

The Influence of Organizational Justice and Negative Emotions on Counterproductive Work Behavior Among Generation Z Employees in Mamuju District

Nur Wahyunianti Dahri, Rohsita Amalyah Rasyid, Agus Halim, Muhammad Aqil dan Junaeda

Universitas Muhammadiyah Mamuju

Email: nurwd@unimaju.ac.id rhs.rasyid@gmail.com agushalim1510@gmail.com, muh_aqil@unimaju.ac.id, edha.doraemon92@gmail.com

Article Info

organizational justice, negative emotions, counterproductive work behavior, Generation Z, workplace behavior, emotional regulation, Indonesian context

Abstract

This study explores the influence of organizational justice and negative emotions on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) among Generation Z employees in a private organization in Mamuju Regency, Indonesia. Generation Z, known for its expressive and emotionally sensitive nature, presents unique challenges in organizational settings, particularly regarding fairness and emotional regulation. Using a quantitative approach, data were obtained from 96 respondents through structured questionnaires. The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis to test the research hypotheses. The findings reveal that organizational justice does not have a statistically significant impact on CWB, although the negative direction of the regression coefficient suggests that higher perceived fairness tends to reduce such behavior. However, negative emotions significantly and positively affect CWB, indicating that employees who frequently experience negative emotional states such as anxiety, frustration, or anger are more prone to engage in deviant workplace behaviors. Furthermore, the simultaneous test results show that both organizational justice and negative emotions together significantly influence CWB. These findings suggest the importance of promoting emotional well-being in the workplace and designing management strategies that are sensitive to the psychological needs of Generation Z employees. This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge in organizational behavior by highlighting the dual role of structural fairness and emotional conditions in shaping employee conduct.

1. Introduction

Human resources (HR) are a vital asset in achieving organizational goals. The success of any organization heavily depends on the behavior and performance of its employees. However, not all employee behavior contributes positively to organizational productivity; some behaviors are detrimental, known as counterproductive work behavior (CWB). These behaviors include tardiness, absenteeism, rumor-spreading, aggression, and even damage to workplace facilities (Fika & Zohriah, 2022).

One of the key factors contributing to CWB is organizational justice. This concept encompasses employees' perceptions of fairness regarding treatment at work, including distributive, procedural, and interactional aspects. When employees perceive unfairness in workload distribution, rewards, or decision-making processes, the likelihood of engaging in negative behavior increases (Ngara et al., 2022).

The quality of the relationship between employees and management plays a crucial role in fostering a conducive work environment. Organizational justice significantly influences this relationship. It refers to employees' perceptions of fairness in various organizational aspects, such as distributive justice (fairness of outcomes), procedural justice (fairness in processes), and interactional justice (fairness in interpersonal interactions). These perceptions affect employee motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and individual performance (Aryanto et al., 2022).

Studies show that when employees perceive fair treatment, they tend to demonstrate higher job satisfaction, increased performance, and greater organizational loyalty. In contrast, perceived injustice may lead to dissatisfaction, decreased motivation, and counterproductive behavior. Such injustice often arises from non-transparent policies, unequal task or reward distribution, and lack

of clear communication from management (Gustiani et al., 2022).

In the Indonesian context, organizational justice is increasingly relevant due to evolving work dynamics and differing employee expectations across sectors. Many organizations still struggle to create fair working environments, especially regarding decision-making affecting employee welfare and career development. Therefore, it is essential for managers and organizational leaders to understand how justice perceptions influence employee behavior and overall organizational performance (Hidayat et al., 2022).

Qur'anic Perspective

Surah An-Nahl, verse 90 emphasizes justice as a fundamental Islamic value with significant implications for individual and organizational behavior:

"Indeed, Allah commands justice, doing good, and giving to relatives; and forbids immorality, bad conduct, and oppression. He admonishes you so that you may take heed."

This verse highlights that justice and *ihsan* (excellence in conduct) should be consistently upheld, including in workplace settings. Organizational justice reflects these values through equitable task distribution, performance appraisal, reward systems, and transparent decision-making.

