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ABSTRACT

Extending the efforts of previous researchers, this study aimed at developing a causal model assimilating the emotional mechanism of perceived injustice and job outcome relationship through episodic envy. The research examined the main and indirect effects of perceived injustice types on job related behavioral job outcomes (organizational and interpersonal deviance, job performance, OCB) and employee’s turnover intentions. The findings significantly supported the assertion that episodic envy mediated this relationship. In addition, this study also investigated the coping capacity of psychological capital in this relationship. The findings revealed that psychological capital tends to moderate the negative effects of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcomes in such that individuals with high psychological capital are less likely to influence their job outcomes detrimentally. The findings also suggest that psychological capital buffers the negative effect of episodic envy on employee’s job performance. The findings are also discussed in terms of its practical and theoretical implications at the end.

Keywords: Perceived injustice, Episodic envy, Psychological capital.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction:
The study of justice has deep roots in literary history and can be traced back in the philosophical literature of Plato and Socrates (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Colloquially, the term justice is used to synonymize the terms of "righteousness" or "oughtness" (Colquitt, 2001). The term “fair” is defined in the internet dictionary as “free from bias or dishonesty, equitable, impartial, legitimate, in accordance with the rules or standards and offering an equal chance of success”. In literature, Cohen (1986, p.4) described justice as “central moral standard against which social conduct, practices, and institutions are evaluated”. Positioning it briefly, ‘fairness’ represents the idea of being treated equally, justly and with “rightness”. Here, being treated fairly, equally or justly indicates that one is dealt with in the same evenhanded, impartial path as one's colleagues, neighbors or friends are dealt with. Justice is, perhaps, one of the primogenital philosophical phenomenon as Rawls (1971, p.3) describes justice to be “the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought”.

Adam’s equity theory was one of the first efforts which explain justice in psychology studies but in social psychological context (Adams, 1963, 1965). However, the notion of organizational justice has flourished in organizational psychology in the last 30 years (Colquitt, 2001). Since then, scholars from industrial psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior extensively studied this phenomenon (Colquitt et al., 2001; Folger, Cropanzano, Greenberg, & Cropanzano, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Although the research on organizational justice is voluminous, at its core, organizational justice is considered as an important factor that shaped and/or related with a variety of psychological and workplace

However, the research on justice literature has changed in certain aspects in last couple of decades. First, the scholars emphasized on the role of social exchange theory as the literature moved from “an emerging lens for justice phenomena” to the explanatory phase of justice effects (Colquitt, 2008; Cropanzano & Rupp, 2008; Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott, & Livingston, 2009). In their effort to relate justice in social exchange context, scholars argued that justice perceptions stimulate the reciprocal actions on the part of employees (Colquitt et al., 2009; Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, & Schminke, 2001; Mowday, 1991). In an earlier article, this instinct is labeled as universal norm that demands from individuals to help those who help them (Gouldner, 1960). In general, explaining social exchange theory in this context also well suited for explaining that why beneficial actions by organizations and/or supervisors might reciprocated by favorable actions by employees.

On the other hand, justice literature is changed in another way, whereby, scholars shifted their focus on investigating that whether affect has any place in justice issues. After decades of
painting individuals as “rational beings” who reasons about justice, researchers started to acknowledge that individuals also “feel” it (De Cremer, 2007; Cropanzano, Stein, & Nadisic, 2011). Although emotions were frequently discussed in justice literature but there remains a debate about the role of emotions in the justice models (Folger, Rosenfield, & Robinson, 1983). The same is also observed by De Cremer (2007) in his investigation on advancement in psychology of justice and affect where he explicitly emphasized that, “relatively little progress has been made in exploring the relationship between two concepts that, by their very nature, should have a friendly relationship, namely, justice and affect.” (p. 2). A similar observation was also narrated by Cropanzano et al. (2011) where they questioned the progress on justice and affect research in these words, “Given the natural affinity between (in)justice and affect, integrating the two literatures has been slower than one might expect.” (p. 3). A similar notion, based on similar observation, has emphasized that the researchers are more inclined to investigate the direct effects of justice and complex integrative models are yet to be explored (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003). Zapata-Phelan et al., (2009) also noted the same and specified that, “based on the current state of research, it is virtually impossible to understand why fair treatment can have positive consequences”.

As a result, current literature is not sufficient to fully understand that how justice perception influences individual’s attitudes and behavior (Colquitt, 2004; Masterson et al., 2000). Extending the efforts of these scholars, this study propagates that perceived injustice is undoubtedly the compelling force which induce individuals towards deviant behavior but it’s not just perceived injustice rather the negative emotions, shaped from this perception, which lead employees to workplace deviance. Previous organizational psychology scholars have labeled perceived unfairness as an emotionally laden experience (Barclay et al., 2005). The previous research in
the justice and emotion domain has suggested that the perceptions of injustice can elicit a range of qualitatively different emotions (Aquino et al., 2006; Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Barclay et al., 2005; Jones & Skarlicki, 2003). Hummer (1992) also argued that our capacity to do things in a just and right manner also depends more on our capacity of sympathy and not solely on cognitive, rational deliberation. Thus, in this view, emotions play an important role in shaping this deliberative justice process in our social environment.

Considerable justice literature indicated, explicitly or implicitly, emotions as the central player which translate a sense of unfairness into work behaviors (Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999). For example, Bies and Tripp (2002) suggest emotions as “part of the relationship between experience of injustice and tendency to retaliate”, but little effort is made to empirically examine the mediating role of emotions in such relationships. Considering this key question in literature, this research aimed at providing a quantitative synthesis of the relationship between injustice perceptions and job outcomes, through the mechanism of emotion of episodic envy. Episodic envy is more relevant in explaining the (in)justice and outcome relationship because it can be experienced by anyone, regardless of one’s general level of feelings of inferiority or ill will and is generally experienced towards a specific person and is also limited to a particular experience or event (Cohen-Charash, 2009). Moreover, at its core, emotion of envy has often reported as detrimental to workplace outcomes (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2004; Gino & Pierce, 2009; Tai, Narayanan, & McAllister, 2012; Vecchio, 2005). Although the majority literature poses envy with negative outcomes, recent studies revealed that it may also lead to certain positive outcomes in certain situations. These include increased admiration for the envied target (Van de Ven, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2009) and increased motivation (Cohen-Charash, 2009). This alternate explanation of envy can also be traced in past literature (Neu,
1980; Rawls, 1971), whereby, scholars posit this emotion as self-motivating force to reduce the social imbalance by lifting oneself up rather than pulling the envied other down (Van de Ven et al., 2009). However, the extent to which this emotion of envy lead to negative and/or positive consequences may depend on certain key moderating factors (Tai et al., 2012).

The current study is an attempt to provide the synthesis to this true nature of envy by understanding the emotion laden mechanism, through which injustice perceptions influence individuals' attitudinal and behavioral job outcomes. This is in line with the strong theoretical notion of affective event theory (AET) which illustrates that employees evaluate organizational events, and based on their assessment, they experience emotions that subsequently influence their attitudes and behaviors (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Following the same view, current research argued that event of injustice triggers the negative emotion of episodic envy and resultantly influence the job outcomes adversely. However, the extent to which employee’s job outcomes will be affected depends on their psychological capabilities. Therefore, this study is an attempt to advance the knowledge on justice literature by examining episodic envy as an mediating mechanism in the relationship of perceived injustice and individual's attitudinal and behavioral job outcomes i.e. interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions.

The existing literature supported the notion that frustrated environment of organizations can compel organizational members to involve in workplace deviant behaviors because of their disturbed feelings (Fujishiro & Heaney, 2007; Griffin, 2005; Hershcovis et al., 2007). Organizational members who sense greater pressure, either from perceived injustice or any other factor, in work settings may also experience greater possibility of triggering the negative emotions and this will lead them to exhibiting low tolerance behavior (Ambrose, 2002; Ambrose
et al., 2002; Beugré, 2005; Beugre & Baron, 2001; Folger & Baron, 1996; Greenberg, 1990a, 1990b; Greenberg & Alge, 1998). Literature gives strong support for the view that perceived injustice has that knack to elicit negative outcomes like theft (Greenberg, 1990a), retaliation (Beugré, 2005; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) and aggressive behavior (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Folger & Baron, 1996). The current study infers the framework by considering perceived injustice as possible source of triggering negative emotions of episodic envy, resultantly shaping the job outcomes undesirably. However, this adverse effect of episodic envy depends on the psychological resources that an individual holds.

This coping capability of psychological resources is harmonized by previous researchers, whereby, they explained that the relationship of negative emotions and its adverse consequences can be moderated by different factors like personality attributes, social environment and self-belief (Abbas, Raja, Darr, & Bouckenooghe, 2014; Jex & Bliese, 1999; Jex & Elacqua, 1999; Lehner, Azeem, Haq, & Sharif, 2014; Mossholder, Bedein, & Armenakis, 1982). Following this theoretical conception, the current research also seeks to investigate the moderating role of a high order construct of individual’s self-belief that has now being studied in organizational psychology research at large i.e. psychological capital, which is “an individual’s positive psychological condition of development” and include four components i.e. (1) self-efficacy (being confident to perform challenging task); (2) Optimism (to develop a positive urge or feeling of being successful in present and future); (3) Hope (provides willingness and energy to attain a specific task or goal) and; (4) Resilience (sustaining and bouncing back after an adverse or problematic situation to attain success) (Abbas et al., 2014; Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009; Luthans et al., 2007). When employees at workplace faced social unfairness, in order to make balance, he/she makes effort to successfully cope with such stressful condition (Abbas et al.,
2014; Hobfoll, 2011; Lehner et al., 2014). These efforts of coping depend on psychological resource (Treadway, Hochwarter, Kacmar, & Ferris, 2005). In this research, researcher proposed that psychological capital will work as psychological resource which helps in coping individuals with negative emotions.

1.2 Problem Statement:

Previous researchers reported workplace deviance as pervasive, detrimental and threatening to organizations and its members (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Griffin & Lopez, 2005; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). For instance, United States’ Department of Justice stated in their report that about 1.7 million Americans experience one or the other type of violent oppressions at workplace per annum (U. S. Department of Justice, 2000). In earlier studies, about 40% to 75% females and 13% to 30% males reported the victimization of sexual harassment at workplace in American public and private sector organizations (McDonald, 2012; Aggarwal and Gupta, 2000). Beside sexual harassment, employees also reported that they receive threats of physical ill will (Northwestern Life Insurance Company, 1993). Research in recent past accused the demanding corporate world tensions for increase in significant level of misconduct on the part of employees. For example, every three out of four employees have reported to steel from their employer at least once in their career (Coffin, 2003; McGurn, 1988). Moreover, earlier scholars also reported that 33% to 75% of the employees have involved in one or the other type of workplace deviant conduct such as unwarranted breaks from work, theft, bullying, fraud, spreading rumor, sabotage, and absenteeism (Case, 2000; Harper, 1990).

Such acts of non-conformity to the organizational norms cost enormous loss to organizations. For example, earlier surveys stated that US economy has to face billions of dollars loss for such acts of deviant behavior at workplace in recent years (Bowling & Gruys, 2010; Stewart, Bing,
Davison, Woehr, & McIntyre, 2009). The annual costs of such deviant acts have been estimated around $4.2 billion for workplace violence (Bensimon, 1994), $40 to $120 billion for theft (Buss, 1993; Camara & Schneider, 1994), and $6 to $200 billion for other types of deviant organizational behaviors (Murphy, 1993). Evidence suggests that it costs $15.1 billion per year to U.S. retailers in internal theft (Hollinger & Davis, 2001). According to the US Equal Opportunity Commission 2010, around 12,000 cases of sexual harassment costing above $48 million are dealt and resolved by the commission (EEOC, 2010). Australian companies also have to face loss of $2.1 million (average) for each fraud an organization experiences (KPMG Forensic, 2004). In addition to these financial loses; the negative effects of workplace deviance is also voluminous, costs for which cannot be estimated. For instance, workplace deviance is found to be related with low job performance, high absenteeism, spoiled organization's reputation, increased turnover, low employee morale, low motivation and reduced commitment (Penney & Spector, 2005, 2008; Spector et al., 2006). Such acts of deviance are so threatening to organizations that it may lead to business failures, especially, if such behaviors spreads over the organization (Jones, 2009).

Considering such massive loses as threatening to the organization, it becomes imperative to ascertain the underlying cause that why employees adopted such behavior. In this research, workplace deviance is considered as an act of reaction to perceived injustice. Workplace deviance is frequently suggested in literature as reaction to frustrating organizational environment and working conditions (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). And this study highlighted the perception of injustice as root cause of deviance at workplace, which is important to explore in order to undermine the negativity at workplace.
The current study is also an attempt in filling the gaps in literature by responding to the calls for investigation by previous researchers in multifold perspectives. Firstly, it addresses the mediating mechanism through episodic envy, by logically relating perceived injustice to individual’s emotional state and then to the subsequent job outcomes. Researchers from organizational sciences have frequently pointed to examine the emotion laden mechanism of injustice and workplace outcomes (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Colquitt et al., 2013; Cropanzano et al., 2011; De Cremer, 2007; De Cremer & Van den Bos, 2007; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). In particular, (Khan, Quratulain, & M Bell, 2013) ask for need to investigate the mechanism through which perceived injustice, envy and counterproductive work behaviors relate to each other. Moreover, Jones (2009) also suggested to explore underlying explanatory motives and mechanism in this relationship (Jones, 2009). Responding to these calls, current study empirically explore a mediated mechanism of episodic envy in injustice-job outcome relationship to address this gap by arguing that event of injustice potentially triggers the emotion of episodic envy, whereby, the victim perceive the other party on the advantageous position and resultantly react to restore equity by involving himself in workplace deviance and affecting his job outcomes detrimentally.

Another important call has been made to investigate psychological capital as moderator which provides more insight about the buffering capabilities of these psychological resources (Abbas et al., 2014; Lehner et al., 2014). Noticeably, Azeem et al., (2015) investigated a similar relationship between interpersonal mistreatment and interpersonal deviance and emphasized on the need to explore moderating role of psychological capital in future. Current study responded to these calls by exploring psychological capital as moderator in direct and indirect effect of
perceived injustice and job-outcome relationship which helps to identify the mitigating effect of psychological resources.

Moreover, Colquitt et al. (2001) in their meta-analytic review of organizational justice found that interactional justice has not received much attention by previous researchers although distributive and procedural justice has extensively been investigated (Colquitt et al., 2001). Current study also addressed this issue by exploring all four perceived injustice types in one comprehensive model in order to better understand the nature of each. There has been a debate about the dimensionality of injustice in literature (Ambrose, 2002; Colquitt, 2001). Current study found better fit for four-factor model of injustice perceptions, which is also consistent with the meta-analysis findings of Colquitt et al., (2013) where they argue about the distinct nature of all four types of perceived injustice.

This study also responded to call of Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001), who proposed to investigate the causality of justice-outcome relationship through longitudinal surveys. Moreover, in-spite of the fact that longitudinal design has largely been suggested to investigate causality in relationship of injustice and its aftermaths, it has rarely been investigated (Colquitt et al., 2013; El Akremi, Vandenberghe, & Cameraman, 2010; Matta, Erol-Korkmaz, Johnson, & B, 2014). Current study investigated the injustice and job outcome relationship by using longitudinal research design which is also suggested for measuring the mediated mechanisms (J. Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2013; MacKinnon, Fritz, Williams, & Lockwood, 2007).

1.3 Research Questions:

The present research aimed at investigating the main effects of perceived injustice and employee’s job outcomes at workplace. Moreover, it is further aimed to examine the relationship of perceived injustice and employee’s job outcomes through episodic envy (as intervening
mechanism). The study also probed psychological capital as a variable functioning as buffering tool to confine individuals from spoiling their job outcomes. The following research questions were addressed in this research:

1. What is the impact of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcomes such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions?
2. Does episodic envy mediates the relationship of perceived injustice and employee’s job outcomes such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions?
3. Does psychological capital moderates the relationship between episodic envy and employee’s job outcomes such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions?

1.4 Significance of the Study:

This study has several significant aspects that could be the major contributions to the existing literature in the field of organizational behavior. First, the comprehensive framework of current study is the first attempt to explore perceived injustice and job outcomes where episodic emotion is involved as mediating mechanism. This effort will contribute to enhance our understanding about the nature of injustice and job outcome relationship. Earlier organizational researchers have focused on affective state of moods (Pekrun & Frese, 1992; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and/or discrete emotions like anger, guilt, resentment, happiness and pride (Barclay et al., 2005; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Daniel P Skarlicki & Robert Folger, 1997; Weiss et al., 1999; Zohar, 1995) as emotional mechanism of (in)justice and outcome relationship, however, due to the dispositional nature of these discrete emotions, some researchers also suggest that prior
emotional state may also cause the emergence of such perceptions and, accordingly, can change the nature of the final justice judgment (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007; Van den Bos, 2003; van den Bos, Maas, Waldring, & Semin, 2003). Current study enriches this debate by investigating the mediation of a more relevant state emotion i.e. episodic envy, which is indicated in literature as event specific (Cohen-Charash, 2009). Second important significance of this study is the investigation of psychological capital as a moderator between direct and indirect effect of perceived injustice and job outcomes to stretch buffering mechanism. This coping mechanism has been called by many previous researchers to investigate and current study is contributing in literature by responding to those calls (Abbas et al., 2014; Azeem, Lehner, & Haq, 2015; Lehner et al., 2014). Moreover, it will also increase our understanding about the coping strategies for envy by arguing that people with high psychological capital will see envy as self-motivating and helps themselves in reducing the envy-aroused pain by using their psychological resources of confidence, hope, optimism and resilience.

