

Organizational injustice and workplace deviance: The mediating role of employee jealousy in manufacturing and service sectors

Enni Sustiyatik¹, Tontowi Jauhari²

Kadiri University, Kediri, Jawa Timur, Indonesia^{1,2}

enni_sustiyatik@unik-kediri.ac.id¹, tontowi@unik-kediri.ac.id²



Article History

Received on 22 May 2025

1st Revision on 24 June 2025

2nd Revision on 21 July 2025

Accepted on 25 August 2025

Abstract

Purpose: This study investigates the effect of organizational injustice including distributive, procedural, and interactional injustice on workplace deviance, with employee jealousy as a mediating variable. The research aims to compare these relationships across two industrial sectors: manufacturing and services in Indonesia.

Methodology: A quantitative survey design was employed involving 421 full-time employees from medium to large-sized companies located in East Java, Central Java, and Jakarta. A structured questionnaire using validated scales was distributed using stratified random sampling to ensure balanced sectoral representation. The analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 4.0 software (SmartPLS GmbH, Germany), and data preparation was performed using IBM SPSS 26.0.

Results: The findings indicate that all three types of injustice significantly increase employee jealousy. Furthermore, jealousy is a strong predictor of workplace deviance. Mediation analysis shows that jealousy significantly mediates the relationships between each dimension of injustice and workplace deviance, with interactional injustice having the strongest overall effect.

Conclusions: This study concludes that employee jealousy is a key emotional pathway through which organizational injustice leads to deviant behavior. The results emphasize the importance of fair interpersonal treatment within organizations.

Limitations: The study is limited by its cross-sectional design and reliance on self-reported data, which may introduce bias.

Contribution: To organizational behavior literature and offers practical insights for human resource management, particularly in emerging economies.

Keywords: *Employee Behavior, Human Resource Management, Jealousy, Organizational Injustice, Workplace Deviance*

How to Cite: Sustiyatik, E., & Jauhari, T. (2025). Organizational injustice and workplace deviance: The mediating role of employee jealousy in manufacturing and service sectors. *Annals of Human Resource Management Research*, 5(3), 667-679.

1. Introduction

Organizational injustice is a critical issue in contemporary organizational behavior research. It is categorized into three primary dimensions: distributive injustice (inequity in outcome distribution), procedural injustice (unfairness in decision-making processes), and interactional injustice (lack of respectful interpersonal treatment within organizations) (Shoaib and Baruch, 2019). These dimensions have been empirically shown to influence various adverse employee reactions, including workplace deviance. When employees perceive unjust treatment in the workplace, they often develop negative emotions such as frustration, resentment, and even aggression (Park et al., 2019). These emotional responses can manifest as behaviors that contradict organizational norms, including absenteeism,

sabotage, and withdrawal. Consequently, exploring the role of organizational injustice in shaping deviant behavior is crucial for developing effective human resource management strategies.

Recent studies indicate a growing trend in workplace deviance globally, including in Indonesia. According to Integrity Indonesia (2021), approximately 68% of organizations reported internal misconduct, such as fraud, asset misuse, and unjustified absenteeism, in the past two years. This is consistent with the findings of Jaeger (2024), who revealed that nearly half of global employees observed unethical conduct at work, with many failing to report it because of fear of retaliation. Workplace deviance is not limited to the manufacturing sector; it also occurs widely in service-based industries such as healthcare, finance, and education sectors. Factors such as weak supervision, inadequate reporting systems, and toxic work cultures often trigger such behaviors. Therefore, an in-depth academic investigation into the underlying causes of workplace deviance is urgently required.

One of the most dominant predictors of workplace deviance is the perception of organizational injustice (OIJ). When employees perceive inequity in reward distribution, non-transparent procedures, or discriminatory interactions with supervisors, the likelihood of deviant behavior increases (Wood, Lowman, Harms, & Roberts, 2019). Procedural injustice makes employees feel excluded from fair decision-making processes, whereas interactional injustice erodes interpersonal trust and cooperation. Several studies argue that workplace deviance is often a psychological compensation for experienced unfairness (Meng, Jiang, Su, Lu, & Chen, 2024; Qin & Zhang, 2022). Thus, identifying and addressing all three dimensions of injustice is essential for developing a healthy and ethical organizational culture that promotes employee well-being.

The impact of workplace deviance extends beyond the individual and affects broader organizational systems. Financial losses due to theft, data manipulation, or time fraud can be significant (Zappala et al., 2022). Moreover, such behavior damages team morale, fosters mistrust among coworkers and reduces collective productivity. Over time, organizations that fail to address deviance effectively may face reputational harm and struggle to retain high-performing employees. Additional costs related to employee turnover, retraining, and potential legal consequences also place a heavy burden on management. Therefore, preventive strategies based on empirical research are necessary to mitigate workplace deviance.

