The Relationship of Organizational Justice to Counterproductive Work Behavior and Personality as a Mediation

I Wayan Eka Darsana[1], I Gede Riana[2]

[1,2]*Post Graduate Program of Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: I Wayan Eka Darsana

Abstract: *This study aims to examine the effect of organizational fairness on counterproductive work behavior and to know the role of personality in mediating the effect of organizational fairness toward counterproductive work behavior.The results of the study found that (1) organizational fairness has a positive and significant effect on the personality. (2) Organizational fairness has a negative and significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. (3) Personality negatively and significantly effect counterproductive work behavior Next, (4) Personality mediates partially in relationship between organizational fairness with counterproductive work behavior. The implications of this study indicate that organizational justice is an important factor in the effort to shape the employee's personality, organizational justice is also an important factor to minimize the level of counterproductive work behavior of employees, the last personality of each individual employee is an important factor in efforts to minimize counterproductive work behaviour of employees. the personality of each individual employee significantly mediates the effect of organizational fairness on the counterproductive work behaviour of the employee.*
Keywords: organizational justice, personality, counterproductive work behavior

----

I. Introduction

Bennet and Robinson (2002) stated that there are four types of human resource work behavior that can degrade the performance of the company, namely 1) production deviance, such as getting home early and deliberately working slowly, 2) deviation from property such as sabotaging equipment and lying about hours of work, 3) political deviance such as favoritism and gossip about colleagues, and 4) personal aggression such as sexual harassment and verbal abuse. This deviant behavior is called counter-productive behavior or Conterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). CWB can be defined as deliberate behavior or acts that are contrary to organizational norms (Dalal, 2005). Negative consequences can be economic losses and social and psychological impacts for organizations and employees within the organization itself. For example, the Price Water House Coopers (2005) survey results in Smithikrai (2008) reported that 60% of employees in Thailand who are victims of deviations from other employees' work habits have decreased their enthusiasm in completing the work.

There are many factors that influence employee counterproductive behavior or Conterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) such as organizational justice (Bennet and Robinson, 2002; Appelbaum, 2009; Radmand and Salmani, 2009; Ineo, 2010; Mohsen, 2015; MacKenzie, 2012). And personality (Colquitt at al., 2006 .; Elovanio at al., 2003.; Henle, 2005 .: Yang and Diefendorff, 2009 ,: Eschleman at al., 2014 ,: Fabio and palazzeschi, 2012 .: Mount at al, 2004). organizational justice as a personal assessment of the ethical and moral standards of managerial behavior. Several studies have tested organizational justice with three components: distributive, procedural, and interactional (Cohen-Carash and Spector, 2001). Greenberg (1987) states that interactional justice consists of two components, namely: interpersonal and informational, so in its development, some researchers claim that organizational justice consists of four components namely informational, distributive, procedural and interpersonal (Colquitt et al., 2001). Organizational justice is an important variable affecting Conterproductive Work Behavior (Bennet and Robinson, 2002). The statement is supported by Appelbaum (2009) that organizational justice is an effective factor that can reduce counterproductive behavior. As in the study Radmand & Salmani (2009) states tendency towards counterproductive behavior occurs because of the injustice in the organization. The Ineo Research (2010) in Mohsen (2015) found organizational justice to significantly effect counterproductive behavior. The study was reinforced by Wu Mingcheng at al (2014) which also states that organizational justice can affect counterproductive employees.

The emergence of personality is caused by organizational justice. The reaction to injustice in an organization usually emotionally affects the employee's personality. Not only the consequences of perception of justice, but also the perception of justice itself depends on individual differences, such as personality and

socioeconomic status. Indeed, in this study the personality is correlated with the perception of justice. Another important aspect of work life, job control, has been found to be related to personality and socioeconomic status (Elovanio at al, 2003). The relationship between perceptions of work situations and aberrations can be limited by personality traits that are theoretically relevant so that situational perceptions are only related to deviant behavior when this behavior conforms to the employee personality character of Mount at al, (2004). the relationship between justice and the organizational personality shows that conformity and neuroticism can be an important correlation of organizational justice (Fabio and palazzeschi, 2012). The statement can be supported by (Colquitt at al, 2006) that Consider personality traits that make individuals more sensitive to justice, they contemplate justice information more precisely, and increase the likelihood that they will react to injustice by some action. That nature must strengthen the level of justice in behavioral reactions, and consequently must be strong enough throughout the context because it is realized through three different mechanisms. Research conducted by Henle (2005). That personality arises because organizational injustice is likely to create aberrant behavior.