Third important significance of current study is its contextual nature. Since, most of the theories and researches are being conducted and developed in Western countries; practitioners and researcher have low confidence regarding its generalizability in non-western settings (Tsui, Nifadkar, & Ou, 2007). Earlier studies explore the effects of perceived injustice in different context of western countries (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Folger & Baron, 1996; J. Greenberg, 1990a; J. Greenberg & Alge, 1998; McGurn, 1988; Mintzberg, 1985; Robinson & Bennett, 1995, 1997) leaving the need for further exploration in different countries, historical and social, with different cultural features across national context (Tsui et al., 2007). Responding to this necessity, current study is a valuable addition in terms of its Eastern context and comprehensiveness.
In addition to these three significant contributions, current study is also pooled with some important aspects which will supplement our research. First, current study examined the dimensionality of perceived injustice construct, which is quite long been in debate. Moreover, Colquitt et al., (2001) found in their meta-analytic review of organizational justice that interactional justice has not received much attention by previous researchers (Colquitt et al., 2001). Current study contributed in literature by advancing our knowledge via exploration of all four perceived injustice types in one comprehensive model which will help us to comprehend about the nature of each. Another important significance is the longitudinal nature of current study, which will give better understanding about the causal effects of perceived injustice over time. Longitudinal design has frequently been suggested in literature but seldom investigated (El Akremi et al., 2010; Matta et al., 2014). This study has been conducted by using time lagged design which augments the significance of current piece of research.

1.5 Theoretical Framework:

Above mentioned research questions assisted to derive the theoretical framework of the study to conceptually sum up the whole theoretical idea in testable framework. The current study discussed the four types of injustice perceptions (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and its aftermaths at workplace (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions). By following the strong theoretical notion of affective event theory (AET), the current study also examined the emotional mechanism by exploring the mediating role of episodic envy in relationship of injustice perceptions and job outcomes of employees in banks of Pakistan. Additionally, this study also suggested the comprehensive model to mitigate the negative effects of emotions, aroused from injustice perceptions, through the introduction of psychological capital as
moderator. Overall, current study provides a comprehensive framework of emotion laden reaction to injustice perceptions and also provides structure to cope with this situation through moderating effect exploration.

Figure 1: Theoretical Framework

This study is conceptualized in three facets; i) the dotted line in the above framework represent the main effects of perceived injustice on its potential aftermaths (i.e. organizational deviance,
interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions), ii) the dark lines represents the indirect effects of perceived injustice on job outcomes through episodic envy as mediator, iii) and the long dash-dotted line represents the last aspect of the framework explaining the examination of individual differences in psychological capital as a moderator by drawing upon the strong theoretical notion of conservation of resource (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 2011) that when employees bump into negative emotions due to injustice perceptions, psychological capital will work as “a solid resource reservoir” and will help the individual’s to reduce the effects of these negative emotions (episodic envy) on work outcomes (Hobfoll, 2002).
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section addresses the literature of all proposed variable of this research study. These variables includes i) four types of perceived injustice, ii) the conceptualization of mediating variable i.e. episodic envy, iii) psychological capital as moderator, and, iv) proposed job outcomes of the study i.e. organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions.

The current section also proposed the hypotheses of the study which includes the main effect relationship between independent variables (i.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational injustice), and dependent variables (i.e. job outcomes such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions). Subsequently, episodic envy also conceptualized and discussed as intervening variable in relationship of perceived injustice and all job outcomes. Based on conservation of resource theory, this chapter also theorized and hypothesized about the moderating role of psychological capital in direct and/or indirect relationship of perceived injustice and job outcomes.

2.1 Perceived Injustice:

The phenomenon of justice has been in debate from primeval era. Rosen (1990) linked the notion of justice from 1790s and defined according to Kent’s views about the regulations of freedom. He defined the social side of justice as “the restriction of each individual’s freedom so that it harmonizes with the freedom of everyone else” (Rosen, 1989, 1990). However, researchers from the field of organizational behavior have taken it from perspective of employee’s perception about themselves. Earlier, Miller (2001) defined perceived injustice as “Injustice is experienced
when people perceive that they are being treated in ways that they do not deserve or that they are not being treated in ways that they do deserve” (Miller, 2001). So, perceived organizational injustice is the perception of the employee about violation of fair treatment with him in the organization.

Previous scholar’s work on justice literature establishes it as a multi-dimensional construct. Initially, studies on justice unveil this construct as two dimensional i.e. distributive (the perceived fairness about distribution of resources such as reward) and procedural (the perceived fairness of process or formal procedure through which such decisions were taken) (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). However, as the field evolved, justice scholars began to acknowledge the importance of how the decisions were communicated and how the procedures were implemented. Eventually, they progressed to reveal the third dimension i.e. interactional justice (the perceived fairness of how the decisions were communicated by decision maker or the behavior with which one is treated at workplace by decision maker). Later, Bies and Moag (1986) discussed the social side of justice and presented a framework for overall justice construct in which interactional justice was incorporated as third dimension. Lately, Colquitt et al., (2013) recently argue about the dimensionality of justice construct by suggesting a four-factor model of justice i.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational.

2.1.1 Distributive injustice:

The first component of justice is distributive justice which is, as depicted by name, associated with the distribution of resources or outcomes that some of the organizational members get and others do not. Theory of distributive injustice follows the notion that resources or outcomes are differentially distributed and employees are not treated equally. In organizational settings, one of the major apprehensions of employees is that whether they are receiving their share of outcome
fairly or not. Outcomes are perceived fairly distributed, when the reward goes to the top performer or to the most deserving and competent employee. However, outcome seems to be distributed unfairly, if they are distributed politically to corporate “insiders” due to their connection with upper management.

2.1.2 Procedural injustice:

The second component is procedural justice which refers to the perceived fairness of the process by which outcomes are allocated by the organization. Perceived fairness of procedures is also an important concern of employees at workplace, since they wanted to know that how decision making policies and practices are devised and implemented. Procedurally just organizations establish rules which clearly specify the roles of individuals. A just process is one which is transparent, unbiased, evenhanded, accurate, correctable, consistent with ethical norms and is applicable to all. On the other hand, a procedure is considered unjust, if the decision is biased, based on favoritism, and ambiguous.

2.1.3 Interpersonal injustice:

Lately, literature argued about the third type of justice which emphasizes that how one person treats another at workplace. Bies and Moag (1986) labeled it as interactional justice and incorporated it in general framework of justice as third type. But as research evolves, researchers started to distinguish interactional injustice in two different forms i.e. a) interpersonal justice, and b) informational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). The interpersonal justice deals with the respect and dignity with which one is treated by the decision maker. In other words, employees perceive interpersonally treated unjust if decision is communicated to all with differential level of respect and dignity, that is, some are treated with respect while others are treated with rude or cruel remarks.
2.1.4 Informational injustice:

Literature marked fourth component of justice as informational justice, which is about the accurateness and completeness of information sharing. Employees perceive informational injustice if the decision maker didn’t provide true, complete and adequate information and/or justification while conveying the decision, especially, when outcomes are not favorable.

Early organizational studies on distributive justice mainly derived and attributed with equity theory of Adams (1965), whereby, justice scholars linked the perceived fairness of outcome distribution with a variety of organizational decisions regarding pay (Mowday, 1983), job security (Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, & Ambrose, 1986), and layoffs (Cropanzano, Ambrose, Greenberg, & Cropanzano, 2001). Additionally, organizational research on distributive fairness showed that such perceptions affect employee’s attitudinal and behavioral job outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, commitment, and intention to quit or stay with the organization. As with distributive justice, the perceived fairness of procedures also affects important employee’s attitudinal and behavioral job outcomes. As a matter of fact, perceived procedural justice can also mitigate the effect of the unfavorable outcomes. In an earlier study, Thibaut and Walker (1975) suggested that employees remained satisfied even with unfavorable outcomes, if they perceive that the procedures were fair and transparent through which the outcomes are produced. Similar to distributive and procedural justice, justice scholars also reported the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on employee’s attitudes and behaviors (Brockner & Greenberg, 1990; J. Greenberg & Alge, 1998; J. Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993).
2.2 Important Job Outcomes:

The current study investigated the major job outcomes of the employees in banking sector. These job outcomes include both forms of workplace deviance in isolation, i.e. organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Moreover, the study also examined the behavior and attitudinal job outcomes i.e. job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions.

2.2.1 Workplace deviance:

The most acknowledged sketch of workplace deviance is presented by Robinson and Bennett (1995), whereby, they conceptualize it as “voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms, and in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization and/or its members” (p. 556). Any act of individual or group is considered as deviant if it violated any of the organizational norms or enacted rules and regulations, particularly, if that act is also threatening to organization and/or its members by putting them at risk (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Scholars who worked on this construct suggested many different names to such non-conformity conducts, such as workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Bennett & Robinson, 2003), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), and Counterproductive work behavior (Beugré, 2005; Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Mangione & Quinn, 1975). In their classical work on workplace deviance, Robinson and Bennett (1995) gave a framework which they labeled as “typology of workplace deviance” and classified deviant behaviors into two dimensions; organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Organizational deviance encircle the acts which are directed towards organizations and are threatening for organization’s well-beings like fraud, embezzlement, theft, absenteeism, putting little effort in work, unwarranted breaks from work, and sabotage (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Ambrose et al., 2002;
Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006), whereas, interpersonal deviance refers to threatening acts which are directed towards the employees and/or members of the organization such as abusing co-worker, spreading rumors, politicking, ostracizing and sexual harassment (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Beugré, 2005; Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007).

The construct of workplace deviance is formally operationalized by Bennett and Robinson (1995), where they differentiate this construct from other similar constructs like antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), and Counterproductive work behavior (Beugré, 2005; Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Mangione & Quinn, 1975). Since then, workplace deviance has received much attention from scholars from organizational behavior (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Langan-Fox, Cooper, & Klimoski, 2007; Spector & Fox, 2005). Initially, earlier scholars of organizational studies relate this construct with perceptions of injustice (Robbins, Judge, Millett, & Boyle, 2013; Robbins, Judge, & Education, 2003), however, as literature evolved, perceptions of organizational injustice became one of the key constructs in explaining workplace deviance (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). This relationship follows the strong principle of retaliation which explains that employees are more likely to involve in deviance when they perceived inequitable treatment at workplace (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Ambrose et al., 2002; Aquino et al., 2006). Similar observations were reported by previous researchers, whereby, perceived injustice has been linked with a range of deviant behaviors such as theft (Colquitt et al., 2006; J. Greenberg, 1990a, 2002), sabotage (Ambrose et al., 2002), and retaliation (Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Barclay et al., 2005). Moreover, and more relevant to current study, deviant behaviors are reported to be associated with different dimensions of injustice. For example, Greenberg (1993b) reported the perception of distributive injustice with employee’s tendency to involve in deviance. Procedural and interactional injustice has also been
linked with workplace deviance in earlier investigations (Barclay & Skarlicki, 2009; Barclay et al., 2005; Daniel P Skarlicki & Robert Folger, 1997). Similarly, another recent study also reported informational justice as a predictor of retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki, Barclay, & Pugh, 2008).

In the same context, previous scholars of organizational psychology research highlighted the workplace attitudes, behaviors and relationships in social exchange context (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). They argue about viewing relationships in context of reciprocal exchange of tangible and/or intangible resources between two entities (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This can be better viewed in context of fairness, such that the employees are likely to contribute more to the organization when organizations reciprocate their contributions by giving them rewards, and those rewards should be according to employee’s contributions (Leventhal, 1976b). This norm of the reciprocity violated if employees perceive that the organization reward them with lesser resources as compared to what they contribute to the organization. And such perceptions of injustice stimulates them to involve in deviant behaviors to restore justice e.g., violating the organizational norms (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In addition to this, if employees perceive injustice that the organization reward their coworkers with better outcomes for almost similar performance, they may also attempt to restore justice by harming the source of injustice, e.g. the organization (J. Greenberg & Scott, 1996), or supervisor (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002), or a co-worker (L. Greenberg & Barling, 1999). Therefore, it should be no surprise that employees will attempt to punish those they consider as responsible for workplace injustices (Bernerth & Walker, 2012).

Researchers in this search of investigating this relationship of injustice and deviance reported that the multidimensional construct of injustice is tied to different sources. For some dimensions
(distributive injustice and procedural injustice); employees consider organizations as responsible for unjust treatment, while for other dimensions (interpersonal injustice and informational injustice), they tied the source with organizational members (Bernerth & Walker, 2012). Employees tend to find the source of unjust treatment to restore equity by reacting against that source, i.e. the source of injustice will then be aligned with the target of deviance. In their meta-analytic review, Colquitt et al (2001) reported that different dimensions of injustice are related to different job outcomes. For example, the two-factor model suggests that distributive injustice would be related to outcome-referenced dependent variables and procedural injustice would predict system-referenced dependent variables (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). Similarly, interpersonal injustice and informational injustice would be related to agent-referenced dependent variables as suggested by the agent-system model (Bies & Moag, 1986). In essence, the source of distributive injustice and procedural injustice is generally tied with the organization; therefore, these dimensions are generally related to organizational deviance (Colquitt et al., 2013; Berry et al., 2007; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Aquino et al., 1999). Similarly, the source of interpersonal injustice and informational injustice is generally tied with specific individuals (like supervisors); therefore, these dimensions are usually related to interpersonal deviance (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993; Aquino et al., 1999; Berry et al., 2007). Following the same notion, current study argued that employees who perceive inequitable treatment would attempt to restore equity by reacting against the source of unfairness. So hypothesizing the relation as:

\[ H1a: \text{Distributive injustice will positively predict employee’s act of organizational deviance.} \]

\[ H1b: \text{Procedural injustice will positively predict employee’s act of organizational deviance.} \]

\[ H1c: \text{Interpersonal injustice will positively predict employee’s act of interpersonal deviance.} \]
**H1d:** Informational injustice will positively predict employee’s act of interpersonal deviance.

### 2.2.2 Job Performance:

Job performance is reported as one of the most extensively examined work related behavioral job outcomes in the field of organizational behavior and has been defined as “employee behaviors that are consistent with role expectations and that contribute to organizational effectiveness” (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Some researchers also attached it with proficiency with which one accomplish the central core activities which are officially recognized as a part of their job (Borman, 2004). For example, Cascio (2006) described that job performance is the degree to which an individual is doing the tasks according to his job description. Previous studies reported that individual’s job performance is largely been influenced by workplace perceptions, attitudes and relationships (Vigoda, 2000). As mentioned earlier, these workplace behaviors and relationship are viewed in reciprocal social exchange context (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). If employees perceive injustice at workplace, they are more likely to involve in distressed behaviors to restore justice, and the most obvious way to restore justice is to reduce their job performance.

Considerable research has been done and supported the view that there is significant association between perceived injustice and job performance (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003; Shirom, Nirel, & Vinokur, 2006; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). However, despite of these efforts, the effects of perceived injustice on job performance is yet to be conclusive (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). For example, as proposed by equity theory, distributive justice is found to be related with performance (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Griffeth, Vecchio, & Logan, 1989). On the other hand, Kanfer et al. (1987) reported a negative relationship of procedural fairness and performance. Another study by Keller and Dansereau
(1995) found a moderate relationship of both these constructs. In their experimental research, Barley and Lind (1987) also reported relationship of procedural justice and performance. All these studies showed mixed results for relationship among procedural justice and performance making it the most unclear of the relationships in literature among other types of justice (Kanfer, Sawyer, Early, & Lind, 1987; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). Similarly, the relationship of performance with interactional injustice is also remained unclear. In a meta-analytic review, the findings revealed near-zero correlations between interactional justice and task performance, however, these findings were based on very few studies (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In addition to these meta-analysis findings, some other studies found insignificant correlations between performance and interpersonal justice (Kickul, Lester, & Finkl, 2002; Colquitt et al., 2006). On the other hand, some studies yielded significant relationships between these two constructs (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Ramaswami & Singh, 2003). These mixed findings, with different magnitude effect of perceived injustice on job performance, indicate the lack of understanding and give rise to the need of further exploration of this relationship between perceived injustice and job performance. Responding to this necessity of exploration, this study investigates the relationship of perception of injustice and job performance. Following hypotheses has been tested for exploring this relationship:

**H2a:** Distributive injustice will significantly reduce employee’s job performance.

**H2b:** Procedural injustice will significantly reduce employee’s job performance.

**H2c:** Interpersonal injustice will significantly reduce employee’s job performance.

**H2d:** Informational injustice will significantly reduce employee’s job performance.
2.2.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior:

Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as an “Individual’s behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988). In this definition, the term discretionary means that the behavior is not an obligation for the employee neither has been written in his formal job description. To put it in more clear way, “the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such as its omission is not generally understood as punishable” (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997). An important aspect of this definition is that when such behaviors are adopted and enacted consistently over time, it results in increased employees and organizational effectiveness. The same observation is reported by Podsakoff & Mackenzie (1997) that organizational effectiveness influenced by employee’s citizenship behaviors in different ways such as it helps in increasing employees efficiency, organizational performance, ability of organization to identify and retain good employees, and also helps organizations to be adaptive to change more effectively. Organ (1988) describes organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as a multidimensional construct. The first dimension is altruism which refers to the behaviors of individuals where they help other employees in their routine work related to organizational matters like being cooperative to colleagues, and helping newcomers etc. the second dimension is sportsmanship which is defined as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining” (Organ 1990; p. 96). Third dimension is conscientiousness which refers to the compliance in work, where employees also work beyond normal requirements or expectation. The fourth dimension is courtesy which is defined by Organ (1990) as “behaviors that are directed towards prevention measures of future organizational problems like advance notices, reminder and whistle blowing”. The last dimension is civic virtue
which refers to an active involvement in organizational activities like participation in organizational events, and attending meetings (Organ, 1990). Organ (1990) suggests that organizational citizenship behaviors are determined by perceived fairness in organizations. Other researchers also reported that such behaviors are expected more often in a just environment (Blakely et al., 2005; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). When employee perceive fair treatment in organization, they are likely to do something in return to reciprocate and, in doing so, engage themselves in voluntary behaviors other than their specific job task (Van dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). On the other hand, they will withdraw from such behaviors in case of unfair treatment (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007). The same is also stated by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) that affective events at workplace might result in spontaneous behaviors such as acts of good or bad citizenship. In an earlier study, Colquitt et al. (2001) presented agent-system model to explain that employees tend to reciprocate perceived injustice by withdrawing citizenship behaviors in an effort to restore justice. Following the same conceptualization, current study argues that individuals who perceive that they are victim of injustice will react and will less likely to involve in organization’s citizenship behaviors. Therefore, hypothesize:

**H3a:** Distributive injustice will negatively affect employee’s organization citizenship behavior.

**H3b:** Procedural injustice will negatively affect employee’s organization citizenship behavior.

**H3c:** Interpersonal injustice will negatively affect employee’s organization citizenship behavior.

**H3d:** Informational injustice will negatively affect employee’s organization citizenship behavior.

### 2.2.4 Turnover intentions:

Turnover intention is defined as “the extent to which an individual plans to quit the organization” (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). It is also defined as “an individual’s own estimated
probability that they are permanently leaving the organization in the near future” (Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). Turnover intention is the volunteer decision of an employee to quit from work (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978). The employees in organizations may vacate their position in two ways, either by voluntarily leaving the company or by involuntarily quit. Voluntarily turnover occurs due to certain reasons like unfavorable working conditions, stress at work, or due to personal reasons of better career orientation or more attractive financial offerings (Dess & Shaw, 2001). On the other hand, involuntary turnover ascends from organizational side due to certain reasons. Organizations may dismiss the employee due to his incompetence, or offer retirement plans due to old age (Dess & Shaw, 2001).