Research on workplace deviance is essential for creating fair, productive, and sustainable work environments. Many organizations currently adopt reactive approaches, punishing deviant employees rather than addressing the root causes. In contrast, a proactive approach that incorporates psychosocial understanding of employee behavior can lead to more sustainable outcomes (Biron, Karanika-Murray, & Cooper, 2012). Understanding how perceptions of injustice trigger deviant behavior enables organizations to design equitable policies and management practices. This aligns with the principles of sustainable human resource development and good governance. Such research also contributes strategically to the creation of culturally and psychologically healthy organizations in the workplace.

To better understand the relationship between organizational injustice and deviant behavior, researchers have proposed emotional variables as mediators, particularly employee jealousy. Workplace jealousy is a negative emotional response triggered by perceptions of unfair treatment or favoritism among peers (Nurdianto and Pratama, 2021). It is commonly intensified when reward systems are ambiguous or leadership dynamics appear biased. Unresolved jealousy can eventually lead employees to engage in counterproductive work behaviors as a form of protest or as an emotional outlet. Therefore, jealousy is a plausible mediator that explains how organizational injustice translates into deviance.

Contemporary studies support jealousy's mediating role in organizational settings. For instance, Sustiyatik, Setiono, and Ridwan (2019) found that jealousy significantly mediates the relationship between procedural injustice and destructive behaviors, such as workplace sabotage and withdrawal. Similarly, Shoaib and Baruch (2019) demonstrated that jealousy amplifies the negative impact of interactional injustice on employees' morale. However, most of these studies were conducted in manufacturing or Western contexts. There is still limited empirical evidence regarding the role of

jealousy in emerging economies such as Indonesia or across different industrial sectors. This presents an opportunity for contextually relevant future studies.

Based on the aforementioned discussion, this study aims to examine the effect of distributive, procedural, and interactional injustice on workplace deviance, with jealousy as a mediator. This study compares the findings across the manufacturing and service sectors in Indonesia. This approach seeks to enhance the theoretical understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying deviant workplace behavior while offering practical insights for organizational policy and human resource development. Ultimately, this study aspires to help organizations implement justice-oriented systems, maintain positive work climates, and improve employee satisfaction and productivity sustainably.

2. Literature review

Organizational justice has long been recognized as a critical component in shaping employee behavior. It encompasses distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, each referring to fairness in outcomes, processes, and interpersonal treatment, respectively (Hariani & Muafi, 2020). Numerous studies have examined how a lack of fairness or organizational injustice leads to counterproductive work behaviors. For instance, Park et al. (2019) emphasized that employees exposed to procedural injustice are more prone to deviant actions, particularly when they perceive supervisory conduct as abusive. This view is reinforced by Chaudhary, Bhatti, Çıpran, and Bajwa (2022), who found that injustice significantly contributes to workplace deviance, especially when linked with inadequate rewards and lack of recognition.

Distributive injustice, or the perception that reward allocation is inequitable, is consistently linked to negative employee reactions. According to Eren and Demir (2023), perceptions of unfair compensation result in lower job satisfaction and increased organizational cynicism. When employees believe that efforts and outcomes are misaligned, they are more likely to retaliate, often through withdrawal or sabotage (Hämmig, 2025). Procedural injustice, which refers to the fairness of decision-making processes, plays a significant role. Adamovic (2023) stated that employees who perceive bias in procedures are more inclined to question organizational legitimacy and engage in counter-normative behavior. Interactional injustice, defined as the lack of respectful treatment and transparent communication, may be the most emotionally charged form. Hershcovis, Cameron, Gervais, and Bozeman (2018) demonstrated that interpersonal mistreatment by leaders intensifies emotional exhaustion and triggers retaliatory actions. Zhang and Bednall (2016) showed that interactional injustice increases employee hostility, especially when coupled with low psychological safety. These findings suggest that unfair social interactions in the workplace contribute significantly to workplace deviance.

The concept of workplace deviance encompasses a range of voluntary behaviors that violate organizational norms and threaten the well-being of the organization and its members (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). Deviant behaviors include theft, sabotage, absenteeism, and the withholding of effort. A growing body of research supports the association between injustice and deviant behavior. Bordia, Restubog, and Tang (2008) found that psychological contract breach due to unfair practices is strongly correlated with interpersonal and organizational deviance. Similarly, Mubashar, Musharraf, Khan, and Butt (2022) observed that employees in high-stress environments with low justice perceptions are more likely to disengage and underperform. Recently, scholars have begun investigating the emotional mechanisms that mediate the relationship between injustice and deviant behavior. Jealousy has gained attention as a powerful affective mediator. Andiappan and Dufour (2020) described jealousy as a response to perceived inequity in valued relationships, particularly when individuals feel overlooked or underappreciated. Sustiyatik et al. (2019) demonstrated that workplace jealousy significantly mediates the effect of distributive injustice on counterproductive behaviors.

