

Overcoming Counterproductive Work Behavior with Organizational Justice and a Job Satisfaction Approach

Reni Kurnia Permata¹, Pantius Drahen Soeling²

^{1,2}Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Universitas Indonesia
renikurnia4future@gmail.com, pantiusdrahen@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the detrimental behaviors that hinder organizational progress is Counterproductive Work Behavior. This behavior is continually being investigated in various organizations in the public and private sectors. This article describes the patterns, forms, and strengths found in different research results related to Counterproductive Work Behavior with the antecedents of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. This article is a literature study. Based on the results of this literature study, Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction are known to be related to Counterproductive Work Behavior in various patterns, forms, and strengths according to other factors that influence organizational conditions. The relationship's pattern, form, and strength open the assumption of the mediating role of Job Satisfaction in the relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior.

Keywords

counterproductive work behavior; organizational justice; job satisfaction



I. Introduction

Not many problems are done by workers, bringing losses to the organization's business profits, such as Counterproductive Work Behavior. It is estimated that counterproductive work behavior has cost organizations worldwide billions of dollars (Bennett, Marasi, & Locklear, 2019; Camara & Schneider, 1994; Murphy, 1993; Vardi & Weitz, 2004). This behavior has hindered the organization's progress with activities that are contrary to the task, violate the rules within the organization, and interfere with the welfare of the organization and other workers (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Sackett & DeVore, 2002). Counterproductive Work Behavior appears and develops due to various antecedents. These antecedents include Organizational Justice (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Flaherty & Moss, 2007; Jones, 2009) and Job Satisfaction (Nemteanu & Dabija, 2021).

Organization must have a goal to be achieved by the organizational members (Niati et al., 2021). Organizational Justice was chosen to be discussed because it is the most researched topic (Nowakowsky & Conlon, 2005). Research focusing on Justice Perception provides sufficient data for meta-analysis (Sulea, Maricutoiu, Dumitru, & Pitariu, 2010). Organizational justice is an interesting topic because it involves the provision of compensation, incentives, social recognition or other forms of rewards (Przeczek, Rosinski, & Manko, 2021). Organizational Justice becomes the dominant antecedent in various forms of factors, namely Dispositional Factors (Personality and Related Attributes, and Perception and Attitudes) and Situational Factors (Macro-Level Organization Factors), which are related to many things and affect the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior (Malik, Sinha, & Goel 2021). While Job Satisfaction is an antecedent for Counterproductive Work Behavior, the correlation will be stronger in Organizational Counterproductive Work Behavior (Penney, & Spector, 2002; Chen & Spector, 1992; Fox & Spector, 1999). Job Satisfaction is an antecedent in the form of Dispositional Factors

(Perception and Attitudes) as well as Situational Factors (Macro-Level Organization Factors) (Malik, Sinha, & Goel, 2021). Therefore, organizational justice and job satisfaction are closely related to counterproductive work behavior, as indicated by several previous research results.

According to Bugdol (2014), Organizational Justice has a direct effect on employee engagement, with Distributive Justice having a particularly high effect on commitment. According to Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009), Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Employee Engagement all have a favorable link with Job Satisfaction in Organizational Justice. Finally, Organizational Injustice resulted in an increase in Negative Work Behavior (Macko, 2009; Turek, 2011).

So, this study will discuss how to overcome Counterproductive Work Behavior from two antecedents that often occur in various organizations globally because they involve organizational conditions and are closely related to other antecedents, namely Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive work behavior is detrimental or intended to harm the organization or people in the organization (Spector and Fox, 2005). This behavior starts from small things, such as taking too long a break or not according to procedures, to serious and detrimental things to the organization, such as being rude to fellow workers or committing fraud within the organization. These small to large scale matters harm organizational effectiveness (Robinson, & Bennett, 1995; Sackett, 2002).