Counterproductive behavior is a serious and costly issue for organizations and members of the organization. Such behavior is defined as dysfunctional, as it almost always violates the main norms in the organization and performs actions that are irrelevant to their goals, violates the procedure, lowers productivity and profitability. Behavioral counterproductive behavior not only affects the organization but overall. The magnitude of the negative impacts caused by employee engagement in counterproductive behavior makes the organization try to avoid it. Unfortunately, any employee with any profession has the potential to engage with counterproductive work behaviors.

II. Literature Review

Organizational Justice

Cropanzano et al. (2007) defines organizational justice as a personal assessment of the ethical and moral standards of managerial behavior. Gibson et al. (2012) defines organizational justice as a level at which an individual feels treated by the organization in which he works. Another definition says that organizational justice is a fair perception of a person against a decision taken by his or her top (Colquitt et al., 2001).Colquitt et al. (2001) argues that organizational justice has four types, namely distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice. The type of organizational justice according to Moorman and Colquitt each has its own advantages and is now used more often than any other organizational justice theory (Cropanzano, 2009).Distributive justice is characterized as equity with respect to the distribution of resources and decision outcomes (Usmani, 2013). Robbins & Judge (2008: 47) defines distributive justice as justice the amount and appreciation felt among individuals. Noe et al. (2011) refers to it as the justice of rewards defined as the judgments people make in respect of the rewards they receive rather than the rewards received by others to which they refer.

Personality

When we talk about personality, it does not mean that someone has a charm, a positive attitude toward life, a smiling face. When psychologists talk about personality, it means a dynamic concept that describes the growth and development of a person's entire psychological system (Robbins & Timothy, 2008: 41). Personality is a set of individual traits that distinguish between individuals with one another. Personality can be regarded as the total number of ways a person reacts and interacts with others. It is most often depicted in terms of measurable properties that a person exhibits. Like opinion (Robbins and Judge, 2013: 133) say that personality is a "dynamic organization within an individual psychophysical system that determines its unique adjustment to its environment." Personality as the total number of ways a person reacts and interacts with his environment.McCrae and Costa (2003: 21) define personality as a trait. Trait is the dimension of individual differences in the tendency to show consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings and actions. The dimensions of individual differences in question is that a person can be ranked based on the extent to which they show the trait. The word "tendency" emphasizes the fact that trait is merely a disposition, not an absolute determinant. The meaning of the word "from thoughts, feelings and actions" is to show that trait applies widely and in general. The "consistent pattern" indicates that the trait should be viewed from time to time as well as under any circumstances.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB)

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) or counterproductive behavior is defined as behavior that violates organizational norms and may threaten the welfare of the organization and its members (Bennet & Robinson, 2002). Examples of such deviant behavior from slow work to fraud. Just as Werner & DeSimone (2012) define counterproductive behavioral behavior as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, and thereby threatens well into an organization, its members, or both. Whereas Dalal

(2005) defines it as a deliberate behavior or act that goes against the norms of the organization.Bennet & Robinson (2002) stated that there are four types of human resource work behavior that can degrade the company's performance, namely production deviation, such as getting home early and deliberately working slowly, deviation from property deviance such as sabotaging equipment and lying about working hours, political deviance such as favoritism and gossip about colleagues, and personal aggression such as sexual abuse and verbal abuse.

III. Hypothesis

The conceptualization of organizational justice as defined (Henry at al, 2008) is that the theory of justice shows that when an organization is fair, employees are more likely to make efforts to improve their organization, in which the organization's justice affects the individual's personality. The study was also reinforced by (Henle, 2005). (Leroy, 2014) found that organizational justice correlates with five personality traits. In the study (lilly, 2006) also shows that the personality traits of the locus of work control have a significant impact on the perception of interactional justice and procedural violations of moral principles can trigger "deontic anger that can trigger retaliatory behavior even when such an act is irrational. Colquitt at al, (2011) has an effect on organizational justice with personality justified by (Suzy at al, 2001) justice has been shown to be significantly correlated with personality and job satisfaction.

