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Introductions

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) has received the attention of researchers and management experts in recent years because it takes high cost to overcome it. Counterproductive work behavior has economic, social, and psychological implications. 

Previous studies (Galperin et al., (2011); Aljabal et al. (2012)) show that CWB is commonly found in public sector organization. It is reinforced by Bashir et al. (2012). CWB behavior can be assessed from the triggering factors (antecedents), such as individual, organization, work, contextual factor, and consequence (Lau et al., 2003). Some studies such as Krischer et al. (2010); Kessler et al. (2013); Yang et al. (2013) conclude that CWB have a negative effect on employees and organization. Organizational justice factor is considered to affect the employee’s decision to be involved in CWB or not (Henle, 2005).

Organizational justice is initially divided into three dimensions, namely distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Siswanti et al., 2018); (Palupi & Tjahjono, 2016); (Tjahjono et al., 2019). The three organizational justice include: (1) distributive justice is the perception of fairness about output allocation in organization (Colquitt, 2001). Distributive justice refers to equity theory (Cook & Gerbasi, 2012) which states that individual defines justice only on the comparison of outcomes received, so that the relationship tends to be more appropriate in economic exchange called contract, ie agreement to create obligations or not do something. Economic exchange reciprocity will be limited in in-role behavior because
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employees see little possibility of doing things that beyond specific contractual agreements; (2) Procedural
justice is the perception of fairness in terms of the rules or procedures used to determine the allocation of
distribution among employees (Colquitt, 2001). Fair procedures must have several criterias, namely:
consistency, lack of bias, correctability, representation, accuracy, ethically (Colquitt et al. (2013); (3) The third
dimension is interactional justice. According to Colquitt et al. (2001); Colquitt & Zipay (2015); Colquitt et al.
(2013), interactional justice refers to the authority well communicated to employees. Interactional justice as
individual's perception about level of an employee is treated with dignity, attention, and respect. According
to Colquitt (2001), interactional justice shows the level of someone treated well, respectfully, and politely. Then,
organizational behavior researchers identify four organizational justice types, namely: distributive justice,
procedural justice, and interactional justice development (interpersonal and informational justice) (Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009).

According to Mossholder et al. (1998), individual approach fails to overcome social contexts when
dealing with the formation of justice perception. In a unit or group, each member interacts with each other,
observes behavior, and tiefed build shared perceptions to evaluate justice which is applied in the organization
(Naumann & Bennett (2000); Li & Cromanzano (2009). Consistent with this statement, current studies are
recommended to see justice as a property and formed by the basis of interaction between each member in the
same unit or group. This formed perception called justice climate. The meta-analysis result (Lau et al.,
2003) recommend further study to examine interaction between individual factors and situational factors
(organizational justice climate) affect CWB, so cross
level research is needed. Cross-level study is conducted when testing the effect of higher levels
(organization or unit/group) on lower levels. Cross-level testing uses Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM)
analysis tool. Seibert et al. (2004) state that HLM is an
appropriate analytical tool to test cross level model in
which there is variance at the individual level and group
level variance with individual level outcomes. The HLM
method still considers variance within units and variance between units (Hoffman et al., 2007).

LITERATURE REVIEW
COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (CWB)
AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE CLIMATE

CWB is work behavior which interferes organization or organizational member, such as theft, sabotage,
interpersonal aggression, slow work, wasting time or material, and spreading rumors (Spector et al., 2006).
Similar definition is conveyed by Grusy & Sackett
(2003) which state that counterproductive work behavior is the behavior of organizational members that is
intentionally break the rules or ignore values that are contrary to the official interests of the organization.
Spector et al. (2006) explain CWB dimension can be divided into five categories, namely: (1) being rude to
others, an employee’s deviation work behavior which can hurt co-workers or other organizational members
both physically and psychologically through actions, such as: threat, ignoring others, unpleasant

comment, or reducing one’s ability to work effectively; (2) deviation in production, (3) sabotage, (4) theft, (5)
withdrawal, an employee’s deviation work behavior which limits the number of work times less than
required by organizations, such as arrive late or leave work early, absence, and increase after period than
determined (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

According to Kozlowski & Klein (2000), several phenomena in organization based on theories of
cognition, affection, behavior, and individual characteristics appear with a higher level, namely
groups or units due to social interaction and exchange between individual. Organizational justice is one of
organization’s phenomena that emphasizes cognitive aspects and treaton higher level because of social
interaction between individual in the process of forming justice perception. Colquitt (2001) reinforces that
organizational justice is the result of social construction. In this social construction, there is an interaction
between individual, exchange, and sharing information process in a unit or group.

