



Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

## **The Impact of Teachers' Deviance on Justice in Secondary Schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan)**

**Dr Muhammad Ibrahim**

Principal, Elementary & Secondary Education Department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Email: [kpk300@gmail.com](mailto:kpk300@gmail.com)

**Muhammad Younas**

Subject Specialist, Elementary & Secondary Education department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Email: [myounas3439@gmail.com](mailto:myounas3439@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The impact of educators' deviance in secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province was examined by the display ponder. The objective of the research is to look at the reasons behind educators' mental health issues and deviance in the classroom. All of the instructors and administrators at public boys' high schools, both in urban and rural locations, make up the study's population. A total of 590 educators and 47 principals were selected from the three studied districts' Charsadda, Peshawar, and Mardan rural and urban areas. Of the chosen sample, 569 educators (94.44%) and 43 principals (91.48%) took part in the research. Justice-related items in the questionnaire include Justice in Distribution, Justice in Procedural, and interaction justice. The gathered data was arranged in tables and subjected to statistical analysis and interpretation. The results indicated that there was a significant link between all of the research measures. To help overcome the deviance difficulties, a focus on directing educators' energy toward worthwhile and advantageous aspects of their work would be helpful.

**Keywords:** Deviance, justice, Justice in Institutions, Justice in Distribution, Justice in Procedural, Justice via Interaction

### **Introduction**

Researchers and educationalists have focused a lot of emphasis on the behavioural abnormalities and misbehaviour of instructors in institutional settings, as well as the potential negative consequences. In the past, the term "deviant" was employed in a variety of ways. It was formerly considered that instructors' abnormal behaviour was immoral. It was then referred to as educators' organizational misconduct. While some studies referred to it as dysfunctional behaviour, others called it unproductive, antisocial, and aggressive behaviour inside the business. In their study, Bennett and Robinson (1995) for the first time referred to this characteristic of instructors as deviant behaviour. The behaviour of deviant instructors at Khyber Pakhtunkhwa secondary schools was thought to be worth examining and analysing. Because there is a dearth of research in this field, the current work is important and necessary. The study's findings may assist administrators in curbing the tendency of instructors' deviations from the norm, which would improve the learning environment in schools. If followed in letter and spirit, the study's several suggestions will solve the issue. Bennett and Robinson (1995) claim that instructors' voluntary violations of significant authoritative



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

criteria are the root source of deviant behaviour, which in turn jeopardizes the health of an association, its members, or both. According to Spector and Fox (2002), is any behaviour by educators that causes direct or indirect harm to an educational institution, its employees, or both. Penney and Spector (2002), stated that deviant behaviour includes verbal abuse, theft, destruction, interference, refusal to assist other staff members, and disregard for the principal's orders.

Deviant instructors' actions have the potential to alter the school's atmosphere. It appears that the deviant educator does not typically disagree with the decisions made by the principal and staff, but their actions cause issues in the school. They act as though they are not aware of the issues that have been referred when the supervisors and principals want an explanation. Principals often misunderstand deviant behaviours in schools and fail to give it the attention it needs because they believe it won't cause additional issues.

Therefore, the study tried to analyse the aberrant behaviours of instructors and how they worked at the schools that were sampled. This necessitated creating tools to gather pertinent information from educators and principals for analysis, findings, and potential suggestions for a corrective action to address the issue.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The research aims to achieve the following goals:

1. To determine the various forms of Justice in Institutions as viewed by the three districts' secondary school educators.
2. To ascertain how educators' views of justice relate to those of their respective schools.
3. To look at the kinds of connections that could exist between personal factors including age, experience, professional and academic credentials, and the educator's perspective on justice in secondary schools.

### **Research Questions**

The research investigated the following important questions:

1. What kinds of Justice in Institutions do the instructors at the secondary schools in the three districts that were sampled think exist?
2. How do educators' opinions about the fairness of their schools relate to each other?
3. How could personal characteristics like age, experience, professional and qualified credentials, and school justice among instructors in secondary schools relate to one another?

The research scope was restricted to public secondary schools in the three sampled districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, both in urban and rural regions. The research investigated the justice using the following forms of justice.

