
**THE INFLUENCE OF WORK MOTIVATION AND WORKLOAD
ON COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (CWB) OF
INDONESIAN NATIONAL POLICE MEMBERS AT THE
PONTIANAK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT, WEST
KALIMANTAN**

Indri Noviantini¹

Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia

noviantiniindri1@gmail.com

Eru Ahmadia²

Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia

eru.ahmadia@unmuhpnk.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of Work Motivation and Workload on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) of Indonesian National Police members at the Pontianak City Police Department, West Kalimantan. This study employs a quantitative approach with an associative design. The research sample consists of 83 respondents selected using proportionate stratified random sampling. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using multiple linear regression with the assistance of SPSS through validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, as well as hypothesis testing using t-test and F-test. The results show that all instruments are valid and reliable, and the data meet the assumptions of normality, linearity, and absence of multicollinearity. Partially, Work Motivation has a negative and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior. Workload has a positive and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior. Simultaneously, both variables have a significant effect, with an F-count value of 35.731 and significance 0.000. The correlation coefficient value of 0.687 indicates a strong relationship, while the coefficient of determination (R^2) value of 0.472 indicates that 47.2% of the variation in Counterproductive Work Behavior can be explained by Work Motivation and Workload, while the remaining variation is influenced by factors outside this study.

Keywords: Work Motivation, Workload, Counterproductive Work Behavior, Police

INTRODUCTION

Human resources (HR) become a determining factor in the success of an organization in facing environmental changes and dynamic work demands. Technological developments and organizational dynamics require members who are competent, adaptive, and have high performance (Hasibuan, 2023). Work motivation and workload are variables related to individual work behavior, including counterproductive work behavior (CWB), which encompasses actions such as tardiness, neglect of duties, and sabotage (Spector et al., 2006). This relationship is also explained in studies concerning the role of workload in influencing individual work behavior (Mahawati et al., 2021).

In the police organizational environment, the nature of work, which is dynamic, responsive, and public service-based, demonstrates the complexity of the relationship between work motivation, workload, and members' work behavior. Work motivation in police institutions is influenced by the reward system and organizational policies that encourage member performance (Hasibuan, 2023). Empirical findings show that organizational support is associated with increased work motivation among members (Albertin et al., 2025). Meanwhile, workload is related to unexpected operational task demands and high time pressure (Pramono, 2025). These conditions are also associated with the dynamics of tasks that are simultaneous and complex (Pradana et al., 2025).

Empirical problems are indicated by the presence of counterproductive work behavior within the Pontianak City Police Department, reflected in attendance data and code of conduct violations. The data show member absences in the form of leave and sick days, as well as 18 cases of code of conduct violations during the 2023–2025 period, predominantly involving personal and institutional ethics violations (Siby & Sanggelorang, 2024). Counterproductive work behavior is also associated with actions detrimental to the organization, such as tardiness and violations of work rules (Fikri, 2023). Previous research indicates that absenteeism and deviant behavior are related to workload and psychological pressure (Pradana et al., 2025). Furthermore, deviant behavior in organizations is also associated with organizational factors and work relationships (Bagyo & Khusnia, 2021).

The urgency of this research is highlighted by the relationship between counterproductive work behavior and organizational effectiveness. Such behavior not only impacts individuals but also affects overall organizational performance, including the quality of public services (Rosalina & Jusoh, 2024). Data show that the performance scores of Pontianak City Police members fall within the good to very good category and have increased year by year (Perpol No. 1 of 2025). Nevertheless, code of conduct violations and absenteeism still occurred during the same period (Human Resources Section, Pontianak City Police, 2026). These conditions indicate a relationship among performance, motivation, workload, and work behavior variables.

Previous studies have shown diverse results regarding the relationships among the variables under investigation. Work motivation has been reported to be associated with increased performance and work discipline (Ristiyan et al., 2024). Other findings indicate that organizational support is associated with increased work motivation among members

(Albertin et al., 2025). High workload is associated with decreased performance and increased absenteeism (Manurung et al., 2024). Furthermore, workload is also related to work pressure experienced by individuals (Pramono, 2025). On the other hand, counterproductive work behavior has a negative relationship with organizational performance (Bagyo & Khusnia, 2021). These findings are further reinforced by research showing a link between CWB and decreased performance (Rosalina & Jusoh, 2024).