Jealousy can be exacerbated in competitive workplace environments, where resources, recognition, and promotions are limited. In such settings, perceived unfairness in treatment or opportunity distribution often leads to social comparison and negative affect (Li et al., 2023). Jealousy not only reduces organizational commitment but also increases the intention to undermine one's colleagues. When organizational justice is low, jealousy becomes a powerful emotional trigger for deviant behaviors,

acting as a cognitive mechanism that rationalizes misconduct (Hussain & Mohr, 2023). Despite these findings, research remains limited in specific cultural and industrial contexts. Much of the literature originates from Western or East Asian countries and tends to focus on the manufacturing sectors. The Indonesian context, particularly within its service industries, remains understudied. Cultural collectivism in Indonesia may alter employees' perceptions and reactions to organizational injustice. Moreover, comparative studies between sectors are limited. This study aims to address this gap by comparing the impact of injustice across the manufacturing and service sectors, with a specific focus on jealousy as a mediating variable.

Another significant gap lies in integrating multiple justice dimensions into a unified model that includes emotional mediators. While studies have examined the direct effects of justice on deviance, fewer have explored how these relationships differ across sectors or are influenced by affective states, such as jealousy. Additionally, few models incorporate jealousy when examining interpersonal and organizational deviance simultaneously. This study seeks to bridge this theoretical gap through a multidimensional analysis using a cross-sectoral sample from Indonesia. Based on a review of the literature, the following hypotheses were developed:

H1: Distributive injustice is positively associated with employee's jealousy.

H2: Procedural injustice is positively associated with employee's jealousy.

H3: Interactional injustice is positively associated with employee's jealousy.

H4: Employee jealousy is positively associated with workplace deviance.

H5: Employee jealousy mediates the relationship between distributive injustice and workplace deviance.

H6: Employee jealousy mediates the relationship between procedural injustice and workplace deviance.

H7: Employee jealousy mediates the relationship between interactional injustice and workplace deviance.

3. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative survey-based research design to examine the relationships between organizational injustice (distributive, procedural, and interactional), employee jealousy, and workplace deviance in the Indonesian manufacturing and service sectors. The research was designed to test hypotheses using a structural equation modeling (SEM) approach with SmartPLS 4.0 (SmartPLS GmbH, Germany).

3.1. Participants and Sampling

The study targeted full-time employees working in two distinct sectors: manufacturing (e.g., food and textile industries) and services (e.g., private hospitals and hospitality). The target population consisted of employees in medium-to large-sized companies (more than 50 employees) located in three major provinces in Indonesia (East Java, Central Java, and Jakarta). A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure a balanced representation from both sectors. The minimum sample size was determined using power analysis via G*Power software (version 3.1), requiring at least 200 responses per sector to achieve a statistical power of 0.8 at $\alpha = 0.05$ for SEM. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed (250 in each sector), and 421 valid responses were used in the final analysis after removing incomplete entries (response rate of 84.2%).

3.2. Questionnaire Design

The data collection instrument was a self-administered questionnaire consisting of five sections.

1. Demographics (e.g., gender, age, education, job sector, and tenure).
2. Distributive Injustice: Measured using a 5-item scale adapted from (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).
3. Procedural Injustice: Measured using a 6-item scale adapted from the same source.
4. Interactional Injustice: Measured using a 7-item scale based on the work of Bies and Moag (adapted by (Zhang and Bednall, 2016)).
5. Employee Jealousy: Measured using a 6-item scale from Vecchio (2000).

6. Workplace Deviance: Measured using a 10-item scale from Bennett and Robinson (2000), covering both interpersonal and organizational deviance. All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The questionnaire was translated into Bahasa Indonesia and back-translated into English to ensure its conceptual equivalence.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The survey was administered online (via Google Forms) and in print. The online version was shared through official company emails or HR departments, and printed questionnaires were distributed by trained enumerators. Participants were informed about the voluntary nature of the study, assured of confidentiality, and provided informed consent before participation.

3.4. Research Conditions and Assumptions

1. This study assumed that all participants answered honestly and independently.
2. Respondents had at least six months of tenure in their current organization to ensure that they had experienced the organizational climate.
3. It is assumed that all measured constructs are latent variables and that the relationships are linear and causal.
4. Measurement error was minimized using established and validated scales with reliability and validity testing.
5. Data Analysis Tools
6. Data were analyzed using
7. SmartPLS 4.0 (SmartPLS GmbH, Germany) for Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM).
8. SPSS 26.0 (IBM Corp., USA) was used for preliminary data screening, descriptive statistics, and reliability testing.

The model evaluation followed a two-stage approach.

1. Measurement model assessment: Convergent validity (using average variance extracted [AVE] and factor loadings), internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability), and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion).
2. Structural model assessment: Path coefficients, R^2 , effect sizes (f^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), and mediation testing using bootstrapping (5000 resamples).

3.5. Reproducibility

The procedure described above ensures that other researchers can replicate this study under similar conditions in the future. All scales, sampling procedures, and analytical frameworks are publicly accessible and have been validated in cross-cultural organizational behavior studies. For researchers seeking to conduct replication studies, the full questionnaire, dataset, and analysis syntax are available upon request.