### **Educators Deviance and Justice in Institutions**

For educators, Justice in Institutions is crucial. Justice in Procedural, according to Mitchell and Ambrose (2007), mimics the lack of prejudice in the movements and tactics established by the organization's founders. It refers to how an educator is handled during a procedure or event, such as during ordinary activities,



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

suspension, or reinstatement. As claimed by Everton et al. (2007), instructors engage in less and milder instances of institutional deviance when the institution and its administrators are fair, helpful, and supportive. Educators' motivation, self-confidence, work satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, and institutional civic behaviours are all impacted by the institution's perceptions of equity and impartiality, in line with Appelbaum et al. (2007). According to Judge et al. (2006), distributive, procedural, and Justice via Interaction norms advise that mistreating instructors may result in deviant behaviours in addition to bad attitudes and feelings. Educators care about justice for a variety of socio-emotional, psychological, economic, and ethical reasons. Depending on different periods and circumstances, these diverse motivations make different aspects of justice essentially notable.

### **Educators' Deviance and Justice in Distribution**

Justice in Distribution, as state by Kennedy et al. (2004), is when everything is done in a fair and reasonable manner, whereas Justice in Procedural refers to the fairness of the process used to distribute awards that are already in place. When the equity hypothesis emerged, Justice in Distribution was obtained. Interpersonal justice, described by Colquitt (2001), emphasizes how much instructors are treated with dignity, respect, self-worth, civility, and importance. Ambrose et al. (2002), described that, institutional injustice refers to a teacher's perception that they have experienced unfair and unjust treatment at their place of employment. A number of behavioural impacts, including work performance and pulling out attempts, are related to Justice in distribution. Consequently, there would be a connection between distributive fairness and behavioural responses.

### **Educators' Deviance and Justice in Procedural**

Masterson et al. (2000), stated that, Justice in distribution is thought to be a less significant determinant of attitude in reaction to decisions about the institution than procedural fairness. Because institutions provide policies and procedures that regulate and supervise Educators' behaviours and determine yield distribution, Educators view institutions as either the foundation of fairness or betrayal. Educators may thus feel that it is challenging to obtain fair returns for their information within the organization if they believe that the rules and regulations are out of line.

### **Educators Deviance and Justice via Interaction**

According to Colquitt et al. (2001), Justice via Interaction focuses on Educators perceptions of the importance of the interpersonal treatment they get when carrying out institutional choices. Educators' responses to criticism of the principal may be significantly predicted by Justice via Interaction. McClurg and Butler (2006), stated that instructors often identify with colleagues who typically carry out comparable or less tasks and possess comparable capabilities. Educators would be more concerned or troubled about alleged unfairness if the referent of association were comparable to them in terms of work, juxtaposition, and rank. Compared to attitudes of the principal, a low income in respect to higher administration would be thought to result in fewer acts of deviant behaviours.



## **Educators Deviance and Manifold Dimensional Perspectives of Justice**

Ambrose et al. (2002), described that, several facets of justice indicate distinct characteristics of the relationship between instructors and their workplace environment. Therefore, every aspect of justice would have a different impact on a range of institutional results. According to the social exchange theory, each component of justice serves as the basis for a unique social exchange correlation, with Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural adding to the relationship between Educators and their institution and Justice via Interaction contributing to the relationship between Educators and their principal.

According to the tenets of social exchange theory, the attitudes of instructors are the result of exchange connections between the institution, administrators, and Educators. Using a social exchange structure, deviance might be seen as the result of a bad or unfavourable relationship between educators, their principals. According to Cropanzano et al. (2003), Educators essentially ascribe their decent treatment to two sources, and their behavioural reactions tend to align with the justice's seeming source. Educators' immediate administrators, such as principals, and their institution as a whole are the two sources of justice.

An empirical research was carried out by Blau and Andersson (2005) to determine the effects of job fatigue in conjunction with distributive, interactional, and Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural. As seen by actions that falsely link unfavourable data to harm an alternative instructor and his institution, the study's findings suggested that deplorable treatment of Educators had a significant influence on Educators' negative motivation. The results showed that although just treatment encourages instructors to contribute positively to the institution and its Educators, injustice pushes Educators to promote ideas that might hurt the institution and its Educators.