However, regardless of approach adopted for employee turnover, the consequences of it are very deleterious and challenging for the company. Organizations have to bear enormous cost in process of recruiting, hiring and training of new employees to replace the departing counterparts (Dalton, Todor, & Krackhardt, 1982). Moreover, it also indirectly reduces the employee’s morale of remaining associates which results in loss of social capital (Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). In principle, the actual cost associated with employee’s turnover is hard to measure, particularly, when the departing employee is highly skilled, knowledgeable and a high performer (Dess & Shaw, 2001; Shaw et al., 2005). Therefore, it’s important for organizations and managers to give fair treatment to their employees because, only then, it stretches the message that they are being valued equally as members of the organization (Sousa-Poza & Henneberger, 2002; Posthuma, Maertz, & Dworkin, 2007; Siers, 2007). Theoretically, fair treatment is viewed by the employees as a fact that organizations value them as an important part of the group. However, unfair treatment stretches a clue that one is no more considered as an important part of the group and, thus, an indication of his disposability. In such cases of unfair
treatment, the employees consider it as employer’s failure to establish the equitable employment relationship (Sousa-Poza & Henneberger, 2002), therefore, will want to cease from such relationships (Bernerth & Walker, 2012). In addition to these situations, fairness and deontological theorist suggests that interpersonal relationships would also have an effect on individual’s decisions to leave or remain with the organization (Bernerth & Walker, 2012). When an employee sees his fellow colleagues being treated unfairly, he may expect the similar type of treatment for himself in future. Such situations of unfair treatment with the fellow counterparts would also likely to influence individual's desire to remain with the organization (Bernerth & Walker, 2012).

In essence, inequitable treatment triggers the emotional judgment that employees are not considered important part of the organization and, therefore, results in intensified turnover intentions. Following the same conception, this study argues that perception of injustice will stimulates the employee’s intention to leave the company. When employees feel that they are being treated unfairly, they might trigger negative emotions in reaction, therefore, will more likely to leave the organization. Considering it in social exchange perspective (Gouldner, 1960; Scanzoni, 1979), employees expect that what they got from organizations should be proportionate to their efforts for the organization. However, if they perceive that they are treated unfairly, they will reciprocate to equal the score by giving reactions such as increased turnover (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007). Similar observations were reported by previous studies that organizational injustice does indeed related to higher turnover intentions (Alexander & Ruderman 1987; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Aryee et al., 2002; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998). However, magnitude of the effect size is yet to be conclusive. For example, Colquitt et al. (2001) in their meta-analytic investigation established that distributive justice had
a strong correlation with employee’s turnover intentions, while procedural justice had a moderate correlation with employee’s turnover intentions. Current study is an attempt to explore the true insight about this relationship and expects by following the theoretical notion of social exchange that perceived injustice relates to amplified turnover intentions. Therefore hypothesize:

**H4a:** Distributive injustice will significantly predict employee’s turnover intentions.

**H4b:** Procedural injustice will significantly predict employee’s turnover intentions.

**H4c:** Interpersonal injustice will significantly predict employee’s turnover intentions.

**H4c:** Informational injustice will significantly predict employee’s turnover intentions.

### 2.3 Episodic Envy:

Definitions of envy labeled it as an “unpleasant, often painful emotion characterized by feelings of inferiority, hostility, and resentment produced by an awareness of another person or group of persons who enjoy a desired possession (object, social position, attribute, or quality of being)” (Smith & Kim, 2007: 49). Consistent with this understanding, Parrot and Smith (1993) earlier defined this experience as; “envy arises when a person lacks another’s superior quality, achievements, or possession and either desires it or wishes that the other lacked it” (1993: 908). Earlier researcher reported envy as conjuncture of related characteristics of “inferiority, hostility, and resentment” commonly persists in almost every definitions of envy (Smith, Kim, & Parrott, 1988; Johnson-Laird & Oatley, 1989; Smith & Kim, 2007). Envy is described as the negative affective reaction triggered from upward social comparison with the superior fortune of the envied other (Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1990). Similar connotation was mentioned in early Greek philosophy about envy that it often considered as very painful experience which arises from social comparison with someone else’s good fortune (cf. Plato, 2007/360 BCE). In such
social upward and unfavorable comparisons, individuals feel themselves inferior, shamed and humiliated as compared to envied other (Parrott & Smith, 1993).

However, although the painful experience is fundamental to envy, it also have an alternative explanation which pitch it as positive and motivating factor to work hard to get the desired outcome (Van de Ven et al., 2009). This type of envy is labelled as “benign envy” which is more like resembling to admiration (Van de Ven et al., 2009; Smith & Kim, 2007) because the feeling of hostility is not present in it. Nonetheless, even the desire to harm the envied other is absent, the experience of pain is the defining quality which is present in benign envy (Tai et al., 2012; Takahashi et al., 2009). Recent evidence from neuroscience also validates envy as painful emotion by showing that experience of envy activates those brain regions which are associated with pain i.e., “the anterior cingulate cortex” (Takahashi et al., 2009).

The tendency to feel envy is so widespread that almost every culture has a word for envy or a word with meaning something close to envy (Schoeck, 1969), moreover, almost everyone has the capability of feeling it (Tai et al., 2012; Smith, Parrott, Ozer, & Moniz, 1994; Salovey & Rodin, 1984). Envy, at its inception, was conceptualized as more of a dispositional tendency (Smith & Kim, 2007; Smith, Parrott, Diener, Hoyle, & Kim, 1999; Gold, 1996). However, as literature evolved, researchers began to realize that envy is not just a personality trait, rather everyone can experience it. Even those individuals who are not predisposed to experience envy may sometimes experience it because of a specific social comparison, whereby, they found themselves less fortunate relative to another (Cohen-Charash, 2009; Schalin, 1979). This temporary, event specific or situation-specific envy is labeled as Episodic envy (Cohen-Charash, 2009).
Episodic envy is relatively a new construct and is defined as “a negatively felt emotional state experienced because of a negative social comparison, when Person A notices that a similar other, Person B, has something (e.g., material or personal) that Person A wants but does not have, and the desired object or condition is central to A’s self-concept” (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007, p. 666). When this kind of envy is experienced, the envious person will not only focus on getting what the other has but also experience the feeling of ill will towards the other (Neu, 1980; Salovey, 1991a). The feeling of ill will is triggered because the envious person blame the “envied other” for his inferiority, therefore, leading to hostile feelings (Smith & Kim, 2007; Smith et al., 1994) and making the “envied other” target of harmful behaviors (Hill, DelPriore, & Vaughan, 2011; Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007; Tai et al., 2012). This view is also validated by Craig (2003), who considered envy as a homeostatic emotion that urges a behavioral response. Homeostasis is described as the process which regulates the physiological balance for survival. For example, human body regulates its internal temperature when encounter the extreme external temperature. Similarly, much like a homeostatic response to regulate body temperature, the experience of envy stimulates the reactive action to regulate the psychological balance. The same is validated from previous conceptual and empirical work on action tendencies of emotions (Frijda, 1993; Bagozzi, Verbeke, & Gavino Jr, 2003); whereby emotions, specifically envy, was found to be associated with threat-oriented action tendencies towards the envied other (Cohen-Charash, 2009; Gino & Pierce, 2009, 2010; Tai et al., 2012; Van de Ven, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2009; Vecchio, 2005).

According to Smith (1991), the reason of action oriented hostility towards envied other is that the envious individuals perceive themselves victims of being treated unjust which activates the feeling of resentment towards the envied counterpart. Some other researchers also investigated
the same and suggested that perceived inequality is related to envy (Ben-Ze'ev, 2002; Tai et al., 2012; Smith, 1991; Smith et al., 1994). In a more recent study, Tai et al. (2012) explicitly referred that "equity theory is a useful lens for understanding envy" (p. 110). Moreover, employee’s feeling of envy due to perceptions of unfairness stimulates more serious reaction than feeling of mild frustration (Yochi Cohen-Charash & Jennifer S Mueller, 2007; E. G. Lambert et al., 2010; M. Lewis, 2008). Following the same conception, current study emphasis on finding true mechanism of injustice perception-job outcome relationship by arguing that employees perception about injustice will trigger negative emotions of episodic envy and to restore balance, they are more likely to involve in deviant activities.

**H5: Episodic envy will mediate the relationship between perceived injustice (distributive and procedural) and organizational deviance.**

**H6: Episodic envy will mediate the relationship between perceived injustice (interpersonal and informational) and interpersonal deviance.**

According to strong theoretical notion of equity theory “people make equity assessments by comparing the ratio of what they receive (outcomes) to what they contribute (inputs) with the corresponding ratios of referent others” (Adams, 1965). In this view, people tend to compare themselves with other and such social comparisons results in hurtful and painful feelings if they found themselves underrated (Harvey & Haines III, 2005; Smith & Kim, 2007; Tai et al., 2012). Moreover, this unfavorable evaluation could also originate envy within the relationship. Following this theoretical impression of equity theory, the behavioral consequences of envy can be substantiated. Earlier researchers have also pointed this out as “People can take steps to reduce this social pain by restoring equity through a variety of means, out of which, one obvious approach is to reduce job performance” (Pinder, 2008). According to Pinder (2008), employee’s
tendency to decrease his performance at workplace by producing or contributing less will satisfy his urge of balancing the score by equalizing his ratio of outcome to input as compared to corresponding ratios of his counterparts. Beside this, the envious parties may also attribute blame for this perceived injustice to the organization and also respond to it by reducing their job performance at workplace. Therefore, arguing about the tendency of envious employee’s to lower the job performance due to perceived injustice, current study hypothesize the mediation test of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and job performance:

**H7:** Episodic envy will mediate the relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job performance.

As mentioned earlier, perceived injustice can trigger envy within relationship. Earlier research have also suggested that, as a reaction to injustice, episodic envy is more likely to predict reduced intend of friendship with envied parties (Salovey & Rodin, 1984), and will also be reluctant to share information with them (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2004). These findings indicate the fewer tendencies of envious individuals to involve in citizenship behaviors (Salovey & Rodin, 1984; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2004). Moreover, envious individuals will less likely to involve in organizational citizenship behavior with those he/she envied due to perceived injustice, irrespective of nature of citizenship behavior required. Therefore, current study conjectures the hypothesis to test the mediation of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and organizational citizenship behavior as:

**H8:** Episodic envy will mediate the relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and organizational citizenship behavior.

In similar studies, envy was also found to be related with depressive tendencies (Smith et al., 1999), lower commitment, increased absenteeism and/or, increased turnover intentions (Duffy &
Turnover intention is one of the attitudinal job outcomes which are related to equity theory (Carrell & Dittrich, 1976; Colquitt et al., 2013; Duffy & Shaw, 2000; Telly, French, & Scott, 1971; Vecchio, 2005). Employees may compare their coworkers' job contribution and reward (Dittrich & Carrell, 1979). Once employees frequently experience imbalances, they may have strong desire to leave their job (J. S. Adams, 1965; Aquino et al., 1997; Cropanzano & Rupp, 2008; Dittrich & Carrell, 1979). In addition, employees who have a poor relationship with supervisors (Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Simons & Hinkin, 2001) or, sense that their supervisors treat them unfairly and do not support them, both of which might increase the chance to have a conflict with their coworkers or leaving the organization (e.g., through envy) (Yang, Wan, & Fu, 2012). Therefore, current study hypothesizes:

**H9**: *Episodic envy will mediate the relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee turnover intentions.*

**2.4 Psychological Capital:**

Historically, the academic and practicing psychologists overwhelmingly emphasized the negative aspects in order to seek solutions of dysfunctional behaviors (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). The field of psychology has largely ignored the elements which contribute to prosperity, rather focusing on what made individuals fail. But as the field evolves, both academic and practicing psychologists started to emphasize the need to explore the positive aspects of human behaviors. Specifically, the movement started with the call made by Martin Seligman in 1998 to start concentrating on recognizing what is right with people, rather only focusing on what is wrong with people (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Youssef & Avolio, 2006, 2007). Since then, the field of psychology has been in the process of advancement in the study of positive human prospective. Although the primary focus was on
positive side of human behaviors, Martin Seligman (1998) actually called for more balanced approach for examining the underlying mechanism of human functioning and behaviors.

While the work on positive psychology had some indirect implications for workplace, the direct inferences emerged with the introduction of a new concept of positive organizational behavior (Luthans, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Wright, 2003). This field of positive organizational behavior or POB focuses on the well-being of individuals and their positive strengths at the workplace. Luthans (2002), initially defined this construct as “the study and application of positively-oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace” (Luthans, 2002b: 59). Afterwards, another higher order construct was introduced which had more direct positive implications for performance at workplace. They named it psychological capital or PsyCap and comprehensively defined it as:

“an individual’s positive psychological state of development that is characterized by (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success”. (Luthans et al., 2007: 3).

Unlike social and human capital, psychological capital provided a new perspective to understand and manage the human behaviors at workplace. It emphasized on “who you are” (the actual self) and “what you intend to become” (your possible self), rather emphasizing on “what you know” (human capital) and “who you know” (social capital) (Larson & Luthans, 2006). Moreover, psychological capital is measurable (Luthans et al., 2006b), composed of malleable and open for
development capacities which can be significantly increased by applying relatively short-term (1 to 3 hours) and focused micro-interventions (Luthans et al., 2006a). These positive psychological capacities are not only developable but also significantly impactful on work-related job outcomes (Luthans et al., 2005; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Earlier investigation on this construct reported that it is significantly associated with employee’s performance at workplace (Luthans et al., 2005, 2006b; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), eventually contributing to the organizations (Luthans et al., 2006a, 2007).

As stated above, there are four components which encircle this higher-order construct of psychological capital i.e. self-efficacy/confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience (Luthans & Youssef, 2004; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006). These components are briefly discussed below in terms of their conceptualization and effects over individual’s behavior at workplace.

**Self-Efficacy:** The concept of self-efficacy is mainly derived from Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997) and can be defined in context of work environment as “an individual’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action necessary to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b: 66). Earlier, Bandura (1997) also defined self-efficacy in similar passion i.e. “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce the given attainments” (p. 3). Previous scholars reported that higher self-efficacy has significantly been related with performance at workplace (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a) and also stated it as developable attribute at the same time (Bandura, 1997). Social cognitive theory can be a useful lens in understanding the developmental state of this construct (Bandura, 2002), according to which, self-efficacy can be enhanced at workplace by
centering the focus on (1) emphasizing the employees to actually experience the mastery (enactive mastery) at work; (2) showing the role models (vicarious modeling) that how they behave in challenging situation, thus enhancing the observers’ believe on his own abilities; (3) positive encouragement (verbal persuasion) that one can perform the challenging tasks; and (4) physiological and psychological states (emotional arousal) which can be informative regarding one’s competence (Bandura, 1997, 2002). These approaches to enhance self-efficacy consequently raised human motivation (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), thus, drastically change the working environment by stimulating positive emotions and increases performance (Jimmieson, Terry, & Callan, 2004; Jex, Bliese, Buzzell, & Primeau, 2001; Jex & Bliese, 1999).