H1: Organizational justice has a significant positive effect on personality

Organizational justice is an important variable affecting Conterproductive Work Behavior (Bennet and Robinson, 2002). The statement is supported by Appelbaum (2009) which states that organizational justice is an effective factor that can reduce counterproductive behavior.Radmand & Salmani (2009) research suggests that the tendency toward counterproductive behavior is due to unfairness within the organization. Therefore, Ineo (2010) in Mohsen (2015) found that organizational justice significantly effects counterproductive behavior. The study was reinforced by McKenzie (2012) which also states that organizational justice can reduce employee counterproductive behavior.

H2: Organizational fairness has a significant negative effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

Personality is an important variable that affects Conterproductive Work Behavior. The statement is supported by Bolton at al, (2010) which states that self-report personality assessment can be a valuable predictor of negative work behavior. These findings offer additional consideration to predict CWB with five personality traits. While it is advantageous for the organization to know which personality traits are related to CWB composites, it is also useful to associate these characteristics with specific CWB dimensions depending on the nature of the work. CWB seems to provide a useful tool for predicting CWB as an overall dimension, two dimensions (interpersonal and organizational), or five dimensions (misuse, production deviation, sabotage, theft, & withdrawal).The factors that contribute to the likelihood of their employees being involved in counterproductive behavior are complex and diverse. Our model recognizes the importance of individual perceptions and assessment of organizational conditions and events. Clearly, organizational support and personality traits are perceived to play a role in irregularities, (Ansari at al, 2013). Some meta-analytic evidence that personality measures are a valid predictor of the category of work-related behaviors. Many studies have examined the relationship between employee personality and behavior. The highest correlation between employee personality and behavior has been found when personality traits are associated with theoretically relevant result variables (Mount, 2004). Abdulah and Marican (2016) also found a significant positive relationship between personality and deviant behavior indicating that personality can increase the occurrence of deviant behavior. The study was also conducted by Syafitri and Napitupulu (2015) but with a reversed result in which the big five personality with a behavioral deviation is not significant. insignificant results were also performed by Chen Lim et al (2016) in his study revealed that the personality traits of agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience have no significant relationship with workplace deviations.

H3: Personality has a significant negative effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

The existence of a relationship of organizational Justice refers to employee perceptions of justice in the workplace and represents an explanation of the situation about workplace deviations. Two personality traits are proposed to moderate the relationship between organizational justice and workplace irregularities: socialization and impulsivity. Both personality traits are chosen because they are often included in the integrity tests used by organizations to screen applicants (Henre, 2005).Various personality traits, such as trait hostility and anxiety, have been shown to moderate the relationship between stressful environments and the possibility of negative health outcomes (Elovanio et al 2003: Henle, 2005). This shows us that the perception of unfair treatment may also not affect everyone in the same way. Mount at al, (2004) shows that personality moderates the relationship between situational perception and deviant behavior. Yang and Diefendorff, (2009) show that some personality factors play a role in mediating CWB relationships. Eschleman at al, (2014) found some personality traits capable of moderating and improving CWB. Simmons, (2006) suggests that organizational justice factors play a role in determining whether a person will produce a creative work or not. Because of the potential benefits of

individual creativity, investigations have been undertaken to determine how individual and contextual factors can improve or impede creative performance. Personality moderates situational perception-situational relationships so that negative perceptions of work situations are more strongly associated with deviations when awareness, emotional stability, or lower inequality. In Mount's study, (2004) personality moderates situational perceptual-situational relationships so that negative perceptions about work situations are stronger associated with deviations when awareness, emotional stability, or lower inequality. This shows that personality moderates the relationship between situational perception and deviant behavior.

H4: Personality mediates the relationship between organizational Justice against Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

IV. Research Methods

Procedure

The sampling technique used is probability sampling. Probability sampling is a sampling technique that gives equal opportunity to every member of the population to be a sample (Sugiyono, 2016: 122). The number of samples used is determined by the formula slovin with the formula n = N / (N (d2) + 1) (Riduwan, 2005: 65). Based on the formula, we get the number of samples n = 314 / (314 (0.12) + 1) = 75,8 rounded to 76 samples.