Everton et al. (2007), described that theft and sabotage are impacted by the way in which instructors are informed of pay reductions. Compared to when supervision announced salary cuts in a brief consultation without giving Educators comprehensive information or expressing regret, theft and sabotage increased less when the reasons for the cuts were explained, the facts were presented to support the decision, and the supervisor apologized for any hardships the Educators might experience.

Educators' work behaviours, including institutional outputs, are influenced by their perceptions of fairness. Koh and Boo (2001), suggested that, "Educators attribute their job satisfaction more to the overall institutional climate than to their specific role." Work satisfaction has a substantial correlation with distributive and Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedurals. Compared to Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural, Justice in Distribution is a more reliable indicator of work satisfaction. McClurg and Butler (2006), described that, instructors often identify with colleagues who typically carry out comparable or less tasks and possess comparable capabilities. Educators would be more concerned or troubled about alleged unfairness if the referent of association were comparable to them in terms of work, juxtaposition, and rank.

Educators may act aggressively or violently toward their principal due to their perceptions of unfairness and needless investigation. Educators are more likely to respond angrily or aggressively toward the principle and the institution if they



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

witness discriminatory principals. Educators at these institutions were found to be more deviant and less equitable in their tasks.

### **Principals Managerial Conduct and Justice**

The administration and oversight of the principal have a significant impact on the school environment. Several studies have shown that a lack of positive initiative inside an organization may be the root cause of unethical behaviour in schools. "Principals who engage in unethical practices may create an unethical culture within the school that will encourage deviant behaviour among Educators," claim Trevino et al. (2000).

Henle (2005), described that, institutional deviance occurs as a response to unfair treatment at school. The findings of these researchers are supported by the Theory of Equity, which postulates that Educators connect inputs like skills, training, qualifications, and effort for the success of the school and students with outputs like compensation, significance in the school, praise, and promotions. In addition, Bennett and Robinson (2000), proposed a connection between perceived injustice and inequality and institutional and interpersonal deviance. In addition to injustice, other factors that may contribute to deviation in the classroom include task organization and duty performance.

Finding both situation-based and people-based recognitions is important because, among the many different kinds of teacher deviances in schools, there are many elements in the school that may contribute to or prevent deviances. The most important individual-based components are the teacher's personality, psychology, and demographic traits or determinants. Teacher groups, teacher union or group behaviours, the ethical climate or environment of an institution, the operational or operational climate or environment, and the principal's and the school's justice system's administrative behaviour are the most pronounced signs of situation-based methodology.

### **Methodology of the Study**

The goal of the current study is to draw attention to the widespread practices and current situations faced by instructors in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Secondary schools. Interviews with school principals provided the qualitative data, while surveys of Educators and principals provided the quantitative data, which was primarily demographic. Questionnaires were used to gather and evaluate data on the current state of affairs, customs, and behaviour of educators.

### **Sample of the Study**

Using the stratified sampling technique, 22 percent of the target population was chosen to create the sample's 47 principals and 590 instructors. The 43 principals and 569 Educators in the sample were spread over three districts, with 9 and 179 urban principals and 34 and 390 rural principals, respectively.

### **Tools and Sources of Data Collection**

Opinion surveys and the examination of pertinent documents served as the main sources of data. Two questionnaires were created, one for instructors and one for principals. To ensure prompt and accurate replies, the questionnaires were given to respondents in person. On the same day, they were retrieved. For the collection





## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

of data the study used the questionnaires developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural; Moorman (1991) Justice via Interaction; and Interpersonal Justice (Colquitt, 2001)

Using the stratified sampling technique, 22 percent of the target population was chosen to create the sample's 47 principals and 590 instructors. The 43 principals and 569 Educators in the sample were spread over three districts, with 9 and 179 urban principals and 34 and 390 rural principals, respectively. During the data collection phase, 590 questionnaires were given to Educators and 43 to principals. Of these, 569 (94.44%) of the teacher questionnaires and 43 (91.48%) of the administrator questionnaires were returned. 569 surveys with a percentage of 96.44% were taken into consideration for the final analysis after seven surveys from Educators were eliminated during the data review and cleaning procedure because they were either incomplete or did not fully mark all the items. The study's overall response rate of 95.25% is excellent and suitable.

The overall and location-specific response rates for principals, Educators, and respondents in each of the three districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa secondary schools.

