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Summary

The main goal of the present study was to extend previous research by studying the role of depletion in the relation between injustice and counterproductive work behavior (or CWB for short). Here we ask when do employees react more strongly to injustice and, thus, show more CWBs: when they are depleted or when they are not depleted? We proposed that employees’ depletion (i.e. the condition of being tired) would moderate the positive relation between injustice perceptions and CWB, so that high depletion will strengthen this relation.

We conducted a 2x2 quasi-experimental design, manipulating justice and depletion to study their impact on CWB. The sample (n = 279) was obtained using Amazon MTurk. The participants were randomly assigned to the 4 conditions. We analyzed moderation and mediation models using PROCESS v3.1 macro for SPSS.

The results showed that employees’ depletion did not moderate the relation between injustice perceptions and CWB. However, complementary analyses showed that depletion interacts with justice in predicting negative affect, which in turn is strongly correlated to CWB.

Keywords: organizational justice, negative affect, counterproductive work behavior, quasi-experimental design.
Injustice and Counterproductive Work Behavior: 
Testing the Moderating Role of Depletion via a Quasi-Experimental Design

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB), defined as voluntary behavior that is detrimental to the organization or its members (Matta, Erol-Korkmaz, Johnson, & Biçaksız, 2014), can be very disadvantageous to organizations if no action is taken or if it is not addressed properly. In this context, the study of this phenomenon offers a key opportunity to help organizations predict, prevent and control CWB.

Scholars’ interest in CWB at work has been vast. Past research has shown that the experience of unfairness plays a key role in predicting CWB (Matta et al., 2014). Moreover, recent research suggests the connection between the depletion of self-regulatory resources (commonly referred to as ego-depletion, Baumeister, 2002) and unethical behavior (Kouchaki & Smith, 2014), suggesting that depletion may also relate to CWB. Little we know, however, about the consequences of the potential interaction between depletion and injustice on CWB. In this line of thought it is important to ask: when do employees react more strongly to injustice and, thus, show more CWBs? When they are depleted (i.e., the individual lacks the full capacity to regulate his or her thoughts, impulses, emotions, or other –automatic or learned– behavioral responses, compromising his or her willpower, self-discipline, and self-regulation; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Henden, 2008; Mischel, 1996; Vohs, 2006) or when they are not depleted (i.e., the individual has at his or her disposal a reservoir of self-control to regulate his or her affective, cognitive and behavioral reactions)? Answering this question, that is, determining the moderating role of depletion in the injustice-CWB relation, may offer important guidelines for the design of preventive interventions that aid organizations better deal with events where being fair is not always possible (e.g., when a supervisor has to inform a subordinate that the promotion he/she was waiting and working for is not going to open because of lack of resources).

In the present study, the main goal is to extend previous research by studying the moderating role of depletion in the relation between injustice and CWB, as depicted in
Figure 1. That is, we propose to test a moderation model that relate injustice perceptions and CWB, with depletion as a moderating variable. In this line, we believe the present study will make three contributions to the intersection between depletion, injustice and CWB. We address these contributions in the next paragraph.

First, we approach the relation between injustice and CWB using a quasi-experimental design, thus, providing a rigorous approach to the study of this phenomenon in comparison to traditional cross-sectional field research. Second, we extend the literature of CWB by considering not only injustice perceptions but also depletion. Finally, by extending the existing literature on CWB, we examine new potential lines of action that can be useful for designing interventions to strategically manage CWB at work.

Figure 1. Interaction effect between injustice perceptions (independent variable) and depletion (moderating variable) on CWB.

In summary, as depicted in Figure 1, our conceptual framework integrates research on CWB, injustice and depletion. In the sections to follow we review the literature and present our hypotheses.
Literature review

Counterproductive Work Behavior

As previously mentioned, counterproductive work behavior (CWB) can be defined as a voluntary behavior that is detrimental to the organization or its members (Matta et al., 2014; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006). These behaviors include both overt and more subtle acts like working slow on purpose (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Examples of these behaviors, which are strongly correlated with each other include: abuse, sabotage, production deviance, theft and withdrawal (for a recent meta-analysis see Marcus, Taylor, Hastings, Sturm, & Weigelt, 2016). The nature of these behaviors is a straightforward indication of the critical role CWB plays at work.

Noteworthy, according to the scientific literature, concepts like unethical behavior (Moore, Detert, Klebe, Baker, & Mayer, 2012) and destructive responses (Van Yperen et al., 2000) are no different to CWB if they are volitional and directed towards either the organization or persons within the organization.

To capture the full range of CWB, it is also important to note that these behaviors are often studied as the opposite to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). OCB refers to “behaviors which are not formally prescribed, but yet are desired by an organization” (Schnake, 1991, p. 736) and has also been shown to impact the organization effectiveness (e.g., Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). According to Dalal (2005), OCB can be regarded as the opposite of CWB because it is also volitional, but it improves (rather than harm) the organization.

In this study, we focus on three destructive behaviors taken from the circumplex model of responses (Hagedoorn, Van Yperen, Van de Vliert, & Buunk, 1999), also studied in Van Yperen et al. (2000). These are “exit” or leaving the organization, “neglect” (i.e. work less or slower on purpose), and “aggressive voice”, defined as an attempt to change a situation without consideration for the concerns of the organization (Hagedoorn et al., 1999). Together, these behaviors represent the darkest side of CWB.
Research examining the antecedents of CWB shows that several phenomena may play a part. These phenomena are generally related to social exchange processes (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), psychological contracts (e.g., Rousseau, 1989), and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). All these theoretical frameworks have one point in common: one way or another they all present organizational justice/injustice as a cornerstone. As we will explain in the next section, employees tend to retaliate against the unfairness they experience at work.

**Organizational Justice**

A narrow definition of justice defines it as “particular judgments concerning various types of events” that take place at work (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015, p. 379). According to Van Yperen et al. (2000), employees may perceive a decision to be unjust or unfair regarding the outcome of the decision, known as *distributive justice*; the formal procedures that lead to the outcome, known as *procedural justice*; and the way they feel treated by the authority, who is responsible of the decision, known as *interactional justice*.

Several studies have demonstrated that organizational justice is an important variable for organizational effectiveness. For instance, justice at work has been related to positive outcomes, such as high performance (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010), positive affect (Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999), and citizenship behaviors (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Injustice, on the other hand, has been related to negative outcomes, such as theft (Greenberg & Scott, 1996), absenteeism (Shapiralishchinsky & Rosenblatt, 2009), and even an increased possibility of suing former employers (Lind, Greenberg, Scott & Welchans, 