

The Relationship between Perceived Overqualification and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Moderating Role of Perceived Distributive Justice

Durdu Mehmet BICKES¹, Celal YILMAZ², Arif SAMUR³, Ozgur DEMIRTAS⁴

¹ Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Faculty of Business Science, Nevşehir, Turkey

² Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, School of Foreign Languages, Nevşehir, Turkey

³ Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Vocational School, Nevşehir, Turkey

⁴ Kayseri University, Social and Human Sciences Faculty, Kayseri, Turkey

Correspondence: Ozgur DEMIRTAS, Kayseri University, Social and Human Sciences Faculty, Kayseri, Turkey.

Received: September 2, 2019

Accepted: October 14, 2019

Available online: November 27, 2019

doi:10.11114/ijsss.v8i1.4628

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v8i1.4628>

Abstract

Employee behaviors can be classified into two basic groups as positive and negative organizational behaviors. One of the negative organizational behaviors is counterproductive work behaviours. It is aimed to reveal the effects of perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviours and moderating role of distributive justice through an empirical study. In this respect, the data obtained from 398 employees in hospitality enterprises was analyzed by means of structural equation modelling (SEM). It is found that there is a positive relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviours, and perceived distributive justice moderates the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviours towards colleagues. Some theoretical and managerial implications are offered about the variables. Distributive justice is effective in reducing counterproductive work behaviours which emerged from perceived overqualification. Managers need to control the factors that lead to perceived overqualification and implement strategies that can activate catalyst variables, lessening or eliminating its negative consequences. In addition, limitations of the study and suggestions for future studies are provided.

Keywords: overqualification, counterproductive, behavior, distributive justice, hospitality enterprises.

1. Introduction

Human capital theory clarifies that individual benefits depend on several individual characteristics that determine productivity. They are 'individual attributes'. In a typical benefit equation, an individual's efficiency is represented by components such as education, experience and tenure. These components can be seen as clues of a number of individual skills; such as teamwork skills, leadership skills, and so on (Frei & Sousa-Poza, 2012: 1838). Therefore, individuals desire to find a job where they can make the best use of all the qualifications they have. However, it is not always possible to achieve person-job fit due to individual, organizational and environmental factors. In cases where the fit is achieved, employees use all the qualifications effectively at work, but in cases where there is not a proper match, either employee insufficiency or overqualification is discussed.

The studies on person-job fit indicate that the match between employee and job requirements will lead to better job outcomes. This match between job requirements and employee qualifications is job-qualification fit. Low job-qualification fit leads to overqualification perception (Lobene & Meade, 2010: 1). Overqualification, which is a form of underemployment, is a concept of being employed in a job with low perceived criteria, unfavorable working conditions, requiring less expertise and education, and evidentially emphasizing underutilization (Wassermann, Fujishiro, & Hoppe, 2017: 78). The concept of underemployment is that the education, knowledge, skills and experience required by the former job is higher than the current job requirements (Akın & Ulukök, 2016: 72). From this point of view, overqualification can be evaluated as a mismatch between job requirements and an employee's capabilities (Wassermann, Fujishiro, & Hoppe, 2017: 79).

Overqualification is a chronic problem not only in developed economies but also in developing economies because of

inadequate unemployment compensation. It has become a world known matter and an interest of both labor economists and management researchers after the publication of Freeman's (1976) groundbreaking book 'The Overeducated American' (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009: 557). It is also a popular subject that attracts the attention of researchers, practitioners and mass media (Liu, Luksyte, Zhou, Shi, & Wang, 2015: 250).

Today's human resources management studies have begun to focus on employees with overqualifications and their effects on organizational performance and overall economic life though previous practices focused on the management of unskilled employees (Alfes, Shantz, & van Baalen, 2016: 84). The findings of recent studies provide strong evidence on the awareness of mismatch which leads to some negative consequences for both employees with overqualification perceptions and organizations (Alfes et al., 2016: 84).

One of the negative consequences of overqualification perception is counterproductive work behaviours (Luksyte, Spitzmueller, & Maynard, 2011; Liu et al., 2015; Harari, Manapragada, & Viswesvaran, 2017). Based on person-job fit research, the mismatch influences the employees' emotion and thoughts about the present unpleasant situation. The stressful events cause counterproductive work behaviours. Another determinant factor on counterproductive work behaviours is perceived distributive justice (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010; Krischer, Penney, & Hunter, 2010; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014). Overqualified employees with low score on distributive justice are sensitive to mismatch between their skills and job demands and they interpret the situation as unfair. Thus, it triggers some negative reactions toward colleagues and organization, counterproductive work behaviours.




Figure 1. Conceptual model

When the literature is reviewed, a great number of studies dealing with the outcomes of perceived overqualification (Lobene & Meade, 2010; Lobene & Meade, 2013; Zhang, Law, & Lin, 2016) and the effect of various mediation and/or moderating variable(s) between overqualification and its consequences exist (Luksyte et al., 2011; Ye, Li, & Tan, 2017; Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Liu et al., 2015). However, it requires new studies owing to several reasons; first because of its gradual rise in developed and developing economies (Liu et al., 2015: 250), second the increase in education level, the global job mobility, economic crises and other factors (Alfes et al., 2016: 84), third because of its considerable negative individual and organizational reflections (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009: 557; Liu et al., 2015: 250). Consequently, justice sensitivity lessens the negative effects of overqualified employees' reactions toward employees and organization when they perceive justice is fair (Liu et al., 2015). So, this study aims at revealing the moderating role of perceived distributive justice in the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviours. The conceptual research model of the study is depicted in Figure 1.

