TURNABOUT IS FAIR PLAY: LINKAGES BETWEEN MULTI-DIMENSIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS AND MULTI-TYPOLOGY COUNTER PRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOURS

AMNA YOUSAF

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology

Abstract- Management research has developed a fairly comprehensive understanding of desirable work behaviors but has largely neglected sub-role, antisocial and deviant work behaviors and specifically their situational antecedents. The purpose of the current study was to develop a conceptual framework that explores the linkages between multiple dimensions of organizational justice such as distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, interpersonal justice and multi-dimensional counterproductive work behaviors such as production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance. Data was gathered from a sample of 250 faculty members from a public sector university of Pakistan and analyzed using structural equation modeling technique. Results indicated that distributive and procedural justice had a significant and negative impact on all forms of counterproductive work behavior. However, contrary to our expectations, interpersonal and informational justice was only related to personal aggression and political deviance. The research offers original contributions both theoretically and practically by exploring the unique linkages between justice perceptions and type of counterproductive behaviors.

Index Terms- Distributive justice; procedural justice; informational justice; interpersonal justice; production deviance; property deviance; personal aggression; political deviance

I. INTRODUCTION

What makes employees behave counterproductively? What are the reasons why some employees deliver poor quality work, engage in sick leave without being ill, or falsify receipts to get reimbursed for more money than they actually spent? Since past decade, negative behaviors, commonly referred to as counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) have gained considerable attention as they can harm the organization and various stakeholders at large (Chang &Smithkari, 2010; Spector & Fox, 2005; Sackett, 2002).To date, however, compared with the significant negative impact of CWB on the organization and employees, the effects of antecedents on CWB have been documented much less extensively (Wei & Si, 2013; Vardi& Wiener, 1992).Moreover, past research on the antecedents ofCWB has mainly focused on employees' individual differences and attitudes toward the organization (Jones,2009; Lau, Au, & Ho, 2003; Rodell& Judge,2009; Murphy, 1993; Ostroff, 1993). More recently, although scholars have turned their attention from the individual predictors of CWB to situational and contextual factors, such as the relationship an individual holds with the organization the interpersonal and situational antecedents of CWB have not been extensively examined in the empirical literature. This article seeks to explain employee CWB in work units by extending research on situational rather than personal antecedents such as organizational justice perceptions. Referring to the laws of equity and reciprocity, it could be inferred that when people perceive any form of injustice, they commonly demand that the violation be censored through punitive actions so as to compensate the victim and restore proportionality to the situation—i.e., to restore equity or equality. It is within this framework that we place our reflections about CWB. This approach is chosen to demonstrate that it is not only people's personality but also their perceived organizational injustice across varied dimensions that may lower their threshold to act counterproductively.

Recently, [1] generated a four-cell typology of CWB i.e. productiondeviance (minor–organizational), property deviance (serious–organizational), personal aggression (serious–interpersonal),and political deviance (minor–interpersonal). This typology was intended to be a comprehensive classification of CWB highlighting the similarities and differences between CWB as well as their underlying dimensions. In the current study, we argue that it isimportant to study how the different multi-dimensional organizational justice perceptions may inadvertently cause employees to engage in different categories of workplace deviant behaviors. Although we find indication of studies conducted in the domain of organizational justice and its relation to CWB none of the studies examines the unique linkages between the four dimensional organizational justice and the four factor conceptualization of CWBs simultaneously.

Important to mention, that since the terms counterproductive and deviant behavior generally denote acts potentially harmful to the organization; they are applied interchangeably in this article.