This research is conducted by using cross sectional survey, that is data collection method where information is collected only at certain moment. Interviews were used to obtain information on the issues under study, namely Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). Questionnaires with Likert scale were used to obtain primary quantitative data on the research variables studied. Data were collected by sending a personally-administered questionnaire. After the questionnaire is distributed, respondents are given one week to answer, and after completing the questionnaire will be reassembled.

This study used Partial Least Square (PLS), with the help of SmartPLS 3.1.3 software, PLS was first developed by Herman Wold (Ghozali, 2014: 29) as a common method for estimating path models using latent constructs with multiple indicators. PLS is intended for causal-predictive analysis in situations of high complexity and low theory support.

V. Result

Based on the gender of the respondents, the majority of male respondents were 45 respondents or 59.2 percent. Furthermore, based on the respondent's age characteristics, dominated by respondents with age > 45 years is 22 respondents or 28.9 percent. based on the characteristics of the last education of the respondents, dominated by respondents who had last high school education as much as 64 respondents or 84.2 percent, based on this data can be described that most workers have a low education. Based on the characteristics of respondent positions, that the number of respondents with the position as the highest collector of 30 respondents or 39.5 percent.

Convergent validity is used to find out the instrument items that can be used as indicators of all latent variables. The results of this test are measured by the value of factor loading (outer loading) of the construct indicator. All of outer loading has a value more than 0.5. Thus, this measurement can be summarized as having met the requirements of convergent validity.

Validity test is also done by testing method comparing square root of average variance extracted (AVE) value in each construct with correlation among other constructs contained in the model. the AVE value in the research variables has values above 0.5 so that these measurements can be summed up to meet the discriminant validity measurement criteria.

Composite reliability test aims to test the reliability of intrument in a research model. the results of the composite reliability test show good results because the latent variable is all reliable because it has a composite reliability value greater than 0.7. This shows all indicators to be the measuring tool of each construct.

By using Partial Least Square (PLS) shows the entire value of the indicator can form a variable. All indicators of organizational justice variables, indicator boss treat me with respect (X3.3) from interactional justice dimension has the highest loading factor value that is equal to 0,927. Of all indicators of personality variables have a value greater than 0.5. Of all the indicators of personality variables, my statement indicator always try to maintain the etiquette and courtesy with others (M2.2) of extraversion dimension has the highest loading factor value that is equal to 0.912. For the variables of organizational authenticity, all indicators show values above 0.5, For the Countraproductive Work Behavior variables all indicators show values above 0.5, of all the Countraproductive Work Behavior indicator indicators, my statement indicator often ignores the superior instruction (Y4.3) of the dimension Personal aggression has the highest loading factor value of 0.897.

Goodness of fit structural model on inner model is tested using value predictive - relevance (Q^2). R^2 value of each endogenous variable in this study can be seen in Table 1. below:

Table 1. R-Square

Endogen Variable	R Square
Distributive Justice. (X1)	0.782
Prosedural Justice (X2)	0.916
Interactional Justice. (X3)	0.832
Informational Justice. (X4)	0.901
Personality. (M)	0.403
Conscientiousness. (M1)	0.720
Extraversion. (M2)	0.761
Neuroticism. (M3)	0.795
Agreeableness. (M4)	0.804
Openness To Experience. (M5)	0.894
Contraproductive Work Behaviour (Y)	0.872
Property Deviation (Y2)	0.889
Political Deviation (Y3)	0.887
Personal Aggresion (Y4)	0.784
Property Deviation (Y2)	0.884

Source: Primary Data, 2018

The predictive-relevance value is obtained by the formula:

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R1^2)(1 - R2^2)$$
$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - 0,403)(1 - 0,872)$$
$$Q^2 = 1 - (0,597)(0,128)$$
$$Q^2 = 1 - 0,076416$$
$$Q^2 = 0,923584$$

The above results show the predictive-relevance value of 0.923584, this value is> 0. Thus it can be interpreted that 92.35% of the variation in the outgoing intense variable is explained by the variables used in the model. The rest of 7.65% is explained by other factors outside the model. With these results it is concluded that this model has a relevant predictive value.

