

Relationship of Organizational Justice with Constructive Deviant Behavior in Manufacturing Organizations

* *S. Riasudeen*

** *Kanimozhi Narayanan*

Abstract

The research paper aims to determine the relationship between organizational justice and constructive deviant behavior. Analytical and descriptive design has been adopted to determine the relationship between organizational justice and the various dimensions of deviant behaviours. The sample of the study consisted of 109 employees from the manufacturing firms. The results indicate that the attributes of organizational justice, that is, procedural, informational, and distributive justice significantly differ from the challenging constructive deviant behavior. One of the dimensions of constructive deviant behavior and interpersonal and informational justice significantly differ from the dimension of innovative and interpersonal constructive deviant behavior. The study also reveals that the experience of the employees with respect to their age, number of dependents, marital status, and designation had significant differences with both organizational justice and constructive deviant behavior, and it was also revealed that gender had significant differences with constructive deviant behavior.

Keywords: organizational justice, constructive deviant behavior, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, challenging behaviour, innovative behaviour, interactional behavior

JEL Classification: D23, M00, L23

Paper Submission Date : November 18, 2013 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** December 27, 2013 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** March 1, 2014

Employee perception plays a major role in today's organizational environment. The involvement of the employees in their job and organization's well being, irrespective of the various attributes like stress, injustice, demotivation, and so forth is one of the important factors that is to be considered by the management (Alias, Rasdi, & Said, 2012). Organizational justice (OJ) is an important component that has an impact on employee behavior (Blodgett, 1997), which may lead to constructive deviant behavior regarding fair treatment where the employees are willing to break the rules of the organization so as to promote effectiveness of the organization (Ambrose, Schminke, & Mayer, 2013). Psychological ownership is known to result in positive organizational characteristics because an individual's responsibility can be increased by the feelings of ownership, irrespective of the injustice of various forms that the employee undergoes, which can be related to constructive deviant behavior that can lead to improving the organization's well-being (Chung & Moon, 2011).

Conceptual Background

➤ **Organizational Justice:** Organizational justice (OJ) refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions, and outcomes being fair in nature. The concept extends traditional models of work behavior that tend to conceptualize job demands, job control, and social support as the main factor determining individual well-being and organizational productivity (Ferres, Connell, & Travaglione, 2004). Fairness is the important factor that determines the social structure in which other characteristics of an organization operate (Harris, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2007). The notion of organizational justice will become relevant and tangible only when a violation of justice occurs (Ali, 2011).

* *Assistant Professor*, Department of Management Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry - 605 014.

E-mail: riasudeen.dms@pondiuni.edu.in

** *Research Scholar*, Department of Management Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry - 605 014.

E-mail: kanimozhi.rayan@gmail.com

OJ is composed of four distinct dimensions:

- (1) Distributive Justice:** It deals with the fairness of decisions of the outcomes. They may be intangible (e.g., praise) or tangible (e.g., pay).
- (2) Procedural Justice:** It the fairness of the processes which will lead to outcomes. Procedural justice is enhanced when individuals perceive that they have a say in the processes without any bias.
- (3) Interactional Justice:** It can be promoted by explaining to the employees the decisions that are made with respect and sensitivity. Interactional justice can be broken into two components: interpersonal justice and informational justice.
- (4) Interpersonal Justice:** It defines the perceptions of one's treatment with respect and dignity.
- (5) Informational Justice:** It defines the explanations given in terms of truthfulness, specificity, and timeliness.