### Data Analysis

The justice scale is further divided into three smaller scales from its 43 constituent parts.

### Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural and Justice in Distribution

The Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural and Justice in Distribution were established by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and originally comprised 46 components. The selected 37 items were used in this research; the remaining 9 items were discarded. Both Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural were analysed using descriptive statistics. The standard deviation (SD), mean, and measurements of the instructors' self-response skewness were used to analyse these items.

Educators' self-response items pertaining to Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural were often negatively skewed and leptokurtic, deviating from the ordinariness presumption. The value of skewness show that respondents tended to engage in these types of behaviours. The value of skewness vary from a low of -6.0202 ("My principal gathers precise and comprehensive information to make judgments about employment.") to a high of 3.110 ("At work, I seldom ever experience stress.").

In contrast to the ordinariness presumption, principals' answers to questions about the distributive fairness and Justice in Procedural of Educators were frequently negatively skewed and leptokurtic. From a low of -3.014 ("Educators are aware of the school's vision as outlined by upper administration. ") to a high of 0.341 ("Educators may typically obtain more resources when they need them to perform their jobs."), the values of skewness indicate that respondents tended to participate in these kinds of activities.



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

Educators Justice in Distribution Justice in Procedural Justice in Procedural Educators

### Justice via Interaction

The six components that make up the Justice via Interaction scale were analysed using descriptive statistics. The standard deviation (SD), mean, and measures of the skewness of teacher self-response were computed for these items. The overall values of the educators' self-reports on the Justice Scale are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Educators' Self Response (N=569) of Justice displaying Descriptive Statistics

Item	Min	Max	Means	SD	Skewness
Justice in Procedural & Justice in Distribution	61.00	243.00	149.89	26.9756	-6.4567
Justice via Interaction	07.00	41.00	6.365451	08.5684	-3.5694

The overall values of the principals' Justice Scale responses about Educators are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Principals' Response about Educators (N=43) of Justice displaying Descriptive Statistics

Item	Min	Max	Means	SD	Skewness
Justice in Procedural & Justice in Distribution	109.00	241.00	179.6389	26.4678	-0.3246
Justice via Interaction	17.00	36.00	23.6983	06.4571	0.3456

### Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural and values of Cronbach's Alpha

The related items found with the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural items (Principals) were determined by the internal consistency of the items extracted from the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural items (Educators). According to Pallant (2007), this showed that the Cronbach's alpha for the Principals and Educators were  $<0.7(0.776)$  and  $<0.6(0.661)$ , respectively, showing strong internal consistency. These criteria, together with the internal consistency of each of them, are shown for the principals and instructors in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Cronbach's alpha of Justice in Procedural and Justice in Distribution of Educators (N=569) and Principals Responses (N=43)

Name of the factor	Number of factors	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha for Educators	Cronbach's alpha for Principals
Justice in Procedural and Justice in Distribution	2	37	0.661	0.766



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

### Justice via Interaction and values of Cronbach's Alpha

The related items found with the Justice via Interaction items (principals) were determined by the internal consistency of the items extracted from the Justice via Interaction items (Educators). According to Pallant (2007), this showed that the Cronbach's alpha for the administrators and instructors were  $<0.6(0.611)$  and  $<0.6(0.644)$ , respectively, indicating strong internal consistency. Table 4 illustrates these factors for the principals and instructors as well as the internal consistency of each.

**Table 4:** Cronbach's alpha of Justice via Interaction of Educators (N=569) and Principals Responses (N=43)

Name of the factor	Number of factors	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha for Educators	Cronbach's alpha for Principals
Justice via Interaction	2	6	0.644	0.611

### t-test of the Educators' Deviance Scales and Subscales and Retort of principals

The goal of this study is to determine the types and causes of deviant behaviour among Educators in Secondary schools in the three districts that were sampled in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province. It also aims to determine the impact of deviant behaviour on the school climate and provide practical recommendations for addressing the issue of deviance among Educators in Secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

The t-test evaluates the difference between the means of two independent or unrelated groups in independent samples. The t-test determines if there is a significant difference between the mean value of the test variable of the principal's answer about Educators and the mean value of the test variable of Educators (self-report). The independent samples t-test was used to satisfy the study's goal for each of the sub-scales and their impact on Educators' deviance in schools. Table 5 showed the results of the t-tests as well as descriptive data for each of the subscales.