Literature Review

Four Factor Conceptualization of Organizational Justice

[2] proposed a four factor dimensionality for organizational justicei.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational. Distributive justice grabs its roots from equity theory and relates to the perceptions of fairness of employees'own input/output ratio compared to that of the referent others . Procedural Justice relates to fairness in procedures and policies applied in decision making process in work environment rather than fairness of outcomes. Interpersonal justiceis concerned with sincere communication, respectful and polite interaction between the supervisor and the subordinate. Informational justice means that there should be adequate explanation of the decisions taken by the supervisor; this adequacy concerns truthfulness, specificity and timeliness. Adequate information decreases feeling of resentment and dissatisfaction among employees because timely and specific information bridges the gap between dissatisfaction of distributed outcomes making employees feel less resentful (Gurbuz& Bingham2007).

Four Factor Typology of Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Production deviance is behaviors that violate the formally legal norms defining the minimal quantity and quality of work to be achieved.Purposefully failing to perform job tasks which the employee was capable of performing successfully (behaviors devastating the work progression)such as coming late or taking longer breaks, chatting with coworkers about non work topics, day dreaming on job, arriving late, taking longer lunch breaks, leaving office before time, wasting resources and cyber loafing are all different types of production deviance that have a devastating effect on the work progression [1]. Property deviance refers to the instances where employees damage or acquire the tangible assets of the organization without authority (Robinson And Bennett, 1995).Property deviance is quite severe in its intensity and harms the organization in numerous ways such as sabotaging equipment, accepting kickbacks, stealing from company, releasing company's secret information, making intentional errors, misusing expense accounts and lying about hours worked (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).Some acts of property deviance are related to the direct cost of the company such as work cannot be performed until the damaged equipment has been replaced consequently declining the individual andcompany productivity (Everton et al , 2005).Personal aggression is the violent and intimidating manner towards other individuals (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Evertson et al, 2005). Verbal abuse, physical assault, sabotaging work of other individuals, harassment, endangering coworkers, destroying property of other people and stealing from them are some forms of personal aggression (Evertson et al, 2005). Employees who have been target of aggression by their coworkers or supervisors have more physical and emotional health problems and are observed to be less committed to their organization. According to a survey more than two million workers are physically attacked at work every year. Aggrieved individuals pose greater cost to their organization, resulting in loss of productivity, inferior quality of work, lost work time, over legal and medical expenses and a damaged public image (Fleet & Griffin, 2006).Political deviance refers to the social interaction which puts other individuals at personal or political disadvantage (Robinson &Bennette, 1995).Workplace discourteousness, making fun of others, spreading rumors or blaming coworkers, competing non-beneficially, showing favoritism, acting rudely and disobeying supervisors instructions are some forms of political deviance [1].Disrespectful and bad behavior is harmful whether it is unintentional or intentional and the consequences of such behaviors are serious. Those who are target of such behaviors are less satisfied from their work settings and also those who are operating it.

TheoreticalFramework to Examine the Underlying Relationships

Conventional wisdom highlights conflicting strategies for dealing with injustice. One perspective suggests that injustice ought to be avenged (e.g.an eye for an eye). Alternatively, some would argue that the best response to injustice is to be more virtuous (e.g., turn the other cheek). Within the organizational justice literature, research has largely focused on retaliation as a common response to perceived injustice. For example, several meta-analytic reviews highlight negative relationships between perceptions of justice and workplace deviance [3]. Perceived injustice is a core determinant of workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). The prevailing notion that individuals will strike back and inflict harm in response to perceived injustice is grounded in principles of retributive justice. Specifically, retributive justice refers to the philosophy that a transgressor who commits an injustice deserves to be punished and punishment helps restore the subjective balance of justice. In simple terms, punishing a transgressor helps a victim of injustice "get even." More technically, retribution can help restore the power and social status that is often compromised by acts of injustice [4] Bies& Tripp, 1996. From the standpoint of equity and justice theory, CWB or deviant behavior is considered an intentional act motivated by the need to restore equity or seek retributive justice. These workplace instigators lead to the assessment that the situation is unfair and an

emotional reciprocal reaction is instigated in different forms in an attempt to restore the disparity to vent the feelings of outrage created thereby. People may react in various ways leading to various types of workplace deviances.