Hope: In its early conceptualization, hope was defined as “overall perception that goals can be met” (French, 1952; Lewin, 1946). However, in a later classical work of Snyder et al., (1991), this construct was more elaborately define in these words; “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy), and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (p. 287). In this conceptualization, agency refers to the person’s willpower or mental power which helps them toward achieving goals. Similarly, pathways refer to the mental ability which gives the alternative road maps to achieve goals in challenging situations. (Snyder, 1994; Snyder et al., 1991). Combining both, agency and pathways, stimulates the state of mind in which a person is capable to plan goals, and works to reach goals, and also capable of making alternate ways when encounter with obstacles. Both, agency and pathway, are independent elements of hope, but still is inseparable like a math equation (Snyder, 1994; Snyder et al., 1991; Snyder, Lopez, & Pedrotti, 2010). Hope is also developable state and different techniques are suggested to develop both elements of it. For
example, one effective way of developing sense of agency is through setting goals which are realistic, specific, measurable and achievable. Another effective technique, called “stepping”, is the division of a greater goal into smaller and achievable sub-goals which are easy to accomplish as agency thinking urges to deny the pursuit of unrealistic goals (Snyder, 1995; Luthans et al., 2001; Luthans & Jensen, 2002). Similarly, individual’s ability to evaluate and adopt alternatives pathways can also be developed through “mental rehearsals”, “contingency planning” and “what-if analyses” techniques which can be used by organizations to develop hope (Snyder et al., 2000a; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Alike others, hope is also one of the vital components of psychological capital which is considered helpful in increasing performance of employees at workplace (Peterson & Byron, 2008), and creating a positive environment (Adams et al., 2002).

Optimism: One of the earliest operationalization of optimism was attributed to Tiger (1979), who defined it as “mood or attitude associated with an expectation about the social or material future one which the evaluator regards as socially desirable, to his advantage, or for his pleasure” (p. 18). According to Luthans (2007), optimism is a positive behavior and characteristic of an individual to feel good for every situation. Unlike optimism, pessimism is adoption of negative behavior and feeling for something bad to happen (Carver & Scheier, 2002). Optimistic individuals should uphold realistic approach to increase their effectiveness (Peterson, 2000), otherwise, they have to face negative results (Seligman, 1998). Generally, optimistic attribution is an explanatory style which attributes the negative event as externally caused and positive event as internally caused (Buchanan & Seligman, 2013). However, optimism in PsyCap gives a more balanced approach by evaluating the true causes and consequences of events, rather just taking credit of success or blaming failures to external factors. As noted with other components of psychological capital, optimism is also a developmental attribute, and the most effective three-
step developmental approach was given by Schneider (2001). These steps include “leniency for the past, appreciation for the present and opportunity-seeking for the future”. In addition to its developmental nature, optimism is also suggested to be related with work-related outcomes. Buchanan and Seligman (2013) discussed in their work that optimism is related to productivity and decreases turnover intention at workplace. Another research on healthcare by Luthans and Jensen, (2005) found positive relationship between optimism and job performance. Hooker et al., (1992) found negative relationship between optimism and stress, moreover, also found that high optimistic approach decreases negative emotions.

**Resilience:** The fourth component is resilience which can be defined, by drawing its roots from developmental, positive and clinical psychology, by Luthans (2002a) in these words; “the positive psychological capacity to rebound, to bounce back from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (p. 702). Resiliency is also defined from individual’s perspective as “a class of phenomena characterized by patterns of positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity or risk” (Masten & Reed, 2002: 75). Similarly, Coutu (2002) also discussed resilience from individual’s perspective by stating that “resilient individuals possess a staunch acceptance of reality; a deep belief, often buttressed by strongly held values, that life is meaningful; and an uncanny ability to improvise” (p. 48). Although this component is also developable but, unlike optimism and hope, is more reactionary in nature. For developing resilience at workplace, scholars suggested three sets of strategies namely, “asset focused, risk focused and process focused” (Masten & Reed, 2002; Masten, 2001). By applying these strategies at workplace, organizations often initiate trainings to enhance the ability of resilience in their employees (Luthans et al., 2006).
2.4.1 Psychological Capital as Moderator:

Although each of the components of psychological capital i.e., self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience, has found to be related with performance of employees at workplace (Luthans, et al., 2007; Luthans & Youssef, 2004), however, when combine all four psychological resources together, this construct transforms into a high-order, core construct (Luthans et al., 2007) which expose more performance variation and satisfaction as compared to each of the four independent constructs (Luthans et al., 2006b). Current study intended to follow the same conception of psychological capital as a high-order, core construct as a moderating variable by using the conservation of resource theory (COR) as foundation. Conservation of resource theory explains that “individuals seek to obtain, retain, and protect resources and that stress occurs when resources are threatened with loss or are lost or when individuals fail to gain resources after substantive resource investment” (Hobfoll, 2002: 312). According to this definition, resources refer to “those entities that either are centrally valued in their own right (e.g., self-esteem, close attachments, health, and inner peace) or act as a means to obtain centrally valued ends (e.g., money, social support, and credit)” (Hobfoll, 2002: 307).

In current study, conservation of resource (COR) theory is used to conceptualize and examine the moderating role of psychological capital in direct and/or indirect effect of perceived injustice and job outcome relationship through internal and contextual resources. According to this theory, the loss of resource exerts more influence relative to resource gain, and creating a balance in this tendency depends on resources associated with individual’s psychological capital such as self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience, and how he/she use them (Treadyway et al., 2005). It follows that more the psychological resources an individual possesses, the less likely he/she will experience resource loss or vice versa.
According to Luthans (2007), self-efficacy is characterized as an individual’s trust on his capabilities to achieve success in his activities. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy can be practiced through indirect learning, socially influencing people and providing positive feedback. Individuals with increased level of self-efficacy, usually, face fewer failures or loss to their confidence level while dealing with negative comments, uncertainty and problems (Bandura & Locke, 2003). Jex and Bliese (1999) examined the self-efficacy as moderator in stressors and outcome relationship and findings suggested that self-efficacy weaken the negative relationship of workload and job satisfaction. However, on the main effects, self-efficacy was found to be related with increased commitment. In another study, Grau et al., (2011) also investigated self-efficacy’s moderating role and found that it buffers the effect of difficult job routine and cynicism. Moreover, their research also examined the combined effect of role conflict and self-efficacy with cynicism and found self-efficacy as moderator. In a similar fashion, hope and optimism also reported as buffering capacities in the relationship of psychological distress, dysfunctional behavior and addiction (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Some earlier studies reported a strong relationship of hope with individual’s ability to deal with tough situations and performance (Snyder, et al., 1991; Curry et al., 1997). The last component of psychological capital is resilience which helps individuals in building their stamina to deal with challenging situations in their lives (Block & Kremen, 1996; Coutu, 2002; Masten, 2001) and stand again in the cases of failures (Youssef & Luthans, 2005). Masten (2001) described the role of resilience at workplace and stated that it allows employees to deal with unjust and ambiguous working environment and enables them to change and adjust according to situation by facing setbacks, failures and adversities (also see Masten & Reed, 2002). These capacities collectively offer “the
necessary staying power in the face of repeated failures, setbacks, and skeptical or even critical social reactions that are inherently discouraging” (Bandura & Locke, 2003: 92).

Considering these resourceful capabilities helpful in hard times, psychological capital is theorized as moderating variable in this study due to its defensive capability to work against situational as well as harmful factors. And it is argued in current study that this defensive capability buffers the effect of emotion of episodic envy aroused from perceived injustice in such a way that people with high psychological capital use this resource composite to convert emotion of episodic envy into positive, self-motivating and constructive force. Employees with high psychological capital have this capacity to activate this psychological resource of hope to confine themselves from negative and destructive effects of episodic envy. They remained hopeful to get the desired outcomes as their self-efficacy leads them to remain positive about accomplishing the challenging tasks (Bandura, 1997). Moreover, their high optimism toward the future (Seligman, 1998), their ability to deal with problems and difficult situations (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), their move as a multi-tasker to approach success (Snyder, 1994), and their capability to bounce back from difficult situations and setbacks (Masten and Reed, 2002) also help them to reduce the negatives of episodic envy. Collectively, this psychological composite works as resource reservoir and individuals are less likely to “feel” injustice and also less likely to consider it as threatening to resource loss. So, current study hypothesizes:

**H10:** Psychological capital will moderate the direct and/or indirect relationship of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions) such that relationship will be weaker when psychological capital is high.

*Note: indirect relationship indicates Perceived injustice → episodic envy → job outcomes*
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section includes the details about methodology used in current research summarizing research design, population, sampling technique and data collection procedure. The section also outlines the scales which are used to collect data and their reported reliability.

3.1 Research Design:

Research design describes the methods to conduct the research process (Zechmeister, Shaughnessy, & Zechmeister, 2001). Literature argued about the necessity that the research design decisions should have the required consistency and get guidance from the research questions and objectives (Lewis, Thornhill, & Saunders, 2007). Moreover, an appropriate research design enables the researcher to conduct the research in an effective and efficient way and unearth the truthful conclusion (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). The research designs can be categorized in three broad classifications namely exploratory, descriptive and explanatory (Saunders, Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2011). The first classification is exploratory research which is conducted to recognize the nature of a problem (Uma Sekaran, 2003). This research design is especially helpful to explore that what is happening by probing the true insights about a certain phenomenon which is new in context (Robson, 2002). Since, the researchers are unsure about the nature of the problem at the start; this research design used qualitative data collection techniques such as observations, expert surveys, literature search and interviews to reach the conclusion (Saunders et al., 2011; Uma Sekaran, 2003; Hair, Wolfinbarger, Ortinau, & Bush, 2008; Malhotra & Birks, 2007).

In comparison, descriptive research is a more structured approach, which is characterized by conducting investigation to answer specific research questions (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). This
research design is particularly fruitful in investigating the characteristics of a certain variables of interest in a specific situation (Uma Sekaran, 2003). More comprehensively, descriptive research aimed at collecting data from a defined target population and elaborates their characteristics by using scientific methods and procedures (Hair et al., 2008). Unlike exploratory design, this approach use quantitative techniques for data collection to reach conclusion by statistically examining the acquired data in terms of frequencies, or mean and standard deviations (Uma Sekaran, 2006).

The third classification of research design is explanatory research which is used to assess the cause and effect relationships (Hair et al., 2008; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). This design is helpful to study a problem or a situation, whereby, the aim is to explain the nature of relationship between certain variables (Saunders et al., 2011), more specifically, determining and explaining the causality among measured variables (Hair et al., 2008). Explanatory study is a pre-planned and structured approach much like descriptive research, however, the descriptive research is not an appropriate method for examining causal relationships (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). It is, however, pertinent to mention that there are no absolute preferences among exploratory, descriptive and explanatory research design i.e. the decision to use particular research design is dependent on the research objectives which may demand the use of more than one research design (Malhotra & Birks, 2007).

The current research employed an explanatory research design as this study aims to assess the cause and effect relationships between independent variable of perceived injustice and the dependent variables of job outcomes such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions. Explanatory research design is useful in explaining the causality among measurable variables, for example how much
and to what extent perceived injustice causes change in job outcomes. The causal relationship can better be investigated by collecting data through quantitative research techniques (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). The use of quantitative and qualitative research method is widespread in business and management research and both can be differentiated largely on the basis of data collection techniques and data analysis procedures (Saunders et al., 2011). In quantitative methods, the data collecting techniques and analysis procedures are largely produces numerical values. On the other hand, the data collecting techniques and analysis procedures produces non-numeric data such as statements in qualitative methods (Saunders et al., 2011). The current research is using quantitative research method which is more beneficial for examining the problem statements of causal nature (Mertens, 2003). When employing the quantitative method, the researchers also need to articulate the time horizon as part of research planning (Saunders et al., 2011). Study of a particular relationship or phenomenon at a particular point in time, and/or a series of snapshots over a given time period, is categorized as cross-sectional and/or longitudinal. Cross sectional research seeks to collect information from respondents only once, however, the information is collected from the sample at specified intervals over an extended period of time in longitudinal research (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). Among other, a major advantage of longitudinal research is the researcher’s ability to observe sample (people or events) over time and exerts a robust control over variables under study (Adams & Schvaneveldt, 1991).

The current research used time lagged longitudinal research design by collecting data in two waves. Study’s independent variables were measured at Time 1 and job outcomes were collected at Time 2 alongside the mediator with a time lag of six weeks. The longitudinal research design is adopted due to many reasons. First, it helps in decreasing the common bias error (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010; Chang, Van Witteloostuijn, & Eden, 2010). Second, this research is
causal in nature, investigating how perceived injustice causes effect on criterions variable, and causality inference can be better explored through longitudinal research design (Cohen et al., 2013; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Third, the framework of present research investigates that the predictors (perceived injustice) effect on mediator (episodic envy) and subsequently, affect the criterion variables (job outcomes). The cross sectional research with mediation analysis is questionable and largely been criticized by previous researcher (Colquitt et al., 2013; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). Only research with different time lags or longitudinal would best estimate the mediations relationship (MacKinnon et al., 2007; Podsakoff et al., 2003).

3.2 Population and Sampling Technique:

Population is defined as collection of observations through data collection to have analysis on variables and relationships (Blerkom, 2009). This study aimed at investigating the impact of perceived injustice in banking sector in Pakistan. Field survey was conducted across various branches of banking organization in Pakistan. Moreover, data was collected by personally visiting the organizations to further minimize the ambiguities faced by respondents. The data was collected through questionnaires containing structured questions to measure the major study variables.

Before collection of data, prior approval in this regard was obtained from the banks explaining the purpose of the study. It was communicated that the study is conducted purely for academic purpose and results will only be published with aggregate findings. While applying for bank's permission for data collection, the researcher provided a written "Statement of Confidentiality" to the banks in which researcher assured complete confidentiality of respondents to address social desirability issues. The statement also explained the respondents' rights to refuse to take
part in the study or withdraw at any stage. It was also explained that the responses of the participants will be completely confidential and that no one will be identified in any written report or publication, and that only aggregate data will be presented. The statement of confidentiality also explained that the researcher is also bound by the "Code of Ethics in research" which mandates complete confidentiality and that under no circumstances any information divulged in this questionnaire be revealed. The confidentiality assurance was also important to communicate because Pakistan is high power distance country (Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Bond, 1988), and respondents might be reluctant to share their perception of injustice at workplace.

In the next step, sample was drawn from the population for data collection (Ruane & Ugur, 2005). According to Ruane and Ugur (2005), results concluded on sample can be easily generalized on population, if the appropriate sample size is chosen. Therefore, it’s important to select right sample size in order to generalize its results on population and have true representation of population. In this study, I succeed to collect the data from 485 respondents (paired responses) which justify the sampling recommendations of earlier researchers and also considered appropriate considering the sample size of previous studies on these variables and were published in reputed journals (El Akremi et al., 2010; Khan, Quratulain, & Bell, 2014; Matta et al., 2014; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). I also carefully choose the appropriate sampling strategy for this study to ensure its generalizability across as well as within industry. I collected the data from branches of banks by using multi stage cluster sampling, which is a type of probability sampling. In First stage, whole population was divided into different homogeneous clusters of branches of banks. Then, in second stage, subsequent clusters were identified according to management levels i.e. upper management, middle management and lower
management. Lower and Middle level management were then selected as our target respondents in third stage. In third stage clusters, randomization for data collection was not needed because I approach to all middle and lower level employees for data collection as they are easily approachable in branches of banks in Pakistan. Middle management employees were communicated to measure the scales for job outcomes (job performance and organizational citizenship behavior) of lower level employees who are working under their supervision.

3.3 Data Collection Method:

The data collection depends on the size and type of the samples (Ruane & Ugur, 2005). The current research collected primary data from employees of banks in Pakistan. The primary data is the type of data in which researcher collected raw hand data for the first time (Bonds-Raacke & Raacke, 2012). For this purpose, the questionnaires were distributed among the respondents by the researcher. The researcher visited the branches of the target bank personally to distribute the questionnaires so that any ambiguity faced by the respondents, while filling the questionnaire, can be resolved on spot. All queries from the respondents were answered with extreme care so that the researcher’s bias should not affect the respondent’s answer. Moreover, in order to ensure the convenience for the respondents after completing the questionnaire, researcher placed a drop box in the corners of the office with the permissions of manger. It was communicated to the respondents that they should drop the questionnaire in the drop box after completion. The researcher collected the filled questionnaires from these drop boxes.

Data (N = 485 paired sample) were collected in two waves from six banking sector organizations located in Pakistan. Total 900 questionnaires, covering questions on study’s independent variables (perceived injustice and psychological capital), were distributed at Time 1 in these organizations. Every respondent was provided with self-reported version of the survey. An
identification number was assigned to identify the respondent and to pair it together with Time 2 survey and supervisor-reported version of survey. We got 648 filled questionnaires back with response rate of almost 72%. While scrutiny, I found 19 unfilled or improperly filled questionnaires, hence, excluded for next phase. In second wave (Time 2), the same remaining 629 respondents were contacted after six weeks and asked to fill the questionnaire including questions for mediating variable (episodic envy) and dependent variables (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance and turnover intentions). The performance was also measured by the supervisors of these respondents at Time 2 by filling the questionnaire containing questions on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior of their subordinates. This time, we got back 485 filled questionnaires which makes 77.10% response rate, showing high and encouraging interest of bank employee’s to participate in the research. Out of these 485, I again scrutinized and exclude the unfilled and/or improperly filled questionnaires, therefore, finally left with 447 usable paired responses (447 self-reported responses and 447 supervisory rated responses).

