



Search information

Received 2023/02/14
Accepted 2023/06/15

Printed ISSN: 2352-989X
Online ISSN: 2602-6856

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.

DJADDA Mahmoud

**University of Bejaia, (Algérie),
Email: mahmoud.djadda@univ-bejaia.dz**

ABSTRACT

Our contribution and research concerns the management and reduction of a number of counterproductive behaviors in the organizational environment; so the objectives are: To understand the meaning of organizational justice with all its dimensions. To diagnose the different types of counterproductive behavior; To check and verify the relationship between organizational justice and counterproductive behaviors; To understand the mechanism by which counterproductive behaviors are linked to organizational justice. To understand the mechanism by which counterproductive behaviors links to organizational justice. Also, to raise awareness and propose to the managers to integrate the practice of justice within the organization since it serves the personal and economic interests of the workers and allows them to satisfy their needs of belonging and self-worth as well as motivating them.

Keywords: Organizational justice, behavior, counterproductive behavior, employees.

INTRODUCTION

Counterproductive behavior has been the subject of much attention in the scientific literature for many years. Despite a better understanding of the phenomenon, counterproductive behaviors remain a scourge for organizations, regardless of their size or sector of activity. The consequences of such behaviours, both in terms of health and efficiency, generate such significant costs that they have become an issue for the prosperity and sustainability of organizations.

Counterproductive behaviours encompass a wide range of behaviours and some researchers have attempted to classify them along different dimensions, creating several typologies: behaviours that reduce the quantity and quality of work (production deviance) and those that damage the company's assets, such as theft or vandalism (property deviance). (Fisher, Locke and Henne, 1992) have also classified anti-citizen behaviors, the negative counterpart of the concept of organizational citizenship, along the following dimensions: work avoidance (absenteeism and tardiness), task avoidance (loitering), attitudes of contradiction and resistance to authority (ignoring a superior's directives), aggression and revenge. However, it was not until the mid-1990s that the first integrative typology was proposed by Robinson and (BENNETT, (2000).). The main reason why we decided to deal with this topic "the impact of organizational justice on the counterproductive behavior of employees" is to gain new knowledge on the topic and to show the impact of organizational justice on the counterproductive behavior of employees.

Talking about human resources does not mean that people are resources, but that people have resources. The mission of resource management is to develop and mobilize employees. The integration of the human resources strategy in the company is a recognized necessity and people give a cooperative advantage to their organization. The human resources function occupies an essential place within organizations. This is why, among the difficulties they are facing today, building a management model of its resources able to attract the best skills, to retain them and motivate them to serve its sustainable development. HRM is one of the fundamental practices that allow the development of any organization, it is an activity that aims to improve communication while enforcing the organization of the company, as such the management of human resources has several complementary

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

facets, inseparable and especially essential to the smooth running of the company. (PERETTI Jean-Marie, 2006)

In order to better motivate employees, we find organizational justice, which is part of the theory of equity that explains how employees respond both cognitively and behaviorally to the perception of justice in their work environment.

Organizational justice describes a professional fairness reserved by the employer for its employees. Fairness, once correctly felt, is transformed into organizational justice that sufficiently and honestly reflects the behaviors of decision-makers and business leaders. This introduces the employer's perception of organizational justice, which reflects the anticipation, understanding and modification of a fair and equitable management style that promotes favorable labor relations. (Brangier, Lancry, Louche, 2004)

Organizational justice is recognized as a determinant of attitudes and behaviors at work, as it is important in organizations because it is based on the principle of belonging and identity of each member, the perceptions of the latter represent in a fundamental condition for the development and maintenance of constructive relationships ensuring trust and quality of exchanges between professional actors.

On the other hand, the vast majority of the literature on counterproductive behaviour does not take into account the work organization mode. However, a growing body of research shows the relevance of doing so when it comes to studying counterproductive behaviors, which may differ or be more or less harmful depending on the work organization mode. In this perspective, we wonder about the impact of organizational justice on the counterproductive behavior of employees?

In other words, does counterproductive behavior change according to the practices of distributive, procedural and interactional justice at the level of a company?

