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Abstract

Organizational justice means perceptions of people regarding justice on justice issues in the organization. Understanding of organizational justice or injustice is a main factor affecting the behaviors and attitudes of Human resources in organizations. This study aims to examine causal relationship between the variables of organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice and organizational misbehavior. The research method is a descriptive survey. This study was conducted in a software Company in Tehran City in Iran, and for this purpose 183 employees were taken as sample. Questionnaire was used as data collection instrument, and PLS and SPSS 17.0 software's was used to analyze the data. The validity of the instrument was achieved through content validity and the reliability through Cronbach Alpha. All the hypotheses of the research were accepted according to their significant figure and findings revealed that organizational justice and its three dimensions as independent variables are negatively associated with organizational misbehavior as dependent variable.
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Introduction

Organizations are the most essential sections of a community which play a main role in life of humans. Human resources are the more important asset of an organization. Literature has consistent shown that understanding of organizational justice or injustice is a main factor affecting the behaviors and attitudes of Human resources in organizations (Tziner and Sharoni, 2014). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, researches concentrated on justice as an antecedent to deviant employee behavior such as organizational misbehavior. Moreover, numerous researches have assessed the relationships among the various forms of organizational justice and types of deviance in workplace (Aquino and Galperin, & Bennett, 2004; Galperin, & Bennett, 2004; Ambrose et al., 2002; Skarlicki et al., 1997). In the research literature, organizational justice is proposed to have negative effects on organizational misbehavior (De Schrijver, 2010 & Trevino and Weaver, 2001 & Hollinger, 1991).

Organizational misbehavior can be described as “any intentional act by employees in organizations that violates main societal and organizational norms” and can be divided into employees own misbehavior, Direct observation of misbehavior, indirect knowledge of misbehavior and Prevalence of misbehavior. Also, organizational misbehavior consists of actions which injure an organization and its or diverge from the values and norms which are stipulated by an unit, organization or society generally (Ter Maat & Aarsten, 2005). The misbehavior is a topic of growing concern to a board scope of organizational behavior scholars. Organizational misbehavior can eventuate in a decrease of productivity, damage to the organization popularity or business, damages to customers and employees, and exposure to costly legal obligation.

A scientific and practically pertaining problem is the subject as to how organizational misbehavior can be decreased. Much scholarly consideration has been assigned to the variables that drive employees to engage in organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). However, our experimental knowledge about how to dominate organizational misbehavior is yet confined (Brown et al. 2005; Brown & Trevino, 2006) and despite a lot of scientific work from many researchers, more investigation is needed to perceive the effects of organizational justice on organizational misbehavior. Also, the aim of this article is to empirically investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational misbehavior among staffs of a software Company in Tehran City.

Organizational justice and Organizational misbehavior

From the 1990s, the variable of misbehavior also became a favorite issue for scholarly discussion in the field of organizational behavior (Vardi and Weitz, 2004; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Sagie et al., 2003). One of the more constant Infrastructures used to understand organizational misbehavior is the rule of justice (Adams 1963, Grenberg 1990). Hollinger (1991) concluded that, employees in organizations accord rightful on misbehavior because they realized that the organization had wronged them for not exercising justice at job. Prior researches have indicated that organizational justice by the organization is important determinants of misbehavior (Rousseau 1989, Greenberg 1990). Peoples were more likely to retaliate by engaging in actions
of misbehavior when they realized that organizational injustices had happened. The perceived injustice is the best predictor of organizational misbehavior (Ambrose et al., 2002).

The searches concentrated on three various forms of justice understanding: distributive justice, procedure justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice is a important dimension that can be described as the normative elements designed to guide the allocation of the benefits and responsibility of economic action. The procedural justice is fairness of processes and Procedures i.e., decision making procedures and interactional justice is degree to which the employee affected by decision is behaved by respect and grandeur. Justice in Organizational practices certainly influences the manners in which employees behave and work. For instance, an employee may choose to desolation the assembly line in response to a perceived injustice. Employees who sense misbehaved by their organizations may feel the necessity to retaliate or get even, and often in a manner that seeks to injure the organization. Perceptions of justice and organizational justice in one’s work environment are positively depended with self-report of misbehavior in organization (Martinson, Crain and De Vries and Anderson, 2011). Scholars who realize that they are being unjustly treated are and more likely to report misbehavior (Martinson, Crain and De Vries and Anderson, 2011). Employees who perceive their job atmosphere as being unwelcoming or non-supportive they are more likely to display counterproductive or negative behaviors (Wolf et al., 2012: 666). Also, literatures investigated organizational misbehavior as a sort of reciprocal action against one’s employer for perceived misbehavior (Ferguson, 2007).