**Table 5:** t-tests of Scales and Subscales of Teacher Deviance of Educators Self Response and Principals Response about Educators

Sampl es in pairs	Subscales	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	p
Pair 1	Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (Educators)	149.89	26.74524	1.2231	139.564	569	.000





	Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (Principals)	179.697	26.9864	3.9936	43.984	42	.000
Pair 2	Justice via Interaction (Educators)	26.365	07.01203	0.4123	89.451	569	.000
	Justice via Interaction (Principals)	24.870	06.0031	0.8543	33.031	42	.000

There is a substantial influence in each of the aforementioned subscales, as indicated by the value of ( $p < 0.001$ ) in every instance. Table 5 makes it clear that, overall, Educators' self-reports show that their unique character qualities are more powerful than their principals' opinions. On average, the administrators' responses for Educators are lower than the Educators' self-report measures. The average Justice via Interaction score for Educators (based on self-response) is 26.365, whereas the average score for principals is 24.870.

On the other hand, the deviation of school instructors is the reverse. Generally speaking, Educators perceive themselves as less likely to be involved in school deviance, whereas principals believe that their subordinates are more likely to engage in such behavior (the means for the Educators' self-report are lower than the means for their principals). As an example, the mean Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural scores for Educators are 149.89, whereas the mean scores for their principals are 179.697 for their subordinates.

## Results

There were 37 items in the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (Educators) categories. Ten of the questions are positively skewed, indicating that respondents do not agree with them, while the remaining 27 items are negatively skewed, indicating that respondents agree with them. There were 37 entries in the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (principles) category. Only one item is positively skewed, indicating that respondents disagree with it, but 36 items are negatively skewed, indicating that respondents agree with them. Very excellent internal consistency is described by the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (Educators) Cronbach's alpha of 0.661, and the Justice in Distribution and Justice in Procedural (principles) Cronbach's alpha of 0.766 for Educators and principals, respectively.

There were six components to the Justice via Interaction (Educators) component. The fact that all six of the items had a negative skew indicates that the respondents agreed with them. There were six components to the Justice via Interaction (principles). The fact that all six of the items had a negative skew indicates that the



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

respondents agreed with them. Both instructors and principals have good internal consistency, as shown by the Justice via Interaction (Educators) Cronbach's alpha of 0.644 and the Justice via Interaction (principals) Cronbach's alpha of 0.611.

### **Coefficients Correlation of t-test Principals' Reports about Educators and Educators' Self-Reports of Independent Samples**

The t-test evaluates the difference between the means of two unrelated or independent groups in independent samples. The t-test determines if there is a significant difference between the mean value of the test variable for Educators (self-report) and the mean value of the test variable for principals. Independent samples t-tests were used to achieve the study's goal for each of the sub-scales and their impact on Educators' deviance in schools. There is a substantial influence in each of the aforementioned sub-scales, as indicated by the value of ( $p < 0.001$ ) in every instance. (Table 5)

The principals' assessment on Educators is on average lower than the subscales where Educators self-report measures are found. The mean of their principals' Justice via Interaction (principals) is 24.870 that of their Educators is 26.365.

The deviation of school instructors has the opposite values. The principals' report on Educators is higher than the means of the subscales where Educators self-report. The average scores of principals and Educators differ significantly across all sub-scales, as indicated by the t-values. Educators in Secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, are particularly prone to deviance, as evidenced by the very significant connection ( $p$  value of 0.000 for all sub-scales). Therefore, the reasons behind the abnormal conduct of instructors at Secondary schools were looked into and identified. Additionally, Educators' average scores are far higher than principals', which shows how this abnormal behaviour affects the school environment.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of the study was to look at the instructors' deviation from justice. Distributive & Justice in Procedural had the greatest mean value among instructors' self-reports. One may get the conclusion that instructors in schools receive very fair treatment. Educators at the school act in accordance with their understanding of distributive and procedural fairness. Educators talk to their principals about their issues. They understand that their individual achievement is a result of the success of the institution. Educators acknowledge that their workload and duties are reasonable, and they have productive relationships with principals. However, it may be concluded that they continue to contribute insufficiently to the department and school.