According to Liao & Rupp (2005), the justice climate is justice perception at the level of group and
organization. Justice perception at the individual level is unable to capture the social context that shapes the
justice perception. Justice climate is shared perception of members in a group regarding policy, procedure, and
treatment which have source from the organization and supervisor. Members in a group are seen to have the
same information and experience due to dealing with same leader, policy, procedure in the organization and
other similar contextual factors. Joint consensus and perception among members in the group will emerge as
a consequence of this similarity. This joint consensus and perception are measured as a justice climate.
Roberson & Colquitt (2005) state that employees or individuals in the group will share each other and will
lead to a shared interpretation of justice through the aggregation of justice perceptions across group
members.

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE CLIMATE, LEADER
MEMBER EXCHANGE(LMX) AND
COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (CWB)

According to G. B. Graen & Scandura (1987); in the role theory, LMX has two dimensions namely
approaches to build good relations with employees which is consist of loyalty, support, and trust. The
dimension which being LMX basis is coupling that focuses on the attitudes of superiors towards
subordinates, including: communication direction (adressing), influence allocation, freedom of
expression, and innovation. Liden & Maslyn (1998) explain that LMX is multidimensional and has four
dimensions, namely contribution, loyalty, affection, and respect for the profession.

Liao & Rupp (2005) show the significant effect of the procedural justice climate and interactional justice
climate (interpersonal and informational) on employee attitudes and behavior, including counterproductive
work behavior. Chernyak-Hai & Tziner (2014) show that distributive justice has a significant (though marginal)
effect on CWB.

Several other empirical studies have shown that procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal
justice, and informational justice have a significant negative effect on CWB both in organization and other interpersonal or individuals (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010); (El Akremi et al., 2010). These results were also strengthened by Berry et al. (2007) & Dalal (2005) in his meta-analysis on organizations and other interpersonal individual. There is a strong negative relationship between interactional justice and CWB. Pillai et al. (1999) find that procedural justice and distributive justice are significantly related to leader-member exchange (LMX). The leader-member exchange has a significant effect on CWB (Seo, 2016).

Hypothesis 1: Procedural Justice Climate (PJC) has significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

Hypothesis 2: Distributive Justice Climate (DJC) has significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

Hypothesis 3: Procedural Justice Climate (PJC) has significant effect on Leader Member Exchange (LMX).

Hypothesis 4: Distributive Justice Climate (DJC) has significant effect on Leader Member Exchange (LMX).

Hypothesis 5: Leader Member Exchange (LMX) has significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

Hypothesis 6: Leader Member Exchange (LMX) mediates the effect of Procedural Justice Climate on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

Hypothesis 7: Leader Member Exchange (LMX) mediates the effect of Distributive Justice Climate (DJC) on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

The instruments for measuring procedural justice climate are developed by Niehoff & Moorman (1993). The instruments for measuring distributive justice are developed by Cropanzano et al. (2011): distributive intra unit justice which is consist of 5 items. The instruments for measuring interpersonal justice are developed by Colquitt (2001b) which is consist of 4 items. The measurement of LMX variable adopts 11 questions from Maslyn & Uhl-Bien (2001). This variable is measured at the individual level. CWB is measured at the individual level with instruments developed from Grusys & Sackett (2003), as many as 27 items. All instruments are measured with a 6 point Adjusted Likert Scale (scale 1 = very strongly disagree to scale 6 = strongly agree). The instrument test is conducted with validity test using confirmatory factor analysis and reliability testing. The reliability test result is shown by looking at Cronbach Alpa. According to Hair et al. (2006), the reliability test limit is α 0.7; whereas if α = 0.6, it can be accepted in exploratory research.

