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ABSTRACT

Objective – This study examined the mediating role of job satisfaction (JS) on the relationship of distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ) to counterproductive work behavior (CWB).

Methodology/Technique – The respondents of this study were a total of 110 employees of service companies in Indonesia. The data used were primary data collected through questionnaires and processed using Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis.

Findings – The results of this research showed that DJ, PJ, and IJ have a positive and significant relationship with JS. DJ has a positive but insignificant relationship with CWB. However, PJ has a negative but significant relationship with CWB. Meanwhile IJ and JS have an insignificant negative relationship with CWB. JS insignificantly mediates the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and CWB.

Originality/value - This study provides empirical support for the relationship between DJ, PJ, and IJ on JS and CWB. This study also provides evidence regarding the relationship between direct OJ and JS with counterproductive work behavior.

Type of Paper: Empirical.

JEL Classification: J60, J61, J69.
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1. Introduction

During the third millennium, CWB in terms of organizational behavior has received a lot of attention from researchers. Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau & Stibal (2003) found 58% of employees reported experiencing potential harassment and 24% reported experiencing sexual harassment in their workplace. In Indonesia, in 2017, it was recorded that 56.5 percent of 773 female workers experienced sexual harassment, verbal and physical abuse (Tirtoid, 2018). In America, CWB costs approximately $ US 50 billion per year and 20% of businesses fail and lose money as a consequences of disrupting behavior (Jones, 2009; Coffin 2003). Correspondingly CWB causes a decrease in employee morale, high absenteeism, and employee turnover as well as low productivity.
Several studies suggest that OJ is related to CWB. This condition occurs because employees feel injustice in the organization resulting in employees responding to it through CWB (O'Neill, Lewis, & Carswell, 2011). This is relevant to the social exchange theory (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006) which holds that employees will respond equally to injustices emanating from the organization or from colleagues. Poor OJ can also lead to decreased organizational performance (Deconick, 2010). A meta-analysis by Berry, Ones & Sackett (2007) states that OJ is a predictor of CWB. However, it is unclear whether distributive, procedural, and interactional justice provides unique predictions about CWB. In addition, there are still limited studies that link DJ, PJ, and IJ to CWB, although it is important to predict each aspect of OJ specifically (Colquitt, 2012).

This study examined DJ, PJ, and IJ based on high power distance and cultural norms centered on status in Indonesia. According to Beugré (2005), in such a culture, the relationship between employees and managers is paternalistic. Respect for authority can be considered a normal way of dealing with supervisors. Such cultures tend to tolerate injustice emanating from authority figures. Based on the above considerations, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between DJ, PJ, IJ, and JS on CWB.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Organizational Justice

OJ is an evaluation process related to management decisions and includes three dimensions, such as DJ, PJ, and IJ (Greenberg, 1987; Searle & Ball, 2004). The DJ dimension relates to a long-term perspective in organizational operations and focuses on the fairness of the allocation decisions of the results (Searle & Ball, 2004) or the rewards received such as promotions, incentives, achievements, and salary increases. The PJ dimension refers to employees’ perceptions of the reasonableness of the procedures used to determine the results and IJ is related to the employee’s treatment of others (Werbel & Henriques, 2009). According to Tatum and Eberlin (2008); Nadiri & Tanova (2010) OJ refers to the extent of employee recognition for organizational fairness in treating them.

2.2 Counterproductive Work Behavior

The CWB has become an emerging issue in recent years. Robbins & Judge (2016); Colquitt, Lepine & Wesson (2015) state that CWB is an action that actively damages the organization and causes harm, and is harmful to individual welfare. Roy, Bastounis & Pousard, (2012); Kelloway, Francis, Prosser & Cameron, (2010) stated that CWB includes stealing, being aggressive towards coworkers, being late and even absent from work. Colquitt, Lepine & Wesson (2015) divides CWB into four levels of dimensions such as organizational-serious, organizational minor, interpersonal-serious and interpersonal-minor which include behavior such as favoritism, slandering, and accusing colleagues of wrongdoing.

