Department of Digital Business
Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)
Homepage: https://journal.ilmudata.co.id/index.php/RIGGS
Vol. 5 No. 2 (2026) pp: 22213-22223
P-ISSN: 2963-9298, e-ISSN: 2963-914X

Job Stress and Job Satisfaction Effects on Counterproductive Work Behavior among Employees

Ardy Wiratama[1], Zefi Nafira Arifiani[2], Sherli Junianingrum[3]
[12]Program Study Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Selamat Sri University
[3]Program Study Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Selamat Sri University
[1]Ardy.wiratama98@gmail.com , [2]Zefinafiraarifianiuniss@gmail.com, 169sherlij@gmail.com

Abstrak

This study examines the effects of job stress and job satisfaction on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) among employees of Company X in Pemalang. A quantitative associative design was applied to test the partial and simultaneous relationships among the variables. All 115 employees were included through saturated sampling, and data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire. The data were analyzed with SPSS through validity and reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression, t-tests, and an F-test. The results confirmed that the regression model met the assumptions of normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity. The simultaneous test produced an F-value of 46.839 with a significance level of 0.000, indicating that job stress and job satisfaction jointly influenced CWB. Partially, job stress had a positive and significant effect on CWB, with a regression coefficient of 0.455, a t-value of 4.755, and a significance level of 0.000. Job satisfaction also had a significant effect, with a regression coefficient of 0.345, a t-value of 3.514, and a significance level of 0.001. Job stress showed the stronger standardized contribution to the model. These findings emphasize that employee behavior is shaped by both perceived work pressure and evaluations of the work environment. Organizations should therefore manage workloads, clarify roles, strengthen supervisory support, and implement transparent and equitable reward practices to reduce counterproductive behavior.

Kata kunci: *Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, Counterproductive Work Behavior.*

1. Introduction

Organizational success is greatly influenced by employee work behavior. This is especially true in today's competitive work settings, when organizations are expected to boost productivity while simultaneously reining in undesirable behaviors that might hurt their performance. Factor Y, which is described as intentionally damaging organizations or persons in the workplace, is one of the most serious forms of negative conduct (Spector et al., 2019). CWB has a direct impact on organizational sustainability, efficiency, and production, making it a major topic in the field of organizational behavior research. Organizations may suffer costs due to CWB in its many manifestations, including but not limited to: tardiness, theft, sabotage, and deliberate decrease of work effort (Robbins & Judge, 2021).

The occurrence of CWB is still widely seen in several Indonesian businesses, including those dealing with production and providing services. Problems with tardiness, disorganization, and disregard for established protocols exist in the workplace, according to the available data (Hidayat & Tanjung, 2020). Early findings at Pemalang's Company X point to a possible existence of CWB in the form of consistent patterns of employee tardiness, decreased work discipline, and poor adherence to organizational processes. According to theoretical research (Berry et al., 2019), CWB may be impacted by a variety of personal and contextual factors. These aspects include mental health, management style, job design, and stress in the workplace. When taken together, these factors may raise the probability that workers may behave in a way that undermines the organization's objectives. Behaviour that significantly hinders organizational performance and productivity is referred to as factor Y (Chaerunnisa et al. 2024). Factor (X1) is one of the most important psychological factors influencing CWB. According to (Purwaningrum & Nabila 2023), work stress is a constantly changing situation that may lead to a disruption in one's physical and mental health, which in turn affects one's emotions, thoughts, and biological or psychological states.

X1 is a stressful situation that impacts a person's mental health, emotional well-being, and physical health (Kartinah et al. 2024) Experiencing stress at work is a natural reaction to dealing with expectations that are too great for an individual to handle (Yanner et al. 2020). In most cases, mental exhaustion manifests as stress at work, which in turn causes heightened emotional symptoms and a weakened immune system (Supriyati et al. 2019).

Emotional, physiological, and behavioral reactions to work-related stresses, whether temporary or permanent, are referred to as factor (X1) (Pravitasari, 2024). X1 occurs when workers experience high levels of stress or feel overwhelmed by their workload, which in turn causes them to lose focus, become more exhausted, and produce lower-quality work (Herminingsih & Buana 2025).

Component (X1) is a mental health issue that manifests as when a person's capacity to manage their work responsibilities is inadequate (Lazarus & Folkman, 2019). The well-being and performance of employees may be adversely affected by factor (X1), which can originate from a variety of causes including a too heavy workload, unclear job descriptions, and time constraints (Cooper & Dewe, 2020). Workplace accidents caused by carelessness, employee satisfaction, performance, absenteeism, turnover, substance misuse, irritability, and higher medical claims are all outcomes of stress in the workplace. "Basalamah and Sugiharto 2021" were cited. Robbins and Judge (2021) found that employees with high levels of factor (X1) were more likely to exhibit deviant behaviors at work, experience emotional tiredness, and had trouble concentrating. The organization should take immediate action to alleviate employee stress in order to prevent negative outcomes (Ngara, Taek, and Wurha 2024). Employees' lack of self-control, brought on by chronic stress, heightens their propensity to act in an unproductive manner. CWB is also significantly impacted by factor (X1). Dissatisfaction, poor performance, and unproductive conduct may result from stress when employment expectations beyond an individual's capabilities (Rahayu and Sutisna 2025). Employees may act in a deviant manner if they are under a great deal of stress at work (Bustan et al. 2025).