In social research, the word counterproductive work conduct is frequently used interchangeably with the term Workplace Deviance Behavior (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). Counterproductive Work Behavior is a product of organizational and workplace psychology (Sackett, 2002). This behavior has a negative impact on coworkers, organizations, clients, and supervisors (Spector & Fox, 2005). Some experts propose the dimensions of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Furthermore, this dimension is used by researchers to measure the perception of the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior in the object of research. Until now, the measurement of Counterproductive Work Behavior tends to focus on individual Counterproductive Work Behavior. However, the development of research on Counterproductive Work Behavior is becoming more integrative or multi-item, and measuring individual Counterproductive Work Behavior is still ongoing.

Spector et al. (2006) developed the following Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist, which includes the following:

- a. Abuse against others, is physical and psychological harassment directed at co-workers, such as threats, disparaging comments, and ignoring others.
- b. Production deviation, is a deliberate deviation or neglect of standards in fulfilling responsibilities.
- c. Sabotage, is intentionally destroying or damaging organizational equipment.
- d. Theft, is stealing organizational equipment and co-workers to harm the organization.
- e. Withdrawal, is limiting the time spent at work so that it does not comply with applicable regulations. For example, being absent for no reason, leaving work early, taking more time off than the allotted time, or coming to the office late.

Furthermore, Robinson & Bennett (2000) with Workplace Deviance Scale, as follows:

1. Production deviance, is the misuse of organizational equipment or goods for personal gain. Behaviors included in this dimension include stealing or taking organizational goods without permission, damaging organizational property, or using organizational goods for personal gain.
2. Property deviance, is behavior that violates organizational rules based on the duties and responsibilities that a worker must complete. Behaviors included in this dimension are reducing working hours, leaving early, using the organization's e-mail or internet for personal gain, not carrying out procedures within the organization correctly, low quality work, and being deliberately slow in completing tasks.
3. Political deviance, is unfair behavior given to workers in the organization. Behaviors included in this dimension are favoritism towards certain workers, judging workers not based on the performance given, blaming or accusing workers of a mistake that was not made, or often spreading gossip within the organization.
4. Personal aggression is behavior within the organization that includes bullying, verbally or physically abusive behavior towards other individuals or workers, stealing other workers' belongings, and other behaviors that annoy, insult, harass, or oppress other workers.

This broad construct of Counterproductive Work Behavior is associated with various relevant organizational variables such as Negative Affectivity, Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, Big Five Personality, and other aspects (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Dalal, 2005; Hershcovis et al., 2007). So there is value in measuring and predicting Counterproductive Work Behavior more broadly (Sackett, 2002).

2.2 Organizational Justice

According to Adams (1965), the focus of justice theory lies in the exchange relationship between what a person gives and what is expected to be received. What is given is called input, and what is expected to be received is called outcome. Additional variables besides input and outcome are referred to as reference persons or groups. Reference groups can be co-workers, family, neighbors, groups of co-workers, or even the person himself in different work and social roles. Adams (1965) proposed that a state of equality exists only when:

One's Outcomes/One's Inputs = Other's Outcomes/Others Inputs.

This, in turn, will motivate others to take action and reduce the difference in the ratio of inputs and outcomes received from others. For example, by reducing performance or even increasing the results obtained.

Robbins & Judge (2015) propose three dimensions in measuring Organizational Justice, namely:

- a. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the allocation or how people value something received. It was probably the first type of justice to gain the attention of academics and continues to receive more attention. In general, there are three rules that people can use to decide whether the results obtained meet justice, namely equity, equality, and need (Deutsch, 1985). Matters related to equity are fairness in providing compensation or workers' salaries following the contributions made. According to Adam's (1965) equity model, workers calculate equity by comparing two-income ratios to input. The first ratio is the outcome compared to the input itself, while the second ratio is others. To get the equity ratio, both must be the same. The allocation with

equality is more about the same amount, regardless of the contribution. This allocation is widely used to maximize group harmony and maximize productivity. The interesting thing about this type of allocation is that it is simpler when compared to other types of allocation because it does not require more thought. Meanwhile, allocations based on needs provide outcomes based on perceived deficits. Allocations based on needs are less widely studied in organizational science, although organizations use this type of allocation in some cases. For example, the provision of leave according to the needs of workers.