The study consists of two parts. In the first part, variables of the research and relationships between the variables have been explained theoretically and in the light of empirical findings. Research hypotheses are developed and opinions about the emergence of overqualification have been provided in this section. In the second part, research methodology and findings are explained.

2. Theoretical Background and Hypotheses

Perceived Overqualification

Overqualification is considered as a mismatch between employee skills and job requirements (Wassermann, Fujishiro & Hoppe, 2017: 79). Various opinions can be found in the literature regarding the occurrence of this mismatch (job-qualification mismatch). Frei and Sousa-Poza, explain these views as follows (2012: 1837-1838): The first is that

the qualification mismatch is caused by disagreements in the labor market. According to Johnson (1978) and Jovanovic (1979), the theorists of job shopping and job matching, employees and organizations cannot perform a correct job-qualification match due to incomplete and/or incorrect intelligence. The second view is that overqualification stems from geographical immobility. Frank's (1978) differential overqualification theory argues that married people, especially women often have to go to their spouses' job locations sacrificing their career or better job opportunities. This impairs people's career opportunities and the possibility of better job matching. Ultimately, these people face a permanent state of job-qualification mismatch. A different theoretical approach to job-qualification mismatch is based on the view that individuals systematically acquire more talent and skills than they can efficiently use at work. In this sense, Spence (1973) emphasizes in the signalling theory that employees pursue to acquire more skills to market their skills and qualifications to potential employers although some of recently acquired skills are not necessary to perform their present job tasks. As a result, these individuals face long-term overqualification as they cannot use some of their qualifications in their job.

It is stated in the literature that overqualification is generally seen in industrialized economies and it is estimated that approximately one quarter of the employees have overqualification perception (Fine, 2007: 61; Fine & Nova, 2008: 346). Erdoğan, Bauer, Peiro and Truxillo (2011: 217) state that the number of employees with overqualification perception is relatively higher in developed countries experiencing economic recession. Individuals have difficulty in finding jobs that they can reflect all their abilities, and they have to work in ordinary jobs due to stagnation. Liu et al. (2015: 250) add that it is also a problem in developing economies.

Overqualification can be assessed under both objective and subjective interpretations. The objective point of view is based on objective criteria, while the subjective point of view is related to one's perception. Therefore, these two perspectives refer to different phenomenon (Johnson, Morrow, & Johnson, 2002: 4237). Objective overqualification refers to the standard of skills and indicates that individuals' educational level and skills are higher than job requirements. Subjective overqualification is based on individuals' interpretations, referring that their skills exceed their job requirements. These individuals tend to show very low level of interest in acquiring a new skill because of this perception. Therefore, it is believed that subjective overqualification has a higher predictive effect on outcome variables than objective overqualification (Lee, Chou, & Wu, 2016: 3).

Perceived overqualification can also be considered as a mismatch between employee needs (e.g., the use of professional skills) and the supply (e.g., difficult tasks) of the job (Luksyte et al., 2011: 283). Some researchers argue that perceived overqualification consists of two dimensions: perceived education and experience mismatch and perceived lack of opportunity for growth (Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, Morrow, & Johnson, 2002). According to this perspective, perceived overqualification is defined as having higher level of education and experience than the job requires and feeling limited opportunity to develop skills in job (Johnson & Johnson, 1999: 16). Some researchers argue that perceived overqualification has a one-dimensional structure (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Maynard, Joseph, & Maynard, 2006). They regard overqualification as the condition when the individual has knowledge, skills, abilities, education, experience and other qualifications more than the job requires (Erdogan et al., 2011: 217).

Counterproductive work behavior

Counterproductive work behaviors refer to a wide range of deliberate actions that threaten an organization and/or its employees, and create detrimental effects (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001: 292). In other words, they are defined as deliberate employee behaviors that harm the legitimate interests of an organization (Dalal, 2005: 1241). In the literature, counterproductive work behaviors range from workplace deviance (Lawrence & Robinson, 2007; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), bad behavior (Griffin & Lopez, 2005), aggression (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Fox & Spector, 1999), antagonistic work behavior (Lehman & Simpson, 1992), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997) to psychological violence/bullying/mobbing (Knorz & Zapf, 1996). In this study, the concept of 'counterproductive work behaviors' was used in accordance with the general tendency in the literature. The common point in all different conceptualizations is that these behaviors harm employees and organizations by targeting their functionality and assets in a manner that reduces their effectiveness and productivity (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2011: 292). Almost all organizations are exposed to potential harms of counterproductive work behaviors (Fine, 2012: 1). They are intentional behaviors that violate important organizational norms, threaten well-being of organizations and their members, and act against legitimate interests of organizations (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012: 613). Robinson and Bennet (1995: 565) evaluate those behaviors, which they define as 'workplace deviance', in two dimensions as counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues and towards organizations. Behaviors towards colleagues can be exemplified by pranking, making fun, being rude, harassing, arguing, inflicting violence, underestimating skills and so on. It is possible to list the behaviors towards organization as theft, sabotage, aggression, absenteeism, intentionally being late, early retirement, deliberate slowdown, concealment of skills, non-work effort and so forth. All counterproductive work behaviors,

regardless of the scale, cause negative developments and destructive effects in terms of organizational functioning. Counterproductive work behaviors can be shown separately towards organizations and individuals or sequentially towards both of them. Fundamentally, it is necessary to identify the factors triggering counterproductive work behaviors to overcome or reduce them. They also serve as an indicator of the existence of various wrong habits and practices in organizational functioning and interpersonal relations (Robinson & Bennett, 1995: 567). In this respect, it is certain to consider them as a mechanism to detect unnoticed malfunctions in organizations.

Perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors

There are various explanations in the literature regarding the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors. One of them is based on the theory of relative deprivation. Relative deprivation theory argues that deprivation and frustration emerge as a result of comparing the benefits and qualifications with the benefits and qualifications of other individuals (Akın & Ulukök, 2016: 73-74). Individuals with overqualification perception think that they deserve more than their current benefits due to their qualifications. This thought lays the ground for a sense of deprivation. This comparison leads to the development of negative emotions such as anger and disappointment when the individual reaches the judgment that there is a negative situation and unfairness for him/her (Yu et al., 2018). Therefore, these feelings may trigger counterproductive work behaviors. Another explanation is based on the frustration-aggression model. This model suggests that employees with a perception of overqualification may exhibit counterproductive work behaviors because they think their valuable resources such as time, energy, knowledge and abilities have been wasted. The model also emphasizes that employees who are unable to utilize their skills believe that they are hindered from their individual and work-related goals and may resort to counterproductive work behaviors as a reaction to this frustrating situation (Fox & Spector, 1999: 916). Berkowitz (1989: 70) states that such a tendency is the result of an individual's natural drive to reduce or eliminate annoying situations.

In a way confirming these theoretical explanations, empirical studies prove that there are many negative individual and organizational reflections of perceived overqualification (Maynard et al., 2006: 510; Erdoğan & Bauer, 2009; Lobene & Meade, 2010; Erdogan et al., 2011; Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013; Liu et al., 2015; Lobene, Meade, & Pond, 2015). One of these reflections is counterproductive work behaviors. The findings in the literature suggest that perceived overqualification has a positive effect on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues and organizations (Luksyte et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2015; Fine & Edward, 2017). In the light of the theoretical explanations and research findings, the following hypotheses were developed for the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors.

Hypothesis 1: Perceived overqualification positively affects counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived overqualification positively affects counterproductive work behaviors towards organization.

Distributive justice perception

Distributive justice refers to the fairness of the results, gained by an employee (Moorman, 1991: 845). Being one of the dimensions of organizational justice, it addresses conclusion justice. This component of organizational justice is similar to Adams's (1965) "equality theory" (Beugr, 2002: 1093) as both of them focus on the distribution of results. This theory assumes that employees will compare their gains in return for their efforts and contributions with the contributions and benefits of other employees in their organization or other organizations (Yeni çeri, Demirel, & Se çkin, 2009: 84). Similarly, Greenberg (1990: 400) states that justice perception originates from comparison of an individual's contributions to the organization and benefits with other employees' contributions and benefits. As a result of this comparison, a sense of injustice will arise if the individual thinks that s/he has not received fair benefits. Thus, perceived distributive injustice leads to the development of several negative behavior forms, resentment and anger (Beugr, 2002: 1093; Joya & Edan, 2016: 16).

It is emphasized in the literature that distributive justice has three rules and managers may adopt any of these rules (Ghazizahed & Soluklu, 2015: 695; Li, Cropanzano, & Molina, 2015: 138). The first rule is called 'equality' and it means each member gets same benefits regardless of their contribution. The second rule is called 'need' and it is based on the needs of members during the process of distributing benefits. The third rule, 'justice', refers to the transfer of benefits to each member in accordance with their contribution rate.

Moderating role of distributive justice

The moderator is a qualitative (such as gender, race and group) or quantitative (such as reward level) variable that affects the direction or strength of the relationship between an independent (predictor) and a dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986: 1174). In other words, if the direction and severity of the relationship between an independent variable (X) and a dependent variable (Y) differs depending on the level of another variable (M), it is the moderator (Hayes, 2018: 9).

Perception of injustice is associated with negative outcomes for all employees (McMillan, Gilley, Caldwell, Heames, & Gilley, 2015: 51). The relevant literature states that employees' justice perception has an impact on their reactions to the system and their colleagues (De Cremer et al., 2010: 291). Employee responses and reactions will vary according to the level of their injustice perception. Gelens, Dries, Hofmans and Pepermans (2013: 346) also emphasize that perceived distributive justice has a crucial effect on shaping employees' emotional, cognitive and behavioral responses. In many meta-analyses, it has been studied. For example, Liu et al., (2015) point out that justice perception is one of the most powerful determinants of counterproductive work behaviors. They also argue that overqualified employees with high level of justice sensitivity see the person-job mismatch as a threat and they interpret it as their worth to organization. On the other hand, overqualified employees with low score on justice sensitivity may have less reaction (e.g., anxiety, anger) for the mismatch because they perceive this misfit less annoying and more tolerable.