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING METHOD**

Hypothesis testing uses Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) because this study examines variables that differ in their level of analysis (cross level), namely group level and individual level (2-1-1). This model is developed by Raudenbush and Bryk (2002).

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**RESPONDENTS PROFILE**

The results in Table 1 show that the majority of respondents are 46-50 years old (27%), female (56%) and 81% have a Master educaton. Whereas, the majority of length of working are 21-25 years old (30%).

---

**Figure 1. Research model**

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

The population in this study is lecturers in three (3) New State Universities (NSU) in Indonesia. There are two sources of data used, namely: primary data (questionnaire and interview) and secondary data (population). Data collection in this study is collected by interview and questionnaire. Sampling used purposive (criteria is respondents is not government employees). Total of population from three (3) New State University in Indonesia is 563. We found 365 minimal sample size with Slovin's formula. There are 55 number of study programs that meet the requirements.

**MEASUREMENT**

---

**Table 1. Respondents Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 50</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 55</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 60</td>
<td>years old</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY TEST RESULTS

Procedural Justice Climate has 9 items whereas 6 items are valid. There are 3 items of distributive justice perception are valid. All LMX items (11 items) are valid. CWB (21 items), there are 15 valid items (Siswanti et al., 2020). Reliability test show that all variable are reliable (has Cronbach Alpha>0.6) (Procedural justice:0.93; distributive justice:0.72; LMX: 0.86; and CWB: 0.93).

HYPOTHESIS TEST RESULT

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The result in Table 2 shows that the average LMX and PJC have high score, DJC has low score, and CWB has very low score. Correlation coefficient of that research variable has a quite high score with the significance level below 0.05. This shows that the each variable that is studied has a significant relationship.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistic and Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Individual level variable</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Perceptio n of Average Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)</td>
<td>4.3743</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.8445</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)</td>
<td>1.5646</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>.46672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIT LEVEL DATA TESTING

The unit level variable in this study is procedural justice climate and distributive justice climate. The data collected is individual perception, so an aggregation justification is needed to make it a unit level variable. When the aggregation is conducted and the results not meet the minimum score, the group or work unit is not suitable to be used as study sample. The stages of aggregation of individual data into group data are as follows:

a) The first step of data aggregation refers to the value of the Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA). Inter-Rater Agreement is an index of approval degrees in a separate work unit. IRA calculation is applied to each work group for each variable. IRA testing has minimum score (cut-off) that must be met. All work units must have a score> 0.70. 55 work groups or units have predetermined score standards (cut-off> 0.70), so they meet the requirements to be included in the analysis testing process.

b) Calculate ICC (1) or Inter-Class Correlation for each justice climate (procedural and distributive). The score generated in the ICC test (1) must be equal to or greater than 0.05; that is the variance between groups is greater than the variants in the group. The ICC value (1) represents that there is sufficient variance between groups.

c) ICC score (2) must be > 0.60, which is the ICC standard score (2) (Newman & Sin, 2009). If standard scores are met the working group or unit, there are average eligibility score given by each working group member to represent score at the group level. The estimation result shows that ICC score (2) meets the standard value of 0.60 for each justice climate.

Unit level data testing result is shown in Table 3.
Cross Level Analysis Of Organizational Justice Climate To Counterproductive Work Behavior: Leader-Member Exchange As Mediation

| Justice Climate | 4. Informatonal Justice Climate | 0.8142 | 0.800 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 61 |

Note: \( r_{	ext{ICC}} \) = Intrater Agreement, ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

d) Between Variance Testing on Dependent Variables

Before testing the hypothesis with HLM, the unconstrained (null) dependent variable model must be tested to determine the variance of the dependent variable between study groups (between-group variance) as a condition that must be met before cross-level testing. The null model testing is conducted on variables that are being the consequences of procedural justice climate, distributive justice climate, namely CWB and LMX.