Properly implemented justice in the workplace fosters a healthy and harmonious environment, motivating employees to avoid deviant behaviors. Conversely, injustice may lead to frustration and negative emotions such as envy and stress, potentially triggering CWBs like sabotage and insubordination. *Ihsan* emphasizes not just formal justice but also empathy and care in interpersonal relationships. These values serve as preventive strategies against emotional distress and behavioral misconduct.

Generational Context and Emotional Impact

Another contributing factor to CWB is negative emotion. Emotions such as frustration, anger, and disappointment can drive adverse responses toward the organization, especially if unmanaged. In the

modern workforce, Generation Z (Gen Z) plays a dominant role. Gen Z (born 1997–2012) is known for emotional expressiveness, a strong sense of fairness, and preference for meaningful and flexible work.

However, there is growing concern about rising CWBs among Gen Z employees, such as procrastination, unexplained absenteeism, and spreading organizational negativity. These behaviors often stem from perceived organizational injustice and unmanaged negative emotions.

Many organizations, including those in Mamuju District, are facing challenges in HR management related to Gen Z employees. Informal data and initial observations reveal managerial concerns about declining work ethic, inconsistent attendance, and intergenerational communication issues. These issues underscore the importance of studying the factors driving CWBs among Gen Z in local contexts.

Theoretical Perspectives

Organizational justice theory asserts that fairness perceptions significantly affect employee attitudes and behaviors. Meanwhile, affective events theory explains how workplace emotions influence work behavior. While previous studies have explored these aspects individually, few have integrated organizational justice, negative emotion, and CWB within the context of Gen Z in Indonesian workplaces.

Negative emotions have significant impacts on social interactions, decision-making, and performance. Research in industrial and organizational psychology indicates that such emotions can influence stress response, adaptability, and interpersonal relationships. Unchecked negative emotions often lead to defensive attitudes, conflicts, and decreased productivity (Mariyam & Sari, 2022).

Practical Relevance

Fair organizational treatment enhances employee satisfaction, loyalty, and engagement, while injustice leads to frustration and CWBs. Distributive, procedural, and interactional injustices can worsen workplace

climate and lower motivation, particularly in Indonesia where cultural and structural complexities may exacerbate these issues.

Therefore, this study aims to explore how organizational justice and negative emotions influence CWB among Gen Z employees in Mamuju District. It intends to provide recommendations for fostering fairness and emotional well-being, thereby creating a more productive and harmonious work environment.

While the effects of organizational justice and emotions have been studied broadly, their specific interaction and impact on Gen Z within the Indonesian organizational context remain under-researched. This research thus seeks to fill that gap by offering empirical insights and practical guidance for HR policy development in contemporary workplaces.

2. Literature Reviews

2.1. Human Resource Management (HRM)

Organizations collect various resources as "inputs" which are then processed to produce goods or services. These resources include capital, technology, operational methods, and people. Among these, human resources (HR) are the most crucial (Diksi Metris et al., 2022).

2.1.1. Definition of Human Resource Management According to Hasibuan (2003, as cited in Diksi Metris, 2022), human resources refer to a person's cognitive and physical abilities. Behavior and personality are shaped by heredity and environment, while motivation to meet personal needs drives performance. Emron (2017, as cited in Diksi Metris, 2022) defines HRM as a process of managing, motivating, and developing human resources to achieve strategic organizational goals and enhance employee performance through strategic initiatives.

2.1.2. HRM Functions According to Marwan Syah (2010), HRM involves utilizing human resources in organizations through functions such as planning and career development, compensation and welfare, occupational health and safety, and industrial relations.

2.1.3. HRM Objectives Samsudin (2010) states that management is working with people to achieve organizational goals through planning, organizing, staffing, leading, and controlling. Terry (as cited in Samsudin, 2010) emphasizes that management is a unique process involving planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling to achieve predetermined goals through the utilization of human and other resources.

2.2. Organizational Justice Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness within the workplace, both in terms of outcomes and the processes used to determine those outcomes, as well as interpersonal treatment (Marso & Anggreyani, 2022; Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Syalsabillah et al., 2022).

