

PRACTICES OF INJUSTICE AND WORKPLACE DEVIANCE: THE CASE OF ASEAN MANUFACTURING FIRM

Sustiyatik E., Setiono B.A., Ridwan A. *

Abstract: This study is aimed to inspect the association of distributive injustice, procedural injustice and interactional injustice with workplace deviance along with the mediating role of jealousy among the employees of Malaysian manufacturing firm. This study was done quantitatively. Data collection has been done through random sampling technique and 5-point Likert Scale was used to employ the data. For the data analysis smart PLS 3.0 was used and this study contains the sample size of 350 which has been taken from the manufacturing firm of the Malaysia. The findings of the study showed that the Malaysian manufacturing firm, employees were critically affected by organizational injustice and this led towards the aggression, jealousy and exhaustion among the employees that eventually produced workplace deviant behaviors. In order to cope with the workplace deviance effectively, management need to eliminate the practices of workplace injustices that arise the feelings of jealousy among that employees and consequently engage them in the deviant workplace behaviors and this situation evidently damage the well-being of the employees.

Key words: interactional injustice, distributive injustice, procedural injustice, workplace deviance, jealousy

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2019.20.1.38

Article history:

Received August 20, 2019; *Revised* November 8, 2019; *Accepted* November 10, 2019

Introduction

In a volatile business environment, firms looking for the loyal and committed employees in order to enjoy the higher level of efficiency and performances. Employees' commitment and loyalty reflected by the job-related attitudes of the employees that they depict time by time at the job. Thus, such changes in workers job-related bring number of different outcomes to the firm. Deviant workplace behaviors go against the acceptable norms of the firm. Norms refers to such acceptable principal's and behaviors and statements which are permitted within the firms. More precisely, when workers go beyond the already described norms which has been stated previously then this situation harmfully affect the organizational processes. Number of studies also established the outcome that the presence of workplace deviant behavior damage employee's productivity such negativity lead towards the deterioration of overall worker's performance (Pera, 2017). Likewise, the concept of workplace deviance behaviors and emotional exhaustion has always

* **Enni Sustiyatik, Ahmad Ridwan**, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Kadiri, Kediri, Indonesia, **Beni Agus Setiono**, Program Diploma Pelayaran, Universitas Hangtuah, Surabaya, Indonesia

✉ corresponding author: enni_sustiyatik@unik-kediri.ac.id

✉ benny.agusetiono@hangtuah.ac.id; ahmad_ridwan@unik-kediri.ac.id

remained so attractive to study for academics, professionals and researchers because of their harmful effects that they throw on employee's productivity, their satisfaction level and on their commitment level as well (Mulki et al., 2006). DWB is quite significant concept for research and notably this concept has extensively studied in the developed countries like UK, USA, China, South Korea, and Australia. Number of earlier studies called for further investigation of this concept of DWB in different cultures and different Asian and developing countries for the sake of enrichment of the literature and to get the better understanding about this concept globally (Schilpzand et al., 2016). The study brings advancement in the existing literature of deviance behavior by scrutinizing this with distributive injustice, interactional injustice and procedural injustice along with the mediating role of jealousy. Lastly, due to the pressing need for research on the impact of interactional injustice, procedural injustice and distributive injustice on workplace deviance behaviors along with the mediating role of jealousy, this research which is aimed to be done in the context of Malaysia fills the lack of investigation in the Asian or non-western context, which is pretty much required.

The problem of workplace deviance behavior has emerged globally (Leweherilla, 2017). In accordance with the, 75% of workers have been observed to be involved in deviant workplace behaviors such as fraud, absenteeism, theft and d lastly vandalism. More precisely, Within Malaysia, the issue of workplace deviant behaviors has been discussed extensively and still consider as one of the most critical issue in newspaper and reports. Besides that, following the local survey which was done by (Alias et al., 2012), which is known as an international audit, tax and advisory professional organization, the findings of this survey gave alarming figures like it has been observed that in Malaysian private and public sector firms, 83% workers engaged in the workplace deviant behaviors like fraud. Moreover, worker's involvements in absenteeism and theft which are known as the predictor of workplace deviant behavior have also turned out to be very serious problems in Malaysia. For example, based on the survey of Global Retail Theft Barometer, it declared that the Malaysia experienced the 1.5% of shrinkage of retail and that is was the 12th highest among 42 nations which has been surveyed in the year of 2010. Furthermore, in the context of Malaysia, 22.3% of employees were observed to be engaged in theft at their workplace and it caused the total damage of almost US\$52 million annually to the firms.