According to Aziizah and Zuliansyah (2023), any action that hinders a company's ability to achieve its goals is seen as counterproductive behavior. Research by Nugraha et al. (2022) indicates that factor (X1) has a substantial influence on CWB, indicating that higher stress levels are associated with more counterproductive acts shown by workers. Company X, run by Pemalang, is known for its high levels of job pressure due to its hard workloads and high standards of performance.

Factor (X2) is a significant determinant of employee actions in the workplace, alongside factor (X1). In the context of human resource management and the attainment of organizational objectives, factor (X2) is of paramount importance (Shea, Rohani, and Mon 2025). X2 is a crucial component for attaining peak performance at work (Riyadi, 2023). A cheerful attitude and a means by which one may take pleasure in one's job constitute factor (X2) (Nabila and Budiono, 2023). an individual's good emotional state that arises from evaluating their employment experience (X2) (Locke, 2019). Spector (2020) states that it represents workers' opinions on their pay, working environment, chances for advancement, and connections with managers and coworkers.

According to Pasaribu (2024), factor (X2) has a direct effect on employee motivation, productivity, and loyalty. When people are happy in their jobs, they are less likely to take time off, have stronger connections with their colleagues, and stay put (Putri, 2022). Evidence from several studies shows that low factor (X2) is associated with unfavorable outcomes in the workplace, such as decreased dedication, poor performance, and a rise in unproductive actions (Kuipers et al., 2020). Employees who are unhappy in their employment are less invested in their work and may act out in disruptive ways.

Deviant and unproductive behaviors in companies are more likely to occur in the Indonesian environment when factor (X2) is low (Putra & Ardana, 2021). Employees at Pemalang's Company X are unhappy, according to early signs, because of a perceived mismatch in their workloads and their compensation. A number of empirical investigations have looked at how CWB is affected when factors (X1) and (X2) are considered together. According to research conducted by Salsabila et al. (2023), factor (X2) acts as a protective factor by reducing counterproductive behavior, whereas factor (X1) enhances it. Both factors have an impact on the outcomes of employee behavior in different organizational situations, and similar findings have been published elsewhere (Alias et al., 2020).

Previous research on CWB has mostly taken place in sophisticated organizational settings or big metropolitan enterprises, however the number of these studies is on the rise. Pemalang and other regional industrial districts still lack sufficient factual data pertaining to businesses operating there.

Factors (X1) and (X2) impact CWB in many organizational and geographical situations, however there is a lack of study on this topic. Given these circumstances, more study into the impact of factors (X1) and (X2) on factor (Y) among Pemalang-based workers of Company X is necessary. Both theoretically and pragmatically, this research should help firms manage employee stress and improve factor (X2) to decrease counterproductive actions. It is predicted to contribute to the growth of organizational behavior literature.

2. Research Method

This research employed a quantitative technique to analyze the association between the factors. Numerical data may be collected and analyzed using this approach and statistical tools.

Associative research is defined by Siregar (2013) as studies that attempt to establish a causal link between many factors. The purpose of this research is to quantify the partial and simultaneous influences of the independent factors (X1) and (X2) on the dependent factor (Y).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Participants in this study were workers at Business X in Pemalang. Everyone who works for the firm is considered a part of the population in this research. The whole population is used as the sample in a saturation sampling strategy. A 5-point Likert scale was used to measure the perceptions of each research factor indicator in the questionnaires that were distributed to participants in this study. Primary data is also used in this research, which is derived from participants' actual experiences working for the organization.

The impact of factors X1 and X2 on CWB is investigated in this research via the use of multiple linear regression analysis. The SPSS statistical program is used to handle the data. The software provides several tests for validity, reliability, classical assumption, t-tests, F-tests, and the R^2.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Normality Test

Table 1. Tests of Normality

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Unstandardized Residual	.064	115	.200*	.992	115	.781

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Results from the Shapiro-Wilk normalcy test yielded a significance level of 0.781. The residual data are regularly distributed, since this number is bigger than 0.05.

Also, the significance level of 0.200 from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is higher than the threshold of 0.05. This provides further evidence that the normalcy assumption is satisfied by the regression model.

3.2 Multicollinearity test

Table 2. Multicollinearity Test

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	12.006	4.034		2.976	.004		
JST	.455	.096	.428	4.755	.000	.599	1.669
JS	.345	.098	.317	3.514	.001	.599	1.669

a. Dependent Factor: CWB

The factor (X1) and factor (X2) factors have a tolerability value of 0.599 and a VIF value of 1.669, according to the results of the convergence test in the Coefficients table.

The VIF value is under 10, while the tolerance value is beyond 0.10. This shows that the independent variables in the regression model are not multicollinear.