Karazsia and Berlin (2018), state that a mediator can also moderate. In other words a third variable can be both a moderator or a mediator between the dependent and independent variables if it meets the requirements. Time plays a critical role to decide the third variable as a moderator or a mediator. This is a cross-sectional study. In cross-sectional studies, it is very difficult to verify the tests of mediation models because mediation tests require multiple timepoints and mediators are both criterions and casual predictors (Karazsia & Berlin, 2018). So, within the framework of these explanations, we propose that perceived distributive justice acts as a buffer reducing negative effects of perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviors. In other words, employees with high perception of overqualification who have a high perceived distributive justice score will resort to less counterproductive work behaviors than the employees with low level of justice perception. In this respect, the final hypotheses of the research are as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Perceived distributive justice moderates the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived distributive justice moderates the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors towards organization.

3. Methodology

Instrument

The questionnaire contains three basic constructs relating to perceived overqualification, perceived distributive justice and counterproductive work behaviors. Each of these constructs was measured using a five-point Likert-type scale. Perceived overqualification and perceived distributive justice responses range from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, but responses to counterproductive work behaviors from 1 = never to 5 = always. The scale with nine items created by Maynard et al., (2006) was used to measure perceived overqualification (e.g., *my job requires less education than I have*). To measure perceived distributive justice, the scale with five items created by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was used (e.g., *my work schedule is fair*). Finally, the scale with 12 items created by Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch and Hulin (2009) was used to measure counterproductive work behaviors (e.g., *I criticized my colleagues' opinion or suggestion*). It has two dimensions, counterproductive work behaviors towards supervisor/coworkers (colleagues) and towards organization. These scales were used in various Turkish studies (e.g., perceived overqualification, Karacaoğlu & Arslan, 2019; perceived distributive justice, Polat, 2007). But, the scale of counterproductive work behaviors, created by Dalal et al. (2009) has not been met in Turkish literature. The back-translation method (Brislin, 1976) was followed to make the expressions in the scales overallly suitable for the sector and respondents by considering the reality of the existence of subcultures in a national culture. First, an expert of both languages, English and Turkish was asked to translate the scales into Turkish. Secondly, the scales, translated into Turkish were translated into English by another specialist. Then the items were compared with the first English version. Thereafter, 20 employees in hospitality sector were piloted and the items were not changed again as there was no problem with them.

4. Data Collection and Sample

The population of the study consists of the employees working in hospitality enterprises in Cappadocia region/Turkey. We could not find the exact employee numbers in the region and decided to get sampling due to various limitations such as cost and time and not being able to reach all employees composing the universe. Therefore, using unlimited universe sampling formula [$n = z^2(pq)/e^2$] (Baş, 2013: 41), the sample size was found as $n = (1.96)^2(0.5 \times 0.5)/0.05^2 \approx 384$. In addition, convenience sampling method was followed in the study considering the employees' possible sickness or days off. The required data was compiled by questionnaire technique. The questionnaire was applied by conducting face-to-face interviews with the employees. In face-to-face interviews, it was ensured that participants' answers would be kept completely confidential and would not be used for any other purposes apart from scientific purposes. As a result of data collection process, 423 responses were received. Hair, Hult, Ringle and Sarstedt (2016: 68) argue that one of the primary issues that must be examined is straight lining before analyzing the data. They state that "When a respondent

marks the same response for a high proportion of the questions, it should be deleted". Finally, 398 statistically acceptable responses were obtained after excluding 25 straight lining questionnaires. As a result, it is possible to infer that sample size is adequate in terms of unlimited universe sampling technique.

Of the 398 participants, 61% are women. While 36% of the participants are married, 64% are single. In addition, most of the participants (76.1%) fall into the age group ranging from 21 to 40. The fact that 72.1% of the participants are at the age of 30 and under shows that approximately 4/3 of them are young people. Considering their work experience, 78% of them have 10 years or less experience, which is in line with the determination of the participants' age category. When their education levels are analyzed, it is seen that 37% of the participants graduate from high schools, and 52.4% have associate degree or undergraduate degree. In addition, 9.8% of them have completed a master's and doctorate program. Of 1% participants did not response the items related to their educational status. Finally, in terms of their supervising or administrative duties, 28.7% have an administrative duty though 71% do not.

5. Data analysis

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test the hypotheses. Firstly, outliers were detected through Mahalanobis distance test. The outliers whose ratios are over three or four may be removed from the analysis in large samples (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2013: 65). In this context, three subjects of which Mahalanobis distance value is above 4 were removed. Skewness and Kurtosis test was conducted to test the multivariate normal distribution (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016: 35). The test results indicate that skewness values are between -1.312 and -.133; $p < .01$, and kurtosis values are between -1.325 and .931; $p < .01$. Thus, it is possible to determine that the data set is normally distributed as values are between the critical values ± 2.58 ; $p < .01$ (Kline, 2011: 160; Hair et al., 2013: 71). No outlier of which Mahalanobis distance ratio over four (Mahalanobis $D > 60.421 / 17 = 3.55$; $p < .001$) was detected after nine items were excluded from the confirmatory factor analyzes (CFA) as their factor loadings fell down 0.50 (Hair et al., 2013: 103). Thus, the analysis of participants' demographic structure was performed through 398 responses. However, the analyses of relationships between variables were conducted using the data set obtained from 395 questionnaires. Two-stage approach (measurement model and structural model) was pursued to analyze relationships between the variables of study (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). For moderation, the interaction approach, focusing latent variables and the results coming out of variables scores was followed to compute the interactive relations in the model. At this point, primarily the main effects and then the interaction effects were analyzed (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016: 221).