Literature Review

This study is aimed to determine the mediating effect of employees' jealousy among the link between interactional injustice (II), procedural injustice (PI), distributive injustice (DI) and workplace deviance (WD). Organizational justice deals with the perception of the employees about how fairly their organization treats them at the job. Within the literature, Organizational injustice represents the lack of fairness and justices in the organizational practices. Injustice at the workplace significantly affects the worker's behaviors and attitudes. When

employees experience fairness then they naturally develop the expectations about being rewarded fairly for their efforts and determinations (Shoaib and Baruch, 2019). On the contrary, low level of organization justices represents the unbalanced ratio of input vs output that eventually force the employees to get engaged in negative and retaliatory behaviors (Frey et al., 2013). Quite a lot of studies has distinguished the organizational injustices in three facets namely, interactional injustice, distributive injustice and lastly procedural injustice. The concept of distributive injustice represents the employee's perception about being treated unfairly in his/her outcomes like payments and rewards.

The procedural injustice dimension represents the lack of fairness and injustice in the procedures which are employed to define one's outcome and decisions (Afzali, et al., 2017). Occurrence of procedural injustice spread negativity and create questions into the mind of the employees about the distribution of outcomes and rewards, that will as a result decrease the motivation level of the employees for stay positive and favorable for their firms (Ceylan and Sulu, 2010). Previous studies recommend that employees become reactive when other used the procedures for the allocation of resources (Tremblay et al., 2010). The same, when staff feel that the organizational procedures are fair then they become more responsible towards the problem contradictory to that point when procedures seem unfair discriminated (Ceylan and Sulu, 2010). Likewise, when employees sense the unfairness and injustice within the organizational procedures then workers are more likely to exhibit damaging and negative behaviors. Present study links the procedural injustice with workers destructive job-related attitudes, which consequently encourages employees to involve in negative activities like WD.

The interactional injustice states to "the inequality of the interpersonal interaction between individuals". Colquitt advanced the idea of interactional injustice by further introducing it to interpersonal injustice and informational injustice. Interactional justice is all about the daily interaction between the employees and employer, so any desecrations from the side of supervisor related justice patterns stimulate workers to involve in the negative exchanges between supervisor and employees. Judgments concerning the interactional injustice are particular in nature because of the perception/views about the leadership attitude (Klaussner, 2014), that workers develop as an outcome of cognitive evaluations regarding the unfairness in relation to handling and behaviors of their leaders/supervisors. It is claimed that workers intensely react to leaders related injustice through direct give-and-take retaliation towards leaders (Herscovis et al., 2007), or either they adopt indirect retaliate approach by involving themselves in deviant workplace behaviors in opposite to workers or organization because of the fear of further retaliation by the harm doer or as a result of worker's incompatibility of being retaliated. Likewise, existing study advocates the role of interactional injustice as very significant predecessor of fostering the workplace deviant behaviors (Park et al., 2017). and the presence of interactional injustice provoke jealousy as well (Khan, 2018).

Jealousy is defined as “the negative emotional state generated in response to a threatened or actual loss of a valued relationship due to the presence of a real or imagined rival” (DeSteno et al., 2006). Meanwhile, workplace jealousy has emerged as an abstract concept, (DeSteno et al., 2006), made an attempt to explain the concept of workplace jealousy and it has formed the emotions in the persons’ mind. In accordance with them, the concept of workplace jealousy is linked to triadic associations where three parties must be engaged for instance, main worker, leadership and colleagues. Within the organizational setting, managers and superiors usually have control over the organizational resources and benefits so as a result colleagues become competitive with focal workers for such remunerations. Employees are bound in their associations with their supervisors because such relationships are quite significant for the valuable employees because organizational resources and benefits are evidently linked with this relationship. Hence, in this perceptible, justice make certain the expectedness of organizational benefits (DeSteno et al., 2006), and any happenings of injustice might decrease the certainty of organizational resources and benefits and this situation Consequently, such situation fosters the emotions of jealousy among the employees (DeSteno et al., 2006)

Shoaib and Baruch (2019) defined deviant behavior in terms of “acts involving opportunism and/or shirking that will have an adverse effect on the achievement of tasks in an ethical manner by increasing the likelihood of triggering inappropriate behaviors”. Workplace deviance has remained the topic of great interest for the organizational intellectuals because this concept causes the higher cost to organizations whenever the practice of workplace deviance occurs (Shoaib and Baruch, 2019). To conclude, workplace deviance behaviors also ensure the failure of the business because when such behaviors widely spread within the firms then it becomes difficult for the leadership to direct the workers to follow firm’s rules and regulations (Johns, 2006). Workplace deviance represents three important aspects and such aspects are such behaviors don’t support the ethical standards. Secondly, such deviant behaviors are mainly directed towards the workers and firms and lastly such behaviors are motivated in nature (Bordia et al., 2008).