- b. Procedural fairness is a term that refers to the decision-making process or collection of policies that is used to allocate resources. For instance, justice is one method for settling conflicts in society. Research shows that as far as people feel control in the legal process, everyone has the same rights and position in dispute resolution. These people are more accepting of unfavorable decisions (Tyler, 2006). Leventhal (1980) and Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry (1980) give a list of six criteria for determining whether a method is fair by applying the concept of procedural fairness to non-legal problems. In general, procedures must be consistent in their treatment of all parties, be free of bias, make decisions based on accurate information, consider input from all parties, be corrected if an error occurs, and adhere to applicable ethics. Lind & Tyler (1988) said, however, that taking into account input from all stakeholders is not based on criteria. Tyler (2006)'s research also demonstrates that procedural justice plays a critical role in promoting legal compliance. When people believe that the political system is just, they are more likely to follow the rules, which are perhaps not viewed as personal desires.
- c. Interactional Justice refers to justice based on social or communication criteria. This means seeing how others treat someone. According to the broad definition, this social criterion can be classified into at least two categories: interpersonal justice and informational justice (Bies, 2001). Interpersonal Justice is concerned with a person's desire for dignity and respect. Interpersonal transactions that are fair will avoid personal attachments, unneeded aggression, and bigotry, among other things. Interpersonal Justice has a very clear relationship with moral judgments. Meanwhile, Informational Justice refers to providing relevant and very important evidence and explanations when something goes wrong. Research by Shaw, Wild, & Colquitt (2003) shows that organizations must provide information media that inform workers about something happening and what workers are doing. This media is important to reduce the feeling of injustice among workers.

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to an individual's overall attitude about the work he or she performs. Thus, Employment Satisfaction is a good attitude toward one's job that results from an assessment of its attributes (Robbins & Judge, 2015). Job satisfaction is a critical goal in human resource management since it has an effect on employees' performance and productivity. A picture of Job Satisfaction can be seen from the ideas generated by workers in their work (Hamermesh, 2001).

High job satisfaction indicates that the organization has effective management in managing the needs of workers. Luthan (2011) argues that Job Satisfaction depends on how the individual perceives carrying out the job. So this variable is very subjective, depending on what is felt by each individual in an organization. Draft (2003) states that Job Satisfaction is a positive feeling that a person has towards the work done.

According to the many definitions of Job Satisfaction provided by these diverse experts, there is widespread agreement that Job Satisfaction is an affective (emotional) response to work that emerges from a comparison of actual results to expected results (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992).

As the most researched topic, Job Satisfaction has several different measurement developments. Numerous large-scale investigations have been conducted to ascertain the psychometric features of these variables. Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Scherriesheim, and Carson (2002) undertook this research, among other things, to determine the validity of the Job Descriptive Index, or JDI, construct developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The JDI has undergone numerous revisions, most recently in 1985, 1997, and 2009. The JDI assesses job satisfaction on five dimensions: the work itself, supervision, income, advancement opportunities, and coworkers. Or so Bowling & Hammond (2008) determined in their study of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale's reliability and construct validity (MOAQ-JSS; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979, 1983). MOAQ-JSS consists of 3 statements related to Job Satisfaction, namely:

- a. First, I generally don't like my job.
- b. Second, overall I am satisfied with my work.
- c. Third, I generally like working here.

III. Research Method

Through a review of the literature, this essay will examine the concept of overcoming Counterproductive Work Behavior through enhancing Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. The data for this study came from secondary sources such as research journals on the patterns and correlations of Counterproductive Work Behavior, Organizational Justice, and Job Satisfaction in the firms studied. Therefore, this article is descriptive by describing the conditions that exist in the article discussed.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1 Relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Wu, Sun, Zhang, and Wang (2016) found that perceived organizational justice, job burnout, and moral identity all have an effect on counterproductive work behavior among public sector employees in China. Job Burnout, in particular, acts as a moderator of the effect of Perceived Organizational Justice on Counterproductive Work Behavior and the effect of Moral Identity. Job Burnout is negatively associated with perceived organizational justice, but low-level Counterproductive Work Behavior is favourably associated with perceived organizational justice. Thus, Wu, Sun, Zhang, and Wang (2016) demonstrate that the relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior is nuanced and not as straightforward as previously believed.

