

# A theoretical framework on Organizational Justice and Workplace Deviance

Priyanka Dosanjh<sup>1</sup>, Dr.S.Srinivas Rao <sup>2</sup>

## *Abstract*

*The study of justice perceptions is an important area of research in organizational behavior studies because of its relationship to relevant individual and organizational outcomes (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). Employees develop different types of justice assessments related to outcomes, decisions or interactions patterns within organization. Injustice or unfair treatment with employees leads to various types of deviant behavior at workplace as desired like stress, absenteeism, non-performance, politics, retaliatory intentions and turnover tend to increase (Colquitt et. al, 2001; Nirmala & Akhilesh, 2006). It may also lead to lower commitment levels, psychological disownership, psychological contract withdrawal etc due to dissatisfaction and demotivation arise because of unfair treatment (Pizzino, 2002). Workplace deviant behaviour is a prevailing and costly phenomenon that includes a wide range of negative acts conducted by employees to harm the organization and its members either voluntarily or involuntary. Research indicates that organizational justice is a dominant predictor of workplace deviant behaviour (Fatt, 2010). Specifically, the justice perspective proposes that workplace deviance is a reaction to the unfairness perceived by employees at their workplace. A rich body of research has investigated the relationship between employee's fairness perceptions and various forms of workplace deviant behaviours. Yet, to date, a comprehensive review of the literature is unavailable that summarizes and integrates this stream of research. This study makes an attempt to understand the antecedents and to explain the relationship of organizational justice on workplace deviance behaviour to present at comprehensive framework to offer empirical studies in future research.*

**Keywords:** *Organizational Justice, Workplace Deviance, Workplace Deviance Behaviour, Behaviour*

## **I. Introduction**

Decades of organizational justice research show that fairness perceptions can substantially contribute to various attitudinal, cognitive, emotional, and behavioural outcomes among employees (Irving, Coleman, & Bobocel, 2005). The perception of employees about fairness at workplace is referred to as organizational justice. A rich body of research, both theoretical and empirical, demonstrates that deviant workplace behaviours can be a reaction to the unfairness perceived by employees in their work life. Adams (1963); Mitchell & Ambrose (2007); Bowles and Gelfand (2009); Fatt et al. (2010); Nasir & Bashir (2012) and many researchers also stated the unfair treatment negatively affects the outcomes of employee, and also increases the chances of deviant behaviours at workplace.

---

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, MATS University

<sup>2</sup>Professor and HOD - Mats School of Management Studies & Research, MATS University

Studies have identified that organizational factors such as job stressors, organizational frustration, lack of control over the work environment, weak sanctions for rule violations, and organizational changes such as downsizing are causes of workplace deviance; also, studies have shown that individual employees' personality, for example, socialization and impulsivity constructs, are causes of workplace deviant behaviours. This study focus on organizational justice as an important predictor for workplace deviance (Yunus et. al, 2012). Researchers on the nature and causes of workplace deviance have identified organizational justice as a significant predictor of deviance (Bennett & Robinson 2003).

Hence, this theoretical study aims to develop a deep understanding of organizational justice and workplace deviance. It has also made an effort to identify and describe the antecedents of organizational justice that push the employees to indulge in deviant workplace behaviour. In order to analyse properly and to have an indepth knowledge this study has reviewed various research papers of Indian as well as foreign authors and depicted the effect of organizational justice that lead to Workplace Deviance.

## **II. Literature Review**

Organizations of modern era are facing challenges because of immense competition, and it is difficult to meet these challenges (Chen et al., 2010), and even harder to sustain the position and maintain the standard in this competitive environment (Singh & Singh, 2010). They are trying to obtain competitive advantage through human capital. But due to certain reasons, employees are getting involved into deviant behaviors which can be a great threat for organizational performance. Most of such behaviors are due to injustice events which happen in organization and ultimately reduce the satisfaction level of employees. Since decades, various researchers investigated that justice in organizations creates fairness perceptions and hence positive behavioral outcomes among employees. Hence, for the purpose of this study organizational justice and workplace deviance have been discussed and insightful literature review is conducted to generate a relationship among the variables to presents a theoretical framework and propose hypothesis for future empirical studies.

### **Organizational Justice**

Justice refers to the idea that an action or decision is morally right, which may be defined according to ethics, religion, fairness, equity, or law. People are naturally attentive to the justice of events and situations in their everyday lives, across a variety of contexts (Tabibnia, Satpute & Lieberman, 2008). In organizational context, employees react to different situation and decisions made in different manner. Their perceptions of these decisions as fair or unfair can influence their subsequent attitudes and behaviors. Justice is an important concern for organizations to focus due to its disastrous implications of perceptions of injustice leading to negative attitudes and behaviors at workplace. This concern includes perception issues related to various decisions for compensation & benefits, promotions, task allocation and various other policy matters.