In response, three assumptions are made as follows;

- The more fair employees perceive the distribution of resources to be, the more counterproductive behavior changes.
- The more employees perceive the distribution of resources to be fair, the more counterproductive behavior changes.
- employees perceive that fair interpersonal relationships can reduce their counterproductive behavior.

In order to better understand the contours and issues of organizational justice, a few concepts and theoretical elements are necessary, because justice is a complex notion. Everyone feels an impression of justice when faced with a decision made by a manager, depending on different parameters or different implicit comparisons, but the difficulty lies in understanding the functioning of an object that is known to everyone and at the same time difficult to circumscribe or to describe (Greenberg, 2000)

1. Dimensions of organizational justice :

1.1 Distributive Justice:

Distributive justice is embedded in both the history of the humanities and in normative philosophy. Distributive justice refers to perceptions and reactions regarding the rewards obtained, both in terms of what employees believe they deserve and how they compare to others. It was the pioneer Stacy Adams who brought distributive justice into organizational psychology in 1963. The major rule highlighted by (Adams, 1965) is that of proportionality. According to this rule, which constitutes the central pivot of equity theory, individuals consider a transaction to be fair when the ratio between their efforts (contributions) and what they receive in exchange (rewards) is balanced, compared to another person in the same situation as them. The referent to which the employee compares himself can be a colleague, the employee himself at an earlier point in his life, or even a fictional referent. In other words, individuals would calculate, more or less consciously, a kind of ratio between their contributions and their rewards, which they would compare with that of another person generally close to them. Contributions include the intensity of the effort, the sacrifices made, the time spent at work or the discrimination suffered. Rewards include salary, diplomas, symbolic rewards (valuation, social recognition) and quality of life. Based on the mechanism of cognitive dissonance, Adams defends the idea that an underpaid employee would feel anger and resentment.

These feelings would motivate the individual, in order to restore fairness, to either change his or her cognitions (e.g., by believing that the initial rewards were abnormal) or to change his or her behaviors (e.g., by decreasing his or her contributions, by working less). In presenting his theory as a model of reaction to the violation of norms of distributive justice, (Adams, 1965) sets out to answer this question posed by the literature: "Are there other consequences to unfair exchanges?" He finds that people do not simply feel injustice. They

respond to this feeling because the violation of the norms of distributive justice elicits a desire to punish the perpetrator(s).

The feeling of distributive justice is therefore based on the evaluation of the contributions made by the employee (efforts made, time spent on the task, investment, etc.) and the rewards granted in return by the company (salary, bonuses, promotions, status, etc.). This evaluation is of course based on a subjective part. Each employee does not have the same perception of the returns he or she receives; some will be more sensitive to a bonus while others will be more attached to the responsibilities entrusted to them.

Since the work of Adams (1963, 1965), several studies have advanced our understanding of the role of rewards on the perception of distributive justice. Thus, recent studies show that the perception of the fairness of a reward focuses both on the estimation of its value as well as on its moral or ethical character, i.e. its consistency with the norms of rewards supported by the employee that meet the criteria of fairness, equality, and need. As for the value associated with the reward, it refers to the employee's evaluation of it in terms of favourable-unfavourable. (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001) have thus shown in their meta-analysis that the unfavourable character of distributive justice in certain circumstances - a reward

1.2. Procedural justice:

Advances in research on organizational justice highlight that the individual defines justice not only in terms of his or her rewards but also in terms of the procedure used to determine the value of his or her returns, this is "procedural justice" (LEVENTHAL, (1980).)Procedural justice theory combines two levels of analysis, the process level and the decision level, the process level refers to an individual's ability to control the way information is gathered and the decision level focuses on decisions; through the control of decisions, the individual is able to evaluate the actual outcome of the situation. Must contain the main elements of the problem, its branches, the importance of the subject. The first level, generally studied under the term "voice", can have a greater impact than the second level (control of decisions) in the perception of justice.