2.2.1. Factors Influencing Organizational Justice According to Rejeki (2015, as cited in Ridwanulloh, 2022), the factors affecting organizational justice include:

1. Task characteristics
2. Subordinate trust in leadership
3. Frequency of feedback
4. Managerial performance
5. Organizational culture

2.2.2. Indicators of Organizational Justice Robbins and Judge (2015, as cited in Ridwanulloh, 2022) propose three dimensions:

- **Distributive Justice:** Fairness in the distribution of outcomes.
- **Procedural Justice:** Fairness in the processes leading to outcomes.
- **Interactional Justice:** Fairness in interpersonal treatment.

2.3. Negative Emotions According to Zulaikhah (2015), emotions are both psychological and physiological reactions to stimuli. Mehu and Scherer (2015) classify emotions into positive (e.g., happiness, satisfaction) and negative (e.g., sadness, anger, disappointment). Negative emotions are triggered by unpleasant internal or external stimuli (Scherer, 2001), and are associated

with adverse outcomes like anxiety, depression, and workplace deviance (Bougie et al., 2003; Szczygiel, 2018).

2.3.1. Factors Influencing Emotions (Scherer et al., 2001):

1. Personality
2. Sleep quality
3. Stress levels
4. Exercise
5. Daily life conditions
6. Age (Papalia, 1992)

2.3.2. Indicators of Negative Emotions (McNair et al., 1971):

1. Sadness
2. Anxiety
3. Anger
4. Confusion

2.4. Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) CWB refers to intentional behaviors by employees that harm the organization (Anderson, 2005). This includes absenteeism, sabotage, aggression, theft, and fraud (Rotundo, 2009; Levy & Ritti, 2003).

2.4.1. Definition of CWB Chand et al. (2014) and Sackett & De Vore (2005) define CWB as behavior that intentionally contradicts organizational goals.

2.4.2. Factors Influencing CWB (Sackett & De Vore, 2013; Martinko et al., 2002):

1. Personality traits
2. Situational (external) factors
3. Dispositional (internal) factors

2.4.3. Indicators of CWB (Spector, 2006):

1. Harassment
2. Production deviance
3. Damage to equipment/data
4. Theft
5. Absenteeism, tardiness, early departure

2.5. Prior Research Prior studies serve as a foundation and justification for the current research, offering insights and relevant theoretical frameworks. The literature

reviewed is used to align with and support the development of the present study.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Location and Setting This study was conducted in the Mamuju Subdistrict, the administrative center of Mamuju Regency in West Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The area was selected due to the concentration of government institutions, private companies, and educational organizations employing a significant number of employees, including members of Generation Z (born between 1997 and 2012). The presence of Gen Z employees in Mamuju has become increasingly prominent due to workforce rejuvenation and recruitment policies favoring young professionals.

3.2 Data Types and Sources

Quantitative Data

Quantitative data, according to Al-Qaisi et al. (2022), is essential for generating objective, statistically measurable findings.

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data, as described by Sugiyono (2022), involves methods such as phenomenology, case studies, grounded theory, and ethnography, offering broader contextual understanding.

Primary Data

Sugiyono (2021) defines primary data as information collected directly by the researcher through interviews, questionnaires, observations, or experiments.

Secondary Data

According to Sugiyono (2021), secondary data refers to information sourced from existing documents such as previous research, books, and institutional reports.

3.3 Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

Population

The population consists of all formal employees from Generation Z working across public and private sectors in Mamuju Subdistrict. Due to the absence of a centralized

database detailing the number of Gen Z workers, this population is considered infinite.

Sampling Technique

A non-probability sampling method using purposive sampling was employed. Respondents were selected based on the following criteria: (1) Born between 1997 and 2012, (2) Employed in Mamuju Subdistrict, and (3) Willing to participate and complete the questionnaire.

To determine the minimum sample size, the Lemeshow formula was applied:

$$n = (Z^2 \times p \times (1 - p)) / d^2 \\ = (1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5) / 0.1^2 = 96.04$$

Thus, a minimum of 96 respondents is considered adequate.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

Observation

Direct observation was conducted at the research site to collect contextual data (Sugiyono, 2021).

Literature

Study

Secondary data were gathered through books, journals, online resources, and institutional documents relevant to the study.

Interview

Structured interviews were conducted with key personnel to enrich the data (Sugiyono, 2021).