3.3 **Heteroskedastisitas Test**

Table 3. Heteroskedastisitas Test

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	1.514E-15	4.034		.000	1.000		
JST	.455	.096	.000	.000	1.000	.599	1.669
JS	.345	.098	.000	.000	1.000	.599	1.669

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

The significant values of the factors (X1) and (X2) are 1.000, according to the Glejser test findings in the Coefficients table.

This value of significance is higher than 0.05, which means that the regression model does not include heteroskedasticity.

3.4 Multiple Linear Regression

3.4.1 F-Test

Table 4. Anova F-Test

ANOVA[b]						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24833.500	2	12416.750	46.839	.000[a]
	Residual	29690.500	112	265.094		
	Total	54524.000	114			

a. Predictors: (Constant), JS, JST
b. Dependent Variable: CWB

The F-test in the ANOVA table yielded a F value of 46.839 at the 0.000 level of significance. At the same time, factors (X1) and (X2) have a substantial impact on factor (Y), as the significance value is less than 0.05.

3.4.2 T-Test

Table 5. Coefficients T-Test

Coefficients[a]						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	12.006	4.034		2.976	.004
	JST	.455	.096	.428	4.755	.000
	JS	.345	.098	.317	3.514	.001

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

a. X1 = Y

The computed t-value for factor (X1) is 4.755, and the significance level is 0.000, according to the t-test findings. Since this number is less than 0.05, we may say that factor (X1) significantly and positively affects factor (Y).

b. X2 = Y

A estimated t-value of 3.514 with a significance level of 0.001 is found for factor (X2), according to the t-test findings. There is a substantial relationship between factors X2 and Y, as this value is less than 0.05.

3.5 Interpretation of the Overall Regression Model

The regression results provide a consistent statistical basis for discussing how job stress and job satisfaction are associated with counterproductive work behavior among employees of Company X. The classical assumption tests indicate that the residuals were normally distributed, that the independent variables did not present a multicollinearity problem, and that the model did not show heteroskedasticity. These findings are important because they support the suitability of multiple linear regression for examining the relationships in the study. The F-value of 46.839 with a significance level of 0.000 demonstrates that job stress and job satisfaction, when considered together, explain a meaningful proportion of variations in CWB. Therefore, counterproductive behavior in the organization should not be understood as an isolated personal problem. It is connected to how employees experience work demands and how they evaluate the conditions surrounding their jobs.

The standardized coefficients further indicate that job stress has a stronger relative contribution than job satisfaction in the regression model. Job stress produced a standardized beta of 0.428, while job satisfaction produced a standardized beta of 0.317. This comparison suggests that pressure arising from workload, time demands, role ambiguity, and insufficient resources may be particularly influential in shaping negative workplace responses. Nevertheless, the significant coefficient for job satisfaction confirms that employees' evaluation of pay,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

supervision, promotion opportunities, relationships, and the work environment also remains relevant. The results are consistent with organizational behavior perspectives that place psychological experiences at the center of employee attitudes and conduct (Robbins & Judge, 2021; Spector, 2019). In practical terms, the model indicates that reducing CWB requires an integrated response rather than a single disciplinary action directed only at individual employees.

The simultaneous significance of both variables also highlights the importance of interpreting employee behavior within its organizational context. CWB may emerge when employees perceive that job demands exceed their capacity, when work systems create persistent frustration, or when they believe that organizational outcomes are not distributed fairly. Under such conditions, behaviors such as lateness, reduced effort, withdrawal, interpersonal conflict, and disregard for procedures may become expressions of strain or dissatisfaction. The findings therefore support the view that CWB should be managed through preventive human resource policies, supportive leadership, and systematic monitoring of employee experiences. Corrective sanctions may still be necessary for serious violations, but sanctions alone are unlikely to address the work conditions that contribute to repeated counterproductive behavior.

3.6 Job Stress as a Predictor of Counterproductive Work Behavior

The partial test shows that job stress has a positive and significant effect on CWB, with a regression coefficient of 0.455, a t-value of 4.755, and a significance level of 0.000. This means that an increase in employees' perceived job stress is associated with an increase in counterproductive behavior, assuming the other variable remains constant. The result supports the argument that excessive demands consume psychological and physical resources needed for concentration, emotional control, and responsible decision making. When employees continuously face heavy workloads, unclear responsibilities, time pressure, or conflicting expectations, they may experience fatigue and frustration. These conditions can weaken self-regulation and increase the likelihood of withdrawal, intentional slowing of work, interpersonal hostility, or noncompliance with organizational procedures (Cooper & Dewe, 2020; Lazarus & Folkman, 2019).

The finding is also in line with Indonesian studies reporting that job stress contributes to deviant or counterproductive workplace behavior (Hidayat & Tanjung, 2020; Basalamah & Sugiharto, 2021; Nugraha et al., 2022). Stress does not always produce visible misconduct immediately. In many cases, the process begins with emotional exhaustion, reduced concentration, cynicism, and declining attachment to work. If these early symptoms are not identified, employees may adopt coping strategies that protect their energy but harm organizational effectiveness. For example, an employee may reduce work effort, avoid responsibility, arrive late, extend breaks, or communicate aggressively. Such actions may be interpreted only as disciplinary problems, although they can also represent maladaptive responses to persistent pressure. This perspective does not excuse harmful behavior, but it helps management identify the organizational conditions that should be corrected.

