
Examining the Influence of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance across Demographics: A Multi-Group Analysis

Submitted 28/03/25, 1st revision 28/04/25, 2nd revision 17/05/25, accepted 30/06/25

Shuja Chaudhary¹

Abstract:

Purpose: This study aimed to investigate the factors contributing to deviant workplace behavior in the public sector of Pakistan, which has become a significant issue for the government and the general public.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Specifically, the study examined the impact of employees' demographics (age, gender, and job position), organizational justice on deviant workplace behavior. Additionally, the study sought to determine the severity and types of deviant workplace behavior prevalent in the Pakistani public sector. The sample was selected using convenient sampling method and consisted of 450 employees. A questionnaire comprising 44 questions was distributed among 560 employees, and 450 fully completed questionnaires were included in the analysis.

Findings: The study uncovered the extent of deviant workplace behavior in the public sector of Pakistan. The demographics of employees were found to have a moderately positive influence on the relationship between organizational justice and deviant workplace behavior.

Practical Implications: The multi-group analysis yielded significant findings regarding the influence of demographics on organizational justice and workplace deviance.

Originality/Value: The study concludes that demographics, including gender, marital status, and age, significantly affect employees' perceptions and responses to organizational justice.

Keywords: Workplace deviance, organizational Justice.

JEL Classification: M12, J24, J71, M54, C38.

Paper type: Research article.

¹Dr., Pmas- Arid Univeristy, Department UIMS, Pakistan, e-mail: shuja@uaar.edu.pk;

1. Introduction

The current study aims to investigate the influence of Organizational Justice (OJ) on workplace deviance, taking into account Employees' Demographics (ED), and its connection to workplace deviance (WD), with a specific focus on Public Sector Employees in Pakistan. Organizations heavily rely on their human resources to create a productive and successful work environment (Kilroy *et al.*, 2022).

Therefore, any issue related to the job performance of employees is considered significant in today's companies. Organizations are highly concerned about employees' behaviors, as they have a critical impact on their job performance and, consequently, on the overall organizational performance (Shah *et al.*, 2021; Iskanto, 2023; Pham *et al.*, 2023). Human beings possess inherent uniqueness, making employees an exclusive resource with distinct characteristics when compared to other resources such as money, materials, and machines (Chaudhary *et al.*, 2022).

Counterproductive workplace behavior has been under the spotlight by academicians for the last few decades (Cohen, 2018; Anderson, 2022; Ilyas and Bhatti, 2023). This behavior has many facets and consists of similar concepts (Table 1) and definitions (Götz *et al.*, 2019). Negativity at the workplace is found in many shapes like aggression, violence, 'antisocial behavior, and workplace incivility (Thrasher, 2019; Krenn *et al.*, 2020).

This is one of the reasons that workplace deviance has gained the attention of scholars (Gökoğlu and Öztürk, 2020; Aisha *et al.*, 2022). Even though these behaviors are reflected as harmful and counterproductive, they may look alike but conceptually and theoretically differ.

Table 1. *Workplace Deviance and Similar Concepts*

Concept	Target	Intention	Intensity
Antisocial Behavior	Organizational/Personal	Unclear, could be norms violation and /or others	From very low to very high
Workplace Deviance	Organizational/Personal	To violate organizational norms	Low until high
Violence	Personal	To harm physically	Very high
Aggression	Organizational/Personal	To harm and injure	Medium and high
Incivility	Personal	Ambiguous, could be with or without intention to harm	Very low

Source: Andersson & Pearson, (1999) Bennett *et al.* (2018).

Deviance in the workplace (WD) is a critical study problem due to its developing and expanding degree and potential impact. Deviant workplace behavior (WD) is not a new topic to address in the corporate world, but the resources that contribute to deviant workplace behavior are still guiding new dimensions to investigate with the passage of time and situations (Öztürk and Poyraz, 2021).

According to a survey conducted in 32 countries across Europe, Asia Pacific, and North America, one-third of all trade reductions were attributed to employee theft (Braje *et al.*, 2020; Imran, 2023). Additionally, when examining the financial impact of WD on the US economy, it is discovered that 75% of employees have engaged in theft from their organizations at least once. Nearly 95% of companies in the United States have reported instances of deviant activities occurring within their organizations (Li and McMurray, 2022).

Robinson and Greenberg (1998) estimated the "Total Annual Bill of DWB" in the USA economy to be \$4.8 billion. In 2004, it was estimated that employee theft would result in an annual loss of \$50 billion to the US economy (Li and McMurray, 2022). In addition to the financial and economic expenses, it is crucial to thoroughly examine the social and cultural factors in order to determine the complete cost of WD (Chaudhary *et al.*, 2022).