Questionnaire

Questionnaires used a five-point Likert scale to measure attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. The response categories were:

- Strongly Agree (5)
- Agree (4)
- Neutral (3)
- Disagree (2)
- Strongly Disagree (1)

Documentation

Archival records such as reports and photos were collected to support primary data (Sugiyono, 2020).

3.5 Data Processing and Analysis Techniques

Instrument Quality Test

Validity Test

Pearson Product-Moment correlation was used to assess validity. Items are considered valid if $r\text{-calculated} > r\text{-table}$ at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Reliability Test

Cronbach's Alpha was used, with a threshold of $\alpha > 0.60$ indicating acceptable reliability (Sugiyono, 2021).

Hypothesis Testing

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was used to evaluate the effect of independent variables (organizational justice and negative emotions) on the dependent variable (counterproductive work behavior). The model is:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$$

Where:

- Y = Counterproductive Work Behavior
- X1 = Organizational Justice
- X2 = Negative Emotion
- a = Constant
- b1, b2 = Regression Coefficients
- e = Error term

t-Test (Partial Test)

The t-test examines the significance of each independent variable's effect. Degrees of freedom: $df = n - k - 1$.

F-Test (Simultaneous Test)

The F-test assesses whether all independent variables simultaneously affect the dependent variable.

- If $F\text{-calculated} > F\text{-table}$ and significance $< 0.05 \rightarrow$ significant effect.

3.6 Operational Definitions of Variables

Organizational Justice (X1)

Measured using three dimensions (Robbins & Judge, 2015 in Ridwanulloh, 2022):

- Distributive Justice
- Procedural Justice
- Interactional Justice

Negative Emotion (X2)

Based on McNair et al. (1971), the dimensions include:

- Sadness
- Anxiety
- Anger
- Confusion

Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y)

Defined as behaviors that harm the organization or its members (Spector, 2006).

Indicators include:

- Harassment
- Production Deviance
- Damage to Equipment or Processes
- Theft
- Absenteeism or Unexcused Departures

4. Results And Discussion

4.1 Data Presentation (Research Results)

4.4 Instrument Quality Testing Results

1. Validity Test

Validity testing is a procedure used to measure the extent to which an instrument accurately reflects the content or meaning it intends to measure. The primary objective of this test is to ensure that each item within the instrument appropriately corresponds to the real-world phenomena it aims to assess, thereby effectively capturing the actual variables under investigation (Sugiyono, 2021:175). Validity is tested by comparing the **calculated r-value (r_{count})** from the data analysis with the **critical r-value (r_{table})**. If $r_{\text{count}} \geq r_{\text{table}}$, the item is considered valid. Conversely, if $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$, the item is considered invalid and requires revision or elimination. This process is crucial to ensure that the research instrument has precise and reliable measurement capabilities.

- If $r_{\text{count}} > r_{\text{table}}$, the item is **Valid**
- If $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$, the item is **Not Valid**

This study investigates the influence of organizational justice and negative emotions on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) among employees. To ensure the reliability and

accuracy of the instrument in measuring variables, validity and reliability tests were conducted with a total of 96 respondents. Validity testing was conducted using the **Pearson Product Moment correlation**, and reliability was measured using **Cronbach's Alpha**.

- Number of Respondents: 96
- $r_{\text{table}} (n = 96, \alpha = 0.05) = 0.200$

Table 4.13

Instrument Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	r_{count}	r_{table}	Status
Organizational Justice (X1)	X1.1	0.779	0.198	Valid
	X1.2	0.782	0.198	Valid
	X1.3	0.719	0.198	Valid
Negative Emotions (X2)	X2.1	0.495	0.198	Valid
	X2.2	0.596	0.198	Valid
	X2.3	0.684	0.198	Valid
Counterproductive Work Behavior (X3)	X3.1	0.596	0.198	Valid
	X3.2	0.586	0.198	Valid
	X3.3	0.598	0.198	Valid
	X3.3	0.647	0.198	Valid

X	0.617	0.198	Val
3.			id
4			
X	0.647	0.198	Val
3.			id
5			

Source: Primary data, 2022

The results presented in Table 4.13 indicate that all items tested have r_{count} values greater than r_{table} , confirming that the entire instrument used in this study is valid. Each item in the questionnaire accurately measures its intended construct, ensuring the data collected can be reliably used in further analysis.