Based on these conditions, this study positions the analysis on the relationship between work motivation and workload and counterproductive work behavior in police organizations at the regional level. The research focus is directed at members of the Pontianak City Police Department, considering the characteristics of the work and the dynamic assignment system. This approach considers the linkage between individual and organizational variables in shaping members' work behavior.

The aim of this study is to analyze the effect of work motivation and workload on counterproductive work behavior among members of the Indonesian National Police at the Pontianak City Police Department, West Kalimantan. This objective is formulated based on the problems identified in this study and the previously identified relationships among the variables.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Work Motivation

Work motivation is defined as the ability to direct employees and the organization to work effectively so that both individual and organizational goals can be achieved (Flippo in Hasibuan, 2023). According to Siagian (2012), motivation is the drive that makes individuals willing to exert their abilities, whether in the form of expertise, skills, energy, or time, to carry out tasks and fulfill their responsibilities. In addition, motivation is also viewed as a set of attitudes and values that influence individuals in achieving specific goals according to the interests they wish to attain (Rivai, 2013). The indicators of work motivation in this study refer to the hierarchy of needs consisting of physiological needs, safety and security needs, social needs, esteem and achievement needs, and self-actualization needs (Maslow in Hasibuan, 2023). These indicators represent the dimensions of work motivation used in the conceptual framework of the study. Empirically, the relationship between work motivation and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) is demonstrated by Nur & Sari (2024), who found a significant and negative relationship, and Wiguna (2018), who showed a significant influence of work motivation on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

H1: Work Motivation has a negative effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior of Indonesian National Police Members at the Pontianak City Police Department, West Kalimantan.

Workload

Workload is defined as the employee's perception of the activities that must be completed within a certain period and the effort required to meet job demands (Budiasa, 2021). Workload is interpreted as the number of activities that must be completed by a unit

or individual within a specific time frame (Sunarso & Kusdi, 2012). Quantitatively, workload reflects the number of tasks to be handled, such as long working hours, high work pressure, and the extent of responsibility inherent in the job (Koesomowidjojo, 2017). The indicators of workload in this study consist of physical demands and task demands, reflecting physical, mental, and job characteristics such as work schedule and activity load (Munandar in Kadarisman, 2023). Empirically, Mangindaan & Timothy (2022) show a significant relationship between workload and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), whereas Yuandana et al. (2025) report no significant influence of workload on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

H2: Workload has a positive effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior of Indonesian National Police Members at the Pontianak City Police Department, West Kalimantan.

Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) is defined as behavior that conflicts with organizational interests (Sackett & DeVore, 2002). Similarly, CWB is understood as a form of employee behavioral deviation that can hinder goal achievement and organizational welfare, resulting in harmful consequences (Ones & Dilchert, 2013). Furthermore, CWB includes various actions such as aggressive behavior toward others, both physically and verbally, as well as withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and tardiness (Fox & Spector, 2005). At the organizational level, this behavior can also manifest as asset misuse and intentional absenteeism (Christine, 2014). An individual is considered to engage in CWB if they deliberately ignore safety procedures, act negligently causing injury, or commit actions causing damage (Fox & Spector, 2005). Thus, CWB can be understood as individual or group behavior that violates organizational norms or rules and has the potential to harm the organization (Fikri, 2023), representing various forms of deviant workplace behavior related to decreased organizational effectiveness and performance.

The indicators of CWB in this study include abuse toward others, theft, sabotage, productivity violations, and withdrawal behaviors reflecting deviant behavior in organizations (Spector et al., 2006). Based on the conceptual framework used, CWB is positioned as the dependent variable influenced by work motivation and workload. Previous research shows that CWB is associated with various factors affecting individuals' conditions in the work environment. Fauziah and Mursyidatunnisa' Nurul (2025) found that work stress influences the emergence of CWB among employees. These findings are consistent with Rahmadhani (2024), who also found an influence of work stress on CWB, indicating a link between individual psychological conditions and counterproductive work behavior.