➤ **Constructive Deviant Behavior :** Constructive deviant behavior has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, but contributes to the well-being of an organization and its members. It has also been argued that constructive deviant behavior is unauthorized, but are helpful acts that can facilitate in achieving organizational goals (Dahling, Chau, Mayer, & Gregory, 2012). Constructive deviance can be related to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) where it promotes the organizational functioning effectively, and it is a behaviour that is not recognized by that of the formal reward system. OCB is similar to constructive deviance since effective functioning of the organization is promoted by both. Constructive deviance and OCB are related in a way that OCB does not depart from the general norms of the organization. Positive deviant behavior must focus on actions that have honourable intentions and be praiseworthy, irrespective of their outcomes. There are three dimensions of constructive deviant behavior :

- (1) Innovative Organizational Constructive Deviant Behaviour:** It refers to behaviors that implement innovativeness so as to perform daily procedures and also developing creative solutions to problems in organizations.
- (2) Challenging Organizational Constructive Deviant Behaviour:** It refers to behaviors that challenge, break, or violate existing organizational rules and norms to solve organizational problems and perform jobs.
- (3) Interpersonal Constructive Behaviour:** It refers to behaviors such as reporting a wrong doing by peers and disobeying the supervisor's orders in order to bring a positive change in the organization.

Literature Review

Constructive deviance is one in which the employees perform unauthorized behaviors to facilitate organizational goals and the perceived justice, job autonomy, leader supportiveness, access to information and resources, individualism, and so forth, have been known to influence the constructive deviance behavior (Galperin, 2002). According to Baldwin (2006), organizational justice has been referred to as the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions, and outcomes to be fair in nature. These perceptions can influence attitudes, behavior for good or ill, in turn having a positive or negative impact on employee performance and the organization's success (Ferres et al., 2004). This positive behaviour can also be determined and compared with other pro-social behaviours such as whistleblowing, corporate social responsibility, organizational citizenship behaviour, and innovation (Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007).

When the relationship between the various dimensions of justice and perceived organizational support (POS), leader-member-exchange, and the organization and supervisor directed deviance were examined (El Akremi, Vanderberghe, & Camerman, 2010), it was found that POS mediated the relationship of procedural justice to organization directed deviance, whereas the informational and interpersonal justice mediated the relationship of

both supervisor and organization directed deviance (Rahim, 2013). The employees who had strong orientation towards justice and also placed a high value on the interpersonal justice rules will refrain from deviant behavior regardless of perceived injustice (Holtz & Harold, 2013).

Constructive deviance is important in businesses today (Robbins & Galperin, 2010) because it can bring about changes that are positive since it involves the breaking of rules and norms by employees in order to benefit the organization by assisting the organization in reaching its financial and economic goals, and may be an important source of innovation and entrepreneurship that enhances the well-being of the organization (Dagher & Junaid, 2011). Organizational climate also plays an important role in the relationship between employee's organizational reactions and the deviant behaviours (Fagbohunge, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012), where the deviant behaviours of males are different from that of their female counterparts depending upon the work environment. According to Iqbal, Aziz, and Tasawar (2012), procedural justice has a strong and positive influence on organizational citizenship behaviour, whereas distributive justice has a positive but weak influence in predicting employee behaviours that are not in their job description. Thus, the positive deviance (PD) approach can be used as a tool for the successful implementation of cultural diversity in organizations by improving the culture of the organization (Obermeit & Fink, 2012).

Methodology

➤ **Need and Purpose of the Study:** With respect to the various situations that prevail in an organization, the employees' perception of justice can be used to determine the levels of job satisfaction and job performance. The presence of equal importance and fairness within the organization which will enhance the innovativeness and creativity among employees to solve organizational problems by breaking rules for the required reasons without fear of being punished can be determined (Chirasha & Mahapa, 2012). The problem of employee dissatisfaction leads to absenteeism, low productivity, and to a large extent, affects employee behavior. The perception of organizational justice may vary among employees, and it will determine the fairness in the treatment by the supervisors that can lead to deviance behavior which can either be positive or negative (Brockner, 1990).

➤ **Sample Description :** The sample consisted of 109 out of 130 employees of junior engineer, senior engineer, and engineer level from a manufacturing plant and the period of the study was from March - July 2013. To protect the identity of the subjects, the demographic details of the respondents were collected without their names for the study. The questionnaires were distributed to the employees via e-mail.