One research concludes that interactional justice was negatively correlated to organizational misbehavior (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999). Gholipour et al (2009) found that there is a positive, significant and remarkable relationship between injustice and anti-citizenship behaviors (Gholipour, Saeidinejad and Zehtabi, 2009) such as misbehavior. Also, Siasi et al (2014) indicated that there is a positive and significant relation between interactional justice, procedural justice and distributive justice with anti-citizenship behaviors (Siasi and Ansari, ). However, as Trevino and Weaver (2001) discuss, a variable that is thoroughly absent in the description of organizational misbehavior, is perceived justice (e.g. Trevino & Weaver, 2001 and Martinson et al., 2006). Jelinek and Ahrean (2006) indicated that organizational agents such as organizational justice affect anti-citizenship behaviors; Ball et al., (1994) found that procedural justice and distributive justice have effects on anti-citizenship behaviors; it should be considered that the employees have the potential to respond to the unjust behaviors of organization by anti-citizenship behaviors (Gholipour, Saeidinejad and Zehtabi, 2009). For instance it has been seen that employees often perceive that punishments and rewards are not divided justly among them (Donath, 1999).

Research expanded to evaluate the effect of organizational justice perceptions on organizational misbehaviors. Much of the studies on organizational misbehavior is concentrated on detecting the reason of organizational misbehavior, without addressing the question as to how it can be decreased. Also there has been little investigation on the relationship between Organizational justice and organizational misbehavior.
Organizational justice and Organizational misbehavior: a software Company in Tehran City

Human resource is investigated as most important resource of an organization to make it successful and the myriad of pressing subjects in better education require shift which cannot happen without institutionally engaged employees. Organizations employees perform a vital role in forming the personality of organizations environments. They organize the durability, matter, and quality of the work operations. Thus, it is vital for scholars to start surveying what thinks about justice in terms of their participation in decision-making, and the effect of perceived justice in shaping employees behaviors and attitudes in organizations. Schrijver (2010) indicated that organizational justice negatively related with organizational misbehavior. Furthermore, Trevino and Weaver (2001) conclude in their research that the more employees perceive that their organization is fair, the less they perceive their university to be undertaken in behavior that damages the organization. Every employee require justice in their organization environment, in terms of distribution of compensations, justice procedures used to determine compensations, interaction with managers to make them more committed and satisfied with their job and organization. When employees are behaved justly overall in the organization, they sense need of reciprocal response to the organization in affirmative behaviors (Aslam and Sadaqat, 2011). Considerable consideration is paid to the software Companies working surroundings, highlighting its active participation in presenting similar working opportunities and justice for all its organization activities; as well as, this higher education institution’s working atmosphere is regarded as a community (Norsilan and Omar and Ahmad, 2014).

Furthermore, the procedures that organizations employees perceive the justice of their behavior and the perceived justice of the distribution of resources are vital antecedents of misbehavior. Skarlicki and Folger (1997) proved that procedural justice may be further broken down into the justice of the decisions, the way in which they are offered, and the behavior accorded the effected employees once the decision has been made. This is termed interactional justice. Organizations practices and policies clearly influence the manners in which employees misbehave and work. Inequity theory (Adams, 1963) demonstrated that employees compare the total of the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards they receive for the attempt they put into the reward others get for their task.