2. Reliability Test

The reliability test assesses the extent to which a research instrument consistently produces stable and dependable results. An instrument is considered reliable if it yields consistent outcomes under similar conditions (Sugiyono, 2021:176). Reliability is assessed using **Cronbach's Alpha**, and an instrument is deemed reliable if its Cronbach's Alpha value is ≥ 0.60 .

If Cronbach's Alpha $\geq 0.60 \rightarrow$ **Reliable**

If Cronbach's Alpha $< 0.60 \rightarrow$ **Not Reliable**

Table 4.14

Instrument Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Threshold	Decision
Organizational Justice	0.636	0.60	Reliable
Negative Emotions	0.726	0.60	Reliable
Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.929	0.60	Reliable

Source: Primary data, 2022

All the Cronbach's Alpha values exceed the 0.60 threshold, indicating that each variable's instrument is reliable. Hence, the collected data meets the requirements for further statistical analysis.

4.5 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

A multiple linear regression model is used to assess the linear relationship between one dependent variable and two or more independent variables. The mathematical equation used is:

$$Y = \alpha + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$$

Table 4.15

Multiple Linear Regression Output

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	6.227	3.841		1.621	.108
Total X1	-	0.282	-	-	.105
	0.461		0.127	1.637	
Total X2	1.059	0.127	0.646	8.352	.000

Source: Primary data, 2022

Regression Equation:

$$Y = 6.227 - 0.461X_1 + 1.059X_2 + e$$

Interpretation:

- **Constant ($\alpha = 6.227$):** When organizational justice and negative emotions are absent (zero), the baseline level of counterproductive behavior among Gen Z employees is 6.227. This implies that other factors beyond the tested variables may also contribute to CWB.
- **b_1X_1 (Organizational Justice):** The regression coefficient of -0.461 indicates that a one-unit increase in perceived organizational justice is associated with a 0.461 unit decrease in CWB. This supports the idea that fairness in organizational procedures, distribution, and interactions fosters employee loyalty and positive behavior.
- **b_2X_2 (Negative Emotions):** A coefficient of 1.059 signifies that a one-unit increase in negative emotions corresponds to a 1.059 unit rise in CWB. This finding confirms the critical role of psychological states in shaping destructive work behavior, underscoring the need for effective emotional regulation strategies in the workplace.

4.6 Partial Hypothesis Testing (t-Test)

The t-test evaluates the individual influence of independent variables on the dependent variable. The rule is:

- $t_{count} > t_{table} \rightarrow$ Significant
- $t_{count} < t_{table} \rightarrow$ Not Significant
- **Sig. < 0.05** $\rightarrow$ Significant
- **Sig. > 0.05** $\rightarrow$ Not Significant

Degree of freedom (df) = $n - k - 1 = 96 - 2 - 1 = 93$

At $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-tailed): $t_{count} = 1.986$

Table 4.16
Partial Test Output (t-Test)
(Refer to Table 4.15)

4.6.1 Hypothesis Test 1:

$t_{count} = -1.637 < t_{table} = 1.986 \rightarrow$ **Not Significant**

Organizational justice has **no significant effect** on CWB. Despite the negative direction of the relationship, its impact is statistically insignificant. This implies that other factors may have a stronger influence on CWB, such as stress or lack of self-control.

4.6.2 Hypothesis Test 2:

$t_{count} = 8.352 > t_{table} = 1.986 \rightarrow$ **Significant**

Negative emotions significantly influence CWB. Higher emotional distress leads to greater tendencies toward counterproductive behavior. This finding reinforces the importance of emotional management strategies within organizations, especially for Gen Z employees.

