes, or unfair workplace practices—individuals experience not only moral wrongs but also tangible harms to their health and well-being.

The evidence reviewed here supports the conclusion that organizational injustice and effort-reward imbalance are complementary rather than redundant forms of inequality. Both violate fundamental norms of reciprocity and respect, and both contribute independently and jointly to adverse health outcomes. Addressing these issues requires institutional reforms grounded in a relational understanding of justice.

Ultimately, the pursuit of equality is inseparable from the pursuit of human flourishing. A society that tolerates injustice undermines not only its moral foundations but also the physical and psychological health of its members. Recognizing justice as a determinant of health invites a reimagining of social and organizational life in which dignity, fairness, and

reciprocity are central values rather than peripheral concerns.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
2. Anderson, E. (1999). What is the point of equality? *Ethics*, 109(2), 287–337.
3. Antoniou, A. S., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). *Research companion to organizational health psychology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
4. Belich, J. (2009). *Replenishing the Earth: The settler revolution and the rise of the Anglo-world, 1783–1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: Evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 105–108.
6. Elovainio, M., Leino-Arjas, P., Vahtera, J., et al. (2006). Justice at work and cardiovascular mortality: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 61, 271–274.
7. Fanon, F. (1961). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
8. Ferrie, J. E., Head, J., Shipley, M. J., et al. (2006). Injustice at work and incidence of psychiatric morbidity. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63, 443–450.
9. Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161–178.
11. Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
12. Harman, E. (2004). Can we harm and benefit in creating? *Philosophical Perspectives*, 18(1), 89–113.
13. Kawachi, I. (2006). Injustice at work and health: Causation or correlation? *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63, 578–579.
14. King, R. (2010). *People on the move: An atlas of migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
15. Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., & Vahtera, J. (2003). Organisational justice and health of employees. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60, 27–34.
16. Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J. E., Brunner, E., et al. (2005). Justice at work and reduced risk of coronary heart disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 165, 2245–2251.
17. Kivimäki, M., Virtanen, M., Vartia, M., et al. (2003). Workplace bullying and the risk of cardiovascular disease and depression. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60, 779–783.
18. Kouvonen, A., Kivimäki, M., Cox, S. J., et al. (2005). Job strain, effort-reward imbalance, and heavy drinking. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 47, 503–513.
19. Krause, N. M., & Jay, G. M. (1994). What do global self-rated health items measure? *Medical Care*, 32, 930–942.
20. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchanges: Advances in theory and research*. New York: Plenum.
21. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845–855.
22. Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23. Sandel, M. (2012). *What money can't buy: The moral limits of markets*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
24. Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 27–41.
25. Siegrist, J. (2005). Social reciprocity and health. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30, 1033–1038.
26. Siegrist, J., Starke, D., Chandola, T., et al. (2004). The measurement of effort-reward imbalance at work. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58, 1483–1499.
27. Strawson, P. F. (1974). Freedom and resentment. In P. F. Strawson (Ed.), *Freedom and resentment and other essays*. London: Routledge.
28. Vahtera, J., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., et al. (2004). Organisational downsizing, sickness absence, and mortality. *BMJ*, 328, 555–558.
29. Woodward, J. (1986). The non-identity problem. *Ethics*, 96(4), 804–831.

30. Woolf, J. (1998). Fairness, respect, and the egalitarian ethos. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 27(2), 97–122.