Thus, when the different parties in dispute can express their point of view, they accept more easily the decisions made, even when these are negative. Subsequently, the concepts of procedural justice have been

applied in the field of organizational psychology. Thus, when individuals feel that they are in the presence of fair procedures, they are more inclined to accept the decisions that concern them than when they feel that the procedures are unfair.

(LEVENTHAL, (1980).)find that the perceived fairness of the procedures in place depends on:

- 1. they are consistent over time and applied to everyone in the same way
- 2. they do not use personal biases or prejudices
- 3. be based on accurate information to make the decision
- 4. they can be corrected based on new information
- 5. have taken into account all relevant criteria
- 6. they are based on the current ethics of the company.

1.3. Interactional justice:

Interactional justice refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment received in the implementation of procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986). Historically, the place of interactional justice within organizational justice theories has been controversial. Some research considered interactional justice as a social aspect of procedural justice while other research attributed to it an independent place. As Cohen, Charash, and Spector (2001) attest in their meta-analysis, the research is more supportive of the latter position by recognizing the independent nature of interactional justice.

Interactional justice is thus distinguished from the previous two types of justice by focusing on employees' perceptions of the quality of interpersonal treatment received during procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986) This justice refers to actions affecting social sensitivity mainly in terms of respect and dignity. In order to refine this definition, other research proposes to split interactional justice into two dimensions, informational justice and interpersonal justice (Greenberg, 1993).

Information received during the proceedings. Whereas interpersonal justice relates to the quality of the interpersonal exchange between individuals and more particularly between the hierarchical superior and his or her collaborator. The authority figure plays a role in the employees' sense of justice.

According to (Bies and Moag, 1986) the perception of justice of authority figures depends on the respect of four rules of interpersonal exchanges:

- Justification: the superior adequately explains the reasons for practices and decisions.

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

- Sincerity: the superior keeps his or her promises and does not lie.
- Respect: the superior treats subordinates with respect and dignity
- Civility: the superior must refrain from making prejudicial remarks or asking inappropriate questions (concerning religion, sex, cultural origins, etc.).

According to the work of (Greenberg, 1993) and (COLQUITT, . (2001).), these four criteria correspond to the two sides of interactional justice, with the first two criteria associated with the informational side (explanations or social accounts) and the last two corresponding to the interpersonal side (interpersonal sensitivity).

Thus, when the representative of the authority treats his collaborators with respect, sincerity and sensitivity and explains to them the reasons justifying the decisions and procedures concerning them, we consider that interactional justice is satisfied. These two sides of interactional justice correspond in reality to two roles that the authority figure must play in his exchanges with his subordinates in order to be perceived as just.

Studies have shown that employees perceive the authority figure as both a full relational partner and an agent or representative of the organization (AMBROS, (2005).) These two facets can be understood by the fact that the supervisor is both in charge of setting and communicating, organizational strategies, decisions, procedures, and practices while also maintaining personal relationships with employees.

I.Methods and Materials:

In order to properly develop our research and to collect reliable data related to our research topic, we opted to use the qualitative method, as our target population consists of 12 employees. Our recourse to this method is also justified by the choice of the survey technique, because we used the "semi-directive" interview, which is based on understanding, which is an appropriate tool for investigating behavioral practices in order to have the maximum of data concerning organizational justice and counter-productive behavior among employees.

1. Location and environment of the survey;

The investigation took place in the wilaya of Bejaia which represents the spatial framework of our study where we have of Bejaia for several reasons. First of all, our knowledge of the field: we live in this locality where we have a lot of information on the characteristics of the company ICO.TAL/SPA (joint stock company) was born from a split of the economic public company (EPE) ECOTEX/SPA. ICOTAL was created in 1959 by a Frenchman in the form of clothing units specialized in the manufacture of shirts, within the framework of

the plan of Constantine under the corporate name: Algerian Cotton Industry by the acronym I.CO.TAL; then nationalized in November 1974 and integrated into the heritage of SONITEX according to the ordinance n° 74-104 of November 15, 1974 with the restructuring of SONITEX in 1982, the company was integrated into the company ICOTEX. Thereafter, on December 20, 1987, the extraordinary general assembly of the EPE ICOTEX in its resolution n° 02, devotes its filiation by becoming thus of the holding taking again its name of origin to know: Algerian cotton industry (I.CO.TAL) the inheritance of the company will be regularized only in April 2002 by a land book delivered by the land conservation of Bejaia