3.4 Scales:
In current field survey, the questionnaire is used as a tool for data collection. I carefully selected the questionnaires by focusing on reported reliability and validity of the scale in previous studies of organizational sciences (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Cohen-Charash, 2009; Colquitt et al., 2013; El Akremi et al., 2010; Gilliland, 2008; Khan et al., 2014; Matta et al., 2014; Vigoda, 2000, 2002; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009). The current study used the self-reported measures for all variables except for that of employee’s job performance and organizational citizenship behavior which were measured by their respective supervisors. The supervisory-rated performance was adopted to address the common method bias which may appear, if the responses were taken from
the same source. All measured remain in English and no translation will be done in native language because English is well-understood by the majority of the working population in Pakistan. Moreover, previous studies conducted in Pakistan also did not apply any translation technique, neither they reported any serious problem in collecting data in English (Abbas et al., 2014; Lehner et al., 2014; Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004). Therefore, standardized back translation of the questionnaire into the native language was not required. Further, the author made every effort to employ well-established scales which are simple in language and easy to understand.

Following scales are employed to collect data for current study:

### 3.4.1 Perceived (in)justice:

Perceived (in)justice has been measured by using 20-items scale developed by Colquitt (2001). Colquitt (2001) extracted this scale from previous researches to seize it towards the dimensionality of perceived (in)justice and is, now, the most widely used scale for organizational (in)justice research. He extracted 4-items scale of Leventhal (1976) for measuring distributive (in)justice. Sample item includes “These outcomes reflect the effort I have put into my work.” The alpha reliability of this scale in current study is (0.89). In current study, responses were taken on a 5-point likert scale, whereby, high scores indicate high degree of perceived injustice. The 5-point likert scale was ranging from “1= strongly agree” to “5= strongly disagree”. To develop procedural (in)justice scale, Colquitt (2001) used 7-items scale of Thibaut & Walker (1975) and Leventhal (1980). Same scale has been used in this study. Responses were taken by using same likert scale, whereby, high scores indicating high level of perceived injustice. Sample item is “I have expressed my views and feelings during those procedures.” Findings
revealed the alpha reliability of the scale as (0.89). For measuring interpersonal (in)justice, 4-item scale developed by Colquitt (2001) has been used in current study. He used 9-items scale of Bies & Moag (1986) and Shapiro et al. (1994) for measuring interactional injustice. Out of these, first four measured interpersonal injustice. Sample item is “He treated me with dignity”. And remaining five measured informational (in)justice. Responses were taken on a 5-point likert scale, whereby, high scores indicated the high degree of perceived injustice. Current study reported the alpha reliability of this scale as (0.91), which was previously reported as (0.84). Perceived (in)justice is multidimensional construct and in order to further validate the contextual difference; I conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Findings revealed a better fit for four factor model of injustice which is consistent with recent meta-analysis results by Colquitt et al., (2013).

3.4.2 Workplace deviance:

19-items scale by (Bennett & Robinson, 2000) has been used for workplace deviance to measure this construct. The reported alpha reliability of workplace deviance was (0.83). 7-items were used to measure interpersonal deviance. Sample item for interpersonal deviance is “I made fun of someone at work”. Organizational deviance is measured by using 12-items; sample item for organizational workplace deviance is “I took property from work without permission”. The result of current study for alpha reliability test is (0.66) for interpersonal deviance and (0.63) for organizational deviance.

3.4.3 Turnover intentions:

Turnover intentions were measured by using global measure developed by Vigoda (2000). This scale is largely been used in previous studies of organizational sciences
(Abbas et al., 2014; Byrne, 2005; Ahmad & Lemba, 2010). These researchers reported high reliability of this scale. For example, Abbas et al., (2014) measured turnover intention with Vigoda, (2000), and reported Cronbach’s alpha as (.76) indicating high reliability. Khan, Abbas, Gul, and Raja (2015) used this scale in their study and reported reliability as (.78). These evidences demonstrate it as valid scale which can be used for further studies. Moreover, current study also found high alpha reliability as (0.85). The sample questions are “next year I will probably look for a new job outside this organization” and “lately, I have taken interest in job offers in the newspaper”. The responses were taken from 5 point likert scale ranging from “1= strongly disagree” to “5= strongly agree”, whereby, high value indicates high intentions of turnover.

3.4.4 Psychological Capital:

To measure these psychological capacities, the 24 item scale of PsyCap developed by Luthans et al., (2007) is used. Psychological capital questionnaire was developed to measure four sub dimensions of positive psychological capital. These dimensions are self-efficacy, optimism, resilience and hope. First six questions were used to assess self-efficacy. The sample items are “I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution”, “I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management” and “I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues”. Next six questions were used to assess hope and the sample items are “at the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals”, “right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work” and “at this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself”. Six questions used to assess resilience and the example questions are “when I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on”, “I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I
have to” and “I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before”. Last six questions were used to assess optimism and the sample questions are “When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best”, “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” and “I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work”. Responses were taken on 6-point likert scale which ranges from “1= strongly disagree”, to “6= strongly agree” and high response value indicates high level of psychological capital resource of respondent. The reported alpha reliability of this scale was (0.88), however, current study found it as (0.91).

3.4.5 Job Performance:

The performance is measured by supervisor-rated measure, consisted of 7 items and developed by (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Sample item includes “this person adequately completes assigned duties”. Current study reported the alpha reliability of this measure as (0.71).

3.4.6 Organizational Citizenship Behavior:

The 14 items of the same measure developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) to assess organizational citizenship behavior has been used in this study. The example item of the scale is “Passes along information to co-workers”. This was also included in supervisor-rated version of scale. The alpha reliability of this measure is (0.75).

3.4.7 Episodic Envy:

Envy has been measured using a 9-item scale developed by (Cohen- Charash, 2009). Sample item includes “I want to have what my fellow employee\colleague has”. Reported
Cronbach’s reliability of this scale was (0.81), which is found to (0.91) in this study. I conducted the confirmatory factor analysis for confirming the validity of the scale and also to check the discriminant validity of episodic envy from that of dispositional envy. Results revealed that episodic envy is significantly different from dispositional envy which works more like a trait emotion.

3.4.8 Control Variables:

The respondents’ demographic information is acquired by several self-reported items that cover gender, age, educational qualification, work experience and their job nature. The reason of including these demographic was to explain the characteristic of respondents who were being surveyed. Moreover, individual differences in demographic variables have also reported to be related with the criterion variables in previous studies of organizational behavior (Xie & Johns, 1995). One-way analysis of variance was applied to reveal any difference in groups of respondents for these variables, however, no significant factor is found except for gender, age and experience which were then controlled for further analyses. I also checked for possible effect of dispositional envy, if any, to cure any possible interaction of dispositional emotion which can affect justice perception but no significant effect found.
4 RESEARCH FINDINGS

This section covers a detailed discussion on findings of the study after data analysis. Firstly, the preliminary data analysis is reported which is performed to check the missing values and outliers. The descriptive statistics is also discussed explaining the nature of each variable separately and how respondents reported them. After examining the data accuracy and missing values, I performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) by using structural equation modeling (SEM). For this purpose, the measurement model of structural equation model (SEM) is performed which enables us to confirm the validation of scales. Present research performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for all independent variables of the study. Mainly, I examined the dimensionality of the perceived injustice as it is largely been in debate regarding its factors. Findings revealed that a four factor model is better fit for empirical evaluation.

Subsequently, the bivariate correlations are discussed to check the possible association among study’s major variables. Afterwards, multiple linear regression analysis is conducted to examine the main effects of perceived injustice on job outcomes. Hayes and Preacher (2013) process conditioning technique is used to test the mediation of episodic envy and for testing moderation of psychological capital in this direct and/or indirect relationship of perceived injustice and job outcomes.

Preliminary data analysis: Preliminary data analysis is conducted where I checked for the missing values and potential outlier which may affect the analysis. Initially, all the data is scrutinized through SPSS and found only two missing values. It was then checked with the respective questionnaire and recorded the missing response. Afterwards, I also checked with minimum and maximum values with respective variable’s scale and found within the prescribed scale range. After detecting missing values, outliers were checked in the dataset by using
Mahalanobis distance test which is widely used test for detecting multivariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Mahalanobis distance test findings revealed only six responses as outliers, hence, excluded from the final analysis.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics:

Table 1 explained the mean and standard deviation values for study’s major variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Nature</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic Envy</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Deviance</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive statistics indicated some good insight about the respondent’s demographic characteristics and how they respond towards variables that are included in the questionnaire. Frequency test findings describe that out of the 447 participants, 125 were females showing an encouraging improved percentage (28%) of female participation in working organizations in Pakistan. In previous studies, data collected from various organizations of Pakistan showed that the organizations in Pakistan have high male dominance and reported less than 15 percent women’s participation (Lehner et al., 2014; Azeem et al., 2015; Haq et al., 2011; Raja et al., 2004). The mean age of the respondents, at the first measurement, is found as 30.5 years ranged from 19 years to 57 years (S.D = 7 years). Findings also revealed that 89% of total respondents are of 40 years or below indicating the trend of young population in joining the banking sector in Pakistan. Level of qualification is much encouraging as 58% of the respondents are having Master’s degree or above education. Out of remaining, 92% are having Bachelor’s degree which shows quite encouraging trend of recruiting educated personnel in banking organizations of Pakistan. Only 14 respondents reported to have higher secondary education, leaving other 97% as having 14 years of education or above. In the first measurement, mean experience was reported as 8 years (SD = 6.2 years) and ranged from 1 year to 34 years which shows a diverse and experienced respondent’s pool. Lastly, job nature ranges from office work to managerial positions. Table 1 also illustrates the respondent’s mean response towards study’s main variables with standard deviation values.

4.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis:

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been done in order to validate the developed scales of constructs. I performed CFA for independent variable (perceived injustice) and moderator (psychological capital), because both these constructs are considered multi-dimensional in
literature (Colquit et al., 2013; Luthans et al., 2007). Further, CFA of episodic envy is also performed to check the discriminant validity of the scale. While performing CFA analysis, I followed the recommendations given by Kline (2005) and Hair et al., (2006) for evaluating model fit for adaptability standards. Following fit indices were examined: “root mean square error of approximation” (RMSEA) with 90 percent confidence interval, chi-square ($\chi^2$), goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and the non-normed fit index (NNFI). As recommended by Greeno, Hughes, Hayward, and Parker, (2007) for model fit, parameter estimates were used which included standardized factor loading at >0.50 (Kline, 2005). Table 2 describes the CFA factor loadings of perceived injustice. I also checked and reported the composite reliability and average variance extracted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive injustice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These outcomes reflect the effort I have put into my work”.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These outcomes appropriate for the work I do”</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These outcomes reflect what I have contributed to the organization”.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These outcomes are justified, given my performance”.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural injustice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have expressed my views and feelings during those procedures”.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I had the influence over the outcomes arrived at by those procedures”.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Those procedures have been applied consistently”.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Those procedures have been based on accurate information”.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures”</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Those procedures confirm ethical and moral standards”.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal injustice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He treated me in a polite manner”.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He treated me with dignity”.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He treated me with respect”.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He refrained from improper remarks or comments”?</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational injustice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He has been candid/frank in his communications with me”.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He explained the procedures thoroughly”.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Were his explanations regarding the procedures reasonable”?</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He communicated details in a timely manner”.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He seemed to tailor his communications to individuals' specific needs”?</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I initially checked the 3-factor model for perceived injustice (distributive, procedural and interactional). All factor loadings are loaded on expected latent variables, however, the model fitness values did not meet the criteria of adaptability standards (Kline, 2005; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The results show GFI = 0.80, CFI = 0.78 and NNFI = 0.79, which are quite less than the acceptable standard of values > 0.90. I retest the model with 4-factors of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational), and find the values GFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.92 and NNFI = 0.91, which are above the accepted standard of model fit and is also consistent with recent meta analysis findings where authors revealed better fit for 4-factor model of injustice (Colquit et al., 2013). Therefore, 4-factor model of perceived injustice is used in further analysis.

Table 3 shows the factor loadings of psychological capital, whereby, all factor loadings are loaded on expected latent variables and found significant (p<0.001). The results show that the values for model fitness meets the criteria of accepted adaptability standard i.e. GFI = 0.91, CFI = 0.94 and NNFI = 0.92.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution”</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management”</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident contributing to discussions about the organization’s strategy”</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area”</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident contacting people outside the organization to discuss problems”</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues”</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If I find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it”</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals”</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There are lots of ways around any problem”</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work”</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals”</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself”</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on”</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work”</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I can be on my own, so to speak, at work if I have to”</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I usually take stressful things at work in stride”.
“I can get through difficult times because I’ve experienced difficulty before”.
“I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job”.
“When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best”.
“If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will”.
“I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job”.
“I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work”.
“In this job, things never work out the way I want them to”.
“I approach this job as if every cloud has a silver lining”.

The last confirmatory factor analysis was performed for episodic envy. Episodic envy is single dimensional construct, nonetheless, I performed the confirmatory factor analysis to check the discriminant validity of the construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stuckeys Envy:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I lack some of the things that my fellow employee\colleague has”</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel bitter”</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel envious”</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have a grudge (resentment, bitterness) against my fellow employee\colleague”</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I want to have what my fellow employee\colleague has”</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My fellow employee\colleague has things going for him/her better than I do”</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel gall (irritated, annoyed)”</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel some hatred toward my fellow employee\colleague”</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel rancor (resentment, ill will) toward my fellow employee\colleague”</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 illustrates the factor loadings of episodic envy. All factor loadings are loaded on expectedly single factor and the results shows the acceptable model fit values, GFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.91 and NNFI = 0.91. I also checked for the discriminant validity of episodic envy by estimating the value of square correlation coefficient of two variables, and had been found less
than the average variance extracted, thus, confirming the discriminant validity of the tested measurement model of episodic envy (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

4.3 **Bivariate Correlations:**

In the next phase, the correlation has been estimated. Table 5 shows the bivariate correlations for all the variables along-side the estimates of reliability (coefficient $\alpha$). Most of study’s proposed zero-order bivariate correlations are found in the expected direction.
Table 5: Result of Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Nature</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic Envy</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational deviance</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal deviance</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447.

** significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
* significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † p
The estimates of reliability (coefficient α) found to be well above the threshold value. The values cited in the table within parenthesis and in bold font indicate alpha reliability of respective variables. The values of Cronbach’s alpha (α) are ranged between 0.63—0.91, indicating good reliability for the used scales (Nunnally, 1978). Results from the bivariate correlations also revealed quite encouraging findings and most of them are in the expected direction. The correlation between distributive injustice and organizational deviance is (r = 0.10, p < .05), positive and significant as proposed in the study showing positive association between distributive injustice and organizational deviance. The correlation between distributive injustice and job performance is (r = -0.21, p < .01), negative and significant as proposed in the study showing negative association between distributive injustice and job performance. Similarly, the correlation between distributive injustice and organizational citizenship behavior is (r = -0.10, p < .05), negative and significant as proposed in the study showing negative association between distributive injustice and organizational citizenship behavior. Results from bivariate correlation also revealed significant positive correlation between distributive injustice and intention to quit (r = 0.24, p < .01).

Results from bivariate correlation for procedural injustice and job outcomes also revealed some interesting findings. A significant correlation had been found between procedural injustice and organizational deviance (r = 0.18, p < .01) showing positive association between both. A significant correlation had also been found between procedural injustice and job performance (r = -0.19, p < .01) showing negative association between procedural injustice and job performance. The correlation of procedural injustice with intention to quit was also significant (r = 0.15, p < .05). However, the association between procedural injustice and organizational citizenship behavior has found to be insignificant.
Similarly, correlations were also checked for interpersonal injustice and job outcomes. Findings revealed that interpersonal injustice is positively associated with interpersonal deviance ($r = 0.43$, $p < .01$) and not with organizational deviance as proposed. Interpersonal injustice is also negatively associated with job performance ($r = -0.34$, $p < .01$). Moreover, correlation between interpersonal injustice and intention to quit is also found in similar way as with other types of injustice ($r = 0.14$, $p < .01$) showing positive association between both. However, correlation of interpersonal injustice with organizational citizenship behavior is found, although in expected direction, but insignificant ($r = -0.05$, n.s.).

Results of bivariate correlation for informational injustice and job outcomes are also found in expected directions. Findings revealed significant positive correlation of informational injustice with interpersonal deviance ($r = 0.33$, $p < .01$), significant negative association with job performance ($r = -0.32$, $p < .01$), and significant positive correlation with turnover intentions ($r = 0.12$, $p < .05$). Results for correlation of informational injustice and organizational citizenship behavior, however, found insignificant.

4.4 Regression Analysis:

In next Phase of data analysis, I examine the main causal effect of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) on job outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions) by using hierarchal regression technique. Hierarchal regression analysis allows the test to control the influence of extraneous variables on relationship of predictor and criterion variables (Cohen et al., 2013). Previous studies in organizational psychology reported that individual differences in demographic variables can influence such relationships (Xie & Johns, 1995). Therefore, I tested the effect of current study’s demographic variables on job
outcomes by applying one way ANOVA test. Findings revealed significant effects of gender, age and experience on certain job outcomes, therefore, treated as control variables. I entered gender, age and experience in step 1, to control for any possible effect of demographics, followed by the independent variables in step 2.