H3: Work Motivation and Workload simultaneously have a significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior of Indonesian National Police Members at the Pontianak City Police Department, West Kalimantan.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses an associative research type aimed at analyzing the relationship

between the variables Work Motivation and Workload and Counterproductive Work Behavior among members of the Pontianak City Police Department, in accordance with the definition of associative research, which emphasizes the interrelation among variables (Machali, 2021). Data collection was conducted through primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through questionnaires; questionnaires were used to collect data from respondents in the form of written statements. Secondary data were obtained from various written sources such as organizational data, attendance records, code of conduct violations, performance, and member awards (Hardani et al., 2020).

The research population consists of 499 police officers. The sampling technique used was proportionate stratified random sampling because the population is non-homogeneous and divided into several strata (Sugiyono, 2022). The sample size was determined using the Yamane formula with a 10% error rate, resulting in a sample of 83 respondents. The research variables consist of independent variables, namely Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2), and the dependent variable, which is Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y). Data measurement used a Likert scale to assess respondents' attitudes and perceptions.

Data analysis techniques include instrument testing (validity and reliability), classical assumption testing (normality, linearity, and multicollinearity), and multiple linear regression analysis to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable (Siregar, 2019; Ghozali, 2021). In addition, the analysis includes the correlation coefficient (R), coefficient of determination (R²), as well as hypothesis testing through simultaneous testing (F Test) and partial testing (t Test) to examine the significance of the effects of the variables both collectively and individually.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Test Research Instruments

a. Validity Test

The validity test was conducted to measure the accuracy of the instrument in measuring the research variables. Testing was carried out on 83 respondents with a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). The r-table value was obtained from $df = n - 2 = 81$, which is 0.215. An instrument is declared valid if the r-count value is greater than the r-table value and has a significance value ≤ 0.05 . Results for Work Motivation (X1), Workload (X2), and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Indicator	r-count	r-table	Description
Work Motivation (X1)	X1.1	0.760	0.215	Valid
	X1.2	0.695		
	X1.3	0.629		
	X1.4	0.639		
	X1.5	0.693		
	X1.6	0.710		
	X1.7	0.698		
	X1.8	0.665		

	X1.9	0.667		
	X1.10	0.688		
	X1.11	0.706		
	X1.12	0.673		
	X1.13	0.730		
	X1.14	0.760		
	X1.15	0.781		
Workload (X2)	X2.1	0.868	0.215	Valid
	X2.2	0.877		
	X2.3	0.843		
	X2.4	0.796		
	X2.5	0.816		
	X2.6	0.738		
Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y)	Y.1	0.683	0.215	Valid
	Y.2	0.885		
	Y.3	0.900		
	Y.4	0.882		
	Y.5	0.862		
	Y.6	0.865		
	Y.7	0.739		
	Y.8	0.948		
	Y.9	0.790		
	Y.10	0.904		
	Y.11	0.678		
	Y.12	0.825		

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 1, the validity test results show that all statement items on the variables Work Motivation (X1), Workload (X2), and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) are declared valid, as they have r-count values greater than the r-table (0.215), thus meeting the criteria for research instrument feasibility.

b. Reliability Test

The reliability test aims to assess the consistency of the measuring instrument if used repeatedly on the same subjects. Testing was conducted using the Cronbach's Alpha method, with a reliability coefficient (r_{11}) > 0.60 considered reliable. The results of the reliability test for the Work Motivation variable (X1) are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Minimum Reliabilities	Description
Work Motivation (X1)	0.911	15	0.60	Reliable
Workload (X2)	0.905	6		

Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y)	0.949	12
Source: Processed Data, 2026		

Based on the results in Table 2, Work Motivation (X1), Workload (X2), and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) have Cronbach's Alpha values > 0.60 , indicating that all instruments are reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

a. Normality Test

The normality test in this study was conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, with the criterion that data are normally distributed if the significance value (Sig.) > 0.05 . The results of the normality test are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Normality Test Results