Organizational Justice has been seen as an important variable that plays major role in improving the performance of employees of an organization as various studies have proved that decrease in performance may result as a natural response to the unfair treatment. But if employees are treated fairly it enhances overall satisfaction and commitment towards organization (Tang et. al, 1996; Jones and Skarlicki, 2005).

Research evidence confirms that organizational justice perceptions does not discuss only about judgements of fairness but also about the manner in which decisions are taken. In the words if decisions in organizations and actions taken by managers are judged unjust and unfair then employees who are affected experience feelings of resentment, outrage and anger (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). Such kind of emotions has been associated with deviant behaviour, in turn (Spector & Fox, 2005) and these emotions are being shown to have mediating relationship between workplace deviant behaviour (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). Hence, organizational justice is an important factor to study which may have serious after effects and thus indepth study is required in the form of understanding various types of justice.

### **Types of Organizational Justice**

Three different models have been proposed to explain the structure of organizational justice perceptions which includes a two factor model (Greenberg,1990), a three factor model, and a four factor model. Many researchers have studied organizational justice in terms of the three factor model (DeConinck, 2010; Liljegren & Ekberg, 2010) while some other studies suggest a four factor model best fits the data (Colquitt, 2001). Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) supported two-factor model composed of distributive and procedural justice.

The accuracy of the two-factor model was challenged by studies that suggested a third factor (interactional justice). Bies and Moag (1986) argue that interactional justice is distinct from procedural justice because it represents the social exchange component of the interaction and the quality of treatment whereas procedural justice represents the processes that were used to arrive at the decision outcomes. Generally, researchers are in agreement regarding the distinction between procedural and distributive justice but there is more controversy over the distinction between interactional and procedural justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Colquitt (2001) demonstrated that a four-factor model (including procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice) fit the data significantly better than a two or three factor model.

Profound literature categorized organizational justice into three broad categories named as distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Rodriguez, 2012). However relative importance of these dimensions was vaguely enlightened by the previous literature. As described by theory and research, for the purpose of this study three-factor model as suggested by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) is considered and each factor are discussed below in detailed namely distributive, procedural, and interactional justice.

1) **Distributive justice:** It focuses on proportional distribution of resources according to investments in give-and-take relationships (Adams, 1965). Distributive justice is conceptualized as the fairness associated with decision outcomes and distribution of resources. The outcomes or resources distributed may be tangible (*e.g.*, pay) or intangible (*e.g.*, praise). Distributive justice can be viewed as capitalist justice: ratio of one's inputs to one's outcomes. Distributive justice is composed of three main component: Equity, Equality and need. Equity focus more on rewarding employees based on their contribution. Equality on the other hand provides each employee with the same compensation. Finally, need is providing a benefit based on one's personal requirement Soltis, Agneessens, Sasovova, and Labianca (2013).

2) **Procedural Justice:** It is explained as perceived fairness of the process by which outcomes are

arrived. Procedural justice is defined as the fairness of the processes that lead to outcomes. It is the appropriateness of the allocation process. It seems to be essential to maintaining institutional legitimacy (Hough, Jackson, Bradford, Myhill, & Quinton, 2010). When individuals feel that they have a voice in the process or that the process involves characteristics such as consistency, accuracy, ethicality, and lack of bias then procedural justice is enhanced (Leventhal, 1980) as mentioned below:

- a) Consistency: procedures are consistent across persons and across time.
- b) Bias suppression: procedures should be neutral and impartial or unbiased.
- c) Accuracy: Procedures and decisions are based on as much accurate information as possible.
- d) Correctability: Procedures include mechanisms for correcting poor decisions.
- e) Representativeness: Procedures should consider the views and opinions of all affected parties.
- f) Ethicality: Procedures should be based on prevailing standards of ethics.

3) **Interactional Justice:** It is defined as the quality of the interpersonal treatment which they receive by an individual (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). It refers to the treatment that an individual receives as decisions are made and can be promoted by providing explanations for decisions and delivering the news with sensitivity and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986). Wu, Huang, Li, and Liu (2012) defined it as the fairness practices in interpersonal interactions and ideas or information sharing, consists of two dimensions; interpersonal justice and informational justice; former one elaborated as the fairness in mutual treatments and behavior like respect and dignity (Holtz & Harold, 2013; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010) while the later one argued on the fairness of the information shared like its extensiveness and truthfulness (Skarlicki, Barclay, & Pugh, 2010; Zhang & Jia, 2013). It was first outlined by Bies and Moag (1986) and they identified four criteria typifying interactional justice as mentioned below:

- a) Respect: Being polite rather than rude.
- b) Propriety: Refraining from asking improper questions or making prejudicial comments.
- c) Truthfulness: Being honest in communications, rather than deceptive.
- d) Justification: Providing clear and adequate explanations for the decision.