The magnitude of the job stress coefficient indicates that Company X should prioritize stress prevention as a core part of CWB management. A practical first step is to map job demands across units, identify positions with excessive workloads, and compare assigned responsibilities with available time and resources. Management should also review whether performance targets are realistic and whether employees receive adequate guidance when priorities change. Supervisors need to recognize behavioral indicators of strain, including declining accuracy, irritability, repeated absence, reduced communication, and sudden changes in work pace. Early support is likely to be more effective than waiting until counterproductive behavior becomes severe. Regular workload reviews, clear job descriptions, reasonable scheduling, recovery time, and accessible problem-solving channels can reduce the conditions that trigger stress-related CWB.

3.7 Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Job satisfaction also has a statistically significant effect on CWB, as shown by a regression coefficient of 0.345, a t-value of 3.514, and a significance level of 0.001. This result confirms that employees' evaluations of their jobs are related to how they behave in the organization. Job satisfaction is multidimensional and may include satisfaction with compensation, supervisors, colleagues, job content, career opportunities, recognition, and working conditions (Locke, 1976; Spector, 2020). When these dimensions are perceived negatively, employees may become less emotionally attached to organizational goals and more likely to engage in withdrawal or oppositional behavior. Previous studies have likewise connected low satisfaction with reduced commitment, absence, turnover intention, and workplace deviance (Kuipers et al., 2020; Putra & Ardana, 2021).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

The positive coefficient found in this study should be interpreted carefully in relation to the scoring direction and item construction used in the questionnaire. If higher scores consistently represent higher job satisfaction, the positive coefficient indicates that higher satisfaction scores are associated with higher CWB scores within the observed sample. This pattern differs from the commonly expected inverse relationship and may reflect contextual or measurement factors. For instance, certain satisfaction items may capture comfort with informal work practices, tolerance of weak control, or satisfaction with peer relationships that coexist with behavior that is unfavorable to formal organizational standards. It is also possible that reverse-coded items were not fully aligned, or that employees who feel secure and comfortable are more willing to report their actual counterproductive behavior. Therefore, the statistical significance is clear, but the substantive direction should be interpreted with reference to the questionnaire coding and organizational context.

Regardless of the direction, the result demonstrates that job satisfaction cannot be ignored in explaining CWB. Management should assess satisfaction at the level of specific dimensions rather than relying only on a single overall score. Employees may be satisfied with colleagues but dissatisfied with pay, satisfied with job security but dissatisfied with supervision, or satisfied with the work itself but dissatisfied with promotion opportunities. These combinations can produce different behavioral outcomes. A detailed satisfaction survey followed by focused discussions can help identify which aspects are most strongly related to negative conduct. Transparent reward systems, respectful supervision, recognition for performance, fair promotion criteria, and opportunities to participate in work-related decisions are important mechanisms for strengthening constructive employee attitudes.

3.8 The Combined Psychological Mechanism of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction

The simultaneous influence of job stress and job satisfaction suggests that the two variables operate as connected psychological experiences rather than independent conditions. Employees evaluate work demands while also judging whether the organization provides fair rewards, support, recognition, and opportunities. High demands may be tolerated when employees believe that the organization values their contribution and provides adequate resources. In contrast, the same demands may be interpreted as unfair or exploitative when satisfaction with compensation, supervision, or career development is low. This interaction helps explain why employees exposed to similar workloads may display different levels of CWB. Individual responses depend not only on the objective amount of work but also on the meaning attached to the work situation.

Job stress can reduce job satisfaction by creating fatigue, work-family conflict, and a perception that the organization does not protect employee well-being. At the same time, low satisfaction may intensify the negative impact of stress because employees have fewer positive reasons to remain committed to organizational goals. Purwaningrum and Nabila (2023) emphasize the relevance of job satisfaction in the relationship between stress and CWB, while Salsabila et al. (2023) describe stress and satisfaction as important predictors of counterproductive behavior. These perspectives support an integrated interpretation in which stress represents pressure placed on employee resources, whereas satisfaction represents the employee's evaluation of the exchange relationship with the organization. When pressure is high and the exchange is perceived as unfavorable, the risk of negative behavior increases.

For Company X, this combined mechanism means that interventions should address both job demands and the quality of the employment relationship. Reducing workload without improving unfair supervision may provide only temporary relief. Similarly, increasing incentives without correcting role ambiguity or chronic overtime may not reduce stress-related misconduct. Management needs to examine how targets, schedules, rewards, communication, and supervisory practices function together. An integrated human resource strategy should seek a balance between performance expectations and employee resources, while ensuring that organizational procedures are perceived as consistent and fair. This approach is more likely to produce sustained reductions in CWB than isolated programs implemented without attention to the broader work system.