Hypothesis testing using Partial Least Square (PLS) will show four hypotheses. This test is done by using t test (t-test) on each path of effect between variables. In the PLS statistical test each hypothesized relationship is performed using a simulation. In this case the bootstrap method is performed on the sample. Testing with bootstrap is also intended to minimize the problem of research data abnormalities. The test results with bootstrapping from PLS analysis can be seen in Table 2. below:

Table 2. PLS Testing Result

Construct	Path Coefficient	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Desc.
Org. Justice -> Contraproductive Work Behaviour	-0.835	15.284	0.000	Sig
Org. Justice -> Personality	0.635	7.753	0.000	Sig
Personality -> Contraproductive Work Behaviour	-0.145	2.291	0.022	Sig

Source: Primary Data, 2018

Hypothesis testing with approach PLS result path coefficient of direct effect of organizational justice to personality with value 0,635 and t-statistic 7753. The value of path coefficient 0.635 indicates that organizational fairness gives a positive effect on the personality of LPD employees. The value of t-statistics 7753 (> 1,960) shows that organizational fairness has a significant effect on the personality of LPD employees. Based on this, hypothesis 1 which states that organizational justice has a positive and significant effect on the personality of LPD employees. This means that the more LPD organization is considered fair by its employees, the better the personality of each individual employee of LPD.

Based on Table 2. it can be seen that on the direct influence of organizational fairness to Counterproductive Work Behavior for employees of LPD with coefficient of lane -0.835 and t-statistic 15,284. The value of path coefficient -0.835 indicates that organizational fairness has a negative effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior from LPD employees. The t-statistic value of 15,284 (> 1,960) indicates that organizational fairness has a significant influence on counterproductive work behavior of LPD employees. Based on that, hence hypothesis 2 which mention organizational fairness have a significant negative effect to counterproductive work behavior accepted. That is, the more the LPD organization is considered fair by its employees, the lower the counterproductive work behavior level of the LPD employees and otherwise.

Based on Table 2. it can be seen that the direct influence of personality of each individual employee of LPD to Counterproductive Work Behavior from LPD employee with coefficient of lane -0.145 and t-statistic 2,291. The coefficient value of line -0.145 shows that the personality of each individual employee gives a

negative influence to Counterproductive Work Behavior from LPD employees. The value of t-statistics 2,291 (> 1,960) indicates that the personality of each individual employee of LPD gives significant influence to Counterproductive Work Behavior from LPD employees. Based on that, then hypothesis 3 that mention personality have significant negative effect to counterproductive work behavior accepted. That is, the more positive the personality level of each individual LPD employee, the lower the counterproductive work behavior level of the LPD employees.

Another way to find out the magnitude of correlation coefficients and the significance of indirect effects is to look at indirect effects which are the output of SmartPLS as presented in table 3.

Table 3.Indirect effects

Construct		Path Coefficient	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Desc.
Org. Justice ⟶ Contraproductive Work Behaviour (Y)		-0.092	2.125	0.034	Sig

Source: Primary Data, 2018

Based on the investigation results of the mediation role test and showed that testing the hypothesis on the indirect influence of organizational fairness against Counterproductive Work Behavior through personality resulted in a coefficient of correlation of -0.092. Similarly, the results of SmartPLS output presented in table 5.13, shows the value of t statistics can be as much as 2.125 (> 1.96) and the value of p Values of 0.034 (<0, 05). So the role of personality mediation is significant. Thus, hypitesis 4 (H4) which states that the Personality mediates the relationship between organizational Justice against Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) is evident. This means that if the organization's treatment of individual employees unfair then it can trigger a bad personality of employees who are able to strengthen its impact on the increase in deviant work behavior. Vice versa if the organization fair in meperlakukan his work then it can trigger the personality of both employees who are able to strengthen its impact on the decline of work behavior deviant.

VI. Discussion and Conclusion

Organizational justice has a significant effect on the personality. This explains that in addition to the personality of a person is the result of heredity or the environment, personality is also one of the factors that are very important attention in the organization, so that organizations can achieve high performance such as high levels of job satisfaction and performance skills and a good personality organization for members / employees, it will have a significant effect on the personality of each individual member / employee.