According to Everton, Jolton, and Mastrangelo (2005), 42% of women employed in organizations have encountered incidents of sexual harassment and violence in their workplaces (Abas *et al.*, 2023). Controlling the occurrence of workplace deviance (WD) has become a paramount concern for organizations worldwide, as DWB directly impacts the financial stability of any organization (Huang *et al.*, 2023; Tufail and Taieb, 2023).

In order to survive in the face of workplace deviance, organizations should take necessary measures such as re-evaluating, restructuring, and standardizing their norms, rules, and regulations. This is crucial due to the increasing dominance of workplace deviance and the significant costs it incurs. Due to the significant economic, social, and psychological costs associated with WD, organizations are urgently seeking a solution to address this pressing issue (Huang *et al.*, 2023).

Hence, it is imperative to identify the origins or catalysts of problematic workplace behavior in order to develop strategies and methods for mitigating aberrant conduct within organizations. Therefore, current research is primarily aimed at identifying and comprehending the impact of the demographics on employees' perceptions of organizational justice.

2. Research Objectives

By studying on the nature of workplace deviance and relationships & influences of employees' perceptions on organizational justice on workplace deviance employees'

demographics on workplace deviance, researcher aimed to achieve following objectives.

- To analyze how demographic variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, tenure, and education level influence the perception of organizational justice and the propensity for workplace deviance.
- To perform a multi-group analysis to determine whether the relationship between organizational justice and workplace deviance differs significantly across various demographic groups.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Organizational Justice and Workplace Deviance

There is a significant correlation between organizational justice and workplace deviance. In the absence of organizational justice, employees perceive inequitable treatment and are more likely to engage in deviant behavior within the workplace (Huang *et al.*, 2023; Jain and Dhingra, 2023; Quddous *et al.*, 2024). Conversely, when supervisors treat employees fairly and impartially, it has a beneficial effect on their behavior and actions, and promotes a feeling of confidence in the organization's fairness.

Equitable treatment serves as the foundation for fostering harmonious professional relationships and discouraging workplace misconduct by leveraging the influence of peers (Yeşiltaş and Gürlek, 2020; Meng *et al.*, 2024). However, the belief that employers are being treated unjustly can result in a lack of trust and the occurrence of unethical behavior in the workplace (Gelfand and Erez, 2023).

Employees form their perception by consistently assessing their expectations for equitable and impartial treatment from their employer, and comparing it to their observations of organizational justice (Salsabil *et al.*, 2023). Therefore, the lack of fairness within an organization is regarded as the primary catalyst for deviant behaviors. Workers form relationships with their colleagues by engaging in mutually beneficial behaviors, following the principles of social exchange and reciprocity theory (Jeewandara and Kumari, 2021; Kilroy *et al.*, 2022).

Brienza and Bobocel (2017) indicate that deviant behavior directly influences employees' emotions (Liu *et al.*, 2022). According to the theory of social exchanges, fairness within an organization has the capacity to reduce deviant behavior among employees in the workplace.

Previous studies have shown a strong negative relationship between organizational justice and deviant behavior in the workplace (Chaudhary *et al.*, 2022; Abo-Algheit *et al.*, 2024).

3.2 Role of Demographics and Workplace Deviance

Regarding demographic factors, extensive literature on organizational behavior has demonstrated that there are several demographic variables that have an impact on work-related behavior (WDB) (Braje *et al.*, 2020; Pletzer *et al.*, 2022; Okeke *et al.*, 2022). Hershcovis *et al.* (2007) found that gender was a more influential factor in predicting interpersonal aggression, which is a type of workplace deviant behavior (WDB) (Hershcovis and Reich, 2013; Olasupo and Fagbenro, 2021; Irshad *et al.*, 2022).

The literature demonstrated that as men exhibit higher levels of aggression compared to women, so males are found to be more involved in workplace deviance (Leavitt *et al.*, 2021; Abas *et al.*, 2023). In addition, Sackett *et al.* (2006) conducted a study to demonstrate the correlation between two domains of citizenship and counterproductive behavior.

The demographic data collected from the research participants includes information on gender, race, age, marital status, highest level of education attained, occupation, average weekly working hours, years of higher education completed, current job tenure, and career tenure. The results showed that demographic variables were significant predictors of both composite OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) and CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior) (Kumari and SK, 2021; Anderson, 2022).

The research analysis conducted by Jeremy (2019) revealed that age, sex, and marital status were all reliable indicators of various deviant behaviors (Mackey *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the primary objective of this study is to expand the existing body of research by conducting a more in-depth analysis of the variations in these factors that influence engagement in WDB.

Age, gender, and personality traits have a stronger influence on workplace deviance than organizational culture. Personality variables have been thoroughly studied as factors that influence individual-level workplace deviance. In general, an individual's demographic and personality have a greater impact on their deviant behavior than the environmental factors present in the workplace. The current research considers key demographic factors, such as gender, marital status, Covid-19, age, and examines their impact on workplace deviance.