6. Findings

Measurement model

In two-stage SEM approach, first, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is conducted (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). CFA provides single and collective performance of the observed variables, the nature and structure of the latent phenomena and the number of dimensions (Bowen & Guo, 2011: 9-10). In this process, Hair et al., (2013: 103) suggest that the items of which factor loading is below 0.50 should be removed one by one from the analysis. As a result, nine items were excluded, three from perceived overqualification, three from counterproductive work behaviours towards colleagues and three from counterproductive work behaviours towards organization.

The results of CFA are depicted in Table 1. It shows goodness-of-fit statistics and construct-validity (discriminant and convergent validity) of the measurement model.

Table 1. Measurement model

First-order variables & Items	SFL	t values	CR	AVE		Correlation
Perceived overqualification (PO)			.876	.546	PDJ	.049 ^a .002 ^b
My job requires less education than I have.	.606	Fix.			CWBC	.169 ^a *** .028 ^b
My education level is above the education level required by my job.	.788	12.101			CWBO	.173 ^a ** .029 ^b
I have a lot of knowledge that I do not need in order to do my job.	.788	12.101				
The work experience that I have is not necessary to be successful on this job.	.812	12.329				
I have job skills that are not required for this job.	.817	12.378				
I have more abilities than I need in order to do my job.	.584	9.729				
Perceived distributive justice (PDJ)			.852	.537	CWBC	-.051 ^a .002 ^b
My work schedule is fair.	.584	Fix.			CWBO	.116 ^a .013 ^b
I think that my level of pay is fair.	.763	11.069				
I consider my work load to be quite fair.	.802	11.373				
I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.	.764	11.077				
Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.	.730	10.779				
Counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues (CWBC)			.864	.694	CWBO	.349 ^a *** .121 ^b
I criticized my colleagues' opinion or suggestion.	.954	Fix.				
I tried to avoid interacting with my colleagues.	.960	26.148				
I spoke poorly about my colleagues.	.502	10.932				
Counterproductive work behaviors towards organization (CWBO)			.799	.571		
I spent time on tasks unrelated to work.	.766	Fix.				
I took unnecessary break.	.684	12.048				
I did not work to the best of my ability.	.812	12.850				

Goodness-of-fit statistics: $\chi^2(221.426) / sd(113)=1.960$; SRMR=.056; CFI=.97; GFI=.94; RMSEA=.049

Fix.: Parameter fixed at 1.0; ^a correlations between latent variables, ***p<.001; **p<.01.; ^b square of the correlations; CR: Construct reliability, AVE: Average variance extracted.

Based on the studies of Byrne (2010: 222) and Kline (2016: 269), χ^2/df , SRMR, CFI, GFI, RMSEA statistics were provided as the minimum goodness-of-fit statistics to be reported in this study. As shown in Table 1, the goodness-of-fit indices of the measurement model ($\chi^2/df=1.960$; SRMR=.056; CFI=.97; GFI=.94; RMSEA=.049) are within acceptable limits (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). Convergent validity is first checked for construct validity and it is found that factor loadings of all observed variables and average variance extracted (AVE) values of all latent variables are over the minimum value, 0.50. Construct reliability (CR) values are above 0.70. Accordingly, convergent validity is achieved (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000: 90; Hair et al., 2013). For discriminant validity, the AVE value of each latent variable must exceed the square of the correlation value with another latent variable (Fornell & Larcker 1981, p. 46; Hair et al., 2013, p. 605). The results showing the correlation squares in Table 1 confirm that discriminant validity is ensured. So, the measurement model meets the construct validity.

Structural model and hypothesis testing

The main effects of perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues and towards organization are determined to test the model and hypotheses developed within the research scope (Hair et al., 2013: 695). The results of SEM in Table 2 show that goodness-of-fit indices of the model, apart from SRMR values, are satisfactory ($\chi^2/df=3.083$; SRMR=.097; CFI=.96; GFI=.94; RMSEA=.073).

Table 2. Main effects model

Hypotheses	Relations	Std. factor Loadings (β)	p	t values	R2	Result
H1	PO→CWBC	.174	.002	3.157	.03	Supported
H2	PO→CWBO	.180	.003	2.981	.033	Supported

Goodness-of-fit statistics: $\chi^2(160.338) / sd(52)=3.083$; SRMR=.097; CFI=.96; GFI=.94; RMSEA=.073

PO: Perceived overqualification, CWBC: Counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues, CWBO: Counterproductive work behaviors towards organization

Perceived overqualification has a significant and positive effect on both counterproductive work behaviors towards

colleagues ($\beta=.174$; $p<.01$) and towards organization ($\beta=.180$; $p<.01$). However, it slightly explains both of the dependent variables (3%). These findings support hypotheses H1 and H2. Therefore, it can be concluded that individuals with high perceptions of overqualification may be more prone to exhibit counterproductive work behaviors towards both their colleagues and organizations, albeit at a low level.