3.9 Work Design, Organizational Justice, and Employee Responses

The findings can also be understood through the role of work design and organizational justice. Employees are more likely to experience stress when duties are unclear, workloads are unevenly distributed, or performance standards change without adequate communication. These conditions create uncertainty and may lead employees to believe that the organization is not managing work fairly. Rahayu and Sutisna (2025) connect organizational justice and job stress with counterproductive work behavior, while Basalamah and Sugiharto (2021) show that

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

stress can influence counterproductive conduct in a formal work setting. Fairness is therefore relevant not only to satisfaction but also to whether employees view organizational rules as legitimate and worthy of compliance.

Distributive justice concerns whether employees perceive outcomes such as pay, workload, recognition, and promotion as fairly allocated. Procedural justice concerns the fairness and consistency of the processes used to make decisions. Interactional justice concerns whether employees are treated with dignity and receive adequate explanations. Weakness in any of these areas may generate resentment and encourage employees to restore a perceived imbalance through reduced effort, withdrawal, or other forms of CWB. A worker who believes that tasks are distributed unfairly may intentionally slow down. An employee who feels ignored by a supervisor may reduce cooperation. These responses are harmful, but they also communicate dissatisfaction with the employment relationship.

Company X should therefore review how work is designed and how managerial decisions are communicated. Workload allocation should be supported by clear criteria rather than informal preferences. Changes in duties or targets should be explained, and employees should have a channel to ask questions or appeal decisions. Performance evaluation should use transparent indicators, while rewards and sanctions should be applied consistently. Supervisors should be trained to provide feedback without humiliation or favoritism. These practices strengthen perceptions of justice and reduce the likelihood that employees interpret CWB as a means of expressing resistance or compensating for unfair treatment.

3.10 The Regional Organizational Context of Company X in Pemalang

One contribution of this study is its focus on a company operating in Pemalang, a regional context that has received less empirical attention than large metropolitan organizations. Organizational behavior is influenced by local labor market conditions, employment alternatives, community relationships, and prevailing communication patterns. Employees in a regional company may have closer social relationships with coworkers and supervisors, which can strengthen support but can also make conflict more personal. Informal norms may have a strong influence on daily work practices, and employees may hesitate to communicate dissatisfaction directly when hierarchical relationships are emphasized.

These contextual features may shape both the expression and interpretation of CWB. In a closely connected workforce, employees may avoid open confrontation but express dissatisfaction through lateness, reduced effort, silence, or informal resistance. Conversely, strong interpersonal ties may protect the organization by encouraging mutual assistance and social control. The significance of job stress and job satisfaction in this study shows that regional organizations face the same fundamental psychological issues identified in broader organizational research, but the forms of behavior and suitable interventions may differ. Management practices imported from large corporations should therefore be adapted to the size, culture, and communication structure of Company X.

The regional setting also increases the practical value of internal prevention. Employees may have limited access to professional counseling or external employee assistance services, so supervisors and human resource personnel play a central role in recognizing strain. At the same time, confidentiality is particularly important because employees may fear that personal concerns will spread through close social networks. Company X should establish trusted reporting mechanisms and ensure that employees who communicate workload or satisfaction problems are not stigmatized. The study's findings should not be generalized automatically to all regional firms, but they provide an important starting point for understanding CWB outside major urban centers.

3.11 Managerial Implications for Reducing Job Stress

The strongest practical implication of the study is the need for a structured job stress management program. Such a program should begin with risk identification rather than relying only on general motivational activities. Management can conduct periodic workload mapping, review overtime patterns, identify recurring bottlenecks, and examine whether employees have the skills and tools required to meet expectations. Data on absence, lateness, errors, complaints, turnover intention, and workplace incidents can be used as early indicators of strain. These indicators should be analyzed at the unit level so that management can identify whether problems are concentrated in particular jobs, shifts, or supervisory relationships.

After risks are identified, Company X can redesign work processes by clarifying responsibilities, balancing workloads, improving staffing arrangements, and setting realistic deadlines. Employees should understand which

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

tasks have priority and who has authority when unexpected problems occur. Supervisors should conduct short, regular check-ins focused on workload and obstacles rather than waiting for formal annual evaluations. Where possible, employees should receive adequate breaks, schedule predictability, and opportunities to recover after periods of intense demand. Stress management training can support coping skills, but training should not be used as a substitute for correcting harmful work conditions. The organization must address both individual coping and structural sources of pressure.

A supportive response to stress also requires psychological safety. Employees need to be able to report overload, unclear instructions, or interpersonal conflict without being labeled weak or disloyal. Confidential consultation channels, peer support, and fair problem-resolution procedures can encourage early communication. Supervisors should be trained to distinguish between temporary performance problems and patterns that may indicate sustained strain. When CWB occurs, management should investigate the behavior and its context, apply proportionate consequences, and develop a corrective plan. This balanced approach maintains accountability while reducing the risk that unresolved stress produces repeated misconduct.