Relationship between Distributive Justice and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Existing research has shown that distributive justice plays a significant role in influencing employees' perceptions of whether the employment relationship is a fair one or not. Employees become demotivated from their job and from respective employer when they feel that the ratio of input to output is not compatible with the ratio enjoyed by other referents (equity theory) [5]. Outcomes of employee performance are an important criterion of equity perceptions; when performance and pay are commensurate, equity is achieved [6]. An organizational system that relates appraisal results to individual achievement and financial gains is extremely valued by employees [7]. Injustice associated with outcomes will evoke one's feelings of dissatisfaction and resentment that motivate the aggrieved individual to react either by modifying their behavior to restore equity or by seeking to change the system. If the individual believes that he or she cannot change the system, one alternative is to inflict punishment upon the parties held responsible for violating their sense of justice. The greater the perceived distributiveinequity, the greater would be the indulgence in deviant behaviors such as production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance. Restitution might be demanded by under rewarded individuals and they may retaliate against the supervisor or organization or engage in vandalism or theft. It was found that envy (a negative emotion), occurred as a result of dissatisfaction with distributive justice which in turn significantly predicted abuse against others and withdrawal. When perceptions of distributive justice were high, the relationship between envy and abusive behavior against others was more evident. Based on these arguments following hypothesis is being proposed:

H1: Employee perceptions of distributive justice are negatively related to (a)production deviance (b)property deviance (c) personal aggression and(d) political deviance.

Relationship between Procedural Justice and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Processes are highly important in developing fair perceptions whenever allocations of outcomes are being made; it is highly likely that procedural justice may have a powerful impact on counter productivity shown by employees). Rules should be consistent and constant across person and time. For example, candidates applying for same job and given same aptitude test, the procedural consistency specifies that the evaluation criteria for all the candidates remains constant, showing fairness in system and procedures and preventing employees falling in any kind of deviance. If top management hires someone favorably and shows biasness in performance evaluation because doing so would in some way serve the personal interest of the employers, it would violate bias suppression and consistency rulesand lead to procedural unfairness perceptions. When employees perceive fairness of procedures, they conform to organizational norms and avoid acts of deviance. There is influence of procedural justice on wide range of emotional and behavioral responses prevailing in an organization. Following from principals of equity and retributive justice, deviant behaviors motivated by procedural injustice could be directed toward both the organization and its members. The organization or the top management is perceived to be a source of in/justice because it establishes formal rules and policies and draws procedures that regulate people's behavior and dictates the allocation of outcomes. If individuals perceive that the rules, regulations and relevant procedures to get things done are inequitable, they may feel that it is impossible to get fair outcomes for their performance. As such, they may retaliate against their employing organization by slowing down performance and misuse of property. Ambrose et al. (2008) showed that when employees perceive procedural injustice, they tended to sabotage their organization. Based on these arguments following hypothesis is being proposed:

H2: Employee perceptions of procedural justice are negatively related to (a)production deviance (b) property deviance (c) personal aggression and(d) political deviance.

Linkage betweenInterpersonalJustice and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Interpersonal justice defines the degree to which people are treated with dignity, respect and politeness.Authorities violating respectful interpersonal treatment and ethical standards abate perception of just treatment And give fire to negative reactions. Abusive supervisors use their power to brutalize and oppress employees through their persistent verbal and nonverbalabuse -they scream, yell, ridicule, intimidate and humiliate their employees.