4. Materials and Research Methods

Non-Probability sampling method was adopted and convenience sampling techniques was chosen. The choice was made keeping in view the available time, resources, willingness of the organizations to participate in the study, and ease of access to the participants. One of the common reasons of choosing convenience sampling is simply because they are easily accessible to the investigator in situations

where other participants or settings of interest cannot be reached. The data has been collected from the employees working in government organizations of Pakistan. For this purpose, comparatively larger companies (government sector) were selected.

The companies included State Bank of Pakistan, Islamabad Electric Supply Corporation, Pakistan International Airlines and Pakistan Railways. The employee of these companies were reached using personal contacts, family members, friends, and colleagues.

Organizational Justice has been measured by the scale of Colquitt, consisting of 20 items. Work Place Deviance has been measured by the scale of Bennett and Robinson, consisting of 19 items. As the total number of items were 39, so by applying the sampling rule of 10 suggested by Westland, the sample size was 390 (Westland, 2010). However 500 questionnaires were distributed out of which 450 were found fit for analysis.

4.1 Multi-Group Analysis

The present study inquires additional critical insights into various the differences caused by various demographic variables kept as control variables. According to the available literature, there is a deficit in multi-group analysis in organizational justice studies (Tricahyadinata *et al.*, 2020). The literature frequently emphasizes only one level of analysis, ignoring the nested nature of Organizational Justice (Wiseman and Stillwell, 2022; Zhang, 2024).

As a result, existing studies often consider justice in distinct intellectual silos at various levels. This is not surprising considering that recent literature on inter-organizational relationships has already identified a multi-group method as an existing blind spot in research (Roehrich *et al.*, 2024).

So, it is pretty clear that the research work done so far regarding Organizational Justice lacks a better understanding of the phenomenon of Justice and its outcomes. The multi-group analysis would be a key factor for a better and deep understanding of organizational justice and how it impacts on Workplace Deviance. For this purpose multi group comparison using T test method was applied as suggested by Klesel in his book (Klesel *et al.*, 2021).

In this approach seems to involve comparing the estimates between two groups for each variable, likely using t-tests to determine if the differences are statistically significant (Klesel *et al.*, 2021). For multi-group analysis, the demographic characteristics included in this research are a) gender, b) COVID Cases (Low vs. High), c) marital status (Single vs. Married) d) Age Groups (Younger vs. Older).

The study obtained empirical evidence against each aforementioned quantitative attribute reported and discussed below.

4.2 Multi-Group Analysis of Gender

The results of the gender-based analysis (Table 2) reveal significant differences through z-score between females and males in their relationships.

Table 2. Multi-Group Analysis of Gender

		Male		Female		Z-score	
		Estimate	P	Estimate	P		
WD	← INTJ	-0.230	0.000	-0.105	0.002	2.767***	Significantly different
WD	← PROC	-0.164	0.000	-0.213	0.000	-0.810	Significantly different
WD	← DISTJ	-0.318	0.000	-0.120	0.135	2.047**	
WD	← INFJ	-0.010	0.736	0.012	0.766	0.436	Significantly different

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

4.2.1 Interpretation of the Results

INTJ → WD. The Z-score is highly significant (greater than 1.96), indicating a statistically significant difference between males and females. This suggests that males experience a significantly stronger negative effect than females in this group.

PROJ → WD. The Z-score indicates that the difference between males and females is not statistically significant. Even though both genders show significant negative effects, the difference between them is not large enough to be considered significant.

DISJ → WD. The Z-score is significant (greater than 1.96), indicating a statistically significant difference between males and females. This suggests that males experience a significantly stronger negative effect than females in this group.

INFJ → WD. The Z-score is not significant, indicating no statistically significant difference between males and females. None of the gender shows a meaningful effect and the difference between them is negligible.

Table 3. Results Interpretation

Demographics		Significantly Difference	Remarks
Gender (Males/Females)			
	INTJ → WD	Yes	Males experience a significantly stronger negative effect than females in this group.
	PROJ → WD	No	Z value less than 1.96

	DISJ → WD	Only for Males	The Z-score confirms that the difference between genders is statistically significant, meaning there is a meaningful difference in how the DISJ variable affects males compared to females.
	INFJ → WD	No	Z value is less than 1.96

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

Significant Differences are observed (Table 3) among the groups INTJ on WD and DISTJ on WD show significant gender differences, with males experiencing stronger negative effects in both cases. No Significant Differences is observed with reference to PROJ on WD group between males and females, even though both have significant negative effects. The INFJ on WD group shows no significant effects or differences between the genders.