Table 4 shows the unconstrained model result of the two output variables. The test result shows a significant chi-square value for CWB (\( \chi^2 = 73.51841; p < 0.05 \)), and leader-member exchange (LMX) (\( \chi^2 = 101.82383; p < 0.001 \)). These results indicate that there are differences in outcome variables between work units, so that cross-level hypothesis testing using HLM analysis tools can be conducted.

Table 4. Summary of Unconstrained Testing Results (Null Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square (( \chi^2 ))</th>
<th>( \sigma^2 ) dan ( \tau )</th>
<th>ICC = ( \tau/(\tau + \sigma^2) )</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)</td>
<td>101.82 383</td>
<td>0.638 51 and 0.008 25</td>
<td>0.012 756</td>
<td>The result of the unconstrained model shows a significant chi-square and ICC, i.e. there are differences in variance between work units/study programs on each dependent variable, so that HLM analysis can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive work behavior (CWB)</td>
<td>73.518 41</td>
<td>0.209 73 and 0.011 42</td>
<td>0.051 639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypothesis testing is divided into two parts, namely: (1) testing the effect of cross-level procedural justice climate and distributive justice climate on CWB; (2) testing the effect of mediating the leader-member exchange (LMX) on the effect of procedural justice climate and distributive justice climate to CWB. Table 5 shows the direct test result of unit level variable on output variable individual level.

Table 5. Direct Test Result Summary of Unit Level Variable on Output Variable Individual Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>LMX</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Unit Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice Climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10 6**</td>
<td>0.0 51</td>
<td>0.0 44</td>
<td>H_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice Climate</td>
<td>0.03 2</td>
<td>0.0 75</td>
<td>0.6 69</td>
<td>H_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>0.17 4***</td>
<td>0.0 51</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***\( p<0.001; ** p<0.05 \)

Table 5 shows that the testing result of the effect of cross-level procedural justice climate on CWB is significantly negative (\( y = -0.106; SE = 0.051; p < 0.044 \)). It means that hypothesis 1 is supported. H2 test result shows that the distributive justice climate does not have a significant effect on CWB (\( y = 0.032; SE = 0.075; p < 0.669 \)). It means H2 is not supported. H3 test result shows a significant positive effect on procedural justice climate to LMX (\( y = 0.572; SE = 0.086; p < 0.001 \)). It means that H3 is supported. H4 test result shows the cross level effect of distributive justice climate on LMX is not significant (\( y = 0.050; SE = 0.111; p < 0.653 \)). This
result indicates that **Hypothesis 4 is not supported.** H5 test result shows a significant negative effect of LMX on CWB (γ = -0.174; SE = 0.051; p < 0.001). This result indicates that **hypothesis 5 is supported.**

This study also measures the variance (r²) of each relationship obtained from the difference between the variance of the null model testing (indicated by γ) with the variance of each model's relationship test (rmean), then divided by the null model variance (Woltman et al., 2012). Table 6 shows steps of hypothesis 6 testing.

### Table 6. Steps of Hypothesis 6 Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Direct Effect (γ)</th>
<th>Effect After Mediation (p)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Effect of PJC on CWB</td>
<td>γ = -0.106; p &lt; 0.044</td>
<td>r² = 7.89%</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Effect of PJCon LMX</td>
<td>γ = 0.572; p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>r² = 37.60%</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Effect of LMX on CWB</td>
<td>γ = -0.174; p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>r² = 38.55%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PJC = Procedural Justice Climate; LMX = Leader-Member Exchange; CWB = Counter Productive Work Behavior

**H6** test result shows that LMX acts as a mediator (Table 6) that is partial (partially mediation variables) so that **Hypothesis 6 is supported.** The assumption developed by (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007) include: if the independent variable has a direct effect (the first step) but not significant after putting mediating variable, then the effect of full mediation is occur. After putting a mediating variable, there is a change in the value of variance (r²). Table 7 shows steps of hypothesis 7 testing.