2. The conduct of the survey and target population:

The survey took place at ICOTAL between 08/01/2021 and 23/02/2021. During this period we had as interlocutors the executives responsible for the commercial direction divided into two departments namely the sale and the supply

I. Results and Discussion:

According to the results obtained from our survey concerning the postulates of our study and which are joined in a general hypothesis which stipulates: "There is an impact of the perception of Organizational Justice on the counterproductive behavior of employees", these results tell us that the practices of Organizational Justice are perceived positive by the majority of employees with a rate of 58%, and 42% of employees perceive negatively the practices of Organizational Justice, as for the counterproductive behaviors they are produced at a rate of 18%, so we deduce that 42% of employees produce 18% of counterproductive behaviors.

According to these results of our survey, the perception of justice of the workers of SPA, is moderately strong in the majority of workers.

The level of perception of the workers of the company SPA of organizational justice appears according to the indifference and fairness of the interaction increases the feeling of affiliation to this company, which can be factors that decrease the production of counterproductive behavior of employees, this justice could be a factor of good behavior of workers.

From these results we confirm our research hypothesis that there is an impact of the perception of organizational justice on the counterproductive behavior of employees.

1. Analysis and interpretation of the results of the first postulate:

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

The results obtained from our survey concerning the first postulate which states: "The more employees perceive the distribution of resources to be fair, the more the counterproductive behavior changes", shows us that the employees of SPA have a moderately high level of perception of the first dimension which represents distributive justice with a rate of 56%, and 44% of employees perceive that the rewards are unsatisfactory in relation to the efforts they provide and that they have never received bonuses whatever their nature. This feeling of unfairness can lead to counterproductive behaviors, 18% of which, according to the results of our study, are adopted by some employees. These results confirm our first hypothesis, i.e. that distributive justice has an impact on counterproductive behavior, and the more employees perceive the distribution of resources as fair, the more counterproductive behavior changes.

-Wage/Premium:

These two concepts are considered the oldest types of organizational justice, distributive justice refers to "the individual's evaluation of the relationship between what he or she invests in the workplace and what he or she gets out of it. It refers to the perceived justice of rewards (rewards received as a result of the distribution of material or socio-emotional resources within the organization).

-Regarding salaries:

According to the results of this study, we note that the respondents are moderately satisfied with their salaries. Bashir, 60 years old, and Rida, 35 years old, say: "Before we were really satisfied with our salaries, but after this inflation we don't have the purchasing power anymore and we have difficulty managing our salaries".

Salim, 30 years old, says: "I am not at all satisfied with my salary and if I find a job in another company I will leave here immediately".

-Regarding bonuses:

According to the results of this study, we find that the respondents are not at all satisfied with the bonuses they are paid.

Yazid, 50 years old, said: "The only time I received a very small amount that cannot even be considered as a bonus is when the company bought another company.

Boubker, 28 years old, says: "There are no bonuses or good salaries here, it is a private company that only seeks to achieve its objectives.

- 2. Analysis and interpretation of the results of the second postulate:

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

The results obtained from our survey regarding the second hypothesis which states: "The more employees perceive the implemented procedures to be fair, the more counterproductive behavior changes" indicate to us that the level of perception of procedural justice is high in 58% of the employees surveyed, and low in 42% of the employees surveyed which may cause some employees to produce counterproductive behavior. According to the results obtained, 18% of counterproductive behaviors are adopted, which confirms that procedural justice has an impact on counterproductive behavior, so that the more employees perceive the procedures in place to be fair, the more counterproductive behavior changes. So our second sub-hypothesis is confirmed.

- Prise de décision/procédures établies :

Cette dimension précise qu'une décision ou un processus de prise de décision peut-être perçue comme juste s'il existe une opportunité de l'influencer.

- Regarding decision making:

In the current research, the majority of employees say that the company does not make its decisions before studying the situation and once the decision is made, there is no right to oppose it.