4.3 Multi-Group Analysis of Covid Low vs. High Cases

The outcomes of the COVID-19 analysis are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Multi-Group Analysis of Covid Low vs. High Cases

		Low Cases		High Cases		Z-score	
		Estimate	P	Estimate	P		
WD	←INTJ	-0.175	0.000	-0.166	0.000	0.186	
WD	←PROJ	-0.164	0.000	-0.168	0.000	-0.076	
WD	←DISJ	-0.243	0.000	-0.247	0.000	-0.042	
WD	←INFJ	-0.084	0.183	-0.058	0.230	-1.793*	Significantly different

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10.

Source: Own study.

4.3.1 Interpretation of the Results

INTJ → WD. The Z-score is not significant, indicating that the difference between Low Cases and High Cases is not statistically significant. Both groups show strong negative effects, but the difference between them is minimal.

PROJ → WD. The Z-score is not significant, suggesting that the difference between Low Cases and High Cases is not statistically significant. The negative effects in both cases are nearly identical.

DISJ → WD. The Z-score is not significant, indicating no statistically significant difference between Low Cases and High Cases. Both groups experience similar negative effects.

INFJ → WD. The Z-score is close to -1.96, indicating that the difference between Low Cases and High Cases is approaching statistical significance. It is noted as significantly different, suggesting that the effect differs between Low and High Cases, even though neither estimate is individually significant.

In all three of these groups (INTJ, PROJ and DISJ → WD), both Low Cases and High Cases exhibit significant negative effects, but the differences between these effects are not statistically significant. This means that the effect of the variable being measured is consistent regardless of whether cases are low or high.

WD → INFJ: This group shows a difference approaching statistical significance between Low Cases and High Cases, with the direction of the effect differing (positive for Low Cases, negative for High Cases), although neither effect is individually significant. This suggests a potential difference in how Low and High Cases affect the outcome, but it's not strong enough to be conclusive on its own.

Table 5. Results Interpretation

Demographics		Significantly Difference	Remarks
Covid Cases (Low/High Cases)			
	INTJ →WD	No	Z value is less than 1.96
	PROJ →WD	No	Z value is less than 1.96
	DISJ →WD	No	Z value is less than 1.96
	INFJ →WD	Yes	Modest but statistically significant difference when compared on group basis on basis of Z value score

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

No Significant Differences is observed (see Table 5) between the impact of INTJ, PROC, and DISJ on WD, there is no statistically significant difference between the effects in Low Cases and High Cases, suggesting consistency in their negative impacts across different levels of cases.

However potentially Significant Difference is found among the INFJ on WD group, there is a potential difference in the effects between Low and High Cases, with a tendency towards significance, even though neither group shows a strong effect on its own.

This could indicate that the relationship between the cases and the outcome is more complex in this group.

4.4 Multi-Group Analysis of Single and Married Employees

The multi-group analysis among single and married employees (Table 6) also reveals that a significant difference is found between organizational justice and workplace deviance.

Table 6. Multigroup Analysis Single vs. Married Employees

	Single		Married		Z-score	
	Estimate	P	Estimate	P		
WD ← INTJ	-0.191	0.000	-0.170	0.000	-0.453	Significantly different
WD ← PROJ	-0.108	0.012	-0.238	0.000	2.236**	
WD ← DISJ	-0.238	0.002	-0.243	0.000	0.048	
WD ← INFJ	0.000	0.999	-0.001	0.983	0.017	

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10.

Source: Own study.

4.4.1 Interpretation of the Results

INTJ → WD. The Z-score indicates no statistically significant difference between Single and Married groups. Both groups show strong negative effects, but the difference between them is minimal and not statistically significant.

PROJ → WD. The Z-score is statistically significant (greater than 1.96), indicating a significant difference between Single and Married groups. Married individuals experience a significantly stronger negative effect compared to Single individuals.

DISJ → WD. The Z-score indicates no statistically significant difference between Single and Married groups. Both groups show nearly identical negative effects.

INFJ → WD. The Z-score indicates no statistically significant difference between Single and Married groups. Neither group shows any meaningful effect, and the difference between them is negligible.

Table 7. Results Interpretation

Demographics		Significantly Difference	Remarks
Marital Status (Single/Married)			
	INTJ → WD	No	Z value less than 1.96
	PROJ → WD	Yes	Married ones are more concerned than single ones
	DISJ → WD	No	Z value less than 1.96
	INFJ → WD	No	Z value less than 1.96

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

The effect of INTJ, PROJ on WD: Both groups (Single and Married) show significant negative effects (see Table 7), but the differences between them are not

statistically significant. This means that the negative impact is similar for both Single and Married individuals in these categories.

The PROJ effect on WD: There is a statistically significant difference between Single and Married groups, with Married individuals experiencing a significantly stronger negative effect compared to Single individuals.