Multiple theoretical frameworks help explain why perceptions of interpersonal injustice often lead to workplace deviance. There is sufficient evidence suggesting that employees respond negatively to supervisory mistreatment by engaging in destructive behaviors that are harmful to the organization and to its members. In social exchange theory, which

narrates that in an interdependent workplace relationship, unfair treatment by one's supervisor indicates an imbalance which requires rectification through negative consequent behaviors themselves. Abused employees reciprocate mistreatment back to the organization, supervisors and other agents. Assessment of situational contexts in which incidents of unfairness occur can better assist in understanding why and when retaliatory action, in response to injustice are less likely to OCCUR. Hence, employees who perceive unfair interpersonal treatment are generally more likely to engage in behaviors harmful to their organization or to individuals in their organization. Meta-analytic evidence corroborates the effect of interpersonal injustice on workplace deviance. Extant literature also shows that one's reaction to decision outcomes is affected by interpersonal justice. Based on these arguments following hypothesis is being proposed:

H3: Employee perceptions of interpersonal justice are negatively related to (a)production deviance (b)property deviance (c) personal aggression and(d) political deviance.

Linkages between InformationalJusticeand Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Lack of two way communications between supervisor and subordinate and lack of employees' participation in decision making creates gap in goal clarity and increases perceived disparity. This feeling causes massive disappointment, considerable injustice resulting in demonization or worse to open hostility. Perceived unfairness leads to retaliationwhich may take several forms, such as unwillingness to work more hours, brief spills of illness and ultimately leads to counterproductive work behaviors, such as theft, sabotage, productivity deviance and withdrawal.

Employees possess confidence and trust in their supervisors and when they believe that they have adequate knowledge about appraisal system prevailing in their organization, their jobdescription and are provided with clear, timely and constructive feedback,and subjected to ratings that are appropriate and reflect abilities and efforts of their performance. Respect, dignity, sensitivity and explanation aspect of informational justice could make employees feel less damaged about an unfavorable outcome. Fairness of performance appraisal also arises from distributive, procedural and interactional justice. The evaluation of outcomes received, the procedures used to allocate outcomes fairly and the fairness of the interpersonal treatment and decision making course of actions are taken by the supervisors .

Employee experience uncertainties when there is lack of accurate information in organization, which can be quite tenuous. When employees experience uncertainty then fairness concerns become more salient to them. Stronger negative reactions from employees are reported when supervisory mistreatment is coupled with lack of information and uncertainty. In organizational justice literature it has been found that informational justice modifies one's reaction to procedures as valid explanation provides information needed to evaluate the structural aspects of the process. When harmonious relationship is maintained in organization, individuals working in the organization show positive reactions followed by adapting positive organizational policies. Deviant behaviors are then avoided because they are considered as a way to ventilate dissatisfaction associated with structural aspects of organization or the system operating individuals of the organization. Based on these arguments following hypothesis is being proposed:

H4: Employee perceptions of informational justice is negatively related to (a) production deviance (b) property deviance (c) personal aggression(d) political deviance.

II. METHODOLOGY

It is noteworthy that we conducted this research in Pakistan, a non-western culture. Most of the extant research on the subject has been based on US and other western samples. Given the fact that the process of justice perceptions and relevant outcomes might be very much influenced by national culture high in collectivism, there is a strong urge to examine such processes in non-western context. Empirical research in this field from the South Asian sites is particularly rare, thus calling for more attention. In stressing the need for indigenous research, it has been established that the implementation of western management models without any consideration of their applicability to the local context will lead to the failure of human resource (HR) initiatives in this direction .Because of the prevalence of small and family owned business in Asia, human Resource Management (HRM) is generally informal and unsophisticated where large firms are more likely to conduct HRM compared to small ones. Unfortunately, HRM continues to be relatively low profiled in most Pakistani organizations especially healthcare and university systems.

We chose an important profession for this study i.e. university teachers. For academics, work behaviors in terms of delivery of lecture, contents, quality, modes of teaching, teacher time to students other than the lecture duration etc maybe highly critical to student learning and satisfaction. Besides, across all occupations, academics are the ones which need strict training and are internationally categorized as independent professions. These aspects highlight that we can test our hypotheses related to

counterproductive work behaviors.