### Table 7. Steps of Hypothesis 7 Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Direct Effect (γ)</th>
<th>Effect After Mediation (p)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Effect of DJC on CWB</td>
<td>γ = 0.340; p &lt; 0.069</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Effect of DJC on LMX</td>
<td>γ = 0.032; p &lt; 0.653</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Effect of LMX on CWB</td>
<td>γ = -0.174; p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Effect of DJC and LMX on CWB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This test is discontinued because the second stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** DJC = Distributive Justice Climate; LMX = Leader-Member Exchange; CWB = Counter Productive Work Behavior

H7 test result shows that LMX does not mediate the effect of the distributive justice climate on CWB (Table 7) so hypothesis 7 is not supported.

**DISCUSSION**

The test results show that the procedural justice climate affects CWB negatively and significantly. The study results support previous studies which state that procedural justice has a significant negative effect on CWB (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001); (Liao & Rupp, 2005); (Jones, 2009); (El Akremi et al., 2010); (DeConinck, 2010); (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010); (Wu et al, 2016). The results show if the perception of procedural justice understood well and continued to increase in groups, it would reduce the individual desire to have counterproductive work behavior. Trust will be realized when there is justice. When someone is treated fairly, there is reciprocity norm that says that they must also do the same. In this case, justice and trust are important (DeConinck, 2010).

The real phenomena in the three institutions of study objects is if all employees in each study program or work unit feel a high perception in procedural justice, their tendency to perform CWB is decreasing (not coming work without information, deliberately coming late to campus, making negative rumors about the leaders or agencies, returning from campus earlier than the schedule and etc). One of the values embedded in their work environment is discipline. The discipline value that had been instilled since the establishment of the three NSUs had been integrated into the every employee’s soul, so he always tried to obey the rules. The results of this study are strengthened by the researchers’ interviews with some participants who receive compensation accordance with official procedures from the government and regulation. They reduce the desire to behave counterproductive work.

Testing the effect of cross-level procedural justice climate on LMX shows significant positive effect. This result indicates that **Hypothesis 3 is supported.** This study supports (Colquitt et al., 2013); (Williams et al., 2016) which state that procedural, distributive, and interactional justice are significantly positive related to LMX. Pillai et al., (1999) find that procedural justice and distributive justice are significantly related to leader-member exchange (LMX). Anderson et al.(2015) find that procedural, distributive, and interactional justice are significantly positive related to LMX. The results of this study show that if procedural justice in units or groups is perceived highly, it would affect the improvement of leader-member exchange.

This study’s results are relevant to social exchange theory (Dulebohn et al., 2012) which states that high procedural justice is reciprocated by increasing the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX). This is relevant to LMX theory (George B. Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), there are three (3) things that are being the basis in building the relationship of leader member
exchange, namely: respect, trust, and obligation. This also happens in the three NSUs which being an object in this study. The culture of discipline, struggle, and creativity made lecturers who have the highest perception in the procedural justice climate, increase their willingness to maintain good relationships with the leader. This small group will foster mutual trust, which is called in-group. This good relationship is created as a result of justice perceptions which perceived positively by work units, thus affecting the quality of the superior-subordinate (LMX) relationship. H5 test result shows that LMX has a significant effect on CWB reduction. The results of this study support previous studies (Dick, 2015); (Pillai et al., 1999); (Kelloway & Barling, 2010); (Vidyarthi et al., 2010); (Clark, 2013); (Colquitt et al., 2013); (Seo, 2018) which state that in the high quality LMX group, when leader offers work in broader scope, responsibilities, communication and support, then in return members respond with higher time, energy, responsibility, commitment, and reduce behavior negative. The results of this study are in line with the values embedded in the study object, especially the second value, namely struggle. Struggle is the obstacle in facing the reality of life. The positive consequences of the struggle in the LMX process foster awareness of doing the best for the organization.