The effect of INFJ on WD: Neither Single nor Married individuals show any significant effect, and there is no significant difference between the two groups.

4.5 Multi-Group Analysis of Age Groups

The multi-group analysis based on age groups (Table 8) reflects a significant difference with regard to multigroup analysis based on age groups.

Table 8. *Multi-Group Analysis based on Age Groups*

		Age 1		Age 3-5		Z-score	
		Estimate	P	Estimate	P		
WD	←INTJ	-0.156	0.000	-0.192	0.000	-0.805	
WD	←PROJ	-0.112	0.000	-0.240	0.000	-1.74*	Significantly different
WD	←DISJ	-0.116	0.002	-0.275	0.031	1.852*	Significantly different
WD	←INFJ	0.005	0.896	-0.009	0.766	-0.295	

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

4.5.1 Interpretation of the Results

The effect of INTJ on WD is not significant, as the Z-score is not significant (far below ± 1.96), meaning the difference between the estimates for single and married individuals is not statistically significant. Despite both groups showing negative estimates, the difference between them isn't strong enough to be considered significant.

PROJ on WD. The Z-score is close to -1.96, suggesting that the difference between the estimates for Age 1 and Age 3-5 is approaching statistical significance. It is marked as significantly different (though only mildly), meaning that the negative effect for Age 3-5 is somewhat stronger than for Age 1.

DISTJ on WD. The Z-score is close to 1.96, suggesting that the difference between the estimates for Age 1 and Age 3-5 is approaching statistical significance. It is marked as significantly different, indicating that the negative effect for Age 3-5 is stronger than for Age 1.

INFOJ on WD. The Z-score indicates no statistically significant difference between the two age groups. None of the group shows any meaningful effect, and the

difference between them is negligible.

Table 9. *Multigroup Analysis Younger vs Older Employees*

Demographics		Significantly Difference	Remarks
Age Groups (Younger/Older)			
	INTJ → WD	No	Z value is less than 1.96
	PROJ → WD	Yes	Both age groups show significant negative estimates, with Age 3-5 having a stronger negative effect than Age 1. The Z-score confirms that this difference between the age groups is statistically significant.
	DISJ → WD	Yes	Both age groups show negative estimates, with Age 3-5 having a stronger negative effect than age 1. The Z-score indicates that this difference between the age groups is statistically significant.
	INFJ → WD	No	P value is insignificant

Notes: *** p -value<0.01; ** p -value<0.05; * p -value<0.10

Source: Own study.

The most notable findings (see Table 9) are in the PROJ on WD and DISJ on WD groups, where the differences between the age groups are approaching or achieving statistical significance. In these cases, Age 3-5 tends to experience a stronger negative effect than Age 1, except for WD DISJ, where Age 1 has the stronger negative effect. The other comparisons do not show significant differences between age groups.

5. Result Interpretations and Conclusion

The results revealed interesting impacts regarding the impact of demographics among INTJ and WD. In case of gender, the literature supports that, studies suggest that women may be less sensitive to interpersonal justice due to socialization processes that emphasize relational and communal aspects (Ng *et al.*, 2016; Reis, 2021).

Women often place a higher value on relationships and communication, which might make them more attuned to how they are treated by others in the workplace (Kneavel, 2020). Conversely, men prioritize their professional advancement and development over their interpersonal relationships (Andoh *et al.*, 2022). In contrast to men, women prioritize the development of their professional relationships over their professional development.

In the case of COVID low versus high, variation in employee's behaviors was observed. In this case the significant relationship was found between INFOJ on WD.

It is observed that employees were more concerned about the informational justice when less covid cases was reported. While in high covid cases employees were less concerned about informational justice as they had fear of losing their job. It can be inferred that during covid pandemic the justice perception significantly changed as employees had a feeling of losing their jobs.

So employees were less concerned regarding the informational justice and they were more concerned about their job security. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, job security frequently superseded employees' perceptions of organizational justice (Hngoi *et al.*, 2023). During crises, employees generally prioritize immediate survival, with job preservation becoming paramount amid prevalent layoffs, furloughs, and economic instability in the workplace (Bhaskar *et al.*, 2020).

In terms of the marital status, the only significant impact was observed between the impact of procedural justice on workplace deviance. So it can be concluded as, married individuals are influenced by financial responsibilities, family dynamics, and long-term commitment, so they exhibit a stronger impact of procedural justice on workplace deviance (Meng *et al.*, 2024). The married ones have more financial responsibilities and are more concerned of the procedural justice at workplace in comparison of the single ones. Same results have been previously reported by (Kim and Tziner, 2019; Chen and Wang, 2021).

The results of age groups shows that procedural justice and distributive justice has a significant impact on workplace deviance. In case of the impact of PROJ on WD, it is observed that the younger ones are less concerned about the procedures as compare to old age employees.