4. Results and discussion

The findings of this study were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with the help of SmartPLS 4.0. Hypotheses H1–H7 were tested to examine the direct and indirect relationships between distributive injustice, procedural injustice, interactional injustice, employee jealousy, and workplace deviance. The model demonstrated strong reliability and validity, with all composite reliability (CR) values exceeding 0.7 and average variance extracted (AVE) values exceeding 0.5.

4.1. Direct Effects

Table 1 presents the results of the direct path analysis between types of injustice and employee jealousy, as well as the effect of jealousy on workplace deviance. All proposed direct paths (H1–H4) were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), supporting the hypothesized relationship.

Table 1. Relationship between organizational injustice, jealousy, and workplace deviance

Predictor	Unstd Coefficients	Std. Error	Std Coefficients Beta (β)	T	Sig – value
(Constant)	0.452			9.284	0.000
Distributive Injustice → Jealousy	0.263	0.083	0.274	3.169	0.002
Procedural Injustice → Jealousy	0.231	0.092	0.244	2.511	0.013
Interactional Injustice → Jealousy	0.289	0.081	0.302	3.568	0.000
Jealousy → Workplace Deviance	0.781	0.067	0.745	11.657	0.000

Source: Processed data by SmartPLS (2024)

These results confirm that all three forms of organizational injustice—distributive (H1), procedural (H2), and interactional (H3)—significantly contribute to increased levels of jealousy among employees. The positive and significant relationships indicate that when employees perceive injustice, regardless of whether it concerns rewards, processes, or interpersonal treatment, they are likely to experience heightened feelings of envy and resentment toward the organization. In particular, interactional injustice had the strongest standardized effect ($\beta = 0.302$), highlighting that interpersonal treatment by leaders plays a crucial role in shaping emotional responses. This underscores the importance of daily managerial interactions, where subtle cues of disrespect, exclusion, or lack of empathy can trigger significant emotional turmoil in employees. These findings support the conclusions of Zhang and Bednall (2016), who demonstrated that perceived interpersonal unfairness from supervisors evokes stronger emotional reactions than perceived injustice regarding outcomes or decision-making procedures.

The robust association between interactional injustice and jealousy also aligns with affective events theory (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1964), which suggests that day-to-day emotional interactions at work are critical triggers of employee emotions and subsequent behaviors. In a collectivist culture like Indonesia, where harmony and respect in relationships are highly valued, violations of interpersonal fairness may have an even greater psychological impact than material inequities. This cultural context may explain why interactional injustice emerged as the strongest predictor of jealousy in this study's findings. Additionally, jealousy had a very strong positive relationship with workplace deviance ($\beta = 0.745$), confirming H4. This indicates that jealousy functions as a powerful emotional mechanism that converts perceptions of injustice into harmful workplace behavior. The strength of this relationship is noteworthy and consistent with earlier findings by Hassan and Siddiqui (2021), who established that jealousy can drive counterproductive behavior when individuals feel undermined or excluded from organizational rewards and recognition. Furthermore, Chen, Xu, and He (2024) emphasized that jealousy fosters social comparison processes, leading employees to engage in behaviors aimed at leveling perceived inequalities, often through deviance directed at either colleagues or the organization itself.

Compared to studies conducted in Western contexts, the magnitude of the jealousy-deviance link observed in this study appears stronger. For example, Shoaib and Baruch (2019) reported a smaller beta value ($\beta = 0.41$) in their study of Malaysian organizations, suggesting that cultural and sectoral differences may moderate the strength of these relationships. The sectors examined in this study, manufacturing and services, also contribute to this pattern. In service-oriented work, where interpersonal interactions are frequent and central to daily tasks, feelings of jealousy may be more likely to spill over into deviant actions than in manufacturing settings, where work is often more task-focused and less relational.

These findings have important theoretical implications. They expand the understanding of how emotional mechanisms mediate the injustice-deviance link, particularly in emerging economies. The

results reinforce the need to integrate affective variables, such as jealousy, into models of organizational behavior, which have historically emphasized cognitive appraisals and rational decision-making. From a practical standpoint, these findings suggest that organizations must go beyond ensuring fairness in procedures and reward systems. They must actively cultivate respectful and inclusive interpersonal relationships. Training managers in empathy, communication, and fairness could mitigate jealousy and reduce the risk of workplace deviance.

4.2. Indirect Effects (Mediation Analysis)

To test H5–H7, a mediation analysis was conducted using the bootstrapping method with 5,000 resample. Table 2 shows the indirect effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional injustice on workplace deviance through the mediating role of jealousy.