H1: There is a significant association between distributive injustice and jealousy

H2: Interactional injustice has positively connected with jealousy

H3: Jealousy has positively linked with workplace deviance

H4: Procedural injustice has positively linked with jealousy

H5: There is a significant mediating role of jealousy between DI and WD

H6: Jealousy played a significant mediating role between II and WD

H7: Jealousy played a significant mediating role between PI and WD

Research Methodologies

Data collection has been done via self-visit to the Malaysian manufacturing firm and 5-point Likert scale was employed to review the data. Moreover, to get the information from the employees, random sampling technique was used. For that

reason, our study covers the sample of 350 respondents. 350 questionnaires were distributed among the management staff of Malaysian manufacturing firm. Out of 350 questionnaires, 299 surveys were returned back. Out of 299, 13 questionnaires were excluded because of their incomplete information, total 286 questionnaires were employed to analyze the data. 82% was the reaction rate after the collection of the information has done, so 82% reaction rate is quite appropriate to carry on the investigation. Afterwards as a factual apparatus Smart PLS 3 has been used in this study. For the analysis of the data, the current study has used smart PLS 3.

Findings

In Table 1, the measurement model assessment Cronbach alpha, Factors loading, CR and AVE were tested (Hair Jr, et al., 2014). Moreover, to evaluate the external consistency, the discriminant validity was measured. As a result, factor loading should be > 0.5 (Hair Jr et al., 2014). The AVE and convergent validity must be greater than or equal to 0.5. In addition, the value of the reliability must exceed the 0.7. Further, the measurement model assessment shows the results of this model. It showed that all the values of the factors are above the minimum standard level as well, the discriminant validity is shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha and AVE

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
DI	0.935	0.951	0.794
II	0.901	0.931	0.772
J	0.910	0.934	0.739
PI	0.948	0.958	0.793
WD	0.921	0.941	0.761

Table 2: Discriminant Validity

Relationship	DI	II	J	PI	WD
DI	0.891				
II	0.883	0.879			
J	0.761	0.769	0.86		
PI	0.898	0.891	0.756	0.891	
WD	0.672	0.736	0.914	0.679	0.872

To measure the study hypotheses, the minimum acceptable standard of t-value should be 1.96. In the Table 3 the direct effect of independent variables (IVs) on dependent variable (DV) has been illustrated. Moreover, the t-value of such relationships is greater than 1.96 with having positive β -value. Consequently, all the relationships between independent and variables are significant. Hence, H1, H2, H3 and H4 are accepted. Furthermore, it is confirmed that with jealousy distributional injustice, interactional injustice and procedural injustice are positively connected. The same, jealousy demonstrated the positive and significant

association with workplace deviance. Mediation effect has been depicted in the Table 4.3. In this model, all the hypotheses connected to mediation were measured. In mediation test Preacher and Hayes (2004) was followed of. The findings of this table showed that of all hypotheses contain t-value which is greater than 1.96, which lead towards the conformation of the mediation effect among independent and dependent variables. As a consequence, H-5, H-6 and H-7 are accepted.

Table 3: Direct Relationship

	Original Sample (O)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
DI -> J	0.277	0.122	2.258	0.024
II -> J	0.351	0.137	2.561	0.011
J -> WD	0.914	0.016	57.674	0
PI -> J	0.195	0.102	2.908	0.017

Likewise, in Table 4, the mediating effect of jealousy between distributional injustice and workplace deviance, the mediating effect of jealousy between interactional injustice and workplace deviance, additional, the mediating effect of jealousy between procedural injustice and workplace deviance have showed. The β -value is positive of each mediating hypothesis. It means organizational injustice enhances workplace deviance through jealousy.