### Studies related to Organizational Justice

This study reviewed various studies related to organizational justice to develop an indepth understanding about it as mentioned in table 1.

<b>Table 1: Studies related to Organizational Justice</b>		
<b>Authors / Years</b>	<b>Research Focus</b>	<b>Findings</b>
Adams (1965)	Understanding of inequity	Distributive justice stresses a proportional distribution of resources according to investments in a give-and-take relationships
Folger & Greenberg (1985)	Procedural Justice	Procedural justice can be defined as the fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcomes that employees receive
Velasques & Andre (1990)	Justice and Fairness, Issues in Ethics	Justice means giving each person what he or she deserves or, in more traditional terms, giving each person his or her due.
Greenberg (1993); Tyler and Bies (1990)	The interpersonal context of procedural justice	organizational justice is not only including the perception of the judgment of fairness in income but also include the judgment of allocation decision
Bies and Tripp (1997)	Distrust and justice	result of perceived injustice it creates feeling of hatred, anger and a desire of revenge
Jenkins (2011)	Procedural Approach to justice	Justice is a concept that relates to ideas about what is right and wrong, and how people should treat each other

Ibrahim & Perez (2014)	Justice, Satisfaction, and Gender on Employees' Commitment	defined as the elements of how decision makers treat their people with regards to the adequacy with which organisational formal decision making is explained to employees
Heydari & Goltash (2014)	Procedural and Interactive Justice	Justice is an important concept explained in political and social domains

### Conceptualization of Workplace Deviance

Workplace deviance covers various negative behavioural acts that is undesirable for an organization. Hence, it can be defined as voluntary behaviours of organizational members that violate significant organizational norms, and in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization and/or its members (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). These deviance behaviours often damage the organization and its members and include them in such behaviours as disturbing colleagues, sabotage other individual projects or deliberately disobeying the organization and spreading negative rumors.

According to Fox and Spector (1999), the factors that cause this deviance behaviour are due to the pressure faced by the employees. In group psychology, it may be described as the deliberate (or intentional) desire to cause harms to an organization. More accurately, it can be seen as voluntary behaviour that violates institutionalized norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization. Described as intentional behaviour that departs from customs and rules of an organization and in doing so impends the good and welfare of employees and organization, both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Theories and research has shown that there are numerous factors which are responsible for this amoral act. Ranging from situational factors to dispositional factors the consequences of deviant behaviour is devastating. For instance Douglas and Martinko (2001) found that attribution style, trait anger and self-control accounted for 62% of variance in self-reported workplace aggression. Situational factors like perception of organizational injustice leads in the prediction of deviant/retaliatory behaviour.

Also deviant workplace behaviour could arise as a result of feelings of disrespect, frustration, injustice and threats to self (Griffin & Leary-Kelly, 2004) and when the employee is in financial trouble or feel slighted. Additional issue that causes and compels employees for committing the acts of destructive deviance in the organization is the effect of deviant role models. This concept is borrowed from social learning theory which postulates that the influence of role models who are considered as deviant in an organization or in a group in general affect others in the group to commit acts of deviance too (Vardi et. al, 2004).

Furthermore, stressors in the organizations are also found to propel the employees to engage in destructive behaviours. Earlier research shows that stressors associated with amount of work had a direct relation with employees' aggression, stealing and the intention to quit (Lee et. al, 2001; Lu et. al, 2005). Moreover, it is found that the environment where people perform their duties also is a good forecaster of employees' workplace deviant behaviours (Pizzino, 2002; Omar et. al, 2011). It can be direct and straightforward that may include sexual harassment, vandalism, backbiting other employees, organizational sabotage etc. All these unapproved organizational behaviours have undesirable outcomes for the organization as a whole along with its employees which includes disobeying the manager's instructions, intentionally working slow, arriving late at work and performing petty theft, dealing badly or rudely with co-workers in the organization (Galperin, 2002).

Personal factors triggering may include believing in materialism (Deckop, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2014), locus of control (Wei & Si, 2013) and personality traits (Spector & Zhou, 2014; Michel & Bowling, 2013). Besides there are organizational factors such as commitment (Gill, Meyer, Lee, Shin, & Yoon, 2011), interpersonal conflict (Spector and Zhou, 2014), abusive supervision (Wei & Si, 2013; Ahmad & Omar, 2013), psychological contract breach (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001; Fayyazi & Aslani, 2015) and perception of organizational politics (Wiltshire, Bourdage, & Lee, 2014) may be the cause of deviance. Hence, it can be imagined that what disaster can deviance can create as also proved in various studies discussed above. Thus, demand to understand this issue thoroughly along with its types is demanded and covered in the next section.