Table 2. Indirect effects through jealousy (mediation analysis)

Path	Unstd Coefficients	Std. Error	Beta (β)	T	Sig – value
Distributive Injustice → Jealousy → Workplace Deviance	0.206	0.079	0.204	2.608	0.009
Procedural Injustice → Jealousy → Workplace Deviance	0.181	0.073	0.176	2.479	0.013
Interactional Injustice → Jealousy → Workplace Deviance	0.226	0.067	0.225	3.373	0.001

Source: Processed data by SmartPLS (2024)

All three mediation paths were statistically significant, supporting H5, H6, and H7. These results indicate that jealousy serves as a critical psychological mechanism that transmits the effects of perceived injustice, whether distributive, procedural, or interactional, to deviant behavioral outcomes. The strongest indirect effect was observed in the path from interactional injustice through jealousy ($\beta = 0.225$), reinforcing the importance of social and emotional fairness in organizational settings. This means that employees who perceive disrespect or mistreatment in daily interpersonal interactions with supervisors or colleagues are not only prone to experiencing heightened jealousy but are also more likely to engage in behaviors that violate organizational norms. The findings highlight how subtle forms of unfairness, often underestimated by managers, can have disproportionately large effects on workplace harmony and productivity in the hospitality industry.

The prominence of interactional injustice as a source of mediated deviance underscores the significance of interpersonal relationships in shaping emotional and behavioral workplace outcomes. In collectivist cultures such as Indonesia, where maintaining social harmony and saving face are deeply ingrained cultural values, violations of interactional justice may be especially detrimental. Employees may feel personally insulted or humiliated by disrespectful treatment, leading to stronger emotional reactions, such as jealousy. This reinforces the view of Zhang and Bednall (2016), who observed that perceived disrespect from supervisors evokes more intense emotional responses than unfair outcomes or processes do in various cultural contexts. Moreover, jealousy in such situations can be particularly toxic, as it not only damages individual well-being but also corrodes team cohesion and trust.

These findings provide empirical support for affective event theory Weiss and Cropanzano (1964), which suggests that emotional responses to workplace events, such as unfair treatment, can directly shape work behaviors. This theory posits that workplace events trigger affective reactions that influence subsequent attitudes and actions. In the context of this study, perceptions of organizational injustice function as negative workplace events that elicit jealousy, which leads to deviant behavior. The role of jealousy as a mediator fits within this theoretical framework, highlighting how emotions act as a bridge between situational factors and behavioral outcomes. This reinforces the idea that models of workplace behavior should not solely focus on cognitive evaluations of fairness but must also consider emotional processes.

The mediation effect of jealousy also aligns with the work of González-Navarro, Zurriaga-Llorens, Tosin Olateju, and Llinares-Insa (2018), who proposed that jealousy functions as a cognitive and emotional filter through which employees interpret organizational actions and formulate responses. According to Yarivand, Al-Shahrani, Hammad, and Malakouti (2025), jealousy fosters negative social comparisons and promotes feelings of injustice even when objective conditions may be relatively fair. This suggests that jealousy not only transmits the effects of injustice but may also amplify perceived disparities, making employees more sensitive to inequities and more prone to deviant behavior. This amplifying effect may explain why the indirect path from interactional injustice to deviance was stronger than the paths through distributive or procedural injustice in this study.

From a comparative perspective, these results are consistent with and extend the findings from other cultural settings. Awee, Mohsin, and Makhbul (2020) found a similar mediating effect of jealousy in Malaysian organizations, although the strength of the indirect effects was somewhat lower. This difference may be attributable to sectoral variations, cultural nuances, or the types of organizations examined. In the present study, the inclusion of both manufacturing and service sectors likely contributed to a richer picture of how injustice and jealousy interact to produce deviance in the workplace. Service sector employees who engage in more interpersonal interactions daily may be especially vulnerable to the negative effects of interactional injustice, thereby intensifying the jealousy-deviance link.

The practical implications of these findings are significant. Organizations must recognize that fostering a culture of interpersonal fairness is as important as ensuring fair procedures and equitable results. Therefore, human resource practices should place greater emphasis on training managers and supervisors in respectful communication, empathy, and conflict resolution. Simple managerial behaviors, such as acknowledging employee contributions, providing constructive feedback respectfully, and avoiding favoritism, can significantly reduce perceptions of interactional injustice. Furthermore, organizations should implement systems that allow employees to safely report perceived injustices, particularly those related to interpersonal treatment, without fear of retaliation. Such mechanisms could help identify and address the sources of jealousy before they escalate into deviant behaviors.

In addition to practical measures, these results offer theoretical contributions to organizational behavior studies. They highlight the need for models of workplace deviance to integrate emotional variables, such as jealousy, more systematically. Traditional models often emphasize rational processes such as cost-benefit analyses of deviant behavior or cognitive appraisals of fairness. This study suggests that emotional processes are equally, if not more, important in explaining why employees engage in deviant behavior. Future theoretical models should also consider how other emotions, such as anger, shame, or resentment, interact with jealousy to influence workplace behavior. Moreover, these findings open new avenues for future research. One promising direction is to explore the role of individual differences in moderating the effects observed in this study. For example, do employees with high emotional intelligence or resilience experience less jealousy in response to injustice, thereby reducing the likelihood of deviance in the workplace? Similarly, future studies could investigate whether organizational factors, such as ethical climate, leadership style, or team cohesion, buffer or exacerbate the jealousy-deviance pathway. Longitudinal studies would be especially valuable for establishing causal relationships and examining how these dynamics unfold over time.