According to Wu, Sun, Zhang, and Wang (2016), Moral Identity as Moral Motivation plays a significant role in the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Employees that have a strong Moral Identity are less likely to engage in Counterproductive Work Behavior. Additionally, a strong moral identity alleviates Job Burnout associated with the link between Organizational Justice and Unproductive Work Behavior. By highlighting the process by which perceived fairness is related to job outcomes, this study

presents a feasible theoretical framework for studying the long-term influence of poor perceived organizational justice on counterproductive work behavior.

Research conducted by Komari & Sulistiowati (2020) shows that it is important to observe further. Job Satisfaction is used as a mediator in this study to examine the relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior. Research respondents conducted by Komari & Sulistiowati (2020) are employees of service companies in Indonesia. There is a positive but not statistically significant influence on Counterproductive Work Behavior in the Distributive Justice dimension. However, the feature of procedural justice has a negative and significant effect on counterproductive work behavior.

Meanwhile, Interactional Justice has a negligible effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior. Distributive Justice's beneficial and minor influence on Counterproductive Work Behavior occurs as a result of the corporation being fair to its employees. As a result, they are disinclined to commit violations. The findings of this study corroborate those of Brimecombe (2012) and Spector et al. (2006), owing to the influence of groups, leadership styles, and the categories of Counterproductive Work Behavior themselves. The results of the following study indicate that procedural justice has a negative and statistically significant influence on counterproductive work behavior. This occurs as a result of the organization's equitable punishment of employees who commit violations. This study's findings corroborate those of Devonish and Greenidge (2010), Bahri, Langrudi, and Hosseinian (2013), Demir (2011), and Korsgaard et al (2010). Finally, Interactional Justice has a somewhat detrimental influence on Counterproductive Work Behavior. This relates to the findings of Brimecombe (2012) and Spector et al (2006).

Al-Awasa (2018) found a substantially unfavorable relationship between organizational justice and counterproductive job behavior among respondents from Jordanian customs officials. By and large, the Organizational Justice dimensions of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice all have a moderately unfavorable effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior. Specifically, the results showed that fairness in the distribution of bonuses and incentives was not achieved, managers did not pay attention to employee motivation financially and morally in making decisions related to assigned tasks, managers did not consider the interests and personal conditions of employees when making decisions related to work, managers did not consider opinions employees in making decisions related to work, and managers do not provide proper explanations regarding decisions taken related to work.

Al-A'wasa's research (2018) also shows that Counterproductive Work Behavior in Jordanian customs is moderate. This is indicated by a series of data showing that some employees leave their duties early, some employees criticize the work environment, and some employees show disrespect for co-workers. The results showed the importance of the role of Organizational Justice on the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior in the Jordanian customs duty environment.

Yogasari & Budiasih (2019) found a substantial influence of organizational justice on counterproductive work behavior among employees of a food industry in Badung, Indonesia. Organizational Justice makes use of the procedural and interactional dimensions, whereas Counterproductive Work Behavior makes use of organizational and interpersonal dimensions. The findings indicated that both procedural and interactional justice had a negative and substantial effect on both organizational and interpersonal elements of Counterproductive Work Behavior. This shows that the perception of justice from employees towards the organization in terms of procedural and interactional influences their involvement in the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior.

When employees are treated fairly in terms of information and procedures, their proclivity to engage in Counterproductive Work Behavior is reduced, and their positive performance increases. When employees are treated fairly through interpersonal interactions during the execution of procedures and choices, the likelihood of engaging in Counterproductive Work Behavior is likewise reduced. This is consistent with the findings of Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001), Akremi, Vandenberghe, and Camerman (2010), as well as Novrianti and Santoso (2014).

Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001), in their research on the effect of Organizational Justice on Counterproductive Work Behavior among employees from various organizations in south and central Florida, discovered that, in general, Organizational Justice is closely related to Counterproductive Work Behavior across organizational types. More precisely, Distributive Justice is demonstrated to be highly associated with the organizational type of Counterproductive Work Behavior but not with the interpersonal kind. Meanwhile, Procedural Justice has a strong correlation with both organizational and interpersonal forms of Counterproductive Work Behavior. However, after adjusting the alpha value for the significance test, it was shown that Procedural Justice had no effect on the interpersonal kind of Counterproductive Work Behavior. This is consistent with the test results for the link between Distributive Justice and Interpersonal Types of Counterproductive Work Behavior. By and large, the findings indicate that Counterproductive Work Behavior is more oriented toward the organization. This shows that the two types of Counterproductive Work Behavior are different.

In general, current research indicates that the relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior is complex. However, it is clear that Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior are inextricably linked in organizations. Differences in the form of relationships in these dimensions are influenced by organizational conditions and other factors that directly and indirectly influence or support differences in each organization. Therefore, Organizational Justice remains one of the factors that must be considered to reduce the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior in organizations.

4.2 Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior

The results of Komari & Sulistiowati (2020) research indicate that Job Satisfaction has no significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior. This happens because the company's policies related to promotion and salaries have been perceived as fair by employees. In addition, superiors have also made efforts to prevent employees from committing violations. The findings of this study corroborate those of Bahri, Langrudi, and Hosseinian (2013), who assert that other factors such as employee conflict and organizational unfairness influence Counterproductive Work Behavior. Additionally, Spector et al. (2006) observed that Job Dissatisfaction does not necessarily manifest itself in Counterproductive Work Behavior.

Astuti, Maryati, & Harsono (2020) found that Job Satisfaction did not affect Workplace Deviance Behavior. This happens because of the influence of high engagement and works culture on the organization. The Job Satisfaction factor does not affect the occurrence of Workplace Deviance Behavior, nor does it trigger the occurrence of Workplace Deviance Behavior. These results align with Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang (2010) and Nakasi (2019). Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang (2010) stated that the effect of Job Satisfaction on Workplace Deviance Behavior would depend on an organization's conditions or work experience.

However, according to Bojarska's (2015) research, Job Satisfaction has an effect on Counterproductive Job Behavior because individuals are unable to combine work issues and personal requirements. Previously, Omar et al. (2011) discovered that unsatisfied workers are less productive as a result of unmet personal demands. In this vein, Robbins & Judge (2016) propose that employees who are satisfied with their jobs will avoid engaging in Counterproductive Work Behavior. Malhotra and Kathuria (2017) discovered a link between Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior. According to Connect (2019), Job Satisfaction has a detrimental effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior but has no effect on performance. This is because Job Satisfaction is not a direct benchmark to show performance, both quality and quantity.

Nemteanu and Dabija (2021) demonstrated that Job Satisfaction had a negative and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior, albeit a less pronounced effect. The findings of Nemteanu & Dabija (2021) are consistent with those of Bojarska (2015), who discovered a negative and significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior, albeit with a weak strength. Wahyono, Prihandono, and Wijayanto (2021) discovered a negative and substantial effect of Job Satisfaction on Workplace Deviance Behavior. Thus, boosting Job Satisfaction will result in a decrease in the incidence of Workplace Deviance Behavior. This indicates that anything the organization does to improve the work environment has the potential to promote job satisfaction and reduce workplace deviant behavior (Robbins & Judge, 2008).

According to Bojarska (2015), Connect (2019), Nemteanu & Dabija (2021), and Wahyono, Prihandono, & Wijayanto (2021), Mount, Ilies, & Johnson (2006) previously discovered that Job Satisfaction is associated with Counterproductive Work Behavior, both interpersonal and organizational in nature. With the caveat that self-evaluation is more valuable than the leader's assessment. In research on Interpersonal Justice, State Hostility, Job Satisfaction, Trait Hostility, and Workplace Deviance Behavior, Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006) discovered a negative link between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Deviance Behavior. Additionally, Appelbaum, Shapiro, and Molson (2006) discovered a negative relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction and Workplace Deviance Behavior.