4.7 Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing (F-Test)

- $F_{count} > F_{table} \rightarrow$ Significant
- $F_{count} < F_{table} \rightarrow$ Not Significant

Degrees of Freedom:

- $df1 = k - 1 = 2$

- $df2 = n - k = 93$
- $F_{count} (\alpha = 0.05) = 3.094$

Table 4.17
F-Test (ANOVA)

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1152.812	2	576.406	37.986	.000
Residual	1411.188	93	15.174		
Total	2564.000	95			

Source: Primary data, 2022

Conclusion:

$F_{count} = 37.986 > F_{table} = 3.094$, Sig. = 0.000 $\rightarrow$

Significant

Both organizational justice and negative emotions **simultaneously** influence CWB. The combined influence underscores the need for a fair and emotionally healthy work environment to reduce CWB.

4.8 Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The coefficient of determination measures how much of the dependent variable's variance is explained by the independent variables.

- $R^2 \approx 1 \rightarrow$ Strong model
- $R^2 \approx 0 \rightarrow$ Weak model

Table 4.18
Model Summary

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error
0.671	0.450	0.438	3.895

Source: Primary data, 2022

Interpretation:

An R^2 of 0.450 indicates that 45.0% of the variation in CWB is explained by organizational justice and negative emotions. The remaining 55.0% is influenced by other variables outside the model. These may include:

1. **Job Stress**
2. **Job Satisfaction**
3. **Organizational Commitment**
4. **Self-Control**
5. **Organizational Culture**

Incorporating these variables in future research may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the predictors of CWB and offer actionable strategies for organizations.

4.2 Analysis and discussion

a. The Influence of Organizational Justice on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Based on the t-test analysis, the calculated t-value was -1.637, while the critical t-value was 1.986 at a significance level of 0.05 with 93 degrees of freedom. Since the t-value (-1.637) is less than the critical value (1.986), the hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational justice does not have a statistically significant effect on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) among Generation Z employees.

Although the regression coefficient indicates a negative direction—suggesting that higher perceived organizational justice may reduce counterproductive behaviors—the relationship is not statistically strong enough to be considered significant. This finding implies that organizational justice may not be the sole or primary determinant of CWB in the context of this study. Other variables, such as negative emotions, job stress, or self-control, may exert a stronger influence on employees' tendencies to engage in behaviors that harm the organization.

These results are consistent with findings by Rachmawati (2020), who also reported that organizational justice did not significantly influence deviant behavior, particularly in organizational contexts characterized by weak supervisory systems or dominant emotional factors. Similarly, Putra and Kurniawan (2019) found that procedural and distributive justice did not directly reduce CWB, as their effects were mediated by psychological variables such as work stress and emotional satisfaction.

Hence, while organizational justice remains morally and ethically important, it may not serve as a dominant predictor of CWB—particularly among Generation Z employees who are more strongly influenced

by emotional factors, workload, and their immediate social environment.

b. The Influence of Negative Emotions on Counterproductive Work Behavior

The results show a calculated t-value of 8.352, exceeding the critical t-value of 1.986 at the 0.05 significance level with 93 degrees of freedom. As the t-value is greater than the critical value, the hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that negative emotions have a significant influence on counterproductive work behavior among Generation Z employees.

The positive regression coefficient indicates that higher levels of negative emotions—such as anxiety, anger, frustration, or sadness—are associated with a greater tendency to engage in behaviors that harm the organization. This finding strengthens the understanding that negative emotions are critical psychological drivers of counterproductive actions, including tardiness, interpersonal conflict, and misuse of organizational resources.

This result aligns with prior literature which suggests that poor emotional states may reduce self-control and increase impulsive behaviors in the workplace. Consequently, organizations are encouraged to develop effective emotional management strategies, including stress management training, counseling services, and the cultivation of a supportive work climate, especially in response to the emotional characteristics of Generation Z.

These findings corroborate several previous studies. Pratiwi and Nugroho (2021), in the *Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, found a significant positive correlation between negative emotions and CWB, particularly among younger employees who tend to be more expressive and reactive to work pressure. Rahmawati et al. (2022), in the *Indonesian Journal of Behavioral Studies*, demonstrated that employees experiencing high emotional distress were more likely to exhibit deviant behaviors such as absenteeism and task neglect. Furthermore, Setiawan and Lestari (2022), in the *Human Resource*

Research Review, confirmed that negative emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety, and frustration) significantly contributed to the rise of passive-aggressive behaviors, including work sabotage and time theft.