Moderating role of perceived distributive justice

The interaction approach (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016: 226) was pursued, and PROCESS, a reliable calculation tool (Hayes, 2013: 419) was used to examine the interaction effect of perceived distributive justice on the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors. The significance of interaction effect was computed using a bootstrapping procedure (5,000 resamples) following the recommendations of Cheung (2007: 238) and MacKinnon, Lockwood and Williams (2004: 120). Since the model has two dependent variables, the interactive effects of perceived distributive justice are examined separately using the simple moderating model (Hayes, 2013: 255). The results of analyses are depicted in Table 3 and Table 4 in details.

Table 3. Interaction effect of perceived distributive justice and perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues

Interaction relations	β	t	p	Confidence intervals (95%)		Result
				Lower	Upper	
PO→CWBC	.163	3.271	.00	.065	.261	
PDJ→CWBC	-.043	-.862	.39	-.142	.055	Supported
PO*PDJ→CWBC	-.096	2.110	.03	.007	.186	
Model summary: $R^2=.04$, $MSE=967$, $F(3.391)=5.530$						

PO: Perceived overqualification, PDJ: Perceived distributive justice, CWBC: Counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues

Table 3 posits that perceived overqualification and perceived distributive justice have a negative and significant interactive effect on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues ($\beta = -.096$; $p < .05$). R^2 increases from 3% (main effect model) to 4% in interaction effect model. So, the increase in R^2 provides that the moderator is meaningful. Based on this finding, H3 hypothesis is accepted. Perceived distributive justice weakens the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues. In other words, as the distributive justice perceptions of employees with overqualification perception increase, their tendency to exhibit counterproductive work behaviors towards their colleagues may decrease. However, overqualified employees with a low level of distributive justice perception may exhibit more counterproductive work behaviors towards their colleagues (see Figure 2).




Figure 2. Moderating role of distributive justice

When Table 4 is viewed, the interactive effect of perceived overqualification and perceived distributive justice is not significant ($\beta=.030$; $p<.51$). Therefore, H4 hypothesis suggesting that overqualified employees who think that distributive justice exists in the organization will exhibit less counterproductive work behaviors towards organization is not supported. As a result, perceived distributive justice does not significantly moderate the relationship between the variables.

Table 4. Interaction effect of perceived distributive justice and perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviors towards organization

Interaction relations	β	t	p	Confidence intervals (95%)		Result
				Lower	Upper	
PO→CWBO	.173	3.462	.000	.075	.271	Not supported
PDJ→CWBO	.077	1.548	.122	-.021	.176	
PO*PDJ→CWBO	.030	.665	.507	-.059	.120	

Model summary: $R^2=.04$, $MSE=966$, $F(3,391)=5.574$

PO: Perceived overqualification, PDJ: Perceived distributive justice, CWBO: Counterproductive work behaviors towards organization

7. Discussion and Conclusion

Overqualification (Liu et al., 2015: 250), a considerable phenomenon in developed and developing economies, is becoming increasingly widespread because of the increase in education level, global business mobility, economic crises and other factors (Alfes et al., 2016: 84). Fine and Nevo (2008: 346) estimate that approximately one quarter of all employees in industrialized economies assume that they are overqualified. Erdoğan et al. (2011: 217) state that the number of employees with overqualification perception is relatively higher in countries experiencing economic stagnation, and the main reason for its abundance is that individuals have difficulties in finding jobs where their skills are properly utilized, and they have to work in any jobs. Therefore, widespread overqualification among the labor force leads to many individual and organizational negative reflections (Erdoğan & Bauer, 2009: 557; Liu et al., 2015: 250), which necessitates further studies on the subject.

In this study, it is analyzed if perceived distributive justice moderates the relationship between perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors on a sample of employees working in hospitality enterprises in Cappadocia region/Turkey. Relying on the findings, theoretical and managerial implications are provided.

8. Theoretical Implications

The findings of the research show that perceived overqualification has a significant and positive effect on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues and organization. This finding is consistent with similar findings in the literature (Lukšyte et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2015; Fine & Edward, 2017). In terms of organizational success and continuity, it reveals the importance of subjective overqualification perception which instigates counterproductive work behaviors and causes a large number of individual and organizational negative outcomes. Therefore, it is crucial for decision makers and managers they should control the factors leading to perceived overqualification in the organization and implement strategies that will activate the catalyst variables which can lessen or eliminate its consequences.

Another theoretical implication is that perceived distributive justice moderates the effect of perceived overqualification on counterproductive work behaviors towards colleagues. It can be interpreted that the tendency of employees with overqualification perception to show negative work behaviors towards their colleagues will decrease when their distributive justice perception is high. This finding posits that overqualified employees with a low level of distributive justice perception may deteriorate communication, interaction, motivation and eventually performance of their colleagues. However, perceived distributive justice does not have significant moderating role between the relationship perceived overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors towards organization. It can be explained by the assumption that participants' distributive justice perception stems from the decisions and practices of members, not from the organization, and so they tend to exhibit undesired behaviors towards their colleagues, instead towards the organization.