➤ **Sample Profile :** The demographic details on various aspects of the respondents are as follows : 36.70% of the respondents belonged to the younger age group (less than 30 years of age), 32.11% of the respondents belonged to middle age group (30-35 years), and 31.19 % of the respondents belonged to the upper age group (greater than 35 years). With respect to experience, 22.02% of the respondents had an experience of less than 2 years, 29.36% of the respondents had an experience of 2 to 4 years, 27.52% of the respondents had an experience of 4 to 6 years, and 21.10% of the respondents had an experience of more than 6 years. Based on the number of dependents, 34.86% of the respondents had 1 to 2 dependents, 33.95% of the respondents had 3 dependents, and 31.19% of the respondents had 4 dependents. When considering the designation of the employees, 31.19% of the respondents were junior engineers, 35.78% of the respondents were senior engineers, and 33.03% of the respondents were engineers. Based on the marital status of the respondents, 48.62% of the respondents were married, whereas 51.38% of the respondents were single. With respect to gender, 52.29% of the respondents were men and 47.71% of the respondents were women.

➤ **Measures and Scale :** For measuring the dimensions of organizational justice, the scale developed by Jason A. Colquit (2001) was used which consists of procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice.

➤ The dimensions of constructive deviance behavior was measured by using the scale developed by Bella L. Galperin (2002) consisting of innovative, challenging, and interpersonal constructive deviant behavior.

➤ **Preliminary Analysis :** A pilot study was undertaken by distributing the developed questionnaire to a sample of 60 respondents drawn from all the participating organizations. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient computed for the measures ranged from 0.93 to 0.94 for constructive deviant behavior and OJ factors, indicating sufficient internal consistency of the measure for their use in the main study.

➤ **Data Collection Procedure :** A structured questionnaire was mailed to 130 respondents of different organizations under study. 115 filled in questionnaires were received, with the percentage of response rate being 88.46%. A check was carried out on the received questionnaires, and it was found that six questionnaires were incomplete and were excluded from further analysis. Hence, the final respondents considered for the analysis were 109 respondents.

➤ **Data Analysis:** Statistical software program was used to perform the statistical analysis. As a preliminary step to the data analysis, statistical information in several areas was examined. The demographic data were tabulated to gain an understanding of the sample. Then, further analysis was carried out to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of OJ and constructive deviant behavior dimensions with respect to the demographic details. This analysis included one-way ANOVA for analyzing the significant differences between the demographic variables such as age, experience, number of dependents, designation with OJ, and constructive deviant behavior dimensions, and independent sample *t*-tests for marital status and gender with the OJ and constructive deviant behavior dimensions.

□

Hypotheses

➤ **H1: There is a significant relation between demographic variables of the respondents and the dimensions of organizational justice.**

➤ **H2: There is a significant relation between demographic variables of the respondents and constructive deviance behavior.**

➤ **H3: There is a significant relationship between dimensions of organizational justice and constructive deviance behaviour.**

➤ **H4: The organizational justice factor serves as a significant predictor and explains the variance in constructive deviance behavior.**

□

Analysis and Results

(1) The reliability (Alphas) of the items of OJ and constructive deviant behavior dimensions were computed using Cronbach's alpha. The results show that the alpha coefficient value is 0.94, indicating that the instrument is having high reliability.

(2) Variable Formation:

➤ Dimensions of Organizational Justice

(1) **Procedural Justice:** Includes expressing views and feelings, influence over outcome, consistent application of procedures, unbiased, based on accurate information, appealing to the outcome, upholding ethical and moral standards.

(2) Distributive Justice : It includes reflecting upon the effort put into work, outcome appropriate to work done, reflecting upon the contribution to the organization, and justification of performance.

(3) Interpersonal Justice: This relates to whether the employees are treated in a polite manner, treated with dignity, and are not at the receiving end of improper remarks from the authority figures in the organization.

(4) Informational Justice: This relates to being candid in communication, providing reasonable explanation for procedures, providing timely communication of details, and tailoring communication to specific needs.