Thus, negative emotion emerges as a critical variable warranting serious attention from organizational leadership. Management should provide psychological support systems, emotional intelligence training, and create an emotionally healthy workplace to mitigate the adverse effects of emotional distress on productivity and organizational culture.

c. The Joint Influence of Organizational Justice and Negative Emotions on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) refers to employee actions that intentionally harm the organization, either directly or indirectly. According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), CWB may include behaviors such as tardiness, unexcused absenteeism, sabotage, interpersonal conflict, theft, and the misuse of organizational resources. Such behaviors are typically deliberate and may arise as responses to dissatisfaction, stress, or perceived injustice in the workplace.

Based on the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the F-value was 37.986, while the critical F-value was 3.094 at the 0.05 significance level. Since the F-value exceeds the critical value, it is concluded that the regression model is significant. This indicates that both organizational justice and negative emotions simultaneously exert a significant influence on counterproductive work behavior.

Furthermore, the significance value (p-value) of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, confirms that the joint influence of these two independent variables on the dependent variable is statistically significant.

This finding suggests that employees' perceptions of organizational justice and their emotional conditions are critical factors that together influence the likelihood of CWB in the workplace. When employees perceive fairness in treatment, processes, and outcomes, they are more likely to adhere to organizational norms

and values. Conversely, when negative emotions are poorly managed, they may fuel destructive behaviors that are harmful to the organization.

From an organizational perspective, fostering a fair and emotionally supportive work environment is crucial—especially when managing Generation Z employees, who tend to be highly sensitive to social justice and psychological well-being. Organizations are therefore advised to not only implement formal structures and policies but also actively support employee mental health and emotional stability as a means of minimizing counterproductive behaviors.

In the field of organizational psychology, CWB is seen as the result of interaction between individual factors (such as emotional state, personality traits, and self-control) and situational factors (such as organizational culture, leadership style, and justice systems). Two widely acknowledged predictors of CWB are organizational justice and negative emotions.

Organizational justice refers to the extent to which employees perceive that they are treated fairly, encompassing distributive justice (fairness in outcomes), procedural justice (fairness in processes), and interactional justice (fairness in interpersonal treatment) (Colquitt, 2001). When employees perceive low justice, they are more likely to experience demotivation and frustration, potentially triggering CWB as a form of protest or retaliation. On the other hand, fair treatment fosters positive work attitudes, loyalty, and productivity.

Negative emotions—such as anger, anxiety, and sadness—also significantly contribute to the emergence of CWB. Affective events theory and related models assert that employees under emotional strain may lose impulse control and make harmful decisions for themselves and the organization (Spector & Fox, 2005). These emotional disturbances often stem from heavy workloads, task ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, or dissatisfaction with organizational systems. If left unaddressed, such emotional conditions can lead to deviant

behaviors like procrastination, reduced productivity, and workplace conflict.

In conclusion, CWB does not arise spontaneously; it is shaped by a combination of psychological and structural factors in the work environment. Organizational justice and negative emotions are two key determinants that influence this behavior. Therefore, organizations must establish equitable systems and foster emotionally healthy work environments to effectively mitigate the risk of counterproductive work behavior.

5. Closing

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the previous discussion and data analysis results in relation to the research problem, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The regression analysis results indicate a t-value of -1.637, which is less than the critical t-value of 1.986 at a significance level of 0.05 with 93 degrees of freedom. Since the $t\text{-value} < t\text{-table}$, the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational justice does not have a significant influence on counterproductive work behavior among Generation Z employees. Although the regression coefficient indicates a negative relationship (i.e., higher organizational justice tends to lower counterproductive behavior), the relationship is not statistically significant. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence to assert that organizational justice directly suppresses counterproductive behavior.
2. The analysis reveals a t-value of 8.352, which exceeds the t-table value of 1.986. Since the $t\text{-value} > t\text{-table}$, the second hypothesis (H2) is accepted. This means that negative emotions have a significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. The positive regression coefficient indicates that the greater the negative emotions experienced by employees—such as anxiety, frustration, or anger—the higher their tendency to engage in counterproductive behaviors, such as

unexcused absences, substandard job performance, or interpersonal conflict.