Test	Value
N (Sample)	83
Test Statistic	.089
Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)	.158 ^c

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the results in Table 3, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value is 0.158, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data are normally distributed and meet the basic assumptions for further statistical analysis.

b. Linearity Test

Linearity was tested using the Test for Linearity method, where a relationship is considered linear if the Linearity significance < 0.05 and deviation from linearity > 0.05 . The results of the linearity test between Work Motivation (X1) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Linearity Test Results

Variable	Linearity	Deviation from Linearity
Work Motivation * Counterproductive Work Behavior	.000	.058
Workload * Counterproductive Work Behavior	.015	.061

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 4, the Linearity significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$ and the deviation from linearity value is $0.058 > 0.05$, indicating that the relationship between Work Motivation (X1) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) is linear. The Linearity significance value is $0.015 < 0.05$ and the deviation from linearity value is $0.061 > 0.05$, indicating that the relationship between Workload (X2) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) is linear.

c. Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to detect correlations among independent variables by examining the VIF and tolerance values. The model is considered free of multicollinearity if $VIF < 10.00$ and $tolerance > 0.10$. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test Results

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Work Motivation	.447	2.237
Workload	.447	2.237

Dependent Variable: Counterproductive Work Behavior

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 5, the tolerance values of Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2) are 0.447 (> 0.10), and the VIF values are 2.237 (< 10.00), indicating that there is no symptom of multicollinearity.

Hypothesis Test

a. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable, both simultaneously and partially, as well as to develop a predictive model of the relationships among the variables. The analysis results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Variable	Coefficients	t Statistic	Significance Value
(Constant)	4.309	12.547	.000
Work Motivation	-.932	-7.880	.000
Workload	.289	3.814	.000

Dependent Variable: Counterproductive Work Behavior

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on the results in Table 6, the multiple linear regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 4.309 - 0.932 X_1 + 0.289 X_2$$

- 1) The constant value (4.309) indicates that Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) will have a value of 4.309 if Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2) are zero.
- 2) The regression coefficient (b1) for Work Motivation (X1) of -0.932 indicates a negative relationship. This means that a decrease of 1 unit in Work Motivation will increase Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) by 0.932 units.
- 3) The regression coefficient (b2) for Workload (X2) of 0.289 indicates a positive relationship. This means that an increase of 1 unit in Workload will increase Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) by 0.289 units.

b. Correlation Coefficient Analysis (R)

The Influence of Work Motivation ...

The correlation coefficient was used to measure the strength and direction of the relationship among variables using the Product Moment method. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Correlation Coefficient Test Results (R)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.687a	.472	.459	.46311

Predictors: (Constant), Workload, Work Motivation

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 7, the correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.687 indicates that Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2) have a strong relationship with Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y), as it falls within the 0.60–0.799 range.

c. Determination Coefficient (R²)

Based on the results in Table 7, the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.472 or 47.2%. This indicates that 47.2% of the variation or changes in Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y) can be explained by the two independent variables in this study, namely Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2). The remaining 52.8% is influenced by other variables outside this research model, which are not discussed within the scope of this study.

d. Simultaneous Test (F Test)

The simultaneous test (F Test) was used to determine the collective effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Simultaneous Test Results (F Test)

Model	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance
Regression	15.326	7.663	35.731	.000 ^b
Residual	17.157	.214		

Dependent Variable: Counterproductive Work Behavior

Predictors: (Constant), Workload, Work Motivation

Source: Processed Data, 2026

Based on Table 8, the test results show that the F-count (35.731) > F-table (3.11) and the significance value 0.000 < 0.05, indicating that the regression model is significant. Therefore, H3 is accepted, meaning that Work Motivation (X1) and Workload (X2) simultaneously have a significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y).

e. Partial Test (t Test)

The partial test (t Test) was conducted to determine the effect of each independent variable separately on the dependent variable. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Partial Test Results (t Test)

Research Variable	Coefficients	t Statistic	Significance Value
(Constant)	4.309	12.547	.000

Work Motivation	-.932	-7.880	.000
Workload	.289	3.814	.000
Dependent Variable: Counterproductive Work Behavior			

Source: Processed Data, 2026

The t-table value was determined at a 0.05 significance level with degrees of freedom (df) = 81, resulting in t-table = 1.663. A variable is considered significant if t-count > t-table and the significance value < 0.05.