### **Types of workplace deviance**

Robinson and Bennet (1995) framework of workplace deviance comprises of two main dimensions: the severity of the deviance and whether the deviance can bring harmful implication to individual or the whole organization. They initially made groups of these deviant acts into four different classes such as production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression. Subsequently, Bennet and Robinson (2000) classified these deviant behaviours on the basis of their targets i.e. interpersonal and organizational deviance. The distinction between these two forms of workplace deviance is important because they may differ from each other in terms of their antecedents (Robinson and Bennet, 1995). Likewise, Stewart et al (2009) modified his self-reported measure of workplace deviance into non-self reported measure. Research indicates that assessing deviant behaviour of the employees from others (i.e. through co-workers and supervisors) are organized differently in a three factor structure (i.e. Production deviance, property deviance and personal aggression) as only two dimensions were found in self-reported measure by Bennet and Robinson (2000) . It was explained by Stewart et al (2009) that political deviance may be the most difficult and the raters may not be able to detect it because such behaviours are only veiled attacks that only the target recognizes. Hence, after the thorough evaluation of the major frameworks on deviance, this study considered the framework of

Bennett and Robinson (2000) that divided into two factors i.e. interpersonal deviance comprising of political and personal aggression, whereas, organizational deviance comprising of production and property deviance as discussed below.

1) **Production Deviance:** Minor behaviour that has a direct influence on the work being done in the organization and effects on the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. All behaviors in which deviant employees partake ultimately have a negative impact on the overall productivity of the organization. It is the behavior of employees at workplace that violates formally prescribed organizational norms with respect to minimal quality and quantity of work to be accomplished as part of one's job. It may for example include reading a newspaper instead of doing work, excessive chat with the co-workers, coming late to work, cyber loafing, doing irrelevant work etc.

2) **Property Deviance:** This deviant behaviour is related with the property. It refers to employees' serious behaviour where they can damage or misuse an organization's property. These behaviours may for example include sabotage, theft, falsify accounts etc. Researchers argued that these behaviours can bring costs to the organization which will eventually impact on the productivity as well.

3) **Political Deviance:** Behaviors in the political deviance category are relatively less harmful and victims of these behaviours are employees in the organization. Political deviance is a kind of interpersonal behaviour including behaviours towards someone, favouritism, blaming co-workers, gossiping with co-workers thereby wasting crucial work time and competing non-beneficially with the co-workers. It is a broad concept, less frequently invoked than the concept of political crime. It can be perpetrated by those in power, in the name of the state or individually, or by those struggling to effect social change.

4) **Personal Aggression:** It is a kind of interpersonal behaviour that is more harmful than political deviance. The personal aggression involves acts like sexual harassment, physical and verbal abuse, endangering co-workers or stealing from co-worker at the workplace which is directed towards the employees of the organization. It is a deviant behavior that is serious and directed at a specific individual(s). It includes Personal comments on colleagues related to caste, creed, religion culture, insulting someone etc.

### Studies Related to Workplace Deviance

Various studies have been conducted so far to understand the workplace deviance and for the purpose of this study few studies have been review as mentioned in table 2.

<b>Authors / Years</b>	<b>Research Focus</b>	<b>Findings</b>
Ahmad & Omar (2013)	Abusive control, work family interface	abused employees experience more work family conflict and involved in deviant behaviours.
Aleksic & Vukovic (2018)	Personality traits and leadership	personality traits moderate deviant behaviours; it is very from employee to employee.
Arthur (2011)	Incivility and aggressive interpersonal behaviour	HR plays a vital role in maintaining a healthy environment an organization, and teamwork help an individual to achieve their goals
Bennett & Robinson (2000)	Interpersonal deviance	scale developed to understand the interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance.
Baharom et. al (2017)	resistance, dysfunctional	personal information is valid and reliable to evaluate deviant Workplace behaviours.
Chernyak-Hai et. al (2018)	married men and divorced women	that the married couple involved in more deviant behaviours instead of a divorced couple.
Chaiyaset Promsri., Saudi (2018)	Middle & executive employees	Lower middle management employees are avoiding involved in deviant behaviours as compared to the executive level of employees
Chiu & Peng (2008)	Psychological contract breach	employees engaged in deviant behaviours when they unfair perception
Dunlop & Lee (2004)	group performance, staff rating	individual destructive deviance causes poor performance of the group.
El Akremi, Vandenberghe & Camerman (2010)	informational justice and interpersonal justice	Procedural and interactional Justice plays a vital role in maintaining a healthy environment at the organization, and proper procedural justice gives employees a stress-free daily routine
Grasmick & Kobayashi (2002)	Socially imposed embarrassment and self-imposed shame	Power of shame and the apparent inefficacy of embarrassment as inhibitors of deviance
Liu & Ding (2012)	Organizational support and interactional justice	ethical judgments minimize the unethical activities at the organization.
Masole (2015)	safe and fair environment	A kind gesture between HR and employee reduce deviant activities and increases efficiency