The population of this study was including teaching faculty comprising research associates, lecturers, assistant, associate and fullprofessors. Using convenience sampling technique, 400 questionnaires were distributed through inter-office mail addressed to employees. A reminder mail was sent out after two weeks.250 useable questionnaires were returned showing a response rate of 63%. Data showed that 56 % of the respondents were males. In terms of marital status, 52 % were married. For age 71.6 % of the respondents were less than 40 years of age. Regarding education, 56% were under graduates, while the rest were holding postgraduate and PhD degrees. Considering work experience 82.6% of the respondents had less than 10 years of experience and remaining respondents had more than 10 years of experience.

Common method variance

All study variables were entered in a principal factor analysis, using varimax rotation, to determine the number of factors that are necessary to account for the variance in the variables. The results showed eight independent factors (distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression, political deviance) with an "Eigen value" greater than 1, accounting for 70.03 percent of the variance. The first (largest) factor did not account for majority of the variance, nor was there a general factor that accounted for the majority of the covariance in these variables. This suggests that common method variance is not of great concern.

Analytical Strategy

Given that there were multiple relationships between the dependent, and independent variables, structural equation modeling (SEM) appeared to be the most appropriate method to address the research questions. SEM has the advantage of pointing out causal relationships, even in cross-sectional designs. Secondly, it is possible to calculate the error-free relationships between concepts, because in latent structure models SEM considers the reliability of the measures. A two-step procedure (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988) of structural equation modeling (SEM) is applied to conduct data analysis after data collection. First, the measurement model was tested for the validity of the indicators and then structural model was evaluated.

Results

No significant relationship was found between any of the study controls and other constructs. Distributive justice was found to be negatively relatedto production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance ($r = -.35$, $p < .05$; $r = -.21$, $p < .05$; $r = -.11$, $p < .05$; $r = -.18$, $p < .05$). Procedural justice was also found to be negatively related to production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$; $r = -.33$ $p < .05$; $r = -.08$, $p < .05$; $r = -.13$, $p < .05$). Interesting to note that distributive justice was more strongly related to production deviance than procedural justice. On the other hand, the correlation between procedural justice and property deviance was stronger compared to distributive justice.Relationship was only significant between interpersonal justice and personal aggression ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$) while for the other dimensions of CWBs i.e. production deviance, property deviance and political deviance ($r = -.15$, ns; $r = -.11$, ns, $r = -.08$, ns). Informational justice was not related to property deviance ($r = -.05$, ns). However it showed to have significant correlation with production deviance, personal aggression and political deviance ($r = -.24$, $p < .05$; $r = -.29$ $p < .05$; $r = -.31$, $p < .05$ respectively).

Measurement Model

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to assess the measurement properties of the scales used in the study. Several fit criteria were used to assess the measurement model, including comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), normed fit index (NFI;, goodness of fit index (GFI) and adjusted goodness of fit index. For the eight-factor model of distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance results showed satisfactory fit indices between data (N=250) and the model (GFI = .96; AGFI = .96; CFI=.97; RMSEA =.03; St. RMR = .03). When we constrained these constructs into one common factor to check the common method bias, the model indices became inferior (GFI = .74; AGFI = .75; CFI= .73; RMSEA = .07; St. RMR = .06). We conclude that the participants perceive distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance as eight different constructs.

We further conducted CFAs with pairs of variables (first with the four sub dimensions of organizational justice, and then with the four sub-dimensions of counter productive work behaviors). For the four-factor model of justice, the CFA results showed a satisfactory fit indices between data and model (GFI = .96; AGFI = .98; CFI=.95; RMSEA =.04; St. RMR = .03). When we constrained distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice into one factor, the model indices became inferior (GFI = .83; AGFI = .78; CFI= .81; RMSEA = .06; St. RMR = .05).