2.3 Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Study by Altahayneh, Khasawneh, & Abedaihafiz's (2014) found that DJ, PJ, and IJ have a positive and significant effect on JS. This is in accordance with the equity theory which states that a person’s satisfaction depends on whether he feels justice or not (Adams, 1963). However, Akbolat, Isik, Yilmaz & Akca (2015) argue health employees are the factors that can influence JS. Suliman (2007) states that if employees feel that they are getting unfair benefits, they will respond to job dissatisfaction. According to Martinez-Tur, Peiro, Ramos, & Moliner, (2006), DJ has a stronger impact on JS than PJ and IJ. Demir's study (2011) found that interactional injustice can not only lead to negative emotional experiences, like hostility, but also reduce JS. Therefore, based on the previous review of the literature, hypotheses are proposed as follows:

H1: Distributive justice has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction
H2: Procedural justice has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction
H3: Interactional justice has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction
2.4 Relationship between Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Berry, Ones, and Sackett (2007); Demir (2011); Bahri, Langrudi & Hosseinian (2013); Al-A'wasa's study (2018) stated that OJ is related to CWB. The study of Devonish & Greenidge (2010) states that DJ, PJ, and IJ have a negative and significant negative effect on CWB. However, Brimecombe (2012); Spector, Penney, Bruursema, Goh & Kessler (2006) found that DJ, PJ, and IJ were negatively and insignificantly related to CWB. Similarly, a study by O'Neill, Lewis & Carswell (2011) states that when employees feel they are getting injustice, employees respond to it through CWB.

According to Appelbaum, Deguire & Lay (2005); Lawrence & Robinson (2007) OJ is an important issue in organizational behavior because it has been linked to critical organizational processes such as CWB. The McKenzie study (2012); Ambrose & Schminke (2009), stated that organizations that treat employees fairly, will respond to employees with work behavior in positive roles and discretion. Through fairness, supervisors promote positive relational norms such as integrity, honesty, and courtesy. This therefore encourages subordinates to reciprocate with beneficial work behavior (Korsgaard, Meglino, Lester & Jeong, 2010).

Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir & Khairudin (2011); Fatima, Atif, Saqib, & Haider (2012); Bojarska (2015) found that one of the causes of CWB is job dissatisfaction. However, according to Bahri et al. (2013) CWB happens due to interpersonal conflicts and injustice within organizations. Hence, based on the previous review of the literature, hypotheses are proposed as follows:

H4: Distributive justice has a negative and significant relationship with CWB
H5: Procedural justice has a negative and significant relationship with CWB
H6: Interactional justice has a negative and significant relationship with CWB
H7: Job satisfaction has a negative and significant relationship with CWB

3. Research Methodology

The OJ measure in this study was developed from Niehoff & Moorman (1993). DJ is measured by using 5 indicators, i.e work schedule, workload, fairness of different work outcomes, job responsibilities and pay level. PJ 6 indicators, i.e. consistency, minimize bias, accurate information, can be repaired, representative, and ethics. IJ 9 indicators, i.e. Courtesy, be dignified, yours appropriateness, honesty, justification, make sense, be on time, be specific. JS was measured using 5 indicators developed from Igbaria & Guimaraes (1993) i.e satisfaction with the work itself, salary, promotional opportunities, supervisor, and colleagues. CBW was measured using 4 indicators adopted from Colquitt, Lepine & Wesson (2015), i.e property deviance, production deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression.

The sample in this study consisted of 110 employees coming from service companies. This study used primary data obtained from a questionnaire. Respondents were given the answer choices using a Likert Scale consisting of 5 score namely score 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Each scorer refers to the categories of strongly disagree, do not agree, quite agree, agree, and strongly agree respectively. The data were analyzed using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) approach and processed using Wrapt PLS. Percentage distribution was also used to analyze the characteristics of the respondents.

4. Results

Most of the respondents were male (70 per cent), aged less than 30 years (70.9%), had a bachelor's degree (42.7%) and who had years of service of 3-4 years as much as 50 percent. The results of data analysis showed that the average responses of respondents to DJ, PJ and IJ were 3.71, 3.84 and 3.87, respectively. Respondents' responses to JS and CWB were 3.83 and 2.69, respectively. Convergent validity test results were for valid indicators only, or those indicators that have t-value of 1.96 or more. The root mean of variance extraction on the diagonal matrix with a value > 0.5, and this indicates that all items used to measure the latent variables have met the assumption of discriminant validity (Fornnel & Lacker, 1981).
Table 1. Composite reliability coefficients & cronbach's alpha coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite reliability coefficients</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Hypothesis test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ausality Relationship</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice -&gt; Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice -&gt; Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice -&gt; Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice -&gt; Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice -&gt; Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>-0.313</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice -&gt; Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction -&gt; Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: significant at the 5 per cent level.