3. According to the F-test results shown in Table 27, the F-value is 37.986, which is greater than the critical F-value of 3.094. Additionally, the p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Thus, the third hypothesis (H3) is accepted, indicating that organizational justice and negative emotions simultaneously have a significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. This finding demonstrates that the combination of perceived organizational justice and employees' emotional states can jointly explain variations in the level of counterproductive work behavior among employees.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher offers the following recommendations as constructive input for stakeholders. These suggestions are intended to serve as a valuable reference for future studies and organizational practices, particularly in the domain of performance management:

1. **For Organizational Leaders and Management:** It is crucial to pay greater attention to the emotional balance of employees, especially Generation Z workers who tend to be more expressive and sensitive to work-related stress. It is recommended to provide counseling services, stress management programs, and soft skills training to help employees cope with negative emotions such as anxiety, anger, and frustration.
2. **Improving Perceptions of Organizational Justice:** Although this study found no statistically significant effect of organizational justice, the negative direction of the relationship still underscores the importance of justice in shaping employee attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, organizations should maintain transparency in workload distribution, reward systems, and decision-making processes to ensure

that employees feel valued and treated fairly.

3. **Preventing Counterproductive Work Behavior:** There is a need for a more human-centered supervision and performance evaluation system—one that incorporates psychological and interpersonal approaches rather than relying solely on punitive measures. Cultivating a positive and collaborative organizational culture is also essential in mitigating deviant behaviors in the workplace.
4. **Suggestions for Future Research:** This study is limited by the number of independent variables examined. Future research is encouraged to explore additional variables that may influence counterproductive behavior, such as job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and self-control.
5. **Human Resource Development:** Organizations are advised to develop character and work ethic programs, particularly during employee onboarding. This is important for instilling core values of professionalism and work integrity that can sustain employees in navigating organizational dynamics.

Bibliography

- Abdillah, J. (2021). *Hubungan kesendirian dan karakteristik pekerjaan dengan perilaku cyberloafing pada pegawai CV Arya Advertising* (Disertasi doktor, Universitas Medan Area).
- Adhana, W., & Herwanto, J. (2021). Hubungan antara kontrol diri dan emosi negatif dengan perilaku cyberloafing pada pegawai negeri sipil (PNS) di Kantor Pelayanan Bea dan Cukai Kota Pekanbaru. *Psikobuletin: Buletin Ilmiah Psikologi*, 2(2), 144–153.
- Adiyanti, S. A., & Nugraha, E. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi finansial dan kompensasi non-finansial terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Remik: Riset dan E-Jurnal Manajemen Informatika Komputer*, 7(1), 166–176.
- Ahmad, A., & Omar, N. (2017). Understanding who cyberloafs from the self-control perspective: A study in the public service sector. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2017.08.017>
- Anisa, C. A. (2021). Tingkat manajemen dan manajer beserta fungsi-fungsi manajemen. *Leadership: Jurnal Mahasiswa Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 2(2), 150–164.
- Apriyani, D., Purnamasari, E. D., & Wulandari, T. (2022). Pengaruh beban kerja, disiplin kerja, dan emosi negatif terhadap kinerja pegawai pada PT Hindoli (A Cargill Company). *Eksis: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 14(1), 8–16.
- Arta, D. N. C., Pabendon, T., Sandy, S., Anwar, M. A., & Taime, H. (2022). Analisis hubungan antara emosi negatif dan lingkungan kerja dengan turnover intention: Literatur review. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Akuntansi (Costing)*, 6(2), 1406–1417.
- Astiezah, R. (2022). *Pengaruh beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap perilaku cyberloafing dimediasi emosi negatif pada guru sekolah dasar negeri 74 dan 58 Kota Bengkulu* (Disertasi doktor, Universitas Islam Indonesia).
- Astuti, S. D., Perdana, T. A., Samasta, A. S., & Sijabat, R. (2022). *Penyimpangan kerja: Fenomena perilaku cyberloafing*. Jakarta: Penerbit NEM.
- Attig, K., & Filatrovi, E. W. (2022). Pengelolaan burnout pegawai guna menghentikan cyberloafing. *Diantara Makarti*, 15(1).