Table 6 presents the results for main effects of distributive injustice on proposed job outcomes (i.e. organizational deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions).
Table 6: Main effects of distributive injustice on job outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organizational deviance</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447. "Gender, age, and experience used as control variables
*** significant at the .001 level (2-tailed),
** significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
* significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † p”
As proposed in hypothesis 1a, distributive injustice is found to be positively related to organizational deviance ($\beta = 0.07$, $p < .01$) thus supporting hypothesis 1a which indicates that employee’s perception of distributive injustice significantly predict their act of organizational deviance. Next, hypothesis 2a proposed a negative relationship between distributive injustice and employee’s job performance. Results revealed a significant support for this hypothesis ($\beta = -0.14$, $p < .001$), therefore, accepted it. The main effects for distributive injustice and organizational citizenship behavior are also found significant and in expected direction ($\beta = -0.05$, $p < .05$) as proposed in hypothesis 3a. Last main effects of distributive injustice was proposed as positive with employee’s turnover intentions in hypothesis 4a, the same was revealed in the results ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < .001$). Therefore, hypothesis 4a is also supported by the findings.

Next, table 7 presents the results for main effects of procedural injustice on proposed job outcomes (i.e. organizational deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions).
Table 7: Main effects of procedural injustice on job outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organizational deviance</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.03***</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447. “Gender, age, and experience used as control variables
*** significant at the .001 level (2-tailed),
** significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
* significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † p”
Results for main effects of procedural injustice on employee’s job outcomes also found convincing support. As proposed in hypothesis 1b, a positive relationship between procedural injustice and organizational deviance is found ($\beta = 0.12, p < .001$), thus, accepting this hypothesis. The main effects of procedural injustice on employee’s job performance also found significant and in expected direction ($\beta = -0.13, p < .001$) as proposed in hypothesis 2b. Hypothesis 3b proposed a negative relationship between procedural injustice and organizational citizenship behavior, however, direct effects has found to be insignificant ($\beta = 0.03, n.s$). Results for hypothesis 4b also revealed significant support for proposed hypothesis ($\beta = 0.15, p < .01$), signifying a positive relationship between procedural injustice and turnover intentions. These results support study’s proposed hypothesis 1b, 2b and 4b for effects of procedural injustice on job outcomes (organizational deviance, job performance and turnover intentions). However, direct effects of procedural injustice has found to be insignificant with organizational citizenship behavior, thus, rejecting hypothesis 3b.

The next table illustrates the results for main effects of interpersonal injustice on proposed job outcomes (i.e. interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions).
Table 8: Main effects of interpersonal injustice on job outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Interpersonal deviance</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447. “Gender, age, and experience used as control variables

*** significant at the .001 level (2-tailed),
** significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
* significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † $p$”
Results for main effects of interpersonal injustice on proposed job outcomes also validate most of the anticipated hypotheses. Interpersonal injustice was found to be positively related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < .001$), thus, supporting hypothesis 1c. Noticeably, the magnitude of the effect is larger than other types of injustice, which shows that interactional injustice at workplace is more painful.

Hypothesis 2c proposed a negative relationship between interactional injustice and employee’s job performance, and results also confirms the proposed notion ($\beta = -0.25$, $p < .001$) demonstrating that employee’s perception about interactional injustice significantly reduces their job performance. The main effects for interpersonal injustice and employee’s organizational citizenship behavior was found in expected direction but not significant ($\beta = -0.03$, n.s), thus, rejecting hypothesis 3c. Hypothesis 4c predicted the positive relationship between interactional injustice and turnover intentions. Results also supported this hypothesis ($\beta= 0.16$, $p < .01$).

The last table of hierarchal regression demonstrates the main effects of informational injustice on proposed job outcomes (i.e. interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions).
Table 9: Main effects of informational injustice on job outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Interpersonal deviance</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447. “Gender, age, and experience used as control variables
*** significant at the .001 level (2-tailed),
**  significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
*   significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † $p$ ”
Like other types of perceived injustice, results for main effects of informational injustice on proposed job outcomes also approve most of the hypotheses as projected in the study. As proposed, informational injustice is found to be positively related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = 0.29, p < .001$), thus, supporting hypothesis 1d. Hypothesis 2d also catch the support from the results ($\beta = -0.25, p < .001$) confirming a negative relationship between informational injustice and employee’s job performance. Alike procedural and interactional injustice, the main effects for informational injustice and employee’s organizational citizenship behavior also found insignificant ($\beta = -0.03, n.s$), therefore, rejecting hypothesis 3d. And last tested main effect of informational injustice is with employee’s turnover intentions. Hypothesis 4d predicted the positive relationship between both and results also found significant support for this ($\beta = 0.12, p < .01$), thus, accepting the hypothesis.

After analyzing the main effects of all types of injustice in isolation, I performed the multiple regression analysis to further explore the unique explanation for impact of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcomes. The result also shows significant insight about the differences of perceived injustice types and its impact on employee’s job outcome. Table 10 below illustrates the multiple regression analysis results of main effects of all types of perceived injustice with job outcomes.
Table 10: Multiple regression analysis of all types of perceived injustice on job outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Workplace deviance*!</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447. “Gender, age, and experience used as control variables
*** significant at the .001 level (2-tailed),
** significant at the .01 level (2-tailed),
* significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), † p”

*! Workplace deviance indicates organizational deviance (with Distributive and Procedural injustice) and interpersonal deviance (with Interpersonal and Informational injustice)
The findings revealed that among relationship of distributive and procedural injustice with organizational deviance, procedural justice brings strong and significant explanation. Results shows that procedural injustice positively predicts organizational deviance ($\beta = 0.11, p < .001$), however, distributive injustice reportedly did not establish any significant relationship in the model. However, the complete model significantly predicts organizational deviance with $R^2$ value of 0.13 at 0.001 level of significance showing 13 percent of the variation in organizational deviance is explained by the given model and remaining by other factors. In the next step, the interpersonal and informational injustice was regressed with interpersonal deviance and both found to be significantly related with the criterion variable. However, interpersonal injustice is found to be more strongly related with interpersonal deviance ($\beta= 0.34, p < .001$) as compared to informational injustice ($\beta= 0.10, p < .01$). A similar pattern of results is found in relationship of job performance and all types of perceived injustice. The results shows that distributive, interpersonal and informational injustice significantly reduces employee’s job performance, however, no significant relationship was found between procedural injustice and job performance. The results of relationship between perceived injustice and organizational citizenship behavior again found no significant relationship confirming the results of simple regression analysis among this relationship. In further exploration, the distributive injustice is found to be the only predictor of turnover intentions ($\beta= 0.20, p < .001$) in multiple regression results with model variation explained as 6.5 percent. This analysis not only gives an interesting insight about the nature of relationship between injustice types and job outcomes but also report that which type of injustice is more strongly related to which job outcome. For example, the procedural injustice is a more strong predictor of organizational deviance and interpersonal injustice is a stronger predictor of interpersonal injustice and reduced job performance. Similarly,
among other types, the distributive injustice is found to be predictor of employee’s turnover intention. These findings give a strong theoretical and practical insight to manage employee’s behavior at workplace.

4.5 Mediation Analysis of Episodic Envy:

In the next phase, the mediation analysis is performed to examine the mediating effect of episodic envy in relationship all types of perceived injustice and employee’s job outcomes. The conditional process technique suggested by Hayes and Preacher (2013), was employed to test this mediation. They elaborated the use of indirect effect, direct effect and total effect for each mediation path. According to Hayes and Preacher (2013):

“The total effect is the effect in which change in independent variable is related with dependent variable (X to Y). The indirect effect is the effect in which a change in independent variable cause change in dependent variable via the mediating variable (X→M→Y). Finally the direct effect is the change in independent variable is directly related to dependent variable without using mediator path”.

For mediation test, it is important to know that nature of mediator could be full, partial and no mediation. Full mediation proved if the direct effect is not significant, whereas indirect effects are significant. However, if both direct and indirect effect were significant with considerable decrease in significance level or effect size, it shows partial mediation (Mathieu and Taylor, 2006). On the other hand, no mediation is observed if the indirect effects found to be insignificant.

This research used SAS macros for with bootstrapping (N= 5000) with confidence interval of 95% (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Baron and Kenny (1986) recommended Sobel test of indirect effect of X on Y through M. Sobel test is very low in power for indirect effects, whereas bootstrap tests in recommended for mediation analysis (see Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Zhao et al.,
Bootstrapping is non-parametric test of re-sampling (Shrout & Bolger, 2002) that replaces sample which is done by several times (1000, 5000, 10000). For each sample of indirect effect, the bootstrapping sampling distributions generated by taking a sample of N from the data set and re-estimate the indirect effect with resample. Researchers strongly recommended bootstrapping because it gives generalized way for testing confidence intervals and significance and bootstrapping does not need so many assumptions (Fritz et al., 2012; Hayes & Scharkow, 2013). The current study proposed episodic envy as mediator in the relationship of perceived injustice types (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, OCB and turnover intentions). Tables given below discuss detailed insight about the findings. Table 11 discusses all results of episodic envy as mediator in relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s act of workplace deviance (organizational and interpersonal).
Table 11: Mediation Analysis for Perceived Injustice and Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>L.C.L</th>
<th>U.C.L</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → Organizational Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → Organizational Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 447. Bootstrap sample size 5,000. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. LCL = lower Confidence Limit UCL= upper Confidence limit.

The current study proposed hypothesis 5 and 6 for tests of mediation for relationship of perceived injustice and workplace deviance. Hypothesis 5 stated that episodic envy will mediate the relationship of distributive and procedural injustice with organizational deviance. And hypothesis 6 narrates that episodic envy will mediate the relationship of interpersonal and informational injustice with interpersonal deviance. Results supported most of the proposed notions and helps in confirming the hypotheses. Findings revealed that the direct effects for distributive injustice and organizational deviance becomes insignificant (Effect =-.07, p=.06).
when tested with indirect effects. Moreover, indirect effects are found significant (Effect = .13, p= .00), proving full mediation. As described by Preacher and Hayes (2013), if presence of indirect effect makes the direct effects insignificant, it supports full mediation. Findings for mediation test of procedural injustice and organizational deviance also revealed similar results. Results of direct effects for procedural injustice and organizational deviance becomes insignificant (Effect =.03, p= .49) while indirect effects are significant (Effect =.08, p= .04) confirming full mediation. Therefore, results fully supported the hypothesis 5 and thus, confirmed that episodic envy mediates the relationship of distributive and procedural injustice with organizational deviance.

However, results for mediation test for hypothesis 6 revealed mixed results. The results of direct effects for interpersonal injustice and interpersonal deviance is found significant (Effect = .38, p= .00) while indirect effects found insignificant (Effect =.04, p= .10), therefore, unable to establish the mediation. I used 95% confidence interval for mediation test (Preacher and Hayes, 2008); however, we could support this mediation if the accepted range of confidence interval decreased to 90%. Hypothesis 6 further stated that episodic envy will also mediate the relationship of informational injustice and interpersonal deviance. Findings revealed a partial mediation in this relationship as results found a significant reduction in effect size of direct effect (Effect = .22, p= .00) to indirect effects (Effect =.05, p= .00), however, relationship remained significant for direct and indirect effects. The results provides a partial support for hypothesis 6 because partial mediation is proved in relationship of informational injustice and interpersonal deviance, however, results did not get any support for mediation of episodic envy in relationship of interpersonal injustice and interpersonal deviance.
Next, table 12 discusses all results of episodic envy as mediator in relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job performance to test for study’s proposed hypothesis 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Mediation Analysis for Perceived Injustice and Job Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 447. Bootstrap sample size  5,000. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. LCL = lower Confidence Limit UCL= upper Confidence limit.

This study proposed hypothesis 7 to test the mediation of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and job performance. Hypothesis 7 proposed that episodic envy will mediate the relationship of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job performance. Results of the mediation test supported most of the proposed
views and helps in confirming the hypotheses. Findings revealed that the direct effects for distributive injustice and job performance becomes insignificant (Effect = .05, \( p = .29 \)) when tested with indirect effects. Moreover, indirect effects are found significant (Effect = -.09, \( p = .01 \)), proving full mediation. Findings for mediation test of procedural injustice and job performance also revealed similar results. Results of direct effects becomes insignificant (Effect = -.03, \( p = .92 \)) while indirect effects are significant (Effect = -.12, \( p = .00 \)) confirming full mediation. Further, results confirm a partial mediation in this relationship of interpersonal injustice and job performance as results found a significant reduction in effect size of direct effect (Effect = -.21, \( p = .00 \)) to indirect effects (Effect = -.03, \( p = .05 \)), however, relationship remained significant for direct and indirect effects. Similarly, a partial mediation is also found in relationship of informational injustice and job performance as results found a significant reduction in effect size of direct effect (Effect = -.16, \( p = .00 \)) to indirect effects (Effect = -.03, \( p = .00 \)), however, relationship remained significant for direct and indirect effects. These results fully supported the hypothesis 7 and thus, confirmed that episodic envy mediates the relationship of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) with employee’s job performance.

Next, table 13 illustrate the results of mediation test of episodic envy in relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s organizational citizenship behavior to test for study’s proposed hypothesis 8.
Table 13: Mediation Analysis for Perceived Injustice and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Injustice</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>L.C.L</th>
<th>U.C.L</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 447. Bootstrap sample size 5,000. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. LCL = lower Confidence Limit UCL= upper Confidence limit.

The current study proposed hypothesis 8 to test the mediation of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and organizational citizenship behavior by stating that episodic envy will mediate the relationship of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s organizational behavior. Contrary to current study’s hypothesis 8, findings did not get any support for this proposed hypothesis. Findings revealed that the indirect effects for all types of perceived injustice (i.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational)
informational) remained insignificant with employee’s organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the hypothesis 8 is rejected.

The last table for mediation test explains the results of episodic envy as mediator in relationship between perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s turnover intentions to test for study’s proposed hypothesis 9.

Table 14: Mediation Analysis for Perceived injustice and Turnover Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Injustice → Episodic Envy → Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>L.C.L</th>
<th>U.C.L</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 447. Bootstrap sample size 5,000. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. LCL = lower Confidence Limit UCL= upper Confidence limit.

The current study proposed hypothesis 9 to test the mediation of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and employee’s turnover intentions. Hypothesis 9 illustrates that episodic envy will mediate the relationship of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal
and informational) and employee’s turnover intentions. Results of the mediation test supported most of the proposed views and helps in confirming the hypothesis except for distributive injustice where the direct effects for distributive injustice and turnover intentions remained significant (Effect =.15, p=.02) while indirect effects found insignificant (Effect = .07, p= .15), endorsing no mediation. However, findings for mediation test of other types of perceived injustice and turnover intentions provide encouraging support. Results of direct effects of procedural injustice and turnover intentions becomes insignificant (Effect = -.09, p= .26) while indirect effects are significant (Effect = .25, p= .00) confirming full mediation. Similarly, results also confirm full mediation in this relationship of interpersonal injustice and turnover intentions as results found insignificant direct effects (Effect = .05, p= .31), while indirect effects are significant (Effect = .10, p= .00), confirming full mediation. Full mediation is also found in relationship of informational injustice and turnover intentions as direct effect becomes insignificant (Effect = .04, p= .38) when tested with indirect effects (Effect = .07, p= .00), confirming full mediation. These results considerably supported current study’s hypothesis 9, except for distributive injustice. Consequently, we can reasonably argue that episodic envy mediates the relationship of perceived injustice (procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s turnover intentions.

4.6 Moderation of Psychological Capital:

In the last phase of analysis, I performed moderation analysis to test the hypothesis 10 which proposed that psychological capital will moderate the relationship of direct and/or indirect effects of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) with job outcomes such that the relationship will become weaker when psychological capital is high. The prior analysis shows that there is no significant direct and/or indirect effect of perceived injustice
on OCB, therefore, OCB is excluded from further analysis. Moreover, I obtained (VIF) scores and the tolerance statistics to check the possibility of multicollinearity among predictors before applying the moderation test (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), however, the results rejects the presence of multicollinearity i.e. VIF scores were below 3 (tolerance > .3).

For moderation analysis, I applied the conditional process technique, suggested by Hayes and Preacher (2013), to check the moderating effect of psychological capital. Preacher and Hayes (2008) provided 76 different models to analyze different mediated and moderated frameworks. These models explained different scenarios of mediation and moderation possibilities in certain framework. However, the current study chooses the model, whereby, the direct effects, indirect effects and moderation on these direct and indirect effects can be tested simultaneously. Figure 2 portrays the process which is used for current analysis.

Figure 2: Moderation Process

Source: Hayes and Preacher, 2013
To run the analysis, I entered the mediator $M_j$ (episodic envy), followed by the independent variable $X$ (perceived injustice) and moderator variable $V$ (psychological capital) and regress with the dependent variables separately. Consequently, the system generates two interaction terms i.e. i) one by multiplying episodic envy and psychological capital to test the indirect effects of perceived injustice on job outcomes and ii) second by multiplying perceived injustice and psychological capital to test the direct effects of perceived injustice on job outcomes.