Thus, the current article aims to contribute the influence of justice perceptions on organizational misbehavior in a software Company in Tehran City. From the above mentioned concepts the following main hypothesis is developed: The first hypotheses assume that the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the organizational justice. The second hypotheses assume that the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the distributive justice. The third hypotheses assume that the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the procedural justice. And finally the fifth hypotheses assume that the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with interactional justice.
Method

Objectives of this research are found out the relationship between organizational justice and organizational Misbehaviors among employees of a software Company in Tehran City in 2015. The current research has a descriptive-correlative method. The matters are chosen among employees of a software Company in Tehran City. Data collection is done through random sampling. First, a group of 30 persons were selected from the subjects and the questionnaire distributed among them. After extracting the data from the responses of the intended group and the variance estimate, the volume of the sample of the study was drawn by using Cookran formula. 183 persons were selected randomly as the subjects of the study. In this research, questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. It included measures on organizational justice (dimensions of distributive, procedural and interactional) and organizational misbehavior (Respondent’s Own misbehavior, Direct observation of misbehavior, Indirect Knowledge of misbehavior and Prevalence of misbehavior). For measurement of organizational justice, we used of Mormon questionnaire. Also, the data collection instrument for organizational misbehavior was a researcher-developed questionnaire which its items were rated according to 5 point Likert scale. The validity of its content was ensured by using the expert viewpoints and consensus. The validity of its structure was measured through using the structural functions. The internal reliability of the items was verified by computing the Cranach's alpha. Nunnally (1978) suggested that a minimum alpha of 0.7 sufficed for stage of search. The Cranach alpha estimated for organizational justice was 0.771 and organizational misbehavior was 0.87. As the Cranach's alpha in this research was all much higher 0.7, the constructs were therefore deemed to have adequate reliability.

In table 1 our research the reliability of the items is checked through Cranach's alpha which shows that our research variables are reliable and there exists internal consistency between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cranach's Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>0/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distributive justice</td>
<td>0/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional justice</td>
<td>0/883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedural justice</td>
<td>0/833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational misbehaviour</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha between research variables

Measures

Organizational justice was measured using twelve items covering perceived distributive justice (4 items), interactional justice (4 items) and procedural justice (4 items). Also, organizational misbehavior was measured using Fifteen items covering Respondent’s Own misbehavior (5 items), Direct observation of misbehavior (5 items), Indirect Knowledge of misbehavior (5
items) and Prevalence of misbehavior (5 items): These items were answered on a scale from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 5 (very strongly agree). Sociopolitical information was obtained regarding participants’ gender, age, level of education, length of service, and religiosity. The social demographic qualifications of the participants are as follows: 93 people (%50.8) are male and 90 people (%49.2) are female participated to the research. The educational background of the participants is; 25 people (%13.7) have diploma, 29 people (%15.8) have Associate course degree, 76 people (%41.5) have b.sc degree, 45 people (%24.6) have M. sc degree and 8 people (%4.4) have PhD degree. The age classification of participants are; 4 people (%4.2) are between 18-20; 50 people (%27.3) are between 21-30; 70 people are (%38.3) between 31-40; 54 people (%29.5) are between 41-50; and 5 people (%2.7) are more than the age of 50. The seniority of participants are; 27 people (%14.8) have less than 5 year seniority; 50 people (%27.3) have 5-10 year seniority; 56 people (%30.6) have 10-15 year seniority, 36 people (%19.7) have 15-20 year seniority and 14 people (%7.7) have 20-25 year seniority. Table 2 shows all relevant average, standard deviations and Pearson correlation coefficient of all variables. All variables are significant relevant at the 0.05 level correlation, among which organizational justice and organizational misbehavior are significantly negatively correlated (C = -0.421). Also, organizational misbehavior and distributive justice (C = -0.274), interactional justice (C = -0.385) and procedural justice (C = -0.406) are significantly negatively correlated. The highest correlation was found between organizational justice and procedural justice (C = 0.890), whereas the lowest correlation was found between organizational justice and organizational misbehavior (C = -0.421).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizational justice</td>
<td>3.622</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 distributive justice</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 interactional justice</td>
<td>3.859</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 procedural justice</td>
<td>3.751</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 organizational misbehaviour</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Correlation Between research variables