The CFA results for production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance as distinct factors showed a satisfactory fit indices between data and model (GFI = .96; AGFI = .97; CFI=

.98; RMSEA =.03; St. RMR = .04). When production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance were constrained as one factor, the model indices became inferior (GFI = .77; AGFI = .80; CFI =.82; RMSEA =.05; St. RMR = .05), suggesting that participants did make a distinction between the different forms of deviant work behaviors. In addition to the positive indices, factor loadings ranging from .75 to .92 supported the measurement properties of the model.

Given the self-reported nature of the data and the need for discriminant valid measures, the results of CFAs also demonstrated distinctiveness of the structure of our measures. We conclude that participants perceive distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice as four different factors. Next, we repeated the same procedure to distinguish the structure between different dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors.

Structural Model

Following the first step of measurement model testing, the second step is analyzing the structural models. Figure 1 illustrates the hypothesized model tested in the present study. The measurement model was tested by adding paths from independent variables (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice) to the dependent variables (production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance).

H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d predicted the negative relationship between distributive justice and the multi dimensional counter productive work behaviors. Results of these models as depicted in figure 1, confirmed our expectations as distributive justice was negatively related to production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance ($\beta = -.38$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.31$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.18$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.24$, $p < .01$ respectively), thus confirming H 1.

H2a, H2b, H2c and H2d predicted the negative relationship between procedural justice and the multi dimensional counter productive work behaviors. Results confirmed our expectations as procedural justice was negatively related to production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression and political deviance ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.25$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$; $\beta = -.11$, $p < .05$respectively) thus confirming H 2a,H2b, H2c and H2d.

H3a, H3b, H3c and H3d predicted the negative relationship between interpersonal justice and the multi dimensional counter productive work behaviors. Results partly confirmed our expectations here too as interpersonal justice was found to be significantly negatively related to personal aggression and political deviance ($\beta = -.24$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.18$, $p <0.01$), however the relationship with production deviance and property deviance could not be confirmed ($\beta = -.22$, ns; $\beta = -.15$, ns). Thus H3a and H3b were rejected whereas H3c and H3d were accepted.

H4a, H4b, H4c and H4d predicted the negative relationship between informational justice and the multi dimensional counter productive work behaviors. Results partially confirmed our expectations here again as informational justice was not found to be significantly related to production deviance and property deviance ($\beta = -.12$, ns; $\beta = -.07$, ns). However, informational justice was found to significantly impact personal aggression and political deviance of employees ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.32$, $p < .01$) thus confirming H 4c and H4d.

DISCUSSION

The objective of the current study was to examine the linkages of individual dimensions of organizational justice with individual dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors.Results reveal that employee perceptions of distributive justice have an inverse relationship with all dimensions of CWB. This signifies the fact that presence of justice and fairness related to outcomes prevented the employees from engaging in deviant behaviors as distributive justice gives employees perception of equity and the feeling that their input has been fairly rewarded when compared to their counterparts As a result employees do not tend to engage in production deviance which they could be expected to engage in when the perceptions of input/output ratio were not fair resulting in efforts to lower quality and quantity of production so as to distort the perceptions of equity. Alike, inequitable perceptions of distribution of outcomes compared to referent others could lead them to property deviance such as trying to steal company property in an attempt to bring the input output ratio to a more equitable level.

Furthermore, the results showed that perceptions of inequity could lead to personal aggression; when the employees feel that their input/output ratio is lower compared to their counterparts it could surely invite feelings of anger and resentment in employees – and the feelings of not being treated fairly by the management. Results also supported our hypotheses related to political deviance by the employees that do not perceive fairness in distribution of outcomes. It can be much expected that when employees perceive injustice with respect to outcomes they try to engage in legitimate or illegitimate political behaviors in an attempt to gain better relationships with boss and extracting positive distributive benefits by engaging in such behaviors.Our findings show that employees could engage in any form of the above types of deviant work behaviors to make the ratio more favorable and equitable to them; it might depend on the individual