Table 15 discusses all results for moderating effects of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effects of distributive injustice and job outcomes (organizational deviance, job performance and turnover intentions). The procedure mentioned in above paragraph is followed by entering episodic envy ($M_j$), distributive injustice ($X$) and psychological capital ($V$) in the prescribed fields along-with dependent variables one by one.
Table 15: Moderation of Psychological Capital on Direct and Indirect Effect of Distributive Injustice and Job Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational deviance</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>UCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic envy</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive injustice</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447
Interaction 1 = Episodic envy * Psychological capital
Interaction 2 = Distributive injustice * Psychological capital
Findings illustrate that psychological capital moderates the indirect effects of distributive injustice and job performance ($\beta = -.16$, $p=.04$, $LCL= -.32$ $UCL= -.12$). However, these findings did not give the complete information about the magnitude of moderation. To fully support this moderation, the interaction should conform to the hypothesized pattern. The slope analysis suggested by Aiken, West and Reno, (1991) is performed to measure the significant interactions for low and high (Mean+- SD). Figure below describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of job performance shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: interaction of psychological capital on indirect effect of distributive injustice and job performance

The figure above support the portioned proposition of current study that individual’s with high psychological capital cope with the negative emotions triggered from unjust events and their performance will not be reduced. The slope of job performance significantly shows that the employees with high psychological capital uphold their job performance level even when they are envious.
Table 16 below illustrates the results for moderating effects of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effects of procedural injustice and job outcomes (organizational deviance, job performance and turnover intentions). The similar procedure was adopted to run the analysis and entered episodic envy (M_j), procedural injustice (X) and psychological capital (V) in the prescribed fields along-with dependent variables one by one. Table below illustrate the output.
Table 16: Moderation of Psychological Capital on Direct and Indirect Effect of Procedural Injustice and Job Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational deviance</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>UCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic envy</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural injustice</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447

Interaction 1 = Episodic envy * Psychological capital
Interaction 2 = Procedural injustice * Psychological capital
Findings revealed that psychological capital moderates the direct effects of procedural injustice and organizational deviance ($\beta = .16$, $p=.04$, $LCL= .01$ $UCL= .33$). Results also found significant moderating effect of psychological capital on indirect effects of procedural injustice and job performance ($\beta = -.15$, $p=.03$, $LCL= .35$ $UCL= .03$). The same procedure is again applied to measure the pattern that whether the interactions are in expected directions or not. Figure 4 describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of organizational deviance shows a decline when psychological capital is high. Whereas, slope of job performance again shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure 5).

**Figure 4: interaction of psychological capital on direct effect of procedural injustice and organizational deviance**

![Figure 4: interaction of psychological capital on direct effect of procedural injustice and organizational deviance](image)

Figure 4 marked significant reduction in participation of employees in organizational deviance when their psychological capital is high. The dark slope showed a significant decline, whereas, the dotted line (representing individuals with low psychological capital) showed the upward tendency of participation in organizational deviance. However, the test for significance of the
slope revealed that the dotted slope is not significant. Additionally, the dark slope gives an interesting insight about the higher tendency of employee’s involvement in organizational deviance when there is no procedural injustice. This might be explained by the fact that psychological capital activates when employees feel the threat of losing the resources in shape of high procedural injustice and only then employees limit themselves from participating in deviant behaviors against organization.

Figure 5: interaction of psychological capital on indirect effect of procedural injustice and job performance

This figure above provides the same information as described in Figure 3 and again supported the apportioned proposition that individual’s with high psychological capital cope with the negative emotions triggered from procedurally unjust events and their performance will not be reduced.

Table 17 stated the results for moderating effects of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effects of interpersonal injustice and job outcomes (organizational deviance, job
performance and turnover intentions). To run the analysis, the similar procedure was adopted except replacing procedural injustice by interactional injustice (X) in the prescribed field.
Table 17: Moderation of Psychological Capital on Direct and Indirect Effect of Interpersonal Injustice and Job Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal deviance</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>UCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic envy</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal injustice</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447
Interaction 1 = Episodic envy * Psychological capital
Interaction 2 = Interpersonal injustice * Psychological capital
Results shows that psychological capital moderates the indirect effects of interpersonal injustice and job performance ($\beta = -.16$, $p=.00$, $LCL= -.28$ $UCL= -.05$). The slope analysis is again performed to measure the significant interactions for low and high (Mean+- SD). Figure 6 below describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of job performance shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6: interaction of psychological capital on indirect effect of interpersonal injustice and job performance**

![Graph showing the interaction of psychological capital on indirect effect of interpersonal injustice and job performance](image)

This figure above again provides the same information supporting the apportioned proposition that individual’s with high psychological capital cope with the negative emotions triggered from interactional injustice perceptions.

Table 18 below describes the results for moderating effects of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effects of informational injustice and job outcomes (organizational deviance, job performance and turnover intentions).
Table 18: Moderation of Psychological Capital on Direct and Indirect Effect of Informational Injustice and Job Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal deviance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job performance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover intentions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>LCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic envy</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational injustice</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 447
Interaction 1 = Episodic envy * Psychological capital
Interaction 2 = Informational injustice * Psychological capital
Findings revealed that psychological capital moderates the direct effects of informational injustice and interpersonal deviance ($\beta = .10, p=.04, LCL= .01, UCL= .23$). Results also found significant moderating effect of psychological capital on indirect effects of informational injustice and job performance ($\beta = -.15, p=.00, LCL= -.26 UCL= -.05$). The same procedure is again applied to measure the pattern that whether the interactions are in expected directions or not. Figure 7 describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of interpersonal deviance shows a decline when psychological capital is high. Whereas, slope of job performance again shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure 8).

Figure 7: interaction of psychological capital on direct effect of informational injustice and interpersonal deviance
Figure 7 reports significant reduction in interpersonal deviance of employees who have high psychological capital. The slope lines showed that people with high psychological capital have fewer tendencies to involve in interpersonal deviance when they perceive informational injustice. The dark slope (representing individuals with high psychological capital) showed significantly more decline as compared to dotted slope (representing individuals with low psychological capital) showing employees tendency to involve in interpersonal deviance.

**Figure 8: interaction of psychological capital on indirect effect of informational injustice and job performance**

![Graph showing the interaction of psychological capital on job performance](image)

The last moderation figure above provides the support for the apportioned proposition that individual’s with high psychological capital cope with the negative emotions triggered from informational injustice perceptions better than those with low psychological capital.

Overall, these results revealed mixed findings on the moderating role of psychological capital. Although, employee’s job performance is found to be moderated by high psychological capital,
no significant moderation is found in the relationship of perceived injustice and employee’s turnover intentions. Moreover, moderation is also not established in relationship of distributive and interactional injustice with its respective deviance type (organizational and interpersonal respectively). However, these deviance types are moderated in case of procedural and informational injustice.

4.7 Summary of Findings:
Overall, results of the current study revealed some encouraging information about relationship between study’s major variables. I not only tested the direct and indirect effects of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) on job related outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions), but also revealed the moderating effect of psychological capital by incorporating COR as foundation. Findings revealed some interesting insight about nature of these relationships.
Table 19 describes the summary of results for main effects of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and job outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions).
Table 19: Summary of results for main effect hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a: Distributive injustice → Organizational deviance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b: Procedural injustice → Organizational deviance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1c: Interpersonal injustice → Interpersonal deviance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1d: Informational injustice → Interpersonal deviance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2a: Distributive injustice → Job Performance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2b: Procedural injustice → Job Performance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2c: Interpersonal injustice → Job Performance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2d: Informational injustice → Job Performance</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a: Distributive injustice → OCB</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b: Procedural injustice → OCB</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3c: Interpersonal injustice → OCB</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3d: Informational injustice → OCB</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a: Distributive injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b: Procedural injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4c: Interpersonal injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4d: Informational injustice → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current study proposed 16 hypotheses for testing these main effects and 13 of these got support from the results, therefore, accepted. The findings revealed that most of the main effects of perceived injustice types influence the employee’s work outcome adversely except for effects of procedural, interpersonal and informational injustice with organizational citizenship behavior.

In addition to main effect results, table 20 illustrates the summary for indirect effects of perceived injustice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and job outcomes (organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions) through episodic envy.
Table 20: Summary of results for mediation of Episodic Envy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor → Mediator → Criterion</th>
<th>Degree of Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → Organizational Deviance</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → Organizational Deviance</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → Job Performance</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → OCB</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Injustice → Episodic Envy → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Injustice → Episodic Envy → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Injustice → Episodic Envy → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Injustice → Episodic Envy → Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current study proposed 4 main hypotheses which initiated 16 mediation tests for investigating these indirect effects. Most of the study’s hypothesis for indirect effects also got support from the results. Findings revealed support for 9 mediations out of which 7 confirms full mediations and 2 partial mediations. However, no mediations were found in perceived injustice types and organizational citizenship behavior relationship. This also makes sense because the main effects were also found to be insignificant in this relationship. The last hypothesis of the current study is about moderating effect of psychological capital and the findings extracts apportioned support for the proposed hypothesis.
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This section encircles the discussion on findings in the light of current study’s research questions. Moreover, this section also provides arguments on current research’s implications for theory and practice. Subsequently, limitations of the study are discussed along-with future directions for future researchers to further extend this effort of knowledge advancement.

5.1 Discussion:

Current study revealed a detailed insight about the emotional mechanism of perceived injustice and job outcomes relationship. Following the strong theoretical notion of effective event theory, it was theorized that the event of injustice triggers the negative emotion of episodic envy and resultantly influence the job outcomes adversely. Further, it was also hypothesized that such relationships are moderated by individual’s psychological resource i.e. psychological capital by incorporating conservation of resource theory as foundation. Most of the study’s proposed hypotheses got encouraging support from the results.

First research question of the current study was about the main effects of perceived injustice and job outcomes. To answer the question, 4 hypotheses were proposed and results yielded strong evidence that perception of injustice is detrimental to workplace outcomes. Findings confirm that distributive and procedural injustice significantly predict employee’s act of organizational deviance, moreover, interpersonal and informational injustice significantly predict employee’s act of interpersonal deviance. These findings are consistent with prepositions of target similarity model of Lavelle et al. (2007), whereby, they propose that organizational focused injustice is more likely to relate with organizational target outcomes, while supervisory focused injustice is more likely to relate with supervisor target outcomes (Colquit et al., 2013). Moreover, Masterson
et al. (2000) and Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) also reported some similar findings in their empirical investigations.

Findings on the relationship of perceived injustice and employee’s job performance also yield the expected results as all types of injustice perception results in significant reduction in employee’s job performance. These findings are consistent with previous studies, where, the workplace behaviors are viewed in social exchange perspective and employees react to balance the score by decreasing their performance, if social exchange norms are violated (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003; Shirom, Nirel, & Vinokur, 2006; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). Contrarily to the next hypothesis, findings for main effects perceived injustice and employee’s organizational citizenship behavior did not get much support. Although distributive injustice significantly explains decrease in employees’ citizenship behavior, remaining types of injustice perceptions remained unable to establish any significant relationship. Last hypotheses for finding main effects also get strong evidence for relationship between perceived injustice and employee’s turnover intentions. Earlier studies consistently reported unfair treatment as an activating force to increased intensions of leaving the organization (Cole, Bernerth, Walter, & Holt, 2010; Li & Cropanzano, 2009b). Consistent with these findings, current study also revealed all types of injustice perceptions as stimulating to increased turnover intentions.

The second research question of the current research asks about the mediating role of episodic envy in relationship of perceived injustice and job outcomes. Mediation analysis also shows significant support for study’s proposed hypotheses of mediation. Full mediation was found in relationship of distributive and procedural injustice with organizational deviance. Results also found partial mediation in relationship of informational injustice and interpersonal deviance. Although there are some studies which recently attempted to investigate the mechanism of
perceived injustice and workplace deviance (see for example Jones, 2009), however, the consensus in literature is yet to be conclusive. Specifically, current study improves our understanding regarding emotional mechanism of injustice. Earlier studies examined some outward focused negative state emotions (e.g. anger and hostility) in relationship of procedural and interactional injustice with retaliatory behaviors in organizations (Barclay et al., 2005), but the current study adds to the literature of justice by examining a more relevant emotion which is episodic and triggered by certain event, i.e. perceived injustice (Cohen-Charash, 2009; Tai et al., 2012). It can reasonably argue that injustice and deviance relationship is explained by more hot or spontaneous instances of affect induced deviance (Fox et al., 2001; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006). Another relevant attempt was also made by Jones (2009), investigating desire for revenge as mediator in relationship of procedural injustice and counterproductive work behaviors at workplace. However, evidently, such perceptions of injustice stimulate negative emotions before stimulating such desires. Further analysis of current study also revealed that the relationship of perceived injustice and job performance is mediated by episodic envy. However, similar to the findings of main effects of perceived injustice with employee’s citizenship behavior, mediation test also did not get any support for indirect effects. Mediation test for indirect effects of perceived injustice and employee’s turnover intentions found significant support except for that of distributive injustice. These findings clearly portrays that employees compare themselves with their coworker (Dittrich & Carrell, 1979) and when they perceive injustice in this comparison, they “feel” it and their intend to leave the organization increased (Adam, 1965; Aquino et al., 1997; Yang et al., 2012).

The third and last research question of the current study aimed at exploring the moderating effect of psychological capital on the direct and/or indirect effects of perceived injustice types on
employee’s job outcomes. The findings of moderation analysis partially supported the third research question of the study as moderation of psychological capital has been found in certain direct and/or indirect effects of perceived injustice and job outcomes. First, the direct effects of procedural injustice with organizational deviance found to be moderated by psychological capital such that the employees with high psychological capital are less likely to involve in organizational deviance when they perceive procedural injustice in the organizations. Similarly, the direct effects of informational injustice with interpersonal deviance have also found to be moderated by psychological capital in such manner that employees with high psychological capital are less likely to involve in interpersonal deviance when they notice informational injustice. In the similar model investigation, result also found the support for moderating effect of psychological capital on indirect effect of all types of perceived injustice with employee’s job performance such that employees with high psychological capita are less likely to reduce their performance even when they “feel” injustice. The psychological resource of high psychological capital buffers the negative effect of episodic envy on employee’s job performance in such a way that employees with high psychological capital convert their envy into positive and bolstering force due to their high composite resource of confidence, hope, optimism and resilience enabling them to face the setback with patience and remain hopeful to move forward and achieve the personal goals in future. However, the remaining moderating prepositions were not supported in the findings. There are certain explanations which can describe that why the findings only reveal certain moderations and not the others. First of all, the results are drawn from the survey conducted in field study which is inherently lacked in its capacity to detect the interactions because of differences in measurement error (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Similarly, another important factor is the low
base rate of self-reported attitudes and behaviors, which may also limit us in our capacity to detect some of the proposed interactions. However, I reasonably believe that the findings of the current study highlighted an important and suggestive provision for the proposed contention because the mainstream interactions were supported for organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance and job performance.

The findings clearly upkeep the contention proposed by current study in the first part that when employees at workplace perceive injustice, they are more likely to involve in organizational and interpersonal deviance depending on their attribution of injustice. Moreover, such perceptions of injustice are also results in their reduced job performance and increased turnover intentions. In addition, the findings also suggest that these main effect relationships are explained through emotion of episodic envy. Results found that episodic envy mediated the main effect relationship of all types of perceived injustice (i.e. distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and employee’s job outcomes (i.e. organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, job performance and turnover intentions). Similarly, findings also found partial support for the moderating effect of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effects of perceived injustice and major employee’s job outcomes like organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance and job performance. However, contrary to our expectations, the moderating effect of psychological capital on direct and/or indirect effect of perceived injustice and intentions to quit was not found significant. This is specifically understandable because earlier scholar frequently reported that employees with high psychological capital might also think of quitting the organization in case of unfavorable working environment because they are more skillful and often have more employment opportunities due to their proven high performance record (Jackofsky, 1984). Moreover, studies also reported that high performing employees are more likely to leave the
organization in pursuit of better working conditions, if treated unjust with unaligned pay and promotion policies (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 1999; Nauta, Vianen, Heijden, Dam, & Willemsen, 2009).

5.2 Implications of the study:
The central conceptual implication of this study is that injustice is an affective event (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) rather merely considering equity theory as foundation of organizational justice’s. More importantly, when equity theory is unable to suggest the tactics that individual can uphold to restore equity (Greenberg, 2010; Mowday, 1983; Pinder, 2008). This central implication that injustice is an affective event is evidenced by model investigated in current study which also extends the efforts of previous researchers by proposing that emotion of episodic envy resulting from perceived inequity prompts reaction, and these reactions are synchronized with actions which are threat oriented. This general implication, in turn, has several important and specific implications which extend the current knowledge in the field of organizational behavior. First, despite the fabulous growth in the literature of organizational injustice, injustice types in single study have largely been overlooked in literature (Colquitt et al., 2001). Current study investigated a comprehensive model covering all four types of perceived injustice in single study to better understand the nature of the whole construct and each component of it in isolation. Additionally, another theoretical implication of this study is its contribution in cultural context by exploring the phenomenon in eastern context, in comparison of earlier studies which explore the effects of perceived injustice in different context of western countries (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Cropanzano et al., 2007; Folger & Baron, 1996; J. Greenberg, 1990a; J. Greenberg & Alge, 1998; Mintzberg, 1985; Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Earlier scholars frequently highlighted the need of exploring the relationship of emotions and
injustice in real world settings. There are studies in literature which have been conducted in laboratory settings in an experimental design by using students as respondents, but the generalizability of the findings are limit by the controlled and artificial work settings (Cropanzano et al., 2001; Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000; Weiss et al., 1999; Gordon, Slade, & Schmitt, 1987). Nevertheless, Weiss et al., (1999) explicitly ask to investigate such relationships in real world settings. Current effort to examine the relationship between fairness, emotions, and job outcomes strengthens the generalizability as it is conducted in a field study, which is another important contribution. Matta et al., (2014) investigated the relationship of justice, emotions and counterproductive work behaviors among young computer programmers in small companies and ask for further examination in other work settings, specifically, service jobs. Current study also responded to that call by conducting the field study in banking industry and verifies the external validity and enhances the generalizability.