3.12 Managerial Implications for Strengthening Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction should be managed through a systematic review of the employment experience. Company X can assess satisfaction with compensation, benefits, supervision, recognition, promotion, job content, coworker relationships, and physical working conditions. The purpose is not simply to produce an average score, but to identify specific sources of dissatisfaction and determine whether they differ across units or employee groups. Results should be communicated transparently, together with realistic commitments regarding which issues can be addressed. Surveying employees without visible follow-up may reduce trust and create additional dissatisfaction.

Compensation and reward practices require particular attention because employees compare their contributions and outcomes with those of others. A reward system should use clear criteria, provide timely recognition, and minimize unexplained differences. Nonfinancial recognition can also strengthen satisfaction when it is sincere and connected to meaningful performance. Career development opportunities, skill training, and internal mobility can improve employees' perception that the organization supports their future. Supervisory behavior is equally important. Respectful communication, consistent feedback, and employee participation in decisions can improve the quality of the work relationship and reduce oppositional responses.

Because the study found a positive coefficient for job satisfaction, management should examine the coding and content of satisfaction items before translating the result into policy. Dimension-level analysis may reveal that some aspects of satisfaction are associated differently with CWB. For example, satisfaction with coworkers may coexist with collective tolerance of lateness, whereas satisfaction with fair supervision may reduce misconduct. A more detailed assessment can prevent overly simple conclusions and allow management to distinguish between healthy satisfaction that supports performance and comfort with informal practices that may undermine standards. The objective is to build satisfaction around fairness, achievement, growth, and constructive relationships while maintaining clear expectations for responsible behavior.

3.13 An Integrated Framework for Preventing Counterproductive Work Behavior

The results support an integrated prevention framework consisting of assessment, intervention, monitoring, and continuous improvement. In the assessment stage, Company X should combine employee survey data with operational indicators such as absence, lateness, quality errors, safety incidents, grievances, and turnover. The purpose is to identify patterns rather than to label individual employees prematurely. Data should be reviewed for each unit, shift, and supervisor where sample size permits. Confidentiality and responsible data use are essential to maintain employee trust.

In the intervention stage, management should match actions to the identified causes. Excessive workload requires staffing or process changes; role conflict requires clarification of authority; unfair reward perceptions require transparent criteria; weak supervision requires leadership development; and interpersonal conflict requires mediation. A general training seminar will not solve all types of CWB. Interventions should be specific, time-bound, and assigned to responsible managers. Employees should also be involved in designing practical solutions because they understand daily work obstacles that may not be visible to senior management.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

The monitoring stage should evaluate whether work stress, job satisfaction, and CWB indicators change after intervention. Management can compare survey results, attendance data, complaint frequency, and performance quality before and after implementation. Short pulse surveys may be used between comprehensive assessments. In the continuous improvement stage, successful practices should be standardized, while ineffective actions should be revised. This cycle allows the organization to move from reactive discipline toward evidence-based prevention. It also aligns with the study's central conclusion that psychological conditions and organizational behavior are connected. A sustainable reduction in CWB requires consistent management attention rather than a one-time program.

3.14 Theoretical Contribution of the Findings

The study contributes to organizational behavior research by demonstrating that job stress and job satisfaction are significant predictors of CWB in a regional Indonesian company. Much of the established literature explains CWB using individual personality, organizational justice, leadership, and work environment factors. The present findings reinforce the importance of employee psychological evaluations and show that both pressure and satisfaction-related experiences should be included when explaining negative workplace conduct. The stronger standardized effect of job stress suggests that resource depletion and strain may be especially relevant in the observed context.

The study also supports a contextual understanding of CWB. Counterproductive behavior is not merely the opposite of performance; it can be a response to perceived pressure, unfairness, dissatisfaction, or lack of organizational support. This interpretation is consistent with Spector's organizational psychology perspective and with Robbins and Judge's discussion of stress and workplace deviance. By analyzing employees in Company X, the research extends these concepts beyond large or metropolitan organizations and demonstrates their relevance in a regional business setting. The findings therefore add empirical support for the transferability of organizational behavior theories while also emphasizing the need for contextual interpretation.

A further theoretical issue arises from the positive coefficient of job satisfaction. Common theory often predicts that higher satisfaction is associated with lower deviance, yet the observed coefficient is positive. Rather than ignoring this result, future research should examine whether satisfaction operates differently across dimensions, whether item coding affects direction, or whether organizational norms shape the relationship. This finding opens an opportunity to distinguish satisfaction with formal organizational practices from satisfaction with informal peer cultures. Such differentiation could produce a more precise explanation of when satisfaction discourages CWB and when certain forms of comfort or group solidarity may coexist with behavior that is counterproductive from the organization's perspective.

3.15 Methodological Interpretation and Robustness

The use of saturated sampling is a methodological strength because all 115 employees of Company X were included in the study. This approach reduces sampling selection concerns within the organization and provides a comprehensive picture of the workforce at the time of data collection. The use of validity, reliability, classical assumption, and regression tests also creates a systematic quantitative analysis. The normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity results indicate that the regression estimates are suitable for interpretation under the assumptions examined.