The sectoral dimension of this study also requires further exploration. While this research included both the manufacturing and service sectors, a more granular analysis could reveal sector-specific patterns in the injustice-jealousy-deviance relationship. For example, employees in service roles, where relational interactions are more central to daily work, may experience stronger effects of interactional injustice than those in more task-oriented manufacturing settings. Understanding these nuances could help organizations tailor interventions more effectively to their specific contexts and needs. Finally, this study underscores the importance of the cultural context in understanding workplace deviance. In collectivist societies such as Indonesia, where group harmony and interpersonal respect are highly valued, violations of interactional justice may have more severe emotional and behavioral consequences

than in more individualistic cultures. Future cross-cultural research should test whether these patterns hold in different national settings and explore how cultural values shape emotional responses to injustice and the propensity for deviance.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the effects of organizational injustice, namely distributive, procedural, and interactional injustice, on workplace deviance, with employee jealousy as a mediating variable, in the context of the Indonesian manufacturing and service sectors. This study is motivated by the growing concern over how perceptions of unfairness within organizations can lead to harmful behaviors that undermine performance and employee well-being. By focusing on two key industrial sectors, this study provides a comprehensive view of how injustice operates in different workplace settings in Indonesia. The findings demonstrate that all three forms of injustice significantly contribute to increased employee jealousy. Distributive injustice, reflecting unfair outcomes or reward allocations; procedural injustice, concerning biased or opaque processes; and interactional injustice, involving disrespectful interpersonal treatment, each play a role in fostering negative emotional reactions. Notably, jealousy emerged as a powerful predictor of workplace deviance, validating its role as a psychological mechanism through which perceptions of injustice are translated into counterproductive behaviors, such as absenteeism, sabotage, or withdrawal.

The results also confirmed that jealousy significantly mediated the relationship between each dimension of injustice and workplace deviance. Among the three dimensions of injustice, interactional injustice exhibited the strongest direct and indirect influence, underscoring the critical role of interpersonal treatment, communication, and leadership fairness in shaping employee emotions and subsequent behaviors. These findings successfully address the research objectives and provide empirical support for affective event theory, which posits that emotional reactions to workplace events influence subsequent behavior. Moreover, this study offers practical implications for organizational leaders, emphasizing the need to promote fairness not only in policies and outcomes but also in daily interactions to foster a healthy and productive work environment.

5.2. Limitations

Despite providing meaningful insights into the dynamics of organizational injustice, jealousy, and workplace deviance, this study has some limitations. First, the use of a cross-sectional design limits the ability to draw strong causal inferences regarding the relationships between variables. Although the statistical models employed suggest significant associations between organizational injustice, jealousy, and deviance, they do not confirm the directionality or temporal order of these relationships. Longitudinal data collected over multiple time points would provide a stronger basis for establishing cause-and-effect links and could shed light on how employee perceptions and behaviors evolve in response to ongoing organizational conditions. Such an approach would also help identify whether jealousy develops gradually as injustice accumulates or whether it arises in reaction to specific, isolated incidents of unfairness.

Second, the data were obtained entirely through self-reported questionnaires. Although self-reports are a common and practical method in organizational behavior research, they carry an inherent risk of common method bias. Respondents may have answered in ways they believe are socially acceptable or that portray themselves in a favorable light, thus introducing social desirability bias. Moreover, self-report measures rely on the accuracy of individual perceptions and recollections, which can be influenced by mood, recent events, or personal interpretations of the workplace dynamics. Future research could benefit from using multiple data sources, such as supervisor ratings, peer evaluations, or objective organizational records, to triangulate the findings and enhance their validity.

Third, while this study compared two important sectors, manufacturing and services, it did not delve into sector-specific contextual factors that could influence the observed relationships. Organizational culture, leadership styles, and work structures often vary significantly between sectors and may act as moderators of the injustice-jealousy-deviance pathway. For instance, hierarchical cultures typical of

some manufacturing firms might exacerbate the impact of procedural injustice, whereas relationally intensive service environments could heighten sensitivity to interactional injustice. A more nuanced exploration of these sectoral differences would enrich our understanding of how and why injustice leads to deviant outcomes in different organizational contexts.

Moreover, the study was geographically limited to three provinces in Indonesia: East Java, Central Java, and Jakarta. While these regions offer diversity in terms of industrial activity and organizational types, the findings may not be fully generalizable to other parts of Indonesia, particularly rural or less industrialized regions. Cultural values, economic conditions, and organizational norms can differ widely across regions, potentially influencing how injustice is perceived and how employees respond. Furthermore, the generalizability of the findings to other countries and cultural contexts remains uncertain. Comparative cross-cultural studies would be valuable in determining whether the relationships observed in this study hold in different societal settings.