Table 4: Indirect Relationship

Relationship	Original Sample (O)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
DI -> J -> WD	0.253	0.114	2.208	0.028
II -> J -> WD	0.32	0.114	2.716	0.007
PI -> J -> WD	0.178	0.09	1.978	0.048

Discussions

This study examines the mediating effect of jealousy among distributive injustice and workplace deviance (WD), procedural injustice and workplace deviance (WD) and lastly interactional injustice and workplace deviance (WD). It is found that distributional injustice, procedural injustice and interactional injustice with workplace deviance, the t-value 2.258, 2.908 and 2.561 respectively these values are greater than 1.95. The positive β -values of distributional injustice, procedural injustice and interactional injustice are 0.277, 0.195 and 0.351 and for the direct relationships between distributional injustice, procedural injustice and interactional injustice with workplace deviance. The t-value of the direct relationship between jealousy and workplace deviance is $57.674 > 1.96$ and β -value is 0.914. These positive β -values and the values of $t > 1.96$ show positive significant relationship

between each variable. However, the mediating effect of jealousy between distributional injustice and workplace deviance is significant with t-value 2.208, β -value 0.253 and p value 0.028 (Moldan et al., 2012). Similarly, the mediating effect of jealousy between procedural injustice and workplace deviance is significant with t-value 1.978; β -value 0.178 and p value 0.048 is significant. Likewise, the mediating effect of jealousy between interactional justice and workplace deviance is significant with t-value 2.716, β -value 0.178, p value 0.007. Thus, the employee jealousy is a significant mediator between distributional injustice, procedural injustice, interactional justice and the workplace deviance through (Wright, 2002). This study is useful for the manufacturing companies that enhance their performance by improving the practices of injustice and workplace deviance in the organization.

Conclusion

This study provides an understanding about how the management can better realize the damaging effect of workplace deviance behaviors that take place in the presence of distributive injustice, interactional injustice and procedural injustice along with the mediating role of jealousy in the Malaysian manufacturing firm. It's been concluded that in the Malaysian manufacturing firm, employees were critically affected by organizational injustice and this lead towards the aggression, jealousy and exhaustion among the employees that eventually produced workplace deviant behaviors. When workers experience injustice, they can feel it. It is conformed that in the presence of organizational injustice worker's intentions to engage in deviant workplace behavior are higher. In a nutshell, current study contributed in the literature by giving better understanding about the association between three independent constructs which are the dimensions of organizational injustice (distributive injustice, interactional injustice and procedural injustice) with the mediating role of jealousy that evidently lead towards the workplace deviance behaviors.

However, this study has some limitations that need to explain. First, this study is conducted only in Malaysian context and data was gathered from the Malaysian manufacturing firm. The reason behind conducting this study in the context of Malaysia is that number of research on injustice has been done on western context, so, this research's findings hold limited validity in other geographical areas and other sectors. This study only addressed the manufacturing sector of Malaysia so the findings of this study may be different in service sector of Malaysia. Furthermore, quantitative research method generally based on a large sample size in order to represent the whole population but this study is limited to the 350 sample size.

References

- Afzali, M., Nouri, J.M., Ebadi, A., Khademolhoseyni, S.M., & Rejeh, N. (2017). Perceived distributive injustice, the key factor in nurse's disruptive behaviors: a qualitative study. *Journal of Caring Sciences*, 6(3), 237.