**Test of structural model:** In this research, we used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) for data analysis. The conceptualized model of research ran as a structural model to test research hypotheses. The method of maximum likelihood estimation in PLS software was used to analyze data and hypotheses testing. To assess the fitness of the proposed model, z significant factor were used. After refining the initial structure model, all of the goodness of fit indexes was found within acceptable range indicating that the model of the research has a good fitness. According to the indexes it can be concluded that the model have a relatively good fitness. Through structural equation modeling hypotheses were examined and path of structural models were evaluated. Each path is corresponds to one of the model assumptions and Numbers on the path is path coefficients. The path coefficients indicate direct effect of one variable on other variables. Whatever path coefficients are higher, the effect of predictive in Latent variable would be higher than dependent variable. The analyses show that the value of the z significant factor between
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organizational justice and misbehavior is 0.609, between Distributive justice and misbehavior is 0.637, between procedural justice and misbehavior is 0.724 and finally between interactional justice and misbehavior is 0.688. According to the indexes it can be concluded that the model have a relatively good fitness. In Table 3 the composite reliability of each variable was examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distributive justice</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional justice</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misbehaviour</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: AVE values and composite reliability**

**Finding**

In the Table 4 research Hypothesis was examined. The Information about any hypothesis Included Beta, T, Sig and Result For each of the variables in research Hypothesis was examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organizational justice and misbehaviour</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distributive justice and misbehaviour</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedural justice and misbehaviour</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional justice and misbehaviour</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: analyzing the hypotheses of research**

Along with results which are congruent with previous findings, the most important finding of this study is the positive fit indexes of modified model in the context of a software Company in Tehran City. This research included four dependent variables; the first one was “organizational justice” which is also referred to and explained as people’s subjective sense of fairness. The applied analyses yield significant results, providing the evidence that H1 is true. The analyses show that the value of the correlation between organizational justice and misbehavior is -0.421 and T is 28.37 and significant is 0.00, (p < .005). Thus, Organizational justice is negatively associated with organizational misbehavior. If the workforce polices and management of an organization has the justice to help one another, it will naturally result in the decrease of misbehavior in the organization and consequently the organization itself. The second variable i.e. distributive justice was also identified to have a tremendous role in the decrease of misbehavior in the organization. Distributive justice is a main dimension that can be defined as the "normative principles designed to guide the allocation of the benefits and burdens of
economic activity. The results shown in correlation table indicate that the relationship between distributive justice and organizational misbehavior was significantly negative i.e. -0.428. Also, T value is 20.587 and significant is 0.00, (p < .005). Thus, Distributive justice is negatively associated with organizational misbehavior. The third variable was procedural justice which is also referred to and explained as fairness of procedures i.e., decision making procedures being perceived as fair. The applied analyses yield negative results, providing the evidence that H3 is true. The analyses show that the value of the correlation between procedural justice and misbehavior is -0.406** and T value is 25.415 and significant is 0.00, (p < .005). Thus, procedural justice is negatively associated with organizational misbehavior. If the procedures, process of decision making and performance evaluation of an organization was correct, it will naturally result in the decrease of organizational misbehavior. Finally, interactional justice was the last among the chosen antecedents of organizational misbehavior. Interactional justice can be explained as the degree to which the people affected by decision are treated by dignity and respect. Interactional justice can also help to make the environment of the organization better and calm and it can help to make affable relationship with peers. The correlation result is showing the significant result on the relationship between interactional justice and organizational misbehavior. The value yielded by this study for correlation interactional justice and organizational misbehavior is -0.385. Also, T value is 24.160 and significant is 0.00, (p < .005). Thus, interactional justice is negatively associated with organizational misbehavior. Generally this finding indicates that organizational injustice can influence employee's misbehavior. In fact using fair in a software Company in Tehran City decreases employee's job misbehavior. Employees, who are satisfied from justice on their job, are more committed to organization and subsequently are more engaged in good behaviors. This result is also congruent with previous studies (Moorman et al., 1993; Clay-Warner, Reynolds & Roman, 2005) which they have found organizational injustice as an important antecedent of organizational misbehavior.