which way s/he adopts i.e. h/she reacts by engaging in production deviance, property deviance, personal aggression or property deviance. These findings seem to be in line with the previous studies .Our next study hypothesis related to the relationship between procedural justice perceptions and counterproductive work behaviors. Results showed significant negative relationship between procedural justice perceptions and all forms of CWB. This shows that if employees do not perceive that the organization is using fair procedures to arrive at the outcomes they could retaliate by displaying any type of CWB's.This means that like distributive justice, employees perceiving lack of procedural justice tend to enter in CWB's that's target is both the organization and the individuals and try to equalize the situation by any or all of the coping mechanisms. Furthermore, perceptions of procedural unfairness makethem angry and annoyed and they try to achieve procedural fairness (such as fairness in performance appraisal process) by engaging in political behaviors.

Our next study hypothesis related to the relationship between interpersonal justice and the multidimensional CWB. The findings indicated that interpersonal justice was related to personal aggression and political deviance which are more theinterpersonal outcomes and that interpersonal justice was not related to production and property deviance that are the organization level outcomes. This could mean that since interpersonal justice relates to the quality of interpersonal relationships and the extent to which an individual is treated with dignity, given respect and interdependent interaction are carried out with politeness, people tend to attribute any such fairness or unfairness perceptions to the other individuals and not the organization and this the target of their behavior is also at the more individual level.

Our last study hypothesis related to the relationship between informational justice and counterproductive work behaviors. This hypothesis also gained partial support as informational justice was relatedsignificantly only to personal aggression and political deviance which are more at the individual level and that informational justice was not related to production and property deviance that are at the organizational level. Informational justice requires valid truthful explanation of the decision to be shared by the supervisor with the subordinate. There is sharing of information between the two parties thus imparting knowledge which creates satisfaction about the decision being made, which in turn decreases the intensity of dissatisfaction and does not let the feeling of injustice concerning the upheld decisions come in the mind of the employee in question. Hence, timely and truthful information regarding the decisions being carried out assists employees to modify their behaviors according to rules and regulations of their respective organization.Since this type of justice also relates to the information sharing coming from the supervisor/boss, the target of CWB is also the individual and not the organization.

Our research findings related to the interpersonal and informational justice linked only to interpersonal behavioral outcomes can be related to the study conducted by Jones (2009) where he also found these two justice perceptions to be linked to CWB directed towards supervisor.

Overall, these findings suggest that employee's perception and judgment about distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational fairness is important and plays a significant role in determining their behavior at workplace. These findings are consistent with those of previous researchers. When employees are dissatisfied with the fairness of distributive outcomes, procedures , interpersonal treatment and informational justice they are likely to violate organizational norms and commit the severe acts of workplace deviance in different forms. These findings imply that employee's judgment about distributive fairness, procedural fairness, interpersonal fairness and informational fairness plays a significant role in determining their behaviors at the workplace. In a similar study conducted in universities of Zimbabwe, results revealed that workplace deviance in its various forms was explicit in universities. Employees were found to be engaged in some deviant behaviors where in production and property deviance were most common in universities.

With respect to university employees , deviant acts are fund misuse for personal benefits, releasing confidential information , publishing plagiarized material , accepting falsified reports, showing biasness in peer evaluations to secure social harmony, showing favoritism and leverages to concerned groups , supporting illegal aspects , prolonged absenteeism , taking small items such as stationary and laptops to their homes, using their privileged transport for their personal use, pooling vehicles , and mishandling university resources i.e., keeping electricity equipments on while leaving office. Furthermore, people may not own workplace belongings at personal level which does not include their own money.

REFRENCES

[1] Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, Vol.38,555–572.

[2] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386-400.

[3] Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., &Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and metaanalysis.Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 410–424.

[4] Bies, R. J., and Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H.

Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.).Research onnegotiations in organizations. 1, 43-55.

[5] 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.

[6] Beer, M. & Katz, N. (1998). Do incentives work? The perceptions of senior executives from thirty countries. Paper presented at the Academy of Management annual meeting to the Human Resource Management Division.

★★★