Older individuals show a heightened impact of procedural justice on workplace deviance, influenced by career impressions, elevated career aspirations, a desire for growth, increased fairness sensitivity, evolving career expectations, and organizational commitment (Kollmann *et al.*, 2019).

While the younger employees are less vocal and concerned regarding the procedural justice as they are new and more concerned of building up their good reput with their supervisor for their better career progression, growth and development (Colquitt *et al.*, 2022).

In terms of distribution of resources it is observed that the older employees are more concerned as compare to younger ones regarding the fair and equal distribution of resources. Older employees typically have invested many years in their organization, and they may feel a stronger attachment to fair outcomes, especially concerning promotions, benefits, and compensation (Kollmann *et al.*, 2019).

Having contributed more to the organization, they naturally expect to be rewarded fairly for their experience and dedication. Distributive fairness in how resources and rewards are allocated, becomes critical to maintaining their trust in the organization (Adamovic, 2023).

The study concludes that demographics, including gender, marital status, and age, significantly affect employees' perceptions and responses to organizational justice. Women emphasize interpersonal relationships and exhibit heightened sensitivity to interpersonal justice, whereas men concentrate on career progression.

Married employees exhibit heightened concern for procedural justice owing to financial obligations and familial commitments, rendering them more attuned to inequitable processes in the workplace. Senior employees exhibit a heightened concern for procedural and distributive justice, anticipating equitable treatment in promotions and resource distribution owing to their extensive tenure with the organization.

In crises such as COVID-19, job security frequently emerges as the predominant concern, eclipsing other perceptions of justice. The findings indicate that employees' perceptions of justice change according to their life stage, experiences, and external influences, with job security and equitable resource allocation being particularly vital during difficult periods.

References:

- Abas, B., Vo-Thanh, T., Bukhari, S., Villivalam, S., Senbeto, D.L. 2023a. Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance and socio-emotional factors at work: the role of socio-demographic traits. *International Journal of Social Economics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/ijse-04-2023-0304>.
- Abo-Algheit, A., El-Sabagy, H., Kassem, A. 2024. Relationship of Abusive Supervision and Organizational Justice with Workplace Deviance Behavior among Nurse. *Mansoura Nursing Journal*, 11(1), 383-395. <https://doi.org/10.21608/mnj.2024.350488>.
- Adamovic, M. 2023. Organizational justice research: A review, synthesis, and research agenda. *European Management Review*, 20(4), 762-782.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12564>.
- Ahmad, N., Siddiq, D.M., Suzana, A., Sofyan, N.I. 2023. The Effect of Workload, Work Stress and Work Fatigue on Employee Performance on Puskesmas in Majalengka Regency. *JRMSI - Jurnal Riset Manajemen Sains Indonesia*, 14(01), 48-56.
<https://doi.org/10.21009/jrmsi.014.1.06>.
- Aisha, R., Channa, N.A., Mirani, M.A., Qureshi, N.A. 2022. Investigating the influence of perceived organizational justice on counterproductive work behaviours: mediating role of negative emotions. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/ijjem-03-2022-0392>.
- Anderson, E.L. 2022. Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Understanding their nature and antecedents through familial, longitudinal, and concurrent data.