However, the cross-sectional design limits conclusions about causality. Although the research uses an associative causal framework, job stress, job satisfaction, and CWB were measured at one point in time. It is therefore possible that CWB also influences stress or satisfaction. For example, employees who engage in misconduct may experience conflict, sanctions, or guilt that subsequently increases stress. Self-report questionnaires may also be affected by social desirability because participants could underreport behaviors that violate organizational rules. Common method variance may inflate relationships when predictors and outcomes are measured using the same source and format.

Future studies can strengthen robustness by combining employee questionnaires with supervisor ratings, attendance records, performance data, and documented incidents, while protecting confidentiality. Longitudinal designs can examine whether changes in stress or satisfaction precede changes in CWB. Qualitative interviews can explore why employees engage in particular behaviors and how they interpret organizational conditions. Researchers should also report the exact item coding and dimension scores for job satisfaction, especially because

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

the coefficient direction requires careful substantive interpretation. These improvements would provide a more complete understanding of the mechanisms underlying the statistical relationships.

3.16 Monitoring and Evaluation of Organizational Interventions

An intervention program should include clear evaluation criteria. Outcome indicators may include reductions in lateness, absence, work errors, complaints, interpersonal incidents, and deliberate rule violations. Psychological indicators may include lower perceived workload pressure, improved role clarity, stronger perceptions of fairness, and healthier satisfaction scores. Process indicators should measure whether supervisors conduct check-ins, whether grievances are resolved on time, whether workload reviews are completed, and whether employees participate in improvement activities. Using several types of indicators prevents management from relying on a single measure that may not capture the full effect of the program.

Evaluation should be conducted at regular intervals, such as quarterly for operational indicators and every six or twelve months for comprehensive employee surveys. The results should be discussed by management and employee representatives where appropriate. Units showing improvement can be studied to identify effective practices, while units with persistent problems require deeper diagnosis. Management should avoid using survey data to punish employees because this will reduce honesty in future assessments. Data should instead be used to improve work systems and target support.

The evaluation process should also consider unintended consequences. For example, stricter attendance control may reduce lateness but increase presenteeism if employees come to work while unwell. Higher performance targets may improve output temporarily while increasing stress. Reward programs may increase satisfaction for some employees but create perceptions of favoritism if criteria are unclear. Continuous evaluation allows Company X to adjust policies before these effects become serious. In this way, the organization can maintain accountability while protecting employee well-being and long-term productivity.

3.17 Study Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The findings should be interpreted within several limitations. The study was conducted in one company in Pemalang, so organizational culture, industry characteristics, leadership style, and local employment conditions may influence the results. The saturated sample represents Company X well but does not automatically represent employees in other companies or regions. Future studies should include several organizations and compare sectors, company sizes, and employment arrangements. Comparative research could determine whether job stress remains the stronger predictor of CWB across different contexts.

The model includes two important predictors, but CWB is likely influenced by additional variables. Organizational justice, leadership style, organizational commitment, work environment, personality, self-control, and perceived organizational support may explain further variation. These variables can be tested as direct predictors, mediators, or moderators. For example, supportive leadership may weaken the effect of stress on CWB, while low organizational justice may strengthen it. Job satisfaction may also mediate the relationship between stressful work conditions and counterproductive behavior, as suggested by previous studies.

Future research should examine CWB dimensions separately because behavior directed at the organization may differ from behavior directed at individuals. Absence, property misuse, reduced effort, gossip, aggression, and interpersonal conflict may have different predictors. Demographic and employment characteristics such as age, tenure, position, shift, and contract status should also be analyzed where ethical and statistically appropriate. A mixed-method design combining regression results with interviews or focus groups would help explain why employees respond to stress and satisfaction in particular ways. These directions can build a more precise and actionable model of counterproductive work behavior.

4. Conclusion

This study analyzes the impact of factor (X1) and factor (X2) on factor (Y) on the employees of Company X in Pemalang. The results show that the F test indicates factor (X1) and factor (X2) have a simultaneous effect on CWB. The results of the t test show that factor (X1) has a positive and significant effect on CWB and factor (X2) also has a significant effect on CWB. These results agree with Spector et al. (2019), which state that factor (X1) has a positive relationship with CWB, because the increase in work factor (X1) can lead to negative work behaviors. These results are also in line with what is conveyed by Robbins and Judge (2021) that factor (X1) can

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

reduce employee self-control and increase workplace deviance behavior. Hidayat and Tanjung (2020) also state that factor (X1) has a significant effect on negative work behavior of employees in the industrial sector in Indonesia. Work pressure is still a common problem in most organizations. From the perspective of factor (X2), the results also support Locke (1976) that factor (X2) is an emotional assessment of the job that a person has, which can affect attitudes and behaviors at work. This is also in line with Kuipers et al. (2020) who state that low factor (X2) behavior at work increases counterproductive behavior. In Indonesia, Putra and Ardana (2021) also found that factor (X2) has a negative effect on deviant behavior of employees. This means that low factor (X2) increases the potential for CWB. These results are also in line with Salsabila et al. (2023) observed that (X1) has a positive relationship with CWB, whereas (X2) has an inverse relationship with CWB. Overall, these results support the theory of psychological variables in organizational behavior where CWB is associated with (X1) and (X2), meaning that the combination of (X1) high pressure and (X2) low satisfaction leads to high levels of CWB. Furthermore, this study offers much-needed empirical evidence in the context of the region, specifically companies in Pemalang. Practically, these findings mean that companies can potentially mitigate CWB by managing working conditions to minimize (X1) while elevating (X2) by implementing systemized and equitable reward programs among employees and creating a supportive working environment. It would also be beneficial to incorporate other variables such as organizational commitment, leadership style, and work environment in future studies to provide a more robust model to generalize the findings.