The principal's response for Educators showed that Distributive & Justice in Procedural had the greatest mean value overall. The mean's greatest value indicates that principals in schools are more worried about their subordinates, the Educators. One may get the conclusion that principals are friendly to them and give explanations for their choices. Educators are their subordinates, and principals are aware of their needs and potential. The principals make every effort



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

to support the Educators and provide them all the tools they need to conduct their jobs more effectively. On their part, the principals make an effort to give instructors the resources they need to ensure the institution runs well.

According to the Cronbach's alpha estimates, the principals had low internal consistency while the instructors had adequate internal consistency. One may draw the conclusion that although instructors are aware of their personal wants and issues, they are sadly unmet when discussing the needs and issues of the school. One may also draw the conclusion that while the principals serve as the schools' facilitators, the instructors only give credit to those who like them; otherwise, they engage in deviance. These findings are consistent with those of Mccardle (2007) and Martin et al. (2009) in the context of justice. Ambrose and Arnaud also came to similar findings (2005).

### Recommendations

The study's findings and conclusions lead to the following recommendations:

1. Principals can be tasked with ensuring that rules and regulations are adhered to in schools by granting them the authority to penalize their educators and enabling them to take part in the recruiting and selection of educators.
2. Educators can be given the opportunity to select the courses they wish to teach by being consulted at every stage of the subject allocation process.
3. Educators ought to have equal opportunity and no discrimination when it comes to being recommended for exams duties.
4. Principals may be held accountable by teachers for remedial action for having monthly staff meetings to discuss the curriculum and course work as well as for completing any unfinished courses.
5. There is an urgent need to develop a code of ethics code for teachers and principals.

### References

- Ambrose, L. Maureen, Seabright, A. Mark & M. Schminke, (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, Volume No.59, pp. 947-965.
- Appelbaum, S.H, Deguire, K.J. & Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behaviour, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 5(4), pp. 43-55.
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38 (2), pp.555-572. *Academy of Management Journal*, Ada, Ohio: Academy of Management, USA.



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 349-360.
- Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005) Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Volume No.78, Issue No.4, pp. 595-614.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 425-445.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume No. 88, pp. 160-169.
- Everton, W.J., Jolton, J.A., & Mastrangelo, P.M. (2007). Be nice and fair or else: understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviours, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26(2), pp. 117-131.
- Galperin, B.L., & Burke, J. R. (2006). Uncovering the Relationship Between Workaholism and Workplace Destructive and Constructive Deviance: an Exploratory Study, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol.17 (2), pp.331-347.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting WD from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 17, pp.247-63.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, Job Attitudes, and Workplace Deviance: Test of a Multilevel Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91(1), pp. 126-138.
- Kennedy, D. B., Homant, R. J. & Homant, M. (2004). Perception of injustice as a predictor of support for workplace aggression. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 18, pp. 323-336.
- Koh, C.H., & Boo, E.H.Y. (2001). The Link Between Organizational Ethics and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Managers in Singapore, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume No. 29, Issue No. 4, pp. 309-324.
- Martin, D. E., Rao, A., & Sloan, L. R. (2009). Plagiarism, integrity, and workplace deviance: A criterion study. *Journal of Ethics and Behaviour*, Vol.19 (1), pp. 36-50.
- Mccardle, G.J. (2007). *Organizational Justice and workplace deviance: The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA.
- McClurg, L.A. & Butler, D.S. (2006). Workplace Theft: A Proposed Model and



## Vol. 3 No. 6 (June) (2025)

Research Agenda, *Southern Business Review*, Vol.31, pp. 25-34.

Mitchel, M., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and work place deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume No. 92, Issue No. 4, pp.1159-1168.

Niehoff, B.P., & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviour: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Volume No. 6, pp. 209–225.

Penney, M. L. & Spector, E. P. (2002). Job Stress, incivility and counterproductive work behaviour: the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 26, pp. 777-796. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, UK.

Spector, E., & Fox, S. (2002). Emotions, Violence and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Kellowa, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour and Management*, pp: 29. *Journal of Organizational behaviour*, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, UK.

Trevino, L.K., Hartman, L.P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership, *California Management Review*, Volume No.42, Issue No. 4, pp. 128-142.