- Andoh, R.P.K., Annan-Prah, E.C., Owusu, E.A., Agyei, P.M. 2022. Trainees' aversions of employee training programs. *European Journal of Training and Development*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-02-2022-0022>.
- Bhaskar, S., Rastogi, A., Menon, K.V., Kunheri, B., Balakrishnan, S., Howick, J. 2020. Pandemic Health System REsilience Program (REPROGRAM) Consortium, & REPROGRAM Health Equity and Justice Study Group. Call for Action to Address Equity and Justice Divide During COVID-19 (Public Mental Health). *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 559905. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.559905>.
- Braje, I.N., Aleksić, A., Jelavić, S.R. 2020. Blame It on Individual or Organization Environment: What Predicts Workplace Deviance More? *Social Sciences*, 9(6), 99. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9060099>.
- Brienza, J.P., Bobocel, D.R. 2017. Employee Age Alters the Effects of Justice on Emotional Exhaustion and Organizational Deviance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00479>.
- Chaudhary, S.I., Bhatti, O.K., Cipran, H., Bajwa, A. 2022. The Conceptual Review on the Impact of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance and the Mediating Role of Psychological Contract Breach. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 11(2), 235-252. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2022.60328>.
- Cohen, A. 2018. Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Understanding the Dark Side of Personalities in Organizational Life. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL28883374M/Counterproductive_Work_Behaviors.
- Colquitt, J.A., Hill, E.T., De Cremer, D. 2022. Forever focused on fairness: 75 years of organizational justice in Personnel Psychology. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(2), 413-435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12556>.
- Dahri, N., Tjahjono, H., Muafi, M., Prajogo, W. 2023. The Influence of Workplace Envy on Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Negative Emotion and Perception of Injustice. *Quality - Access to Success*, 24(193). <https://doi.org/10.47750/qas/24.193.04>.
- Gelfand, M.J., Erez, M. 2023. The Oxford Handbook of Cross-cultural Organizational Behavior. [http://books.google.ie/books?id=_Ati0AEACAAJ&dq=Raver,+J.+L.+\(2024\).+Culture+and+Workplace+Deviance.+The+Oxford+Handbook+of+Cross-Cultural+Organizational+Behavior,+268.&hl=en&cd=1&source=gbs_api](http://books.google.ie/books?id=_Ati0AEACAAJ&dq=Raver,+J.+L.+(2024).+Culture+and+Workplace+Deviance.+The+Oxford+Handbook+of+Cross-Cultural+Organizational+Behavior,+268.&hl=en&cd=1&source=gbs_api).
- Google Scholar. (n.d.-a). https://scholar.google.com/scholar?as_ylo=2023&q=younger+vs+old+employees+and+procedural+justice+&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5.
- Google Scholar. (n.d.-b). [https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Fazzino,+L.,+%26+Jones,+B.+A.+\(2021\).+Risk+Analysis:+National+and+International+Standards.+In+Encyclopedia+of+Security+and+Emergency+Management+\(pp.+846-858\).+Cham:+Springer+International+Publishing.&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Fazzino,+L.,+%26+Jones,+B.+A.+(2021).+Risk+Analysis:+National+and+International+Standards.+In+Encyclopedia+of+Security+and+Emergency+Management+(pp.+846-858).+Cham:+Springer+International+Publishing.&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5).
- Herscovis, M.S., Reich, T.C. 2013. Integrating workplace aggression research: Relational, contextual, and method considerations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(S1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1886>.
- Hngoi, C.L., Abdullah, N., Sulaiman, W.S.W., Nor, N.I.Z. 2023. Relationship between job involvement, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment with job insecurity: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1066734>.

- Huang, X., Ye, Y., Wang, Z., Liu, X., Lyu, Y. 2023. The influence of perceived organizational exploitation on frontline hospitality employees' workplace deviance: an organizational justice perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(12), 4137-4157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-06-2022-0786>.
- Ilyas, S., Bhatti, O. 2023. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/LOBJ/PDF/5_V3_No_1_23.pdf. Chrome-extension://Efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/LOBJ/PDF/5_V3_No_1_23.pdf. Retrieved August 14, 2024, from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?lookup=0&q=Workplace+Deviant+Behavior:+A+Systematic+Literature+Review+shuja++ilyas&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5&as_ylo=202
- Imran, M. 2023. Role of NAB in Eliminating Corruption from Pakistan: A Critical Analysis. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 4(II). [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2023\(4-ii\)15](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2023(4-ii)15).
- Irshad, M., Hussain, M., Qureshi, M.A. 2022. Abusive Supervision: A Catalyst for the Employee Deviance Work Behavior. *DOAJ*. <https://doi.org/10.53909/admin.v3i2.102>.
- Iskamto, D. 2023. Organizational Culture and Its Impact on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Management and Digital Business*, 2(1), 47-55. <https://doi.org/10.54099/ijmdb.v2i1.584>.
- Jain, N., Dhingra, R. 2023. A Bibliometric Analysis of 25 years of Workplace Deviant Behavior Research, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/25819542231185598>.
- Jeewandara, S., Kumari, T. 2021. A Theoretical Review of Deviant Workplace Behavior. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 91. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351037080>.
- Kilroy, J., Dundon, T., Townsend, K. 2022. Embedding reciprocity in human resource management: A social exchange theory of the role of frontline managers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33(2), 511-531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12468>.
- Klesel, M., Schuberth, F., Niehaves, B., Henseler, J. 2021. Multigroup analysis in information systems research using PLS-PM: A systematic investigation of approaches. <https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai%3Aris.utwente.nl%3Apublications%2F5df1cf31-7e3b-499f-a17d-1b7f56b984d6>.
- Kneavel, M. 2020. Relationship Between Gender, Stress, and Quality of Social Support. *Psychological Reports*, 124(4), 1481-1501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294120939844>.
- Kollmann, T., Stöckmann, C., Kensbock, J.M., Peschl, A. 2019. What satisfies younger versus older employees, and why? An aging perspective on equity theory to explain interactive effects of employee age, monetary rewards, and task contributions on job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 59(1), 101-115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21981>.
- Kumari, T., Jeewandara, S.K. 2021). A Theoretical Review of Deviant Workplace Behavior. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 10(4), 91-113. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351037080_A_Theoretical_Review_Of_Deviant_Workplace_Behavior.
- Leavitt, K., Zhu, L., Klotz, A., Kouchaki, M. 2021). Fragile or robust? Differential effects of gender threats in the workplace among men and women. In: *Organizational*