- Alias, M., Rasdi, R.M., & Said, A.-M.A. (2012). The impact of negative affectivity, job satisfaction and interpersonal justice on workplace deviance in the private organizations. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 20(3), 829-846.
- Bordia, P., Restubog, S.L.D., & Tang, R.L. (2008). When employees strike back: investigating mediating mechanisms between psychological contract breach and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1104.
- Ceylan, A., Sulu, S. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship of procedural injustice to job stress. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 5(2), 65-74.
- DeSteno, D., Bartlett, M.Y., & Salovey, P. (2006). Constraining accommodative homunculi in evolutionary explorations of jealousy: A reply to Barrett et al. (2006).
- Hair F. Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121.
- Frey, B.S., Homberg, F., & Osterloh, M. (2013). Organizational control systems and pay-for-performance in the public service. *Organization studies*, 34(7), 949-972.
- Hershcovis, M.S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K.A., Dupré, K.E., Inness, M., . . . Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228.
- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 386-408.
- Khan, M.A. (2018). *Perceived injustice and its impact on job outcomes: role of jealousy and self-efficacy*. University of Salford.
- Klaussner, S. (2014). Engulfed in the abyss: The emergence of abusive supervision as an escalating process of supervisor-subordinate interaction. *Human Relations*, 67(3), 311-332.
- Leweherilla, N.C. (2017). The antecedents of deviant workplace behaviors on the employees of Regional Apparatus Organization (ODP) in Maluku Province, Indonesia. *RJOAS: Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 6(66), 165-174.
- Moldan, B., Janoušková, S., & Hák, T. (2012). How to understand and measure environmental sustainability: Indicators and targets. *Ecological Indicators*, 17, 4-13.
- Mulki, J.P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W.B. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance: Can the right job and a leader's style make a difference? *Journal of Business Research*, 59(12), 1222-1230.
- Park, H., Hoobler, J.M., Wu, J., Liden, R.C., Hu, J., & Wilson, M.S. (2017). Abusive supervision and employee deviance: A multifoci justice perspective. *Journal of business ethics*, 1-19.
- Pera, A. (2017). The prevalence and cost of deviant behavior in the workplace to both organizations and employees. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, 9(1), 139-145.
- Preacher, K.J., & Hayes, A.F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I.E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, S57-S88.

- Shoab, S., & Baruch, Y. (2019). Deviant behavior in a moderated-mediation framework of incentives, organizational justice perception, and reward expectancy. *Journal of business ethics*, 157(3), 617-633.
- Tremblay, M., Cloutier, J., Simard, G., Chênevert, D., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). The role of HRM practices, procedural justice, organizational support and trust in organizational commitment and in-role and extra-role performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(3), 405-433.
- Wright, T.S. (2002). Definitions and frameworks for environmental sustainability in higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 15(2), 105-120.

PRAKTYKI DOTYCZĄCE USZKODZENIA URZĄDZENIA W MIEJSCU PRACY: PRZYPADEK FIRMY ASEAN MANUFACTURING

Streszczenie: Niniejsze badanie ma na celu zbadanie związku niesprawiedliwości dystrybucyjnej, niesprawiedliwości proceduralnej i niesprawiedliwości interakcyjnej z dewiacją w miejscu pracy, a także mediacyjną rolę zazdrości wśród pracowników malezyjskiej firmy produkcyjnej. Badanie przeprowadzono ilościowo. Zbieranie danych przeprowadzono losowo w celu wykorzystania danych zastosowano technikę próbkowania i 5-punktową skalę Likerta. Do analizy danych wykorzystano inteligentny PLS 3.0, a badanie to zawiera próbkę o wielkości 350, pobraną z firmy produkcyjnej z Malezji. pokazał, że malezyjska firma produkcyjna, pracowników została poważnie dotknięta niesprawiedliwością organizacyjną, co doprowadziło do agresji, zazdrości i wyczerpania wśród pracowników, którzy ostatecznie doprowadzili do odchylenia w miejscu pracy. Aby skutecznie radzić sobie z odchyleniem w miejscu pracy, zarząd musi wyeliminować praktyki niesprawiedliwości w miejscu pracy, które budzą poczucie zazdrości, że pracownicy i w konsekwencji angażują ich w odbiegające od normy zachowania w miejscu pracy, a sytuacja ta najwyraźniej szkodzi dobrobytowi pracowników.

Słowa kluczowe: niesprawiedliwość interakcyjna, niesprawiedliwość dystrybucyjna, niesprawiedliwość proceduralna, dewiacja w miejscu pracy, zazdrość

工伤与劳动偏差的实践:东盟制造企业案例

摘要:本研究旨在探讨分布不公,程序性不公和互动性不公与工作场所偏差的关系,以及嫉妒在马来西亚制造公司员工中的中介作用。这项研究是定量进行的。数据收集是通过随机抽样技术完成的,并使用5点Likert量表来使用数据。对于数据分析,使用了智能PLS3.0,本研究包含350个样本量,该样本量来自马来西亚的制造公司。该研究的结果表明,这家马来西亚制造公司的员工受到组织不公正的严重影响,这导致员工之间的侵略,嫉妒和精疲力尽,最终导致了工作场所的异常行为。为了有效地应对工作场所的偏差,管理层需要消除导致员工之间产生嫉妒感的工作场所不公的做法,从而使他们参与异常的工作场所行为,这种情况显然损害了员工的福祉。

关键词:互动不公,分配不公,程序不公,工作场所偏差,嫉妒