Conclusions

Organizational misbehavior mostly has a intense and destructive effect on the organization in which it arises, also on the organization’s employees. On an individual and organizational level, the hurt it brings can be considerable or moderate, emotional or monetary or both. This research purposes to investigate causal relationship between the variables of organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice and organizational misbehavior. The organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the organizational justice in first hypotheses. In second hypotheses the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the distributive justice. The organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with the procedural justice in third hypotheses and in fourth hypotheses the organizational misbehavior is negatively associated with interactional justice. These results are consistent with previous research (De Schrijver, 2010 & Trevino and Weaver, 2001 & Gholipour et al, 2009 & Hollinger, 1991). The findings of this research have several implications for software Companies and public and private organizations managers, researchers and policy makers. Variable and Sub variables of organizational justice are influential in motivating good behaviors indicators in organizations. They should furnish themselves with qualities which enhances such dimensions.
Involving employees in decision making processes and procedures and behaving justly with them increases their trust and motivates their work related perceptions and attitudes. Policy makers who have shared managerial manner can develop high quality employees which are eager to engage in good behaviors. Failure to improve attitudes and perceptions of justice can eventuate in overt behaviors that may reduce from a inclination to share vital information and knowledge, resulting in misbehavior through a lack of attempt, interest and attendance. Various attitudes and perceptions exist between management and employees requiring obvious expression of expectations to prevent attitudes of unjust distribution. Achievements should be defined to help promote good behavior levels. Organization managers training should include methods and ways to elicit employee's thoughts on justice and identify causes of injustice. With a high excellent of interpersonal interaction in the organization, employees decrease the organizational misbehavior. Organizations should reinforce the development of good relationship between manager and their employees. Since employees have a Lower degree of misbehavior in their manager when they realize a larger level of interactional justice, organizations should reinforce the expansion of close relationships between manager and their employees. With a excellent quality of manager–employee interaction and interpersonal behavior in the organization, organizations managers can reinforce good behaviors among Iranian employees. Therefore, managers need training to learn how to behave their employees politely and justly to increase their interpersonal capabilities and supervisory.

One manner to reinforce procedural justice climate is by ensuring that compensations are given out consistently and accurately. Employees focus or surveys teams can present an perfect illustrate of whether the processes used to provide compensation systems and the way those rewards are viewed by the receivers. Moreover, our outcomes confirm that the manager who implements the reward policies and programs must set obvious ground principles so that employees are justification on what is expected of them and the reward they will receive for useful attempt. Some rules such as the use of employee election manners designed to screen for potentially aggressive employees, sanctions to discourage aggressive actions, procedures designed to decrease perceptions or feelings of injustice, and implementation of training programs to provide individuals with developed social abilities, behavioral alternatives, and to coping strategies aggression may prove beneficial in preventing and controlling misbehavior in organization. Furthermore, more focus should be paid to the process of distribution of results and rewards consistent and justly procedures regarding recruitment, promotion and performance evaluation should be expanded. The constant and justly procedures regarding job and recruitment are more considerable for the improvement of procedural justice in good behaviors. Decisions about promotions, payment, and other tangible results should involve this manager as the most frequent communicator with the employee. The organizations need to pay more consideration to policies, procedures and programs that patronize justice in order to elevate employee good behavior.

Knowing how perceived justice affect in good behavior and allows the management of organizations to take appropriate actions to improve the behaviors levels of employees. The research literature on distributive justice discusses that paying compensation above the market clearing level may be a manner of discouraging misbehavior. The organizational misbehaviors
can be reduced by paying focus to the development of distributive justice: specifically the organization should concentrate on justly distribution of compensation and on providing congenial and ready access to colleagues, employees, and management. In this manner, distributive justice is increased to enhance good behavior in organization. If the effort–reward ratio is not proportional, some will feel that they are overpayment, whilst others will feel they are overpayment.

The more consideration should be paid in managers to the distribution of results and compensations so as to improve distributive justice, as well as, principal assessment of employee's misbehavior can generate bias because principals may not be capable to perceive or understand all employees behaviors and particularly misbehaviors. These constraints could be avoided in subsequent research. This research is performed in a software Company in Tehran City. A similar research should be performed in other software Companies or in other public Companies to compare the conclusions.
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