- Behavior and Human Decision Processes (Vol. 168, p. 104112).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2021.104112>.
- Li, L., McMurray, A. 2022. Corporate Fraud Across the Globe. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3667-8>.
- Liu, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhao, H., Liu, L. 2022. The double-edged sword effects of differential leadership on deviant behavior. *Current Psychology*, 42(32), 27888-27900.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03845-x>.
- Mackey, J.D., McAllister, C.P., Ellen, I., Carson, J.E. 2019. A Meta-Analysis of Interpersonal and Organizational Workplace Deviance Research. *Journal of Management*, Vol. XX, Issue X, pp. 1-26.
- Mackey, J.D., McAllister, C.P., Ellen, B.P., Carson, J.E. 2019. A Meta-Analysis of Interpersonal and Organizational Workplace Deviance Research. *Journal of Management*, 47(3), 597-622. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319862612>.
- Meng, R., Jiang, Z., Su, Y., Lu, G., Chen, C. 2024. The effect of perceived organizational justice on workplace deviant behavior of new nurses: the role of emotional labor and psychological capital. *BMC Nursing*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01937-6>.
- Ng, T.W., Lam, S.S., Feldman, D.C. 2016. Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Do males and females differ? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 93, 11-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005>.
- Okeke, C.C., Okeke, C.I.O., Ugwuanyi, C.S. 2022. Demographic determinants of work deviant behaviors of rural community-based primary school teachers: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 51(1), 168-181. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22895>.
- Olasupo, M.O., Fagbenro, D.A. 2021. Examining Socio-Demographic Factors in Workplace Deviance among Selected University Workers. *Acta Educationis Generalis*, 11(1), 29-42. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2021-0003>.
- Pham, N.T., Jabbour, C.J.C., Pereira, V., Usman, M., Ali, M., Vo-Thanh, T. 2023. Common good human resource management, ethical employee behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors toward the individual. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33(4), 977-1000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12493>.
- Pletzer, J.L., Oostrom, J.K., Voelpel, S.C. 2022. Age and Workplace Deviance: A Meta-Analytic Test and a Trait-Based Examination of Why Older Employees Engage in Less Workplace Deviance. *Work Aging and Retirement*, 9(2), 153-168.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waab033>.
- Quddous, A., Shaikh, A. A., Abro, L.A. 2024. Dimension of the Corruption in Pakistan. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 13(1).
<https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00278>.
- Reis, H.T. 2021. Gender Effects in Social Participation: Intimacy, Loneliness, and the Conduct of Social Interaction. *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 91-105).
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003164005-8>.
- Roehrich, J.K., Sarafan, M., Squire, B., Lawson, B., Bouazzaoui, M. 2024. Conflict and Contract Use in Cross-Cultural Buyer–Supplier Relationships: The Role of Cultural Context. *Production and Operations Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10591478241265481>.
- Salsabil, A.S., Bagis, F., Darmawan, A., Rahmawati, I.Y. 2023. Controlling Workplace Deviant Behavior through the Role of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction as Mediation in Islamic Colleges Purwokerto City. *South Asian Journal of Social*

- Studies and Economics, 20(4), 156-172.
<https://doi.org/10.9734/sajsse/2023/v20i4750>.
- Shah, S.A.H., Shah, T.A., Ullah, A., Yasir, M. 2021. Workplace Deviance in Public Sector Organizations: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Studies*, 5(1), 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.34260/jaebis.514>.
- Tricahyadinata, I., Hendryadi, N., Suryani, N., Za, S.Z., Riadi, S.S. 2020. Workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intentions: Multi-group analysis. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1743627>.
- Tufail, M., Taieb, M. 2023. The Cultural Dynamics of Power and Corruption in Local Government Department, District Swabi, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Journal of Management Practices Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(6).
<https://doi.org/10.33152/jmphss-7.6.2>.
- Westland, J.C. 2010. Information & Decision Sciences: Lower bounds on sample size in structural equation modeling. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2010.07.003>.
- Wiseman, J., Stillwell, A. 2022. Organizational Justice: Typology, Antecedents and Consequences. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1287-1295.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia2030086>.
- Yeşiltaş, M., Gürlek, M. 2020. Understanding the Nature of Deviant Workplace Behaviors. *Advances in hospitality, tourism and the services industry (AHTSI) book series* (pp. 305-326). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1474-0.ch017>.
- Zhang, X. 2024. Workplace Deviant Behavior, Stress, and Change in the Post-epidemic Era: the Case of the Catering/Hotel/Tourism Industry. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-01955-4>.