Organizational fairness has a significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. The results of this study means that if the boss can improve perceptions about the implementation of fair management in LPD Se-Sub Abiansemal, it will be able to contribute significantly to suppress the behavior of counterproductive or deviant work on the employees. That is, the more fair to an organization for members / employees, the lower the level of counterproductive work behavior of members / employees, and vice versa.

Personality has a significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. This means that when employees are frustrated, they try to overcome their negative feelings by doing some form of misbehavior (CWB) such as theft of office property and even aggression. This means that the better / positive personality of individual members / employees, it will have a significant effect on the level of counterproductive work behavior that the lower the member / employee.Personality can mediate partially in the relationship between organizational fairness and counterproductive work behavior.

Research Implication

This research has some practical implication. Firstly, The result of statistical analysis shows that organizational fairness for employees of LPD gives a significant influence to the personality of each individual employees. This means that organizational justice can be an important factor in the effort to shape the personality of LPD employees.

Secondly, the results of statistical analysis show that organizational fairness is an important factor to minimize the counterproductive work behavior level of LPD employees. The indicator of the superior's statement to treat me in a polite manner from the interactional justice dimension becomes a very important factor of organizational fairness to minimize the counterproductive work behavior of LPD employees . When an LPD employee of the feels that the boss treats him politely, it will minimize the level of counterproductive work behaviors, in particular, will reduce the level of political deviation by employees in which the LPD employees of will not discuss corporate secrets with undue people.

Thirdly, The results of statistical analysis indicate that the personality of each individual employee of LPD is an important factor in the effort to minimize counterproductive work behavior level from LPD

employees . The statement indicator I always believe in my own ability to do anything from the dimension of openness to experience is not an important factor of the personality of each individual LPD employee an effort to minimize counterproductive work behavior. In this case, the effort to minimize the counterproductive work behavior level in which the LPD employees of do not do political deviation by not discussing the secret of the company with the undue person, is not influenced by the confidence of the LPD employees of on their individual ability in doing any.

Fourth, the results of statistical analysis indicate that the personality of each individual employees of LPD significantly mediate the influence of organizational fairness against counterproductive work behavior of LPD employees . The indicator of my statement always believes in my own ability to do anything from the openness to experience dimension of the personality of each individual LPD employee is an important factor that can enlarge the influence of organizational fairness in an effort to minimize the counterproductive work behavior of LPD employees . In this case, the confidence of LPD employees will be able to strengthen the influence of the superior employee's behavior to the employees that minimize the counterproductive work behavior level especially the level of political deviation by the employees where the employees of LPD will not discuss company secrets with undue people.

Limitation and Future Research

Based on the research that has been done, there are some limitations in this research. This study uses LPD employees as respondents, so it is important for future research to complement and enrich empirical studies related to this topic by using industry categories other than MFIs, such as hotels and manufacturing.This research is exactly executed in December until january resulted in long time required, because LPD of is in close of annual book and preparation of RAT. The existence of research limitation by using questionnaire that is sometimes answer given by respondent do not show the real situation. It is suggested that future researchers may develop more appropriate research questionnaires used to measure personality, organizational fairness and counterproductive work behaviors.

Future research is advised to choose a more appropriate time in which the subjects studied in order to be in a better situation and support to be researched so that the time of the study more effective and efficient.It is suggested that future researchers may develop more appropriate research questionnaires used to measure personality, organizational fairness and counterproductive work behaviors.Future research should consider using other constructs such as interpersonal, integrity or workload variables that can be predictors of counterproductive work behavior. In addition, subsequent researchers can also use demographic characteristics such as gender in distinguishing trends in performing irregularities of work between men and women.

References

[1].   Abdulah, A & Sabitha Marican. 2016. The Effects of big-five personality traits on deviant behavior. Jurnal of economics and administration, university Malaya, 50603 kuala lumpur.

[2].   Ansari, M.E., Maleki V. S., Mazrae, S., Khazaeli,H.M . 2013. Individual, Job, and Organizational Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 3(4) 78-86.

[3].   Bennett, R.J., &Robinson S.L. 2002.Organizational behavior: The state of the science. New York: Wiley

[4].   Bolton, L. R., Becker. L.K., Barber, L. K 2010. Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions.Personality and Individual Differences 49.537–541.