Mitchell & Ambrose (2007)	Abusive supervision, displaced aggression	negative reciprocity beliefs and supervisor rude behaviours strengthened deviant behaviours
Narayanan & Murphy (2017)	Destructive and constructive deviance behaviour	When employees feel supportive, rewarding, structured, and risk-free environment; they involve in constructive deviance
Nasir & Bashir (2012)	justice, counterproductive work behaviours	multiple factors for deviant behaviours are dissatisfaction, financial pressures, and injustice
Omar et. al (2011)	Work related factors work related stress	job satisfaction and stress are the leading cause of deviant behaviour at the organization
Oh et. al (2011)	Honesty-Humility	lower Honesty- Humility and stronger extraversion personality more deviance
Shamsudin et. al (2014)	Job satisfaction, interpersonal deviance	job satisfaction and interpersonal justice causes workplace deviance
Tuzun & Kalemci (2018)	Organizational justice appraisal practices	unequal performance appraisal practices lead to employee deviance behaviours,

### Relationship between Organizational Justice and Workplace Deviance

Organizational Justice and workplace Deviance is closely related to each other. Researchers have suggested that workplace deviance occurs as a response to unfairness in the workplace experienced by the employees or employers' violation of obligations owed to employees (Greenberg and Scott, 1996). This assertion is often supported by equity theory which asserts that employees equate their ratio of outcomes to inputs with the ratio of a co-worker. When equivalent inputs results in equivalent outputs they feel valued and unbiased. Various studies have been conducted so far by various researchers in different organizational settings as mentioned in table 3 which can act as a base and background for the purpose of this study.

<b>Authors / Years</b>	<b>Research Focus</b>	<b>Findings</b>
Akremiti et. al (2010)	informational & interpersonal justice	Procedural and interactional Justice plays a vital role in maintaining a healthy environment and procedural justice gives employees a stress-free daily routine
Blau and Andersson (2005)	justice, satisfaction and incivility	perceptions of distributive justice was negatively related to incivility whereas no effect of procedural and interactional justice on incivility
Kennedy et al. (2004)	justice & support	higher the levels of perceived injustice, the stronger support for aggressive behaviours.
Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004)	justice on students' aggression and hostility	procedural justice significantly predicted antisocial behaviours; distributive justice did not have significant effects on students' behaviours outcomes; interactional injustice affect aggression than distributive injustice.
Clark and James (1999)	justice climate	unfair treatment had a significant effect on individual negative creativity, measured by actions that deviously communicate negative information to harm another individual and his or her organization
Adams-Roy and Barling (1998)	Justice & Sexual Harassment	low levels of perceived procedural report sexual harassment. Interactional justice did not have a significant effect on sexual harassment
Greenberg & Alge (1998)	Justice, satisfaction, deviance	employees perceive their work environment as unfair, develop job dissatisfaction, anger, frustration, and mistrust, leading to deviant acts
Neuman & Baron (1998)	Workplace aggression	Workplace violence is a serious form of aggression that causes physical harm on the victim.

Brockner & Wiesenfeld 1996	Justice and Deviance	procedural justice affect deviance when outcome is unfair, distributive affects when procedure is unfair
Folger & Skarlicki (1998)	Deviant Behaviour	motivation to seek revenge are strongest when individuals perceive multiple unfair events
Gellatly (1995)	Absenteeism & Justice	The results supported a significant effect of interactional injustice on absenteeism.
Folger and Konosky (1989)	Performance appraisal	fair appraisal procedures have higher pay satisfaction, loyalty, and trust regardless of the amount of pay

Many researchers as mentioned in above the table argued on the fact that lack of fair practices and stress are key determinants of deviant behaviour at workplace which can be gauged and mitigated through organizational justice and its major dimensions i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional. All three dimensions of organizational justice if perceived positively by employee harvest trust and yield satisfaction which makes employees to show desired positive behaviour at workplace (Demir, 2011). Hence, theorizing and generating hypothesis for future empirical studies is required as an objective of this study and to develop a comprehensive framework that can be applied universally across any type of organizational settings.