➤ Dimensions of Constructive Deviance Behavior

(1) Innovative Organizational Deviance: Developing creative solutions and innovative ways to perform everyday work, figuring out unconventional ways to achieve goals that are away from traditional approaches to solve problems, introducing changes to improve performance.

(2) Challenging Organizational Deviance: Breaking rules to perform job, violating company procedures to solve problems, departing from procedures to solve customer problems, bending rules to satisfy customer needs, departing from dysfunctional policies to solve problems, departing from requirements to increase quality of service.

(3) Interpersonal Deviance: Reporting a wrong-doing to co-workers, surpassing orders of supervisors to improve work, disagreeing with others to improve current procedures, disobeying supervisor's instructions to perform efficiently, reporting a wrong-doing to bring a positive change.

➤ Demographic Variables of the Respondents

(1) Age: The respondents were classified into three categories depending upon their age. Respondents of less than 30 years of age were categorized as young, those falling between the age group of 30 to 35 years were labelled as middle aged, whereas those aged greater than 35 years were labelled as belonging to the upper age group.

(2) Experience: Based on experience, the respondents were classified into four categories. Those having less than 2 years of experience, those having 2 to 4 years of experience, those having 4 to 6 years of experience, and those having greater than 6 years of experience.

(3) No. of Dependents: Based on the number of dependents, the respondents were classified into three categories namely small, if the respondents had 1 to 2 dependents; medium if the respondents had 3 dependents; and big, if the respondents had 4 dependents.

(4) Designation: The respondents were classified into three categories as junior engineers, senior engineers, and engineers depending upon their designation.

(5) Marital Status : Based on their marital status, the respondents were classified into two categories - either married or single.

(6) Gender: Based on gender, the respondents were classified into two categories - either male or female.

➤ **Dimensions of Organizational Justice:** As can be inferred from the Table 1, the experience of the employees shows a significant difference with the distributive and informational justice dimensions of organizational justice, and of the four categories of experience, the mean score of the respondents in the 2-4 years experience group is significantly higher than that of the employees in the less than 2 years, 4-6 years, and greater than 6 years of experience groups. The age, number of dependents, and designation demographics have no significant difference with respect to the dimensions of organizational justice.

Table 1. ANOVA for Age, Designation, Experience, and No. of Dependents' Demographics and Dimensions of Organizational Justice

	Age			Designation			Experience (in years)				No. of Dependents		
	YOUNG	MIDDLE	UPPER	JR.ENGG	SR.ENGG	ENGINEER	<2	2-4	4-6	<6	1-2	3	4
	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD
<i>N</i>	40	35	34	34	39	36	24	32	30	23	38	37	34
Procedural	26.15	26.05	24.55	26.00	25.30	25.61	27.00	26.03	24.23	25.43	25.94	26.02	24.82
	4.51	4.69	3.87	4.67	4.18	4.47	4.68	5.22	3.60	3.42	4.34	4.42	4.46
<i>F</i>		1.461			0.221			1.931				0.816	
Distributive	14.27	14.00	13.50	14.08	13.79	13.97	14.70	14.87	12.63	13.56	13.47	14.67	13.67
	3.35	2.95	2.95	3.55	3.04	3.32	3.07	3.52	3.07	2.88	3.33	3.00	3.43
<i>F</i>		0.518			0.074			3.186				1.441	
Interpersonal	14.45	14.28	14.14	14.38	14.07	14.47	14.54	15.06	13.76	13.69	14.07	14.45	14.38
	3.15	2.76	2.95	2.87	2.99	3.02	2.82	3.31	2.73	2.68	2.99	3.10	2.77
<i>F</i>		0.096			0.184			1.436				0.172	
Informational	18.12	18.22	17.85	17.58	18.41	18.16	18.54	19.21	16.66	17.82	17.81	18.67	17.70
	3.56	3.85	3.28	4.06	3.08	3.55	3.21	3.89	3.58	2.80	3.92	3.24	3.44
<i>F</i>		0.101			0.501			3.016				0.812	