Further, the comprehensive framework of current studies, to our little knowledge, is the first attempt to explore perceived injustice and job outcomes where state emotion is involved as mediating mechanism. This will enhance our understanding about the true insight of this injustice-outcome relationship by arguing that it is mediated by episodic envy. Such mechanisms were also suggested to investigate by previous researchers in order to better understand the nature of this injustice-outcome relationship (Khan et al., 2013; Jones, 2009). Another important theoretical implication of this study is the examination of prevalence of psychological capital as a moderator between direct and/or indirect effect of perceived injustice on job outcomes to stretch buffering mechanism and responding to call for investigations (Abbas et al., 2014; Azeem et al., 2015; Lehner et al., 2014). This coping mechanism also helps to identify envy categorization by arguing that individual’s with high psychological capital ease the envy-aroused
pain and see it as self-motivating rather than feeling it as malicious. Nonetheless, another significant contribution of the study is the longitudinal nature of the study which gives better understanding about the effects of perceived injustice over time. Longitudinal design has frequently been suggested in literature but seldom investigated (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Taken together, this examination extends our understanding of seeing the injustice as an affective phenomenon and how such perceptions are transformed into work attitudes and behaviors at workplace. This examination also initiates the debate of tackling the negative effects of emotions through high psychological capital.

5.3 Implications for Practice:
This study provides substantial and valuable implications for practice, especially, to managers by emphasizing the need and importance of adhering to the fair procedures while applying the human resource policies (Scott, Colquit, & Paddock, 2009). The current study also points to the manager to stay cautious from the harmful effects of injustice perception at workplace. Moreover, organizations should also encourage and train their managers to treat their subordinate with equality while appraising them and also when explaining the decisions (Skarlicki & Latham, 2005). The managers should avoid all the potential contributors to such perceptions like unclear procedures, ambiguous feedback, lack of communication and mentoring, and absence of dignity and respect in communication. This is even more important for the managers of the organizations those are going through mergers, acquisitions, downsizing, or restructuring because the working environment of such organizations already going through uncertain conversations and rumors (Van den Bos, 2001; Van den Bos & Lind, 2002; Lind, Greenberg, Scott, & Welchans, 2000). The findings of the current study also points to the need of implementing the fair procedures during appraisals because it will help organizations in reducing
the involvement of their employees in deviant behaviors (Cropanzano et al., 2007). Indeed, the fair and transparent procedures escalate the credibility of the organization and employees attribute it feeling of support by their organization. Literature also reported that organizations with fair and transparent procedural justice profited with higher in-role and extra-role performances from the (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Moreover, the findings also highlight the importance of giving respect and dignity while dealing with subordinates. Indeed, the respectful treatment and supportive behavior from supervisor can mitigate the effect of distributive or procedural injustice.

Another important and valuable implication which can be extracted from the findings of this study is that it stresses the need of examining and changing the selection criteria for hiring the employees by including the tests of characteristics such as confidence, hope, optimism and resilience because these characteristics can help the newcomers to cope the undue perceptions of injustice (Abbas et al., 2014). Moreover, as these psychological capabilities are developable, organizations can also introduce the appropriate training interventions which can help the existing employees to enhance these psychological capabilities enabling them to deal with such perceptions. The managers can use the tactics of emotional arousal, verbal persuasion, goal-directed energy boosters, defining pathways, and trainings for opportunity seeking in future, enactive mastery at work and vicarious modeling can help to develop and increase the psychological capital of individuals at workplace. Moreover, the trainings for coping with emotions can also be introduced, whereby, employees would be exposed to emotional intelligence training interventions and counseling. This would help managers to deal with their subordinate’s emotional state before it transforms into detrimental workplace behaviors (Kwok, Au, & Ho, 2005).
The findings of the current study also urge managers to be aware of the episodic models at workplace, which in turns help them to manage the emotions of employees effectively. Moreover, managers can also develop effective techniques to cope with emotional reaction by understanding when and how one is experiencing it (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Another method to prevent the emotion of envy is by fostering cooperative working environment where every employee feel comfortable approaching his manager and/or colleagues and talk to him regarding his problem. The managers can also use another important strategy of boosting self-reliance for coping with envy (Salovey & Rodin, 1998). Self-reliance helps employees in increasing their emotional control and perseverance, thus, reducing envy. A more specific organizational implication of this study is for organizations in Pakistan, who can use the findings of the current study for managing the detrimental forces of envy and workplace deviance. The early cultural theories suggested that the negative emotions and behaviors are generally less tolerated in high power distance and collectivist cultures. However, employees still found some ways to deviate due to the pain they experience from upward comparison. This situation can be tackled by fostering a strong group harmony and cooperative working environment.

5.4 Limitations and Future Directions:

While this study has substantial implications of exploring the emotional mechanism of reaction to injustice perceptions, it certainly has some limitation. First, the results of this research are limited to banking sector of Pakistan, and could be different in other sectors and geographical areas (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Jo & Joo, 2011). The ratio of such injustice perceptions and its impact could also vary in other organizations or industries of Pakistan. Another limitation of this study is the inability to control for the environmental support in such relationship. Support from supervisor or colleagues may help to cope with such injustice perceptions or may also
affect such perceptions in a way that individual’s would not take it as emotional as in absence of such support (Allen *et al.*, 1999; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Similarly, a crucial limitation of the current study is its inability to control the impact of the labor market opportunities which might have an effect on the results of the study. As argued in the above section, high performers have more opportunities in labor market, hence tends to leave the organization in case of unfavorable working conditions. This may also be true with other factors like age, gender and experience etc. for example, older employees might not leave the company even treated unfairly because they perceive fewer opportunities outside (Ng & Feldman, 2009).

Another limitation, normally associated with investigation of emotions, is the use of self-report scale to measure emotions of individuals at workplace. However, previous studies reported that considering the implicit nature of emotions, self-reported measures are better at estimating the emotional experiences (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Diener, 2000). A similar suggestion was also made to measure the deviant behaviors of the employees because some of these behaviors are covert and implicit (Khan *et al.*, 2014). Moreover, the appraisals are important to employees and they are more likely to remember and recall more important events than the less important ones (Fabiani & Donchin, 1995). Therefore, the injustice perceptions were also measured by using self-reported measures because the individuals perceiving such perceptions can only best recall such events. However, the performance of employees was measured by using supervisory-rated measure to avoid the single source bias. The current study is also limited because of measuring study variables over one time lag of six weeks and at two fixed time points. Though, the process examined here actually may have long time lag, previous studies
suggested four-week time lag difference as the minimum to measure the emotion related variables (Côté & Morgan., 2002).

As an important contribution, this study examined a different cultural context which is in-line with calls made by scholars of organizational behavior to test the validity for theories of western considerations in eastern countries (Johns, 2006). While the findings of the current study provides the support for such validity and generalizability of examined relationship, it certainly highlighted the importance of examining more discrete contextual factors like cultural values (Abbas et al., 2014). This could also be achieved by comparing the findings with similar cultural context like India and Bangladesh which will helps to increase generalizability as the cultural values differ in those countries as compared to Pakistan. Similarly, this research model needs to pursue in other Asian countries with different cultures (China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia) helping to ensure generalization of research findings in Asia.

Future researchers may also examine other emotions as possible mediators in relationship between injustice perception and job outcomes. For example, injustice perceptions could also prompt the emotion of anger in individuals and could be investigated in future studies (Walsh et al., 2011). Similarly, other phenomenon like “attribution of blame” can also be tested as possible explanation of injustice and outcome relationship at workplace (Barclay et al., 2005). The current study attempts to examine the emotion laden mechanism of perceived injustice and employee’s job outcomes relationship. The social exchange perspective of perceived injustice is also well researched; therefore, give rise to the need of exploring a comprehensive comparative study of perceived injustice; comparing how the affective and reciprocated social exchange mechanisms differ (Gouldner, 1960). It will results in finding out the unique effect of each mechanism even it might be the case that some of their impact is shared. It will also help us in
understanding the respective role of affects and social exchange as drivers of deviant behaviors in reaction to injustice perceptions.

Certain other phenomenon which are relevant to injustice perceptions also needs to be examined as possible alternative explanation. For example, individual’s social identities are particularly related with interactional injustice, whereby, individuals viewed their identity being threatened hence involved in deviant behaviors (Blader & Tyler, 2009). Therefore, this would suggest that individual identity and/or group identity can be tested as mechanisms of the relationship between injustice experiences and employee’s respective job outcomes. Additionally, this research thesis examined negative behavioral job outcomes and employee turnover intention. Future researchers may benefit by investigating the positive consequences of envy, where employees take envy as motivating and work harder to get the desired object. From another perspective, the moderating factors needs to be explored in future, which help individuals to cope with the emotions of envy. In addition, the personality traits like core self-evaluation and emotional intelligence could also weaken the negative effects of emotions and job related outcomes and could be investigated in future.

In conclusion, it is evidenced that individuals who encounter injustice “feel” that unfairness. This experience has been described as “hot” and painful (Bies, 2001), and those encountering this experience stimulates negative emotional reaction and are more likely to balance the score by involving in undesirable outcomes. Therefore, the current study emphasize to the need of giving equal importance to emotions at work because we, as human beings, both think and feel (Muchinsky, 2000). The current study also shed light on dealing with emotions by developing strong psychological capabilities which helps them in coping with emotion of episodic envy. This study concludes that perceived injustice is detrimental to workplace outcomes, especially
when it triggers the negative emotions. However, people with high psychological composite resource have that ability to cope with such unjust situations better.
6 REFERENCES


De Cremer, D. (2007). *Advances in the psychology of justice and affect: IAP.*


Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of marketing research*, 382-388.


Gino, F., & Pierce, L. (2010). Lying to level the playing field: Why people may dishonestly help or hurt others to create equity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1), 89-103.


Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (2005). How can training be used to foster organizational justice?


justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221-258.

Associates.


The role of age in the perceptions of politics--job performance relationship: a three-study
constructive replication. *Journal of applied psychology, 90*(5), 872.

Tripp, T. M., Bies, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2002). Poetic justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of
revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89*(1), 966-984.

reconciliation, forgiveness, and avoidance. *Social Justice Research, 20*(1), 10-34.


Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup

and behavioral engagement*; Psychology Press.


Van de Ven, N., Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2009). Leveling up and down: the experiences of

reactions to perceived procedural fairness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(6), 931.

information in the psychology of justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 85*(3), 482.


Respected Sir/Madam,

I am a doctoral research student at Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria. I would like to invite you to participate and complete a survey which will take 20 – 30 minutes of your time. The aim of this study is to examine the effects of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcome. However, I am also looking to investigate the emotional mechanism of this relationship along-with coping tool.

Your precious time and valuable participation will be a great contribution towards the noble cause of knowledge creation. I ensure you that any information obtained in connection with this study, will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented. Moreover, I am also bound by the researching code of ethics to keep the data safe and report the aggregate results without harming any individual’s reputation. Additional, it is also important to note that the participation is voluntary and the participant can also leave at any time, if not feeling comfortable.
Please tick/fill with the appropriate answer:

1. Gender:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female


3. Job Nature: (You can tick more than one option)
   - ☐ Field work  ☐ Office work  ☐ Technical  ☐ Staff  ☐ Managerial

4. Tenure with current organization:
   - ☐ Less than 1 year  ☐ 1-5 years  ☐ 5-10 years  ☐ 10-15 years  ☐ 15 & above

5. Total Experience: ____ (Years)

6. How many organizations you have worked in? ______________

7. Monthly Income:  ☐ Below 25,000  ☐ 25,000-40,000  ☐ 41,000-50,000  ☐ 51,000 and Above

8. Highest Qualification:  ☐ SSC  ☐ HSSC  ☐ Graduation  ☐ Master  ☐ M.Phil/PhD

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For each item of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your agreement and disagreement by ticking the appropriate box.

These items refer to the benefits / rewards your organization provides for your efforts at work (e.g. pay, promotion, time-off etc). The words outcomes used below refer to your pay, promotion, time-off etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  These outcomes reflect the effort I have put into my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  These outcomes appropriate for the work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  These outcomes reflect what I have contributed to the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  These outcomes are justified, given my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items refer to the procedures or processes which are used by the managers / management to decide the benefits / rewards provided to you. (your performance appraisal procedures).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  I have expressed my views and feelings during those procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I had the influence over the outcomes arrived at by those procedures.

Those procedures been applied consistently.

Those procedures have been free of bias.

Those procedures have been based on accurate information.

I have been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures.

Those procedures confirm ethical and moral standards.

The following items refer to your Manager / Regional or Area Manager who has a determining / deciding role in the benefits / rewards which organization offers to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 He treated me in a polite manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 He treated me with dignity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 He treated me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 He refrained from improper remarks or comments?</td>
<td><em><strong>explanation</strong></em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(he avoids to give improper remarks or comments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items refer to your Manager / Regional or Area Manager who has a determining / deciding role in the benefits / rewards which organization offers to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 He has been candid/frank in his communications with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 He explained the procedures thoroughly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Were his explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 He communicated details in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 He seemed to tailor his communications to individuals' specific needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each item of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your agreement and disagreement by ticking the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick for each question, extend to which, you disagree or agree with the following statements:

21 I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution

22 I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management.

23 I feel confident contributing to discussions about the organization’s strategy

24 I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area

25 I feel confident contacting people outside the organization (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems.

26 I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.

27 If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it.

28 At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals.

29 There are lots of ways around any problem.

30 Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.

31 I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals.

32 At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself.

33 When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on.

34 I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work.

35 I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to.

36 I usually take stressful things at work in stride.

37 I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before.

38 I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job.

39 When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>In this job, things never work out the way I want them to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I approach this job as if “every cloud has a silver lining.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>“Thank you for giving your precious time to contribute towards noble cause of knowledge creation by filling this questionnaire.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Self-rated questionnaire (Time 2)

Name: ____________________

Respected Sir/Madam,

I would like to invite you again to participate and complete a survey which is the continuity of the same previous questionnaire. I would like to remind you that the aim of this study is to examine the effects of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcome. However, I am also looking to investigate the emotional mechanism of this relationship along-with coping tool.

While thanking you for your participation in last survey, I would again like to pass my gratitude for your precious time and valuable participation. Please place this questionnaire after filling in the box placed in your branch for this purpose.

Please read the instructions below and tick for each question, extend to which, you disagree or agree.

Compare yourself to a fellow employee at your same level (i.e. not with your supervisor and subordinate) with whom you consistently compare yourself. Please choose the fellow employee who is perceived by you as more successful than yourself at gaining things that you strive for and that are very important to your self-worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I lack some of the things that my fellow employee'colleague has.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I feel bitter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I feel envious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I have a grudge (resentment, bitterness) against my fellow employee'colleague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I want to have what my fellow employee'colleague has.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 My fellow employee'colleague has things going for him/her better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I feel gall (irritated, annoyed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I feel some hatred toward my fellow employee/colleague.
9. I feel rancor (resentment, ill will) toward my fellow employee/colleague.

Please tick for each question, extend to which, you disagree or agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel envy every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The bitter truth is that I generally feel inferior to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feelings of envy constantly torment me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is so frustrating to see some people succeed so easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. No matter what I do, envy always plagues me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am troubled by feelings of inadequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It somehow doesn’t seem fair that some people seem to have all the talent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Frankly, the success of my neighbors makes me resent them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick for each question, extend to which, you disagree or agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. I often think about quitting this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Next year I will probably look for a new job outside this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lately, I have taken interest in job offers in the newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each item of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your agreement and disagreement by ticking the appropriate number on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick for each item, extend to which, you involve in the following:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Taken property from work without permission.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead working</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Taken an additional or a longer break than is acceptable your workplace.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Come in late to work without permission.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Littered your work environment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Neglected to follow your boss's instructions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Put little effort into your work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dragged out work in order to get overtime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Made fun of someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Said something hurtful to someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark or joke at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cursed at someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Played a mean prank on someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Acted rudely toward someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Publicly embarrassed someone at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Thank you for giving your precious”
Respected Sir/Madam,

I am a doctoral research student at Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria. I would like to invite you to participate and complete a survey which is about the performance of your subordinates. The aim of this study is to examine the effects of perceived injustice on employee’s job outcome. However, I am also looking to investigate the emotional mechanism of this relationship along-with coping tool.

Your precious time and valuable participation will be a great contribution towards the noble cause of knowledge creation. I ensure you that any information obtained in connection with this study, will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented. Moreover, I am also bound by the researching code of ethics to keep the data safe and report the aggregate results without harming any individual’s reputation. Additional, it is also important to note that the participation is voluntary and the participant can also leave at any time, if not feeling comfortable.

Please answer the following questions by recalling the performance of your subordinate (the name of the subordinate mentioned above). The following scale will help you to rate his performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) None</th>
<th>(2) Rarely</th>
<th>(3) Sometimes</th>
<th>(4) More Often/Mostly</th>
<th>(5) A Lot</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This person………

1. Adequately completes assigned duties.  
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.  
3. Performs task that are expected of him/her.  
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.  
5. Engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation.  
6. Neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform.  
7. Fails to perform essential duties.  
8. Helps others who have been absent.  
9. Helps others who have workloads.  
10. Assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).  
11. Takes time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Goes out of way to help new employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Takes a personal interest in other employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Passes along information to co-workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Attendance at work is above the norm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Takes undeserved work breaks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Complains about insignificant things at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Conserves and protects organizational property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Thank you for giving your precious time to fill this questionnaire."
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