In general, available research indicates that the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior is extremely complex. Some relate negatively, some are unrelated or relate to weak forces. This happens because of other factors that affect the form and strength of the relationship itself, such as conditions and work experience of an organization, injustice in the organization, conflict within the organization, administrative control, and other aspects that affect the form and strength of the relationship itself. Therefore, Job Satisfaction remains a reference in an organizational improvement to reduce the occurrence of Counterproductive Work Behavior.

V. Conclusion

Based on the discussion of Counterproductive Work Behavior, Organizational Justice, and Job Satisfaction, as well as the nature and strength of the relationship between these variables, it can be concluded that Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction can be improved in order to reduce Counterproductive Work Behavior in organizations. To some extent, the research findings indicate that the nature and strength of the relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction in Counterproductive Work Behavior are extremely varied, implying that Job Satisfaction may play a mediating role in the relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advances In Experimental Psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Al-A'wasa, S. I. S. (2018). The impact of organizational justice on the counterproductive work behavior (CWB): A field study conducted in the Jordan Customs Department (JCD). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 9(1), 27-38.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Shapiro, B.T., & Molson, J. (2006). Diagnosis and remedies for deviant workplace behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 9(2), 14-20.
- Astuti, R. J., Maryati, T., & Harsono, M. (2020). The effect of workplace spirituality on workplace deviant behavior and employee performance: The role of job satisfaction. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(12), 1017-1026.
- Bahri, M. R. Z., Langrudi, M. S., & Hosseinian, S. (2013). Relationship of work environment variables and job satisfaction of employees with counterproductive work behaviors: A study of non-governmental non-benefit Islamic Azad University employees in West Mazandaran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(12), 1812-1815.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.
- Bennett, R. J., Marasi, S., & Locklear, L. (2019). *Workplace Deviance. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management: 1-25*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 410-424.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in) justice: The sacred and the profane. *Advances in Organizational Justice*, 89-118.
- Bowling, N. A., & Hammond, G. D. (2008). A meta-analytic examination of the construct validity of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(1), 63-77.
- Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., & Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 915-934.
- Brimecombe, M. J. (2012). Exploratory investigation of the predictors of counterproductive work behaviors among major league baseball employees.
- Bugdol, M. (2014). Znaczenie sprawiedliwości w zarządzaniu ludźmi.
- Camara, W. J., & Schneider, D. L. (1994). Integrity tests: Facts and unresolved issues. *American Psychologist*, 49(2), 112-119.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.). *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York: Wiley-Interscience.