Table 2. Independent Sample t-test for Marital Status and Gender Demographics and Dimensions of Organizational Justice

	Marital Status		Gender	
	Married	Single	Male	Female
	M	M	M	M
	SD	SD	SD	SD
<i>N</i>	53	56	57	52
Procedural	25.16	26.05	25.8	25.42
	4.07	4.69	4.69	4.1
<i>t</i> - value	-1.052		0.453	
Distributive	13.75	14.12	13.59	14.32
	3.31	3.25	3.51	2.96
<i>t</i> - value	-0.588		-1.174	
Interpersonal	13.9	14.67	14.1	14.51
	2.87	2.98	3.06	2.82
<i>t</i> - value	-1.376		-0.734	
Informational	17.52	18.58	18.1	18.03
	3.43	3.61	3.55	3.57
<i>t</i> - value	-1.572		0.098	

➡ **Independent Sample t - test:** The results of the Table 2 show that marital status and gender show no significance difference with the dimensions of organizational justice. Based on the results, it can be defined that with the exception of experience, other demographics have no significant difference with the dimensions of organizational justice. Thus, the hypothesis H1 is accepted.

Table 3. ANOVA for Age, Designation, Experience, and No. of Dependents' Demographics and Dimensions of Constructive Deviant Behaviour

	Age			Designation			Experience				No. of Dependents		
	Young	Middle	Upper	Jr. Engg	Sr. Engg	Engg	<2 yrs	2-4yrs	4-6 yrs	<6yrs	1-2	3	4
	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD
N	40	35	34	34	39	36	24	32	30	23	38	37	34
Innovative	16.9	18.28	17.14	17.17	17.61	17.44	18.08	17.71	17.06	16.78	17.31	17.83	17.08
	3.15	3.51	3.46	2.86	3.77	3.5	2.97	3.76	3.35	3.35	3.51	2.97	3.72
F		1.741			0.151				0.762			0.456	
Challenging	21.87	21.42	20.73	21.38	20.51	22.3	23.04	22.68	19.53	20.21	20.84	21.94	21.35
	4.99	5.2	5.17	5.39	4.94	4.93	4.87	5.13	4.83	4.79	5.07	5.3	4.95
F		0.458			1.163				3.495			0.436	
Interpersonal	17.37	18.48	18.17	17.67	18.2	18.02	18	18.53	17.13	18.3	17.92	18.29	17.7
	3.04	3.45	3.48	2.74	3.72	3.41	3.53	3.44	3.03	3.26	3.38	3.25	3.39
F		1.131			0.232				1.017			0.287	

Table 4. Independent Sample t - test for Marital Status and Gender Demographics and Dimensions of Constructive Deviant Behaviour

	Marital Status		Gender	
	Married	Single	Male	Female
	M	M	M	M
	SD	SD	SD	SD
n	53	56	57	52
Innovative	17.01	17.8	25.8	25.42
	3.27	3.48	4.69	4.1
t value		-1.211		-0.059
Challenging	21.07	21.66	13.59	14.32
	5.14	5.07	3.51	2.96
t value		-0.598		-1.355
interpersonal	17.67	18.26	18.1	18.03
	3.22	3.41	3.55	3.57
t value		-0.925		0.003

➡ **Results for Demographic Details and Dimensions of Constructive Deviant Behavior :** The results of the Table 3 show that experience shows a significant difference with the challenging dimension of constructive deviant behavior and of the four categories of experience, the mean score of the employees with less than 2 years of experience is significantly higher than that of the employees in the 2-4 years, 4-6 years, and greater than 6 years of experience groups. The demographic variables - age, number of dependents, and designation - have no significant difference with respect to the dimensions of constructive deviant behavior.