9. Managerial Implications

In organizational behavior, the emergence of a conclusion necessitates the existence of many factors. Some variables increase negative outputs caused by perceived overqualification emerging from variety in education level, global businesses, periodic economic crises (Alfes et al., 2016: 84), and some variables reduce them. From this perspective, it is possible to imply what managers in hospitality sector should perform as follows. They should

- Consider job-qualification fit in employee selection, training and career planning processes. It should be remembered that maximum job-qualification fit leads to better performance though poor fit results in lower performance (Lobene & Meade, 2010).
- Identify and manage the factors leading to overqualification perception in their organization.
- Identify and utilize mediators and moderators to minimize or, if possible, eliminate negative impacts of perceived overqualification. It's important to plan and organize when and how these factors will be used.
- Bring the value and importance of work in terms of organizational and social functioning to the forefront and not allow the loss in the meaning of work.
- Not ignore that all managerial decisions and practices have short-, medium- and long-term chain effects. Every decision to be taken should not be deviated from the line of justice, and the reasons should be shared with the employees.

10. Limitation and Future Research

This study has some limitations. One of them is the fact that research results cannot be generalized when the sector and sample size is taken into consideration. Thus, it requires more studies in various sectors. Researchers who want to work on these variables can test the relationships in different sectors and on different samples. Different research findings will contribute to the formation of a general opinion. Another limitation is the likelihood of social appreciation tendency. It may play a role especially when the variables, counterproductive work behaviors and justice are considered. Common method variance may occur when various variables are evaluated by the same respondents and in the same period. Therefore, it should not be ignored that the variance of common method may influence the strength of relationship between the variables. To avoid the negative reflections of this method, data can be collected from different sources in future studies. Another limitation of the study is that it is a cross-sectional study. The data set represents the perception of participants at a given moment and so, the findings refer to those perceptions. It may be suggested that future studies should be performed in a longitudinal design as perceived overqualification and its consequences require a process. Furthermore, it would be better to consider perceived distributive justice as a mediator in future studies.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2 (pp. 267-299). New York: Academi. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Akın, A., & Ulukök, E. (2016). Fazla Nitelikliliğin Bireysel ve Örgütsel Sonuçlarının İncelenmesine Yönelik Bir Kavramsal Değerlendirme. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(4), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2016.207>

- Alfes, K., Shantz, A., & van Baalen, S. (2016). Reducing perceptions of overqualification and its impact on job satisfaction: The dual roles of interpersonal relationships at work. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(1), 84-101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12094>
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A Review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Baş, T. (2013). *Anket*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(1), 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.59>
- Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 613-636. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026739>
- Beugr, C. D. (2002). Understanding organizational justice and its impact on managing employees: An African perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(7), 1091-1104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190210131311>
- Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bowen, N. K., & Guo, S. (2011). *Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195367621.001.0001>
- Byrne, B.M. (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with Amos: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a1>
- Cheung, M. W. (2007). Comparison of approaches to constructing confidence intervals for mediating effects using structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(2), 227-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510709336745>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 1051-1066. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.44636148>
- De Cremer, D., Brockner, J., Fishman, A., Van Dijke, M., Van Olffen, W., & Mayer, D. M. (2010). When do procedural fairness and outcome fairness interact to influence employees' work attitudes and behaviors? The moderating effect of uncertainty. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 291-304. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017866>
- Devonish, D., & Greenidge, D. (2010). The effect of organizational justice on contextual performance, counterproductive work behaviors, and task performance: Investigating the moderating role of ability-based emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(1), 75-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00490.x>
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Siguaw, J.A. (2000). *Introducing Lisrel: A Guide for the Uninitiated*. London: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209359>
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547-559. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547>
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2009). Perceived overqualification and its outcomes: The moderating role of empowerment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 557-565. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013528>
- Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Peiró J. M., & Truxillo, D. M. (2011). Overqualified employees: Making the best of a

- potentially bad situation for individuals and organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(2), 215-232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01330.x>
- Fine, S. (2007). Overqualification and selection in leadership training. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(1), 61-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1071791907304291>
- Fine, S. (2012). Estimating the economic impact of personnel selection tools on counterproductive work behaviors. *Economics and Business Letters*, 1(4), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.17811/ebl.1.4.2012.1-9>
- Fine, S., & Edward, M. (2017). Breaking the rules, not the law: The potential risks of counterproductive work behaviors among overqualified employees. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25(4), 401-405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12194>
- Fine, S., & Nevo, B. (2008). Too smart for their own good? A study of perceived cognitive overqualification in the workforce. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(2), 346-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701799937>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration/aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 91-931. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199911\)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6)
- 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>
- Frank, R. H. (1978). Why women earn less: the theory and estimation of differential overqualification. *The American Economic Review*, 68(3), 360-373.
- Frei, C., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2012). Overqualification: permanent or transitory? *Applied Economics*, 44(14), 1837-1847. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2011.554380>
- Gelens, J., Dries, N., Hofmans, J., & Pepermans, R. (2013). The role of perceived organizational justice in shaping the outcomes of talent management: A research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 341-353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.05.005>
- Ghazizadeh, M., & Soluklu, M. E. (2015). The Relationship between Customer's Cognitive Evaluations, Affective Responses and Complaint-Handling Satisfaction (A Case Study of Tejarat Bank and Parsian Bank in Tehran). *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3S2), 692-702. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s2p692>
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). "Bad behavior" in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 988-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279942>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2013). *Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson New International Editio* (7th ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harari, M. B., Manapragada, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2017). Who thinks they're a big fish in a small pond and why does it matter? A meta-analysis of perceived overqualification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 28-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.06.002>
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *An introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.273>
- Johnson, G. J., & Johnson, W. R. (1999). Perceived overqualification and health: A longitudinal analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(1), 14-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224549909598358>