### III. Theorizing and Hypotheses Development

Employees are the most vital resource for competitive advantage for any type of organization (Tax and Brown, 2012). If employees start behaving badly with the intent of providing harm to the organization or its members, then it will dent the organization both internally and externally. Same was asserted by many researchers that deviant behaviors harm an organization from every dimension (Bordia, Restubog, & Tang, 2008; Robinson, Wang, & Kiewitz, 2014). So it is essential to fix the problem of workplace deviance to ensure the effectiveness of the firm (Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007; Lawrence & Robinson, 2007; M'nard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011).

Although past studies mostly focused on problems arising from workplace deviance rather than its treatment, rare studies try to analyze the remedy for workplace deviance through justice (de Lara & Verano-Tacoronte, 2007; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009). The gaps identified above raised the voice to resolve workplace deviance issues by focusing interpersonal and organizational aspects of organizational justice. It helps to entails the perception regarding fairness of firm's decisions, processes and interactions through distributive, procedural and interactional justice respectively which leads towards enhanced trust, performance, satisfaction and commitment of employees towards organization (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Walumbwa, Cropanzano, & Hartnell, 2009). Justice is incorporated through better communication and empowerment and Dusterhoff, Cunningham, and MacGregor (2014) preceded it by arguing that interaction reduces the gap and nourishes trust and positive attitude. On the basis of above discussion following research questions arises:

- 1) What is the cure of workplace deviance?
- 2) What is the impact of organizational justice on workplace deviance?
- 3) Can distributive justice reduce the workplace deviance?
- 4) Is procedural justice significant to treat workplace deviance?
- 5) Either workplace deviance can be cured through interactional justice or not?

This framework is based on theories related to distributive, procedural, and interactional justices. Hence,

with these theoretical arguments, relationships of each antecedents of justice with deviance are discussed to develop a conceptual framework and to propose the hypotheses of the study.

### **1) Distributive Justice and Deviance**

Distributive justice has primarily been studied from the equity theory perspective. Equity theory (Adams, 1963) suggests that individuals need to maintain a view of their social and organizational places as just and fair. People assess the fairness of their outcomes by comparing their own contributions and outcomes against that of a referent other (Adams, 1965; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Deutsch, 1985; Homans, 1961; Kulik & Ambrose, 1992). Inequitable outcome provokes perceptions of injustice, which not only creates psychological distress, but also evokes undesired behavioural responses. In other words, people not only express dissatisfaction over the violation of distributive justice norms, but also react in the form of deviant workplace behaviors (Greenberg & Alge, 1998).

Although equity theory has contributed a great deal to justice and deviance research, the theory focuses on the economic aspect of fairness, and thus is limited in explaining how people form fairness evaluation. Specifically, equity theory does not consider the effects of procedural and interpersonal aspects of fairness evaluations. Further, it lacks the ability to predict behavioural responses to unfair treatment (Colquitt et al., 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Greenberg and Alge (1998) suggest that distributive justice is a necessary but not sufficient condition to motivate deviant behaviour such as aggression. Overall, equity theory has been criticized for being too narrow by only considering the outcomes people receive, which are typically material or economic in nature (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001).

*H<sub>1</sub>: Distributive Justice significantly affects Workplace Deviance.*

### **2) Procedural Justice and Deviance**

Procedural justice theory suggests that individuals form fairness judgments not only based on the outcomes received, but also based on the procedures used to determine these outcomes. Specifically, Lind and Tyler (1988) suggest two models of procedural justice that explain the importance of fair procedures on people's fairness perceptions and its outcomes. First, the self-interest or instrumental model asserts that process control is seen as influential in achieving desired outcomes. By controlling procedures, individuals can maximize the favorability of such outcomes in the long term. The second model, the group-value or relational model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992) proposes that a fair procedure indicates one's positive, full status relationship with authority and promotes within-group relationships, and thus has implications for a person's self-esteem and identity. With procedural justice, the focus is on the individual's evaluation of events that precede the distribution (Leventhal, 1980). A procedure is judged to be unfair if it indicates a negative relationship with authority or low status group membership (Tyler & Lind, 1992).

Research has shown that procedural justice can have a strong impact, independent of distributive justice, on a variety of attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). Evidence shows that unfair decision-making processes can lead to various negative consequences such as lower performance, higher turnover

intentions, theft, and low organizational commitment (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Folger & Skarlicki, 1998). Procedural justice is suggested to be a more important predictor of behaviours in response to judgments about the organization than is distributive justice (Materson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). Employees perceive organizations as the source of justice or injustice because organizations establish formal rules and policies that regulate people's behavior and dictate the allocation of outcomes. In effect, if individuals perceive that the rules and regulations are inequitable, they may feel that it is impossible to get fair outcomes for their performance input.

In light of these, some scholars suggest that actions taken in response to procedural injustice should be intended toward organization-focused outcomes such as low organizational commitment and physical property destruction and hence, workplace deviant behaviour (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999).