Malik, 47 years old, says: "My superior never thinks about my personal interests when he makes a decision, for him the interests of the company come first. His silence was a confirmation that the administrative decisions are not applied on the workers without exception".

Smail, 43 years old, says: "If I claim my rights regarding the remuneration I will be immediately fired and foreigners have no place in the positions of responsibility because it is a family business".

Regarding established procedures:

The majority of respondents say that the company establishes procedures that serve the smooth running of the organization and the well-being of employees.

Mounia, 40 years old, said: "It is true that there is a dialogue between me and my superior, but the interests of the company come first, and the company does not establish any procedures to treat workers fairly.

3. Analysis and interpretation of the results concerning the third postulate:

The results obtained from our survey regarding the third postulate which states: "The more employees perceive fair interpersonal relations, the more counterproductive behavior changes", The results

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

obtained tell us that the level of perception of interactional justice is high in 57% of the employees surveyed, and low in 43% of the employees surveyed which may cause some employees to produce counterproductive behavior. According to the results obtained, 18% of counterproductive behaviors are adopted, which confirms that interactional justice has an impact on counterproductive behavior so that the more employees perceive fair interpersonal relations, the more counterproductive behavior changes. So our third sub-hypothesis is confirmed.

a. Informational Justice/Interpersonal Justice:

Interpersonal justice refers to the sincerity and respect that one individual receives from another. Informational justice refers to the adequacy of explanations given.

Regarding information:

The majority of employees say that they do not have access to information.

Ferhat, 55 years old, says: "we don't have access to information, everything is confidential, as for communication, the company encourages both types: formal and informal".

- Regarding interpersonal relations:

The majority of respondents are not satisfied with their relationship with the supervisor but they get along well with each other.

Elvachir, **39 years old**, says: "my superior does not make me feel like an important element in the organization, I feel like a production machine".

Farid, 34 years old, says in the same way: "I don't remember the day when my superior asked me about my health". He considers that his ratio of retribution / contribution and that of the person taken as a referent are different. In moral philosophy, the norm of equity is a foundation of justice according to the merits of Aristotle, who suggests that a just allocation of resources would be that established according to the rule of proportionality between contributions and rewards.

b. The procedural dimension:

This is the extent to which procedures:

- Are free of bias, i.e., are not susceptible to influence by the self-interest of decision makers ;
- Result in consistent allocations, i.e., apply impersonally and timelessly. This rule implies a certain stability of the characteristics of

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

the procedure over time and an elimination of any form of favoritism (no one person will have a special advantage);

- Are based on reliable, accurate information and informed advice to minimize the likelihood of error;
- Allow individuals to review and correct decisions by giving them the opportunity to appeal;
- Represent the interests, values, and major goals of all parties (individuals and groups) affected by the decision;
- Respect the ethical standards and moral values valued by the individuals involved.

c. The interactional dimension:

Indeed, (BIES & Moag, (1986)) argue that the perceived fairness of authority figures is conditioned on compliance with four rules of interpersonal behavior: (1) justification (the extent to which the superior adequately explains the rationale for practices and decisions), (2) sincerity (the extent to which he or she keeps promises and does not lie), (3) respect (the extent to which he or she treats subordinates with dignity, politeness, and respect), and (4) the extent to which he or she refrains from using inappropriate remarks or abusive language.

Conclusion:

Our research on "the impact of organizational justice on counterproductive behavior" was carried out in the company SPA. It is important to recall the objective of this work which was first to determine and explain the organizational justice with its dimensions related to work, and second to verify our hypotheses.

Thanks to the theoretical knowledge, the collected data and based on the results obtained in the analysis and results part, we found out that the organizational justice has a positive impact on the counterproductive behavior of the employees, this last one, seems to be an essential competitive factor able to answer the needs of the employees (equality, salary, bonuses, decisions, rewards, respect...) and an indispensable element for the success of the organizations.