- Johnson, G. J., & Johnson, W. R. (2000). Perceived overqualification, positive and negative affectivity, and satisfaction with work. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15(2), 167-184.
- Johnson, W. R. (1978). A theory of job shopping. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 92(2), 261-278. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884162>
- Johnson, W. R., Morrow, P. C., & Johnson, G. J. (2002). An evaluation of a perceived overqualification scale across work settings. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136(4), 425-441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209604169>
- Jovanovic, B. (1979). Job matching and the theory of turnover. *Journal of political economy*, 87(5, Part 1), 972-990. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260808>
- Joya, A. I., & Edan, M. A. (2016). Psychological Capital as a Moderator between Justice Types and Outcomes. *Journal of Business Management and Economic Studies*, 1(2), 14-32.
- Karacaoğlu, K., & Arslan, M. (2019). Algılanan aşırı niteliklilik ve iş tatmini ilişkisinde iyimserliğin aracı rolü: istifa eden veya erken emekli olan subaylar üzerine bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 33(1), 107-136.
- Karazsia, B. T., & Berlin, K. S. (2018). Can a mediator moderate? Considering the role of time and change in the mediator-moderator distinction. *Behavior Therapy*, 49(1), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2017.10.001>
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Knorz, C., & Zapf, D. (1996). Mobbing—Eine extreme Form sozialer Stressoren am Arbeitsplatz, [Mobbing—An extreme form of social stressors in the workplace]. *Zeitschrift fuer Arbeits- und Organisations Psychologie*, 40, 12-21.
- Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M., & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018349>
- Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't misbehavin': Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 378-394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300816>
- Lee, H. M., Chou, M. J., & Wu, H. T. (2016). The Measurement Of Perceived Overqualification And The Relationships Among Perceived Overqualification, Psychological Empowerment, Job Satisfaction Of Private Kindergarten Teachers. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 4(8), 1-15.
- Lehman, W. E. K., & Simpson, D. D. (1992). Employee substance use and on-the-job behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(3), 309-321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.3.309>
- Li, A., Cropanzano, R. S., & Molina, A. (2015). Fairness at the unit level: Justice climate, justice climate strength, and peer justice. In Russell S. Cropanzano ve Maureen L. Ambrose (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace* (pp. 137-164). New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199981410.013.6>
- Liu, S., Luksyte, A., Zhou, L., Shi, J., & Wang, M. (2015). Overqualification and counterproductive work behaviors: Examining a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(2), 250-271. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1979>
- Lobene, E. V., & Meade, A. W. (2013). The effects of career calling and perceived overqualification on work outcomes for primary and secondary school teachers. *Journal of Career Development*, 40(6), 508-530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845313495512>
- Lobene, E. V., Meade, A. W., & Pond III, S. B. (2015). Perceived overqualification: A multi-source investigation of psychological predisposition and contextual triggers. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(7), 684-710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2014.967654>
- Lobene, E., & Meade, A. W. (2010). Perceived overqualification: An exploration of outcomes. In *25th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, April 8-10, Atlanta, GA*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e518392013-311>
- Luksyte, A., Spitzmueller, C., & Maynard, D. C. (2011). Why do overqualified incumbents deviate? Examining multiple mediators. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 279-296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022709>
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 39(1), 99-128. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3901_4

- Maynard, D. C., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2013). Perceived overqualification and withdrawal behaviours: Examining the roles of job attitudes and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(3), 435-455. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12006>
- Maynard, D. C., Joseph, T. A., & Maynard, A. M. (2006). Underemployment, job attitudes, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(4), 509-536. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.389>
- McMillan, H., Gilley, A., Caldwell, J., Heames, J., & Gilley, J. (2015). Antecedents of Managerial Ethicality: A Multi-Dimensional/Multi-Level Exploration of Employee Perceptions. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 12(2), 50-66.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of applied psychology*, 76(6), 845-855. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management journal*, 36(3), 527-556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>
- Polat, S. (2007). Orta öğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, SBE, Kocaeli.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors—A multidimensional-scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2016). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge Psychology Press.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.434>
- Spence, M. (1978). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355-374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
- Wassermann, M., Fujishiro, K., & Hoppe, A. (2017). The effect of perceived overqualification on job satisfaction and career satisfaction among immigrants: Does host national identity matter? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 61, 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.09.001>
- Ye, X., Li, L., & Tan, X. (2017). Organizational support: Mechanisms to affect perceived overqualification on turnover intentions: a study of Chinese repatriates in multinational enterprises. *Employee Relations*, 39(7), 918-934. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-11-2016-0213>
- Yeniçeri, Ö., Demirel, Y., & Seçkin, Z. (2009). Örgütsel adalet ile duygusal tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişki: İmalat sanayi çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *KMU İİBF Dergisi*, 11(16), 83-99.
- Yu, G., Zhao, F., Wang, H., & Li, S. (2018). Subjective social class and distrust among Chinese college students: The mediating roles of relative deprivation and belief in a just world. *Current Psychology*, June, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9908-5>
- Zhang, M. J., Law, K. S., & Lin, B. (2016). You think you are big fish in a small pond? Perceived overqualification, goal orientations, and proactivity at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(1), 61-84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2024>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.