Finally, the conceptual model of this study focused exclusively on jealousy as a mediating variable. While jealousy plays a significant role in transmitting the effects of injustice to deviance, other emotional or cognitive mechanisms likely contribute to this process. Emotions such as anger, frustration, or shame, as well as cognitive states such as perceived control or helplessness, may interact with or independently mediate these relationships. Future studies could adopt a more comprehensive approach by integrating multiple mediators, thereby providing a richer and more complex understanding of the pathways linking organizational injustice to deviant workplace behavior.

5.3. Suggestions

Based on the findings and limitations of this study, several suggestions are proposed for future research and organizational practice. First, future studies should employ longitudinal designs to examine how organizational injustice and emotional responses, such as jealousy, evolve over time and influence long-term behavioral patterns. A longitudinal approach allows researchers to capture dynamic processes and causal relationships that unfold gradually, which are difficult to detect in cross-sectional designs. For instance, it would be valuable to observe whether sustained exposure to interactional injustice leads to cumulative increases in jealousy or whether certain employees become desensitized over time. Similarly, such designs could help identify critical periods when interventions might be most effective in preventing workplace deviance in the future.

Researchers are also encouraged to incorporate multi-source data in future investigations to overcome the limitations of self-reported measures. Collecting data from supervisors, peers, and objective organizational records (such as attendance logs or disciplinary reports) can provide a more robust and triangulated understanding of how organizational injustice influences employee attitudes and behavior. This multi-source approach would not only reduce the risk of common method bias but also capture different perspectives on workplace dynamics that self-reports alone may overlook.

In addition to methodological improvements, future research should explore additional mediating or moderating variables to deepen our understanding of the injustice–deviance relationship. For example, organizational support, perceived organizational justice climate, or team cohesion might buffer the negative effects of injustice and reduce the likelihood of jealousy and deviant behaviors in the workplace. Similarly, individual differences, such as emotional intelligence, resilience, or personality traits (e.g., agreeableness and neuroticism), may influence how employees process and react to perceived injustice. Investigating these variables could help create more comprehensive models that reflect the complexity of human behavior in organizational settings.

Sector-specific investigations are also recommended. While this study provides comparative insights between the manufacturing and service sectors, further research could explore how specific industry characteristics, such as customer orientation in service roles or hierarchical structures in manufacturing, shape the injustice-jealousy-deviance pathway. Understanding these sectoral nuances would enable the design of tailored interventions that address the unique challenges and cultural norms of each sector.

From a practical perspective, organizations should prioritize fairness in both structural and interpersonal domains to prevent the emergence of harmful emotional states and deviant behavior. Management must ensure transparency in decision-making processes, equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, and consistent policy application across all organizational levels. Fostering a culture of respect, inclusion, and open communication is equally important. Training programs aimed at improving leadership communication skills, empathy, and fairness in daily interactions can play a critical role in reducing perceptions of injustice and mitigating emotional triggers, such as jealousy. Additionally, organizations should consider establishing formal mechanisms for employees to voice their concerns about perceived injustices without fear of retaliation. By addressing these issues comprehensively, organizations can create healthier, more inclusive work environments and ultimately enhance organizational effectiveness, employee well-being, and long-term performance.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Universitas Kadiri and Lembaga Penelitian, Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat, dan Penjaminan Mutu (LP3M) Universitas Kadiri for their invaluable support in the completion of this research. This study was made possible through financial assistance and academic facilitation provided by LP3M as part of the university's commitment to advancing scientific research and community engagement. The authors also thank all the participants and organizational partners who contributed their time and responses to this study.

References

- Adamovic, M. (2023). Organizational Justice Research: A Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. *European Management Review*, 20(4), 762-782. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12564>
- Andiappan, M., & Dufour, L. (2020). Jealousy at Work: A Tripartite Model. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(1), 205-229. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0299>
- Awee, A., Mohsin, F. H., & Makhbul, Z. K. M. (2020). The Factors Why People Exert Less: The Relationship Between Workplace Envy and Social Loafing Moderated by Self-Esteem. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 27(2), 27-46. doi:<https://doi.org/10.32890/ijms.27.2.2020.7523>
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(3), 349-360. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Biron, C., Karanika-Murray, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2012). *Improving Organizational Interventions For Stress and Well-Being: Addressing Process and Context*. London: Routledge.
- Bordia, P., Restubog, S. L. D., & Tang, R. L. (2008). When Employees Strike Back: Investigating Mediating Mechanisms between Psychological Contract Breach and Workplace Deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(5), 1104-1117. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1104>
- Chaudhary, S. I., Bhatti, O. K., Çıpran, H., & Bajwa, A. H. (2022). The Conceptual Review on the Impact of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance and the Mediating Role of Psychological Contract Breach. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 11(2), 235-252. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2022.60328>
- Chen, L., Xu, Y., & He, Y. (2024). Social Media Use in the Workplace: The Role of Social Comparison in Negative Behaviors. *Acta Psychologica*, 243, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104144>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. doi:<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Eren, G., & Demir, R. (2023). The Effect of Perceived Pay Equity on Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Organizational Cynicism. *Ege Academic Review*, 23(2), 219-236. doi:<https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.1103337>
- González-Navarro, P., Zurriaga-Llorens, R., Tosin Olateju, A., & Llinares-Insa, L. I. (2018). Envy and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Moderation Role of Leadership in Public and Private Organizations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(7), 1-17. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15071455>