In general, the results of our research confirm the existence of a relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and counterproductive behavior. Specifically, our results suggest that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and counterproductive behavior, and the more the dimensions of organizational justice are implemented, the less counterproductive

behavior is adopted. We hope through this research, that we have brought some explanatory elements of our field of study, and to open new perspectives on the theoretical and practical level for further research. As a finality we propose to give importance to all dimensions of organizational justice, as :

1-The distributive dimension:

The norm of fairness assumes that the rewards received are proportional to the contributions made; in other words, a reward is perceived as fair if it is based on the evaluation of the relative contributions of each individual. According to (ADAMS, Inequity in social experimental social psychology ., ., (1965).)theory of inequity, individuals cognitively evaluate the ratio between their contributions and the resulting rewards by comparing it to the ratio of another person taken as a reference. The feeling of justice is then based on a universal psychological mechanism characterized by the requirement of equal proportionality between the contributions and rewards of the various actors being compared. An out come will be perceived as unfair when the person judges that his ratio of rewards/contributions and that of the person taken as referent are different. In moral philosophy, the norm of fairness is a foundation of justice according to the merits of Aristotle, who suggests that a fair allocation of resources would be that established according to the rule of proportionality between contributions and rewards.

2-The procedural dimension:

This is the extent to which procedures:

- Are free of bias, i.e., are not susceptible to influence by the self-interest of decision makers ;
- Result in consistent allocations, i.e., apply impersonally and timelessly. This rule implies a certain stability of the characteristics of the procedure over time and an elimination of any form of favoritism (no one person will have a special advantage);
- Are based on reliable, accurate information and informed advice to minimize the likelihood of error;
- Allow individuals to review and correct decisions by giving them the opportunity to appeal;
- Represent the interests, values, and major goals of all parties (individuals and groups) affected by the decision;

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

- Respect the ethical standards and moral values valued by the individuals involved.

- **3. The interactional dimension:**

Indeed, Bies and Moag (1986) argue that the perceived fairness of authority figures is conditioned on compliance with four rules of interpersonal behavior: (1) justification (the extent to which the superior adequately explains the rationale for practices and decisions), (2) sincerity (the extent to which he or she keeps promises and does not lie), (3) respect (the extent to which he or she treats subordinates with dignity, politeness, and respect), and (4) the extent to which he or she refrains from using inappropriate remarks or abusive language.

Bibliography

ADAMS, J. S. ((1965).). *Inequity in social experimental social psychology* ., . (Vol. vol. 2,). New York, NY: Academic Press: In CAROLINE Piasseki, l'utilisation de la justice organisationnelle dans une démarche de prévention des risques psychosociaux, université cote d'azur 2017.

ADAMS, J. S. ((1963).). *Toward an understanding of inequity*. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(5), 422-436. In CAROLINE Manville, les perceptions de la justice organisationnelle des salariés atypiques.

AMBROS, M. L. ((2005).). *Are procedural justice and distributive justice* .

BENNETT, R. J. ((2000).). *Development of a measure of workplace deviance*. Journal of Applied Psychology, (Vol. 85,).

BIES, S., & Moag, R. e. ((1986)). «*Interactional justice: communication criteria of fairness*»,.

Cohen-Charash, Y. &. ((2001).). *The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958> Consulté le 09/10/2021.

COLQUITT, J. A. (. (2001).). *conceptually distinct?* In J. Greenberg, & J. A. . Colquitt (Eds.).

GREENBERG, J. (1993). *Han book of Organisationnel Justice Psychology*, Édition Presse Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (Vol. 86(3)).

LEVENTHAL, G. S. ((1980).). *What should be done with equity theory?* In K. Gergen, M.

Louche, C. (2007). « *introduction à la psychologie du travail et des organisations* ». .

PERETTI Jean-Marie. (2006). *Ressources humaines*,. Paris.: Dunod,.

ROBINSON, S. e. ((1995)). *A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study*. (Vol. 38(2),). Academy of Management Journal,.

Organizational justice and counterproductive employee behavior.
DJADDA MAHMOUD

Whitener, E. M. ((1997)). . *The impact of human resource activities on employee trust.*
Human Resource Management Review, (Vol. 7(4),).