Based on Table 9, the partial t-test results show that:

- 1) The t-count value for Work Motivation (X1) is -7.880. Since the t-count is smaller than the t-table value, $-7.880 < 1.663$, and the significance value (Sig.) is $0.000 < 0.05$, H1 is accepted. It can be concluded that, in this study, the variable Work Motivation (X1) has a negative and significant partial effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y).
- 2) The t-count value for Workload (X2) is 3.814, which is greater than the t-table value, $3.814 > 1.663$, and the significance value (Sig.) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Based on these results, H2 is accepted, indicating that the variable Workload (X2) has a positive and significant partial effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (Y).

Effect of Work Motivation on Counterproductive Work Behavior

The results of the study indicate that the variable Work Motivation has a negative and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), with a t-count value of -7.880 and significance $0.000 < 0.05$. The regression coefficient of -0.932 indicates a negative relationship, where every decrease in work motivation is followed by an increase in Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) by 0.932 units. This finding indicates that work motivation plays an important role in reducing Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) among police officers. In police organizations, motivation is not only related to work enthusiasm but also to discipline, compliance with rules, responsibility, and commitment to public service. Officers with high motivation tend to perform their duties more optimally and maintain behavior that is in line with organizational standards.

The negative direction of the effect indicates that the higher the work motivation, the lower the tendency of officers to engage in counterproductive behavior, such as tardiness, neglect of duties, rule violations, or actions that harm the organization. Therefore, efforts to reduce CWB should not rely solely on sanctions and supervision but should also be supported by strengthening motivation, such as providing fair rewards, career clarity, leadership support, and recognition of officers' performance. This result is in line with Nur & Sari (2024), who found a negative relationship between work motivation and CWB, and supports Wiguna (2018), who stated that work motivation plays a role in explaining counterproductive work

behavior. This finding strengthens the evidence that, in police organizations, work motivation is an important factor in maintaining discipline, ethics, and public service accountability.

Effect of Workload on Counterproductive Work Behavior

The partial test results show that Workload has a positive and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior, with a t-count value of 3.814 and significance $0.000 < 0.05$. The regression coefficient of 0.289 indicates that an increase in workload is followed by an increase in Counterproductive Work Behavior by 0.289 units. This indicates a direct relationship between workload and counterproductive work behavior. This finding also shows that workload contributes to increasing Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) among police officers. Workload is not only related to the number of tasks but also includes time pressure, responsibility demands, readiness requirements, and psychological pressure. In the context of the Pontianak City Police Department, a high workload may arise from operational duties, public services, security tasks, report handling, and administrative work. If not managed proportionally, this condition can trigger fatigue, reduce concentration, and weaken officers' behavioral control.

The positive direction of the effect indicates that the higher the workload, the greater the tendency for counterproductive behavior to emerge, such as tardiness, task avoidance, reduced responsibility, or violations of internal rules. Therefore, workload management is important through balanced task distribution, adequate rest time, and organizational support so that officers can maintain discipline, work ethics, and service quality. This result is consistent with Mangindaan & Timothy (2022), who found a significant relationship between workload and CWB, but differs from Yuandana et al. (2025), who found no significant effect. This difference indicates that the effect of workload on CWB may depend on organizational characteristics and work pressure. In police organizations, this effect tends to be stronger because the work is urgent, risky, directly involves the public, and is closely related to institutional discipline.

Simultaneous Effect of Work Motivation and Workload on Counterproductive Work Behavior

The results of the simultaneous test (F Test) show that Work Motivation and Workload simultaneously have a significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior, with an F-count value of 35.731 and significance $0.000 < 0.05$. The correlation coefficient value of 0.687 indicates a strong relationship between the two independent variables and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), while the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.472 indicates that 47.2% of the variation in Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) can be explained by Work Motivation and Workload, with the remaining 52.8% influenced by other variables outside the research model.