The results of this study support H6 which shows LMX mediates a partial effect of procedural justice climate on CWB. It also supports previous studies (Pillai et al., 1999); (Anderson et al., 2015) which state that the procedural justice climate has a positive and significant effect on leader-member exchange (LMX). The improved quality of LMX will have an effect on decreasing CWB (Pillai et al., 1999); (Vidyarthi et al., 2010); (Colquitt et al., 2013); (Seo, 2017). When the procedural justice climate is highly perceived by the work unit, there are reciprocal efforts to improve the quality of LMX. High quality of LMX (in group), will minimize the possibility of lecturer's CWB in the study object.

H2 test result shows that distributive justice climate has no effect on CWB. This result contradicts previous studies (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010); (El Akremi et al., 2010); (Colquitt et al., 2013) which state that the distributive justice climate has a significant negative effect on CWB. Although the results are contradicted to previous studies, this study supports (Cohen & Diamant, 2019); (Shahid Tufail et al., 2017) which state that distributive justice perception has no significant effect on CWB. Previous studies show that there may be other variables that directly affect CWB, beside distributive justice climate. Other variables that are possible to have a significant effect on CWB are gender (Chenyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014); (Bowling & Burns, 2015), personality factors also have a significant effect on CWB. This is reinforced by (Van Zyl & de Bruin, 2018); self-awareness (Langkamp Jacobson, 2009); self-control (Ju et al., 2019); emotional intelligence also has a significant effect on CWB (Raman et al., 2016); (Miao et al., 2019); (Dirican & Erdil, 2020); work conditions, worktype, coworkers, financial conditions, employee benefits have a significant effect on CWB (Debusscher et al., 2016); social demographics (Uche et al., 2017); social support (Matta et al., 2015); employee engagement (Wahyu Arian, 2013); Individual characteristics (Uche et al., 2017); Stress levels (Hasanati et al., 2018); organizational support (Vatankhah et al., 2017); emotion (Fida et al., 2015); (Harold et al., 2016); Self efficacy (Roman, 2018); Self esteem (Whelpley & McDaniel, 2016); religiosity (Palupi & Tjahjono, 2016); leadership (Ju et al., 2019); organizational culture (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Those studies are strengthened by researchers' interview with participants and the results show that gender, personality, self-awareness, self-control, emotional intelligence, personality, work conditions, individual characteristics, social support, religiosity, leadership, and organizational culture are factors that have potency to affect the CWB level, especially for lecturers in the three objects studied.

H4 test result shows that the distributive justice climate does not have a significant effect on LMX (H4 is not supported). This study does not support previous studies (Pillai et al., 1999); (Colquitt et al., 2013); (Williams et al., 2016); (Anderson et al., 2015); (Syauffuddin, D et al., 2015) which state that procedural, distributive, and interactive justice are significantly positive related to LMX. Although H4 is not supported, this study supports previous study (Fein et al., 2013), which states that distributive justice perceived by 112 employees of cellular companies in Israel has no significant effect on LMX.

H7 test result show that LMX does not mediate the effect of distributive justice climate on CWB. From the history of the establishment of the objects, it can be seen that internalizing the values of discipline, struggle, and creativity process is based on the leadership concept which contains a semi-military element because it was founded by veterans. In general, military leadership requires members to obey the leader (Sheller, 2018). Comply with the leaders carries in the form of behaviors that tend to be positive (Styles, 2018). So the results of this study find that gender, personality, self-awareness, self-control, emotional intelligence, personality, work conditions, individual characteristics, social support, religiosity, leadership, and organizational culture are factors that have the potency to affects the level of CWB especially at lecturers in the three objects it is not the distributive justice climate, interpersonal justice climate, and informational justice climate.

THEORITICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

This research contributes to strength the theory and science about the need of LMX as fully mediated variable about related distributif, interpersonal, and informational justiceclimate to counterproductive work behavior. This research used cross level analysis with Hierarchical Linear modelling (HLM) to test the climate of justice which already has validity in predicting individual unit level attitudes and behavior beyond the perception of individual level justice because justice perception at the individual level is unable to capture the social context that shapes the justice perception. This research also gives practical implication to the notion that need to improve LMX in the leadership-subordinate relationship, so that the organizational justice climate can improve and minimize the occurrence of CWB.
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