- Chen, P. Y., Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(3), 177-184.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Czarnota-Bojarska, J. (2015). Counterproductive work behavior and job satisfaction: A surprisingly rocky relationship. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 21(4), 460-470.
- Daft, R. L. (2003). *Management (6th Ed.)*. Thomson Learning.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- Demir, M. (2011). Effects of organizational justice, trust and commitment on employees' deviant behavior. *Anatolia*, 22(2), 204-221.
- Deutsch, Morton (1985). *Distributive Justice*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Devonish, D., & Greenidge, D. (2010). The effect of organizational justice on contextual performance, counterproductive work behaviors, and task performance: Investigating the moderating role of ability-based emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 18, 75-86.
- El Akremi, A., Vandenberghe, C., & Camerman, J. (2010). The role of justice and social exchange relationships in workplace deviance: Test of a mediated model. *Human relations*, 63(11), 1687-1717.
- Flaherty, S., & Moss, S. A. (2007). The impact of personality and team context on the relationship between workplace injustice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(11), 2549-2575.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 915-931.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.
- Hamermesh, D. (2001). The changing distribution of job satisfaction. *Journal of Human Resources*, 36(1), 1-30.
- Herscovis, M. Sandy, Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, Kara A., Dupré, Kathryne E., Inness, M., LeBlanc, M.M., & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228-238.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 126-138.
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: Relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 525-542.
- Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 14-32.
- Komari, N., & Sulistiowati. (2020). Relationship between organizational justice and counterproductive work behaviors, *J. Mgt. Mkt. Review*, 5(4) 206-212.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: understanding rewarded and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 277.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.). *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.). *Justice and Social Interaction* (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press.
- Luthan, Fred. (2011). *Organization Behaviour (12th ed.)*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Macko, M. (2009). Poczucie sprawiedliwości organizacyjnej a zachowania pracowników. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
- Malhotra, M., & Kathuria, K. (2017). Relationship between spiritual intelligence, job satisfaction and counterproductive work behaviour among employees of multinational companies in India. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, 12(2), 315-323.
- Malik, Akanksha, Sinha, Shuchi, & Goel, Sanjay (2021). A qualitative review of 18 years of research on workplace deviance: New vectors and future research directions. *Human Performance*, 34(4), 271-297.
- Mount, M. K., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. C. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.
- Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the Workplace*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Nakasi, M. (2019). Employee Emotionality, Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior among Employees of Uganda Red Cross Society Lubaga. Dissertation, School of Psychology, Makerere University.
- Nemteanu, M. S., & Dabija, D. C. (2021). The influence of internal marketing and job satisfaction on task performance and counterproductive work behavior in an emerging market during the Covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(7), 3670.
- Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The Effect of Training on Work Performance and Career Development: The Role of Motivation as Intervening Variable. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 2385–2393. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1940>
- Novrianti, D., & Santoso, C. B. (2014). The role of transformational leadership as a moderating variable for the relationship of justices and counterproductive work behavior at the public organization. Proceedings of Annual Tokyo Business Research Conference.
- Nowakowski, J. M., & Conlon, D. E. (2005). Organizational justice: Looking back, looking forward. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16, 4-29.
- Omar, F., Halim, F.W., Zamani, Z.A., Farhadi, H., Nasir, R., & Khairudin, R. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World applied sciences journal*, 12, 46-51.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 10(1/2), 126-134.

- Przeczek, C., Rosinski, J., & Manko, B. A. (2021). Research Review in Organizational Justice. *Journal for Perspectives of Economic Political and Social Integration. Journal for Mental Changes*, 26(1-2), 49-68.
- Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational Behavior* (16th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Robbins, Stephen P., & Judge, T. A. (2016). *Organizational Behavior, 16th Edition*. New Jersey : Pearson Prentice Hall. (R&J).
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge Timothy, A. (2008). *Organizational Behavior : Perilaku Organisasi. Edisi 12*. Jakarta : Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Sackett, Paul R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 5-11.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2002). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.). *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology: Personnel Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). London: Sage.
- Sambung, R. (2019). Job satisfaction on employee performance : Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior as mediators. *International Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 7(3), 50-56.
- Shaw, J. C., Wild, E., & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). To justify or excuse? A meta-analytic review of the effects of explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 444-458.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.). *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 151-174). American Psychological Association.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Sulea, C., Maricutoiu, L., Pitariu, H., & Dumitru, C. (2010). Predicting counterproductive work behaviors: A meta-analysis of their relationship with individual and situational factors. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane*, 8, 66-81.
- Turek, D. (2011). Sprawiedliwość organizacyjna w przedsiębiorstwie. *Kwartalnik Nauk o Przedsiębiorstwie*, 18(1), 41-45.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). Restorative justice and procedural justice: Dealing with rule breaking. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(2), 307-326.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehaviour in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wahyono, Prihandono, D., & Wijayanto, A. (2021). The influence of spiritual leadership on spirituality, conscientiousness and job satisfaction and its impacts on the reduction of workplace deviant behavior. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 37(1), 90-113.

- Wu, M., Sun, X., Zhang, D., & Wang, C. (2016). Moderated mediation model of relationship between perceived organizational justice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 7(2), 64-81.
- Yogasari, I. A. M., & Budiasih, I. G. A. N. (2019). Impact of organizational justice perceptions and transformational leadership role on counterproductive work behavior. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(6), 239-243.