These results indicate that Work Motivation and Workload are simultaneously related to changes in Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). This finding can be associated with Nur and Sari (2024), who found that work motivation has a negative relationship with CWB, so an increase in work motivation is associated with a decrease in counterproductive behavior. On the other hand, Yuandana et al. (2025) found that workload does not have a significant

effect on CWB, showing that relationships among variables may vary depending on the characteristics of the subjects and research design. Previous studies have examined the effect of variables partially on CWB, and there has been no research that simultaneously analyzes the effect of Work Motivation and Workload on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) within a single model. Therefore, the results of this study indicate that both Work Motivation and Workload are simultaneously associated in explaining variations in Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB).

CONCLUSION

This study shows that Work Motivation and Workload have a strong relationship with Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), with a correlation coefficient of 0.687. Work Motivation and Workload simultaneously have a significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), contributing 47.2% in explaining the variation of this behavior. Partially, Work Motivation has a negative and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), whereas Workload has a positive and significant effect on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). These findings indicate that variations in counterproductive work behavior are related to the levels of motivation and workload experienced by members.

Theoretically, the results of this study strengthen the link between work motivation and workload in explaining counterproductive work behavior as shown in previous empirical findings and expand the evidence within police organizations at the regional level. Practically, these findings provide implications for human resource management, particularly in managing work motivation through reward systems and managing workload through proportional task distribution.

For future research, it is recommended to develop the research model by adding other variables that potentially influence Counterproductive Work Behavior, such as work stress, job satisfaction, leadership style, and organizational culture. Future studies may also consider using mediation or moderation variables to gain a deeper understanding of the relationships among variables. Additionally, expanding the research objects by involving more than one police unit or other organizations with different characteristics can provide a broader perspective. Using a larger sample size and more diverse research methods can also enhance the depth of analysis and strengthen research results.

REFERENCES

- Albertin, T., Toding, A., & Baharuddin. (2025). Analisis Disiplin dan Motivasi Kerja serta Kinerja Anggota POLRI pada Bidang Hubungan Masyarakat Polda Sulawesi Selatan. *Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, 6(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.52682/mk.v6i1.11107>
- Bagyo, Y., & Khusnia, R. (2021). Komitmen Organisasional Memediasi Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Counterproductive Work Behavior Terhadap Kinerja. *Ekonika: Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Kadiri*, 6(1), 50–64. <https://doi.org/10.30737/ekonika.v6i1.1437>