- Hämmig, O. (2025). Reward Frustration and Withdrawal from Work in Health Care—A Cross-Sectional Study among Health Professionals. *Frontiers in Health Services*, 5, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/frhs.2025.1498073>
- Hariani, N., & Muafi, M. (2020). Pengaruh Keadilan Organisasional terhadap Employee Engagement Dimoderasi Etika Kerja Islam. *Telaah Bisnis*, 21(1), 1-20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35917/tb.v21i1.210>
- Hassan, A., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2021). Envy, Counterproductive Work Behavior, and Wellbeing: The Role of Employee Exhaustion Complemented by LMX. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1-29. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3942287>
- Hershcovis, M. S., Cameron, A.-F., Gervais, L., & Bozeman, J. (2018). The Effects of Confrontation and Avoidance Coping in Response to Workplace Incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 163-174. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000078>
- Hussain, U., & Mohr, I. (2023). Dispositional Malicious Envy and Workplace Deviance: Divergent Thinking as a Mediator. *Sage Open*, 13(4). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231200310>
- Jaeger, J. (2024). ECI's 2023 Global Business Ethics Survey Reveals Harsh Realities About E&C Programs. Retrieved from https://www.navex.com/en-us/blog/article/ecis-2023-global-business-ethics-survey-reveals-harsh-realities-about-ec-programs/?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Li, M., Xu, X., & Kwan, H. K. (2023). The Antecedents and Consequences of Workplace Envy: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 40(1), 1-35. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-021-09772-y>
- Meng, R., Jiang, Z., Su, Y., Lu, G., & Chen, C. (2024). The Effect of Perceived Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviant Behavior of New Nurses: The Role of Emotional Labor and Psychological Capital. *BMC Nursing*, 23(1), 1-11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01937-6>
- Mubashar, T., Musharraf, S., Khan, S., & Butt, T. A. (2022). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Role of Organizational Trust. *Cogent Psychology*, 9(1), 1-16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2022.2080325>
- Nurdianto, W., & Pratama, A. A. N. (2021). Pengaruh Work Pressure, Job Insecurity dan Workplace Favouritism Terhadap Turnover Intention dengan Taqwa Sebagai Variabel Pemoderasi. *Journal of Management and Digital Business*, 1(2), 73-89. doi:<https://doi.org/10.53088/jmdb.v1i2.80>
- Park, H., Hoobler, J. M., Wu, J., Liden, R. C., Hu, J., & Wilson, M. S. (2019). Abusive Supervision and Employee Deviance: A Multifoci Justice Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(4), 1113-1131. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3749-2>
- Qin, G., & Zhang, L. (2022). Perceived Overall Injustice and Organizational Deviance—Mediating Effect of Anger and Moderating Effect of Moral Disengagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1023724>
- Shoaib, S., & Baruch, Y. (2019). Deviant Behavior in a Moderated-Mediation Framework of Incentives, Organizational Justice Perception, and Reward Expectancy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(3), 617-633. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3651-y>
- Sustiyatik, E., Setiono, B. A., & Ridwan, A. (2019). Practices of Injustice and Workplace Deviance: The Case of ASEAN Manufacturing Firm. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 20(1), 447-455. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2019.20.1.38>
- Vecchio, R. P. (2000). Negative Emotion in the Workplace: Employee Jealousy and Envy. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(3), 161-179. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009592430712>
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1964). Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of The Structure, Cause and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work. *Research in Organization Behavior: Journal An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, 18(1), 34-74.
- Wood, D., Lowman, G. H., Harms, P., & Roberts, B. W. (2019). Exploring the Relative Importance of Normative and Distinctive Organizational Preferences as Predictors of Work Attitudes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 104(2), 270-292. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000356>
- Yarivand, M., Al-Shahrani, H. F., Hammad, M. A., & Malakouti, M. (2025). The Moderating Role of Perceived Injustice in the Relationship between Being Envied

- and Social Undermining in Public Sector Organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1-12. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1582051>
- Zappala, S., Sbaa, M. Y., Kamneva, E. V., Zhigun, L. A., Korobanova, Z. V., & Chub, A. A. (2022). Current Approaches, Typologies and Predictors of Deviant Work Behaviors: A Scoping Review of Reviews. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-22. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.674066>
- Zhang, Y., & Bednall, T. C. (2016). Antecedents of Abusive Supervision: a Meta-analytic Review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 455-471. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2657-6>