Table 1 shows the reliability test results of the exogenous latent variable composite > 0.7, meaning that the indicators used are reliable to measure the construct (Esposito Vinzi, Chin, Henseler, & Wang, H. (2010). Table 2 shows the positive relationship between DJ and JS (0.205) and significant 0.038 < 0.05. The relationship between PJ and JS is positive (0.299) and significant 0.001 < 0.05. The relationship between IJ and JS is positive (0.354) and significant 0.002 < 0.05. The relationship between DJ and CWB is positive (0.043) and insignificant 0.763 > 0.05. While the relationship between PJ and CWB is negative (-0.313) and significant 0.020 < 0.05. The relationship between IJ and CWB is negative (-0.059) and insignificant 0.724 > 0.05. Also, the relationship between JS and CWB is negative (-0.050) and insignificant 0.722 > 0.05. The results of the calculation of the Sobel test obtained z values of -0.282, -0.284 and -0.282, respectively, with the z-table value for N = 110 was 1.658. Accordingly, the value of z which is smaller than the z table proves that job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between distributive, procedural and interactional justice on counterproductive work behavior.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of DJ, PJ, and IJ on JS and CWB. The study found that DJ, PJ, and IJ have a positive and significant relationship to JS. This is because the work schedule, salary level, workload, rewards, and job responsibilities are in line with employee expectations. Employees feel that the organizations have also made fair decisions that are concerned with mutual welfare. In addition, organizations treat employees with courtesy and dignity. Thus, the results of this study confirm the studies’ findings of Altahayneh et al., 2014; Martinez-Tur et al., 2006; Demir, 2011, and in line with the theory of justice which states that a person's satisfaction is related to perceived justice (Adams, 1963). However, the results of this study seem to deny the study by Akbolat, et al. (2015) which states that healthy employees are the factors that can influence JS.

This study also found that DJ has a positive but insignificant relationship on CWB. This is because the company has provided justice so that employees are not motivated to behave deviantly. Hence, this study
finding is in line with the studies’ results of Brimecombe (2012) and Spector et al. (2006) which state that this study in terms of study coverage, is too broad due to the influences of the group, leadership styles and the categories of CWB. However, the findings of this study are not in line with several studies such as McKenzie (2012); Berry et al. (2007); Ambrose & Schminke (2009); Korsgaard (2010) and Bahri et al. (2013) which state that OJ has relationship on CWB.

On the other hand, the results of the study found that PJ has a negative and significant effect on CWB, this is due to organizational justice in carrying out punishment for employees who commit violations. The findings of this study support the studies’ results of Devonish & Greenidge (2010); Bahri et al. (2013); Demir (2011) and Korsgaard et al. (2010). Unlikely, IJ has a negative and insignificant effect on CWB. This affirms the studies (Spector et al. (2006) and Brimecombe (2012). However, the premise differs from the study findings by Khan, et al. (2009) which states that justice facets causing IJ relationship with CWB.

The results of this study also indicated that JS was not significantly related to CWB. This is due to company policies regarding promotions, salaries that are felt to be fair by employees and co-workers who are willing to help prevent employees from engaging in deviant work behavior. The findings support the results of study by Bahri et al. (2013) which states that there are other factors that can influence counterproductive work behavior such as interpersonal conflicts and injustice within organizations. Accordingly, Spector et al. (2006) stated that job dissatisfaction does not always result in counterproductive work behavior. On the other hand Bojarska (2015) which states that job satisfaction has an effect on counterproductive work behavior due to the inability of employees to balance difficulties at work with personal needs. Additionally, Omar et al. (2011) argue that employees who are less satisfied with their work may become less productive because their needs are not met. As a result, they tend to damage the organization by conducting production deviations where employees show behavior that violates organizational norms. Also, Fatima et al. (2012) states that when employees feel what they get is not as expected, this decreases the employee's JS but increases CWB. Likewise, Robbins & Judge (2016) argue that someone with a high level of job satisfaction will feel positive feelings about their work so that employees tend to not behave counterproductively.

In conclusion, the results of this study show that DJ, PJ, and IJ are related to JS, but DJ, IJ, and JS are not related to CWB, while the relationship between DJ, PJ, and IJ on CWB are not significantly mediated by JS. Thus, future research needs to explore several variables related to OJ such as work engagement, organizational commitment, and performance. Especially, the social exchange needs to be considered as a moderating variable that relates the OJ variable to CWB. A similar study also needs to be carried out at the governmental level.
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