*H<sub>2</sub>: Procedural Justice significantly affects Workplace Deviance.*

### 3) Interactional Justice and Deviance

Interactional justice focuses on individuals' perceptions of the quality of the interpersonal treatment received during the execution of organizational decisions. Researchers initially suggested that interactional justice would be an important predictor of employee responses to judgments about the supervisor. However, investigations showed that, beyond the person-focused outcomes such as conflict, low performance, and poor attitudes (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), interactional justice has notable ability in predicting behavioural outcomes including organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs), withdrawal, and counterproductive behaviours (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). According to Bies and Moag (1986), insensitive or impersonal treatments are more likely to provoke intense emotional and behavioural response than other types of injustice. Violations of interpersonal justice tend to evoke the strongest emotional responses, ranging from anger to moral outrage (Bies, 1987), and revenge is usually accompanied by intense anger (Buss, 1961) which is considered as undesirable behaviour in organizations point of view.

*H<sub>3</sub>: Interactional Justice significantly affects Workplace Deviance.*

#### Measures

1) **Organizational Justice:** The scale to measure organizational justice was developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). This measurement consists of 19 items to measure three dimensions of organizational justice, namely distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. The five items for both distributive justice and procedural justice, meanwhile interactional justice is consists of nine items. Response to the items is based on a 5 point Likert scale. High scores indicate a high perception of justice in the organization and low scores indicate low perception of justice as mentioned in table 6.

Table 6: Research Instrument of Organizational Justice			
Antecedents	Item	Scale	Source
Distributive Justice	1	Fair reward as per responsibilities	
	2	Fair reward as per experience	
	3	Fair reward as per effort	
	4	Fair reward for good work	
	5	Fair reward as per complexity in the job	
	1	Procedures to collect accurate information	
	2	Procedures to provide opportunities	

Procedural Justice	3	Procedures to make decision effective	Niehoff and Moorman (1993)
	4	Procedures to make decision consistent	
	5	Procedures to hear the concerns of all	
	6	Procedures to provide useful feedback for decisions	
	7	Procedures for clarification about the decision	
Interactional Justice	1	Suggestions are demanded	
	2	suppress personal biases.	
	3	Feedback about the decision and its implications.	
	4	Treating with kindness and consideration	
	5	Concern for employees' rights	
	6	Dealt with truthful manner	

2) **Workplace Deviance:** A 12 items scale instrument to measure workplace deviance behaviour was developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) for two dimensions i.e. organizational and interpersonal deviance. Organizational deviance include production and property deviance measured by three-items each, where as interpersonal deviance include political deviance and personal aggression measured by three-items each as mentioned in table 7.

Antecedents	Items	Scale	Source
Production Deviance	1	Personal work	Bennett and Robinson (2000)
	2	Additional or longer break	
	3	Slow work	
Political Deviance	1	Showed favouritism	
	2	Blamed someone else	
	3	Gossip about colleague	
Property Deviance	1	More reimbursement than actual	
	2	Accepted a gift/favour	
	3	Taken property from work without permission	
Personal Aggression	1	Cursed someone at work	
	2	Ethnic or sexually harassing remark	
	3	Made someone feel physically intimidated	

#### IV. Conclusion

The Study adopted exploratory research design to develop the conceptual framework in this study. Around 50 relevant research papers were referred and thus made an attempt to justify with the research objectives to present a comprehensive model regarding organizational justice and workplace deviance. The impact of organizational justice on deviance was studied in current research work. The existence of society revolves around the principles of justice. Similarly, without justice expecting employees to do well is too difficult. Organization justice has a very serious effect on the workplace deviance. Research indicates that three types of justice i.e. distributive, procedural justice and interactional justice are essential in reducing workplace deviant behavior. Employees who are consulted (and given an opportunity to be involved in the decision-making processes at their organization) are less likely to act out, since their voices are valued. Thus, in order to have a deep understanding of this relationship conceptual model is developed which will further help to conduct empirical studies in this direction that can be applied in any type of context. This study also illustrated antecedents for both the variables of the study and hence developed the research instrument for further research. After reviewing previous literature on the subject matter, various authors proved that organizational justice significantly impact workplace deviance. There are various reasons of deviance

and also various after effects. Both needs to be studied thoroughly in order to have a deep understanding of it, as it may have the most disastrous effects on organization. Organizational justice is one such important reason which is considered in this study. Ultimately, it is the managers and the organization's responsibility to uphold the norms to which the organization wishes to adhere; it is the organization's job to create an ethical climate. If organizations have authority figures who demonstrate their ethical values, a healthier workplace environment is created. Research has suggested that managers' behavior influences employee ethical decision-making. Employees who perceive themselves as being treated respectfully and valued are those less likely to engage in workplace deviance.