[5].   Chen Lim Li., Jin Teh Choon., Benjamin, Chan Y, F. 2016. A Preliminary Study of the Effects of Personality Traits on Workplace Deviance in the Voluntary Sector, International Review of Management and Marketing, 6(S7) 6-10.

[6].   Cohen-Carash, Y. & Spector P.E. 2001.The Role of Justice in Organizations :A Meta- Analysis. Journal Of Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 86(2): 278 – 321.

[7].   Colquitt, J.A., Wesson M.J., Porter C.O.L.H., Conlon D.E., dan Ng, K.Y. 2001. Justice At The Millenium : A Meta-Analytic Review Of 25 Years Of Organizational Justice Research. Journal Of Applied Psychology, Vol. 86(3): 425 – 445.

[8].   Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B.A., Judge, T.A., Shaw, J. C . 2006. Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 110–127

[9].   Cropanzano, R., Bowen D.E., dan Gilliland, S.W. 2007. The Management Of Organizational Justice. Academy Of Management Perspectives, Vol. 21(4): 34– 38.

[10].   Dalal, R.S. 2005. A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. The Journal of Applied Psychology. 90(1): 1241–1255.

[11].   Desimone, R.L., &Werner J.M. 2012.Human Resouces Development. Sixth Edition.Canada: South-Western Cengage Learning

[12].   Eschleman, Kevin J., Nthan A. Bowling & David Lahuis, 2014. The moderating effects of personality on the relationship between change in work stressors and change in counterproductive work behaviours, Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology

[13].   Greenberg, J. 1987. A Taxonomy Of Organizational Justice Theories. Academy OfManagement Review, Vol. 12(1): 9 – 22.

[14].   Henle, Christine A. 2005. Predicting Workplace Deviance from the Interaction between Organizational Justice and Personality. Journal of Managerial Issues.Vol. XVII Number 2: 247-263.

[15].   Leroy, F.N., Desrumoux, P., Tessa, M., Lapointe, D.2014. Mediated effect of the psychological needs satisfaction between job demands, organizational justice, personality with subjective well-being and burnout. Laboratoire EA.4072 PSITEC .PTO – vol 20 – n°2

[16].   Lilly, J.D., Virick, M. 2006.The effect of personality onperceptions of justice. Journal of Managerial PsychologyVol. 21 No. 5.

[17].   McKenzie, T.N.G., & Ronan C. 2012. Dysfunctional behaviour in organizations: can HRD reduce the impact of dysfunctional. Journal of applied psychology, Vol 7(6): 25-31.

[18].   McCrae, R.R. 2010. The Place of the FFM in Personality Psychology. Psychological Inquiry, 21: 57–64.

[19]. Mohsen, Rafiee. 2015. The relationship of the deviant workplace behaviour withe the organizational justice and staff development in the Universities of Tehran. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, Vol. 5(1): 126-140.

[20]. Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R. 1991. The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. Personnel Psychology; Spring; 44.

[21]. Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck J.R., Gerhart B., dan Wright P.M. 2011. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Mencapai Keunggulan Bersaing, Edisi 6. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

[22]. Radmand, M., & Salmani D. 2009. The roll of organizational factor and management in creating deviant work place behavior.Journalof public management,vol 12(1): 55-68

[23]. Smithikrai, C. 2008. Moderating effect of situasional strength on the relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviour. Asian Journal of Social Psychology. 11(1): 253-263.

[24]. Suzy, F., 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, 291–309.

[25]. Syafitri, H., Napitupulu, L. 2015. Relationship between the big five personality factor (NEO – PI – R) with deviant behavior employees, e journal fakultas psikologi Universitas Islam Riau, An - Nafs, Vol. 09, No. 02

[26]. Usmani, S. 2013. Impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice, spatial justice on job satisfaction of banking employees. Integrative Business and Economics Research, Vol 2(1): 351 - 383

[27]. Yang, Jixia & Diefendorff, James M, 2006. The Relations Of Daily Counterproductive Workplace Behavior With Emotions, Situational Antecedents, And Personality Moderators: A Diary Study In Hong Kong,62, 259–295, Personnel Psychology