- Budiasa, I. K. (2021). *Beban Kerja dan Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. CV. Pena Persada.
- Christine, Y. (2014). *The Reality of Counterproductive Work Behaviors*. The University of Auckland.
- Fikri, F. (2023). *Counterproductive Work Behavior*. CV. Diva Pustaka.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803>
- Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26 (10th ed.)*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hardani, H., Andriani, H., Ustiawaty, J., Utami, E. F., Istiqomah, R. R., Fardani, R. A., Sukmana, D. J., & Auliya, N. H. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif*. CV. Pustaka Ilmu.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Edisi revisi)*. PT Bumi Aksara.
- Kadarisman, M. (2023). *Analisis Beban Kerja (Workload Analysis) dan Analisis Jabatan (Job Analysis) Organisasi Publik*. CV. Bintang Semesta Media.
- Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. (2025). Peraturan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang penilaian kinerja anggota Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia dengan sistem manajemen kinerja.
- Koesomowidjojo, S. R. M. (2017). *Panduan Praktis Menyusun Analisis Beban Kerja*. Raih Asa Sukses.
- Machali, I. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Panduan Praktis Merencanakan, Melaksanakan, dan Analisis Dalam Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan, UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta.
- Mahawati, E., Yuniwati, I., Ferinia, R., Rahayu, P. P., Fani, T., Sari, A. P., Setijaningsih, R. A., Fitriyatinur, Q., Sesilia, A. P., Mayasari, I., Dewi, I. K., & Bahri, S. (2021). *Analisis Beban Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Yayasan Kita Menulis.
- Mangindaan, N. M., & Timothy, K. T. (2022). Hubungan Beban Kerja dengan Konflik Pekerjaan-Keluarga dan Perilaku Kontraproduktif di Tempat Kerja pada Profesi Dokter. *Jurnal Kesehatan Medika Saintika*, 13(1), 196–203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30633/jkms.v13i1.1136>
- Manurung, D., Harahap, F., Nasution, N. S., Daulay, S., Andaresta, N., Oktapiani, F. D., & Astuty, D. A. (2024). Hubungan Beban Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Kantor Pencarian dan Pertolongan Kelas A Medan. *Prepotif: Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 8(3), 3846–3851. <https://doi.org/10.31004/prepotif.v8i3.37105>
- Nur, M. D. P., & Sari, E. Y. D. (2024). Hubungan Motivasi Kerja dan Workplace Spirituality dengan Counterproductive Work Behavior pada Karyawan Perusahaan Multimedia. *Cognicia*, 12(2), 124–131. <https://doi.org/10.22219/cognicia.v12i2.35901>
- Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2013). Counterproductive Work Behavior: Concepts, Measurement, And Nomological Network. *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology*, 1(1), 643–659.
- Pradana, A. M. Y., Kadir, Y., & Moonti, R. M. (2025). Tinjauan Hukum Bidang Propam Polda Gorontalo dalam Menanggulangi Anggota yang Mangkir dari Tugas Ditinjau dari

- Peraturan Kapolri No. 14 Tahun 2011 Tentang Kode Etik Kepolisian. *Gorontalo Justice Research*, 1(1), 110–123.
- Pramono, G. P. (2025). *Manajemen Karyawan: Kelelahan Fisik, Mental, dan Emosional*. WehaPress.
- Rifqi, A. F., & Ahmadia, E. (2025). The Influence of Organizational Culture and Workplace Happiness on Organizational Commitment of Civil Servants at the Gang Sehat Community Health Center in Pontianak City. *Electronic Journal of Education, Social Economics and Technology*, 6(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.33122/ejeset.v6i2.758>
- Ristiyani, L., Subarno, A., & Murwaningsih, T. (2024). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Produksi di PT Djarum Kudus. *JIKAP (Jurnal Informasi dan Komunikasi Administrasi Perkantoran)*, 8(1), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.20961/jikap.v8i1.76254>
- Rivai, V. (2013). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan: dari Teori ke Praktik*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Rosalina, K., & Jusoh, R. (2024). Levers of Control, Counterproductive Work Behavior, and Work Performance: Evidence from Indonesian Higher Education Institutions. *SAGE Open*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241278455>
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2002). Counterproductive Behaviors at Work. *Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology* 1(1), 145–164.
- Siagian, S. P. (2012). *Teori motivasi dan aplikasinya* (Cetakan ke-3). Rineka Cipta.
- Siby, P. S., & Sanggelorang, P. E. (2024). *Persepsi Dukungan Organisasi (Kepuasan Kerja dengan Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif)*. Star Digital Publishing.
- Siregar, S. (2019). *Statistik Parametrik untuk Penelitian Kuantitatif: Dilengkapi dengan Perhitungan Manual dan Aplikasi SPSS versi 17*. PT Bumi Aksara.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The Dimensionality of Counterproductivity: are all Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446–460.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sunarso, S., & Kusdi, K. (2012). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Kedisiplinan, Beban Kerja, dan Motivasi terhadap Kinerja Guru Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Slamet Riyadi. Jurnal Manajemen SD Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta*, 4(1), 72-79.
- Wiguna, F. M. (2018). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, dan Komitmen Supervisor terhadap Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). *Agora*, 6(2), 1–6.
- Yuandana, H., Siswanti, Y., & Wahyuni, P. (2025). Pengaruh Narsisme dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif dengan Kepemimpinan Autentik sebagai Moderasi pada Guru PNS DIY. *Multidiscience: Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 2(1), 252–261. <https://doi.org/10.59631/multidiscience.v2i1.318>