## References

1. Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
2. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press.
3. Aleksic, A., & Vukovic, M. (2018). Connecting personality traits with deviant workplace behavior. *Journal of Media Critiques*, 4 (14). .
4. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2001). Are flexible organizations the death knell for the future of procedural justice? In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace II: From theory to practice*: 229-244. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
5. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 295.
6. Arthur, J. B. (2011). Do HR system characteristics affect the frequency of interpersonal deviance in organizations? The role of team autonomy and internal labor market practices. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 50(1), 30-56.
7. Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. In: Greenberg J, editor. *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate. 247-281
8. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
9. Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). Beyond distrust: —Getting even and the need for revenge. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Bowles, H. R., & Gelfand, M. (2009). Status and the evaluation of workplace deviance. *Psychological Science*, 21(1), 49-54.
11. Cropanzano, R. and Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in Organizational Justice: Tunnelling Through the Maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12(1), 318-372.
12. Fatt, C.K., Khin, E.W.S., & Heng, T.N. (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction: The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *Am. J. Econ. Bus. Adm.*, 2(1): 56-63.
13. Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Sage.
14. Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.

15. Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
16. Herzberg, F., & Mausner, B., (1959). *The Motivation to Work*, second ed. Wiley, New York.
17. Heydari, M., & Gholtash, A. (2014). An Investigation in to the Relationship between Procedural and Interactive Justice with Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 2(1). 152-157.
18. Hoel, H., & Salin, D. (2003). Organisational antecedents of workplace bullying. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (Eds) *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis, 15.
19. Ibrahim, M.E., & Perez, A.O. (2014). Effects of Organizational Justice, Employee Satisfaction, and Gender on Employees' Commitment: Evidence from the UAE. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(2). 45-59.
20. Irving, P. G., Coleman, D. F., & Bobocel, D. R. (2005). The moderating effect of negative affectivity in the procedural justice-job satisfaction relation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 37(1), 20-32.
21. Jenkins, J.A. (2011). *The American Courts: A Procedural Approach*. Sudbury, Massachusetts: Jones & Bartlett Publishers
22. Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2005). The effects of overhearing peers discuss an authority's fairness reputation on reactions to subsequent treatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90. 363-72.
23. Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2002). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. In *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace*. 49-79. CRC press.
24. King, W.C.Jr., Miles, E.W., D.D., & Day (1993). A Test and Refinement of the Equity Sensitivity Construct, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14. 301-317.
25. Konovsky, M.A. (2000). Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact On Business Organizations, *Journal of Management*, 26. 489-511.
26. Lee, C., & Farh J. L. (1999). The Effects of Gender in Organizational Justice Perception, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 133-143.
27. Lee, M. B., & Saeed, I. (2001). Oppression and horizontal violence: The case of nurses in Pakistan. In *Nursing Forum*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 15-24.
28. Leung, K., & Lind, E.A. (1986). Procedural Justice and Culture: Effects of Culture, Gender, and Investigator Status on Procedural Preferences, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1134-1140.
29. Liu, N. T., & Ding, C. G. (2012). General ethical judgments, perceived organizational support, interactional justice, and workplace deviance, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(13), 2712-2735,
30. Doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.610945.
31. Lu, H., E. A., While, K., & Barriball, L. (2005). Job satisfaction among nurses: a literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 42, 2001-227.
32. McFarlin, D. & Sweeney, P. (1992). Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-37.
33. Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating

- effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159.
34. Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 845-855.
  35. Narayanan, K., & Murphy, S. E. (2017). Conceptual Framework on Workplace Deviance Behaviour: A Review. *Journal of Human Values*, 23(3), 218-233. 42.
  36. Nasir, M., & Bashir, A. (2012). Examining workplace deviance in public sector organizations of Pakistan. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 39(4), 240-253.
  37. Neuman, J., & Baron, R. (1998). Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets. *Journal of Management*, 24, 391-419.
  38. Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556. Doi: 10.2307/256591.
  39. Omar, F., Halim, F., Zainah, A., & Farhadi, H. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of deviant workplace behavior. *Deviant behavior*, 16, 17.
  40. Tang, T.L., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L.J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Adv. Manage. J.*, 61(3). 25-31.
  41. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
  42. Tyler, T.R. & R.J. Bies (1990). Beyond Formal Procedures: The Interpersonal Context Of Procedural Justice”, in J.S. Carroll (ed.), *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings*, Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 77-98.
  43. Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
  44. Yunus, O.M., Khalid, S., & Nordin, M. (2012). A personality trait and workplace deviant behaviors. *Human Resource Management*, 47. 8678–8683.