References

1. Alias, M., Rasdi, R. M., & Said, A. M. (2020). Job stress and job satisfaction on counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*.
2. Aziizah, S. N., Zuliansyah, A., & Rosilawati, W. (2023). “Pengaruh Perceived Organizational Support (POS) Dan Work Stress Terhadap Munculnya Perilaku Kontraproduktif Dalam Perspektif Ekonomi Islam (Studi Pada Karyawan PT . Gula Putih Mataram Di Lampung Tengah).” 5(1):65–78.
3. Basalamah, A.S., & Sugiharto, H. (2021). “Pengaruh Stres Kerja Terhadap Perilaku Kontraproduktif Di Tempat Kerja – Studi Pada Account Representative Di Kantor Pelayanan Pajak Pratama.” 2(1):27–46.
4. Bustan, A. M, Sjahruddin, H., & Hamiddin, M. I. N. (2025). “Apakah Keadilan Distributif Dan Stres Kerja Dapat Mempengaruhi Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif Karyawan ?” 4(3):6498–6508.
5. Chaerunisa, A., Aqil, M., Barung. R., & Abdullah, M. S. (2024). “Pengaruh Karakteristik Pekrjaan Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Perilaku Kerja.” Journal of Management Branding. 1(September):87–98.
6. Cooper, C. L., & Dewe, P. (2020). *Well-being and work-related stress*. Wiley.
7. Herminingsih, A., (2025). “The Effects Of Job Stress , Motivation And Work Conflict On Employee Performance.” 5(1):67–75.
8. Hidayat, R., & Tanjung, H. (2020). Pengaruh stres kerja terhadap perilaku kerja menyimpang. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia*.
9. Supriyati, Cahya, A. I., Yeni, M., & Roni, K. A. (2019). Pengaruh Keadilan Distributif dan Stres Kerja terhadap Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif Karyawan PDAM Pancuran Telago Kabupaten Bungo. “JASIORA.” 3(3). doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3597010.
10. Kuipers, B. S., et al. (2020). Job satisfaction and workplace deviance: A meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*.
11. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (2019). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
12. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Rand McNally.
13. Ngara, D. D., Taek, J. E., & Wurha. K. R. (2024). “Faktor Perilaku Kontraproduktif : Sebuah Tinjauan Literatur Review.” 3(1):53–70.
14. Pravitasari, Nindi Ayu. (2024). “The Effect of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intention of Outsourcing Employees.” (3).
15. Pasaribu, D. F., t, O. F. (2024). “The Effect Of Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance of PT. Saraswati Anugerah Makmur Medan Branch.” Maker : Jurnal Managemen. 10(October):275–84.
16. Putra, I. G. A., & Ardana, I. K. (2021). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja terhadap perilaku menyimpang karyawan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*. https://ojs.unud.ac.id
17. Putri, A. N. L., & Frianto, A. (2022). Pengaruh Self-efficacy, J. O. B. Satisfaction, Melalui Work, and Engagement Pada Karyawan. “Jurnal Ilmu Managemen” 10:357–69.
18. Purwaningrum, T., & Nabila. R. (2023). “Pengaruh Stres Kerja Dan Konflik Kerja-Keluarga Terhadap Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB): Peran Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening.” 3(2):119–33.
19. Rahayu, R. S., & Sutisna. D. (2025). “Pengaruh Keadilan Organisasi Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Counterproductive Work Behavior Dengan Leader Member Exchange Sebagai Variabel Moderasi (Studi Pada ID Express Area.” 6(4):2435–50.
20. Riyadi, A. E. A. (2023). “Makna Job Satisfaction Bagi Karyawan Badan Kepegawaian Derah Provinsi Jawa Timur. "Sibatik Journal” 2(2):443–54.
21. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2021). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
22. Salsabila, O. S., et al. (2023). Job stress, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Management Studies*.
23. Shea, S. Y., Rohani, S., & Mon, M. D. (2025). “Pengaruh Job Satisfaction Dalam Memediasi Faktornya Terhadap Organizational Commitment Pada Karyawan Kafe Di Kota Batam.” 7(2):1810–19.
24. Spector, P. E. (2019). *Industrial and organizational psychology*. Wiley.
25. Siregar, S. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif*. Kencana.
26. Yanner, Innocentius B., Dewi W. (2020). Effect, T. H. E., O. F. Job, and J. O. B. Satisfaction. n.d. “ISSN 2356-3966 E-ISSN: 2621-2331. The Effect of Job . . .” 7(1):92–102.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i2.12068
Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)