➡ **Independent Sample t -test:** The results of the Table 4 show that there is a significant difference between the challenging constructive deviant behavior dimension of constructive deviant behavior, and of the two categories, the mean score of female employees is significantly higher than that of their male counterparts. It was also found that there is no significant difference between the demographic variable marital status with the dimension of constructive deviant behavior. Based on the results, it can be said that with the exception of experience and

Table 5. Correlation Between Organizational Justice and Constructive Deviant Behaviour

Pearson Correlation	Procedural	Distributive	Interpersonal	Informational	Innovative	Challenging	Interpersonal
Procedural	1						
Distributive	0.65**	1					
Interpersonal	0.62**	0.58**	1				
Informational	0.66**	0.67**	0.59**	1			
Innovative	0.53**	0.47*	0.63**	0.56**	1		
Challenging	0.70**	0.75**	0.68**	0.59**	0.51**	1	
Interpersonal	0.56**	0.49**	0.63**	0.55**	0.75**	0.57**	1

**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed).

Table 6. Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice and Constructive Deviant Behavior

	Predictor Variables	β	t	p
Innovative	Interpersonal	.461	5.179	.000
	Informational	.290	3.259	.002
	Adj. $R^2 = 0.444$ $F = 44.201$			
Challenging	Distributive	.423	5.576	.000
	Interpersonal	.277	3.751	.000
	Informational	.253	3.188	.002
	Adj. $R^2 = 0.670$ $F = 74.137$			
Interpersonal	Interpersonal	.467	5.216	.000
	Informational	.276	3.082	.003
	Adj. $R^2 = 0.437$ $F = 42.909$			

gender, other demographics have no significant difference with the dimensions of constructive deviant behavior. Thus, the hypothesis H2 is accepted.

➤ **Correlation Between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour :** From the Table 5, it can be inferred that there is a positive correlation between different variables. Among all the variables, there is a high correlation between challenging organizational deviance and distributive justice (0.75), procedural justice (0.70), and interpersonal justice (0.68) dimensions of organizational justice. The innovative organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance dimensions of constructive deviance behaviour also have a high correlation with the interpersonal justice (0.63) dimension of organizational justice. Thus, the hypothesis H3 is accepted.

□

➤ **Regression Analysis Between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour :** The results of the Table 6 reveal that under the innovative organizational deviance, interpersonal justice ($t=5.179$, $p<0.01$) involving whether the employees are treated in a polite manner, are treated with dignity, and are not at the receiving end of improper remarks by the authority figures, and informational justice ($t=3.259$, $p<0.05$), which relates to being candid in communication, explaining the procedures, timely communication of details attributes of the predictor variables contribute significantly to constructive deviant behavior with a variance of 44.4%.

With respect to challenging organizational deviance, the results reveal that under distributive justice ($t=5.576$, $p<0.01$) which involves reflecting upon the effort put into work, outcome appropriate to work done, reflecting upon the contribution made to the organization; under interpersonal justice ($t=3.751$, $p<0.01$), which relates to whether the employees are treated in polite manner, are treated with dignity, are not at the receiving end of improper remarks by the authority figures ; under procedural justice ($t=3.188$, $p<0.05$), the attributes like expressing views and feelings, influence over outcome, consistent application of procedures contribute

significantly to constructive deviant behavior directed with a variance of 67%.

The results also reveal that under interpersonal organizational deviance, interpersonal justice ($t = 5.216$, $p < 0.01$) involving whether the employees are treated in polite manner, are treated with dignity, and are not at the receiving end of improper remarks by the authority figures, and informational justice ($t = 3.082$, $p < 0.05$), which relates to being candid in communication, explaining the procedures, timely communication of details - attributes of the predictor variables contribute significantly to constructive deviant behavior with a variance of 43.7%. Hence, the hypothesis H4 is accepted.

Conclusion

The justice perception of the employees will contribute towards the organization's well-being and when fairness is the most prevalent aspect within the organizational environment, there will be an increase in the employees' satisfaction levels, and also, such an environment will result in a positive relationship between the employees and their superiors. An organization with a culture that is centered on ethical values is likely to minimize negative deviant behavior in the workplace (Ritter & Venkatraman, 2008). The upper-level management focuses on conveying strong norms and values so that these will trickle down throughout the organization (Wilks, 2011).

Employee contribution is a major determining factor for the successful operation of a corporation. The positive perception of organizational justice, irrespective of experience, age, gender, designation, and so forth will enhance the commitment of the employees by providing them with an insight to display innovative behaviour or initiate a change for tasks or processes which will benefit the organization to achieve breakthrough performance. This relationship between organizational justice and constructive deviance behaviour will thus provide a positive work environment that will enhance the job satisfaction, performance, and citizenship behaviour of the employees.

Managerial Implications

From the research, it has been observed that the employees with 2 to 4 years of experience perceived distributive justice and informational justice in the organization by relating their outcomes to their efforts, performance, and by having a candid communication with their supervisors. With regards to deviance behaviour, the employees with 2 years of experience engaged in challenging organizational deviance involving the employees to break the rules against organizational norms in order to solve a problem - be it the organization's or the customer's problem. The study also shows that women displayed a greater challenging deviance behaviour than their male counterparts. They are more keen on arriving at solutions, irrespective of the rules that are to be followed, and hence, such a behaviour will provide more opportunities for female employees to gain a position in the top-level management.

From the study, it can be inferred that the perception of interpersonal justice and informational justice will lead to innovative organizational deviance since the positive treatment given to employees in the work environment and the timely communication of information will enhance the employees' creativity in coming up with innovative solutions to problems. The study also determines that the employees, if allowed to have an influence over the outcomes, have a positive attitude towards the efforts they put into their work, and if the perception regarding the manner in which they are treated by their superiors is positive - that is, the superiors are polite and they treated with dignity - then the employees will show challenging organizational deviance by breaking rules to solve problems (out of box thinking) and will find solutions that will enhance customer satisfaction (such positive treatment creates in them a sense of ownership and loyalty towards the organization).

The interpersonal and informational justice dimensions of organizational justice that involves the employees being treated with respect and providing reasonable explanations to procedures in a timely manner will enhance interpersonal deviance, where the employees are encouraged by the superiors (Tziner, Fein, Sharoni, Bar-Hen & Nord, 2010) to report a wrong-doing by a co-worker in order to bring about a positive organizational change, and

if a rule has been broken in order to perform a job efficiently, then proper guidance and support should be given to the employees so as to encourage their work involvement. However, if a rule is broken intentionally without any need, then the employee should be warned about the negative consequences of his actions.

From the present study, it can also be inferred that there is no significant difference with regard to the demographics - age, designation, status, and the number of dependents of the employees since equal opportunity was given to all the respondents, irrespective of these details. The perception of the employees about the various dimensions of organizational justice can be enhanced by providing them with training and development programs that will improve their job commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizations should have an interest in increasing positive deviant behaviors within their walls by empowering the employees. Pro-social behaviors such as innovation is the key to determine the competitive edge of a company, where empowerment is the precursor which will enhance the financial success of the organization in a long-term. Information regarding organizational goals and strategies, when accessible to the employees, will lead them to behave innovatively and understand the corporate environment.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

The study has a number of limitations. First, since the data was collected from the self-reports of the employees, they might not have been accurate in giving their responses. The correlation between constructive deviance and organizational justice may be attributable to the respondents' data response to both the variables. Secondly, social desirability is a human tendency, which may have resulted in the respondents' giving socially desirable answers to the questionnaire, which serves as another limitation. Third, despite the need for the understanding of the prevalence of the constructive deviance behavior in the organizations, the theoretical perspectives in the area were limited, leading to limitations in the understanding of workplace deviance.

Further research can be carried out to ascertain the relationship of the personality factors with the constructive deviance behaviors, taking into account the organizational climate and culture as a mediating factor. This will broaden the knowledge on how an individual's personality has an important role to play in workplace behavior outcomes, thus adding to the exploratory literature.

References

- Ali, S. Z. (2011). Absence of procedural justice leads to retaliation behaviour. *International Journal of Business Research*, 11 (4), 149-159.
- 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.
- Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2013). Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98 (4), 678-689. DOI: 10.1037/a0032080
- Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance*, 7(5), 586-598. DOI:10.1108/14720700710827176
- Baldwin, S. (2006). Organizational justice (pp. 1-13). Institute for Employment Studies.
- Blodgett, J. G. (1997). The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on postcomplaint behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (2), 185-210. DOI : [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(97\)90003-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(97)90003-8)
- Brockner, J. (1990). Scope of justice in the workplace: How survivors react to co-worker layoffs. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(1), 95-106. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb00274.x

- Chirasha, V., & Mahapa, M. (2012). Analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behaviour in the workplace. The case of secretaries in state universities. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3 (5), 415-421.
- Chung, Y. W., & Moon, H. K. (2011). The moderating effects of collectivistic orientation on psychological ownership and constructive deviant behavior. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (12), 65-77.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 386-400.
- Dagher, G., & Junaid, N. (2011). Employee engagement and constructive deviant behavior at the workplace: An empirical investigation (pp. 166-175). *Proceedings of the Institute of Behavioural and Applied Management's 2011 Annual Conference*. IBAM 19, October 13-15, 2011, Orlando, Florida.
- Dahling, J. J., Chau, S. L., Mayer, D. M., & Gregory, J. B. (2012). Breaking rules for the right reasons? An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(1), 21-42. DOI: 10.1002/job.730
- El Akremi, A., Vandenberghe, C., & Camerman, J. (2010). The role of justice and social exchange relationships in workplace deviance: Test of a mediated model. *Human Relations*, 63 (11), 1687-1717. DOI: 10.1177/0018726710364163
- Fagbohunge, B. O., Akinbode, G. A., & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7 (5), 207-221. DOI: 10.5539/ijbm.v7n5p207
- Ferres, N., Connell, J., & Travaglione, A. (2004). Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19 (6), 608-622. DOI:10.1108/02683940410551516
- Galperin, B. L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: An empirical examination in Canada and Mexico* (Ph.D. Thesis). Concordia University, Quebec, Canada.
- Harris, K. J., Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). The moderating effects of justice on the relationship between organizational politics and workplace attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22 (2), 135-144. DOI : 10.1007/s10869-007-9054-9
- Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2013). Interpersonal justice and deviance: The moderating effects of interpersonal justice values and justice orientation. *Journal of Management*, 39 (2), 339-365.
- Iqbal, H. K., Aziz, U., & Tasawar, A. (2012). Impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical evidence from Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19 (9), 1348-1354. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.09.750
- Obermeit, T., & Fink, S. (2012). The positive effects of the positive deviance approach on cultural diversity. *Political Change, Cultural Dynamics and Competitiveness of Firms. Proceedings IACCM*, June 20-22, 2012, Naples.
- Rahim, M. A. (2013). A model of leaders' social intelligence, interpersonal justice, and creative performance. *Social Intelligence, Leadership, and Problem Solving*, 16, 39-59.
- Ritter, B. A., & Venkatraman, S. (2008). Swedish and American cultural differences in the relationship between perceptions of justice and organizational deviance. *Review of Business Research*, 8 (2), 201-206.
- Robbins, D. L., & Galperin, B. L. (2010). Constructive deviance: Striving toward organizational change in healthcare. *Journal of Management and Marketing*, 5 (1), 1-11.
- Tziner, A., Fein, E. C., Sharoni, G., Bar-Hen, P., & Nord, T. (2010). Desviación Constructiva, Intercambio Líder-Miembro y Confianza en la Evaluación: ¿Cómo se Interrelacionan, si lo Hacen? *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 26(2), 95-100 [Constructive deviance, leader-member exchange, and confidence in appraisal: How do they interrelate, if at all? *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 26 (2), 95-100].
- Wilks, D.C. (2011). Attitudes towards unethical behaviours in organizational settings: An empirical study. *Ethics in Progress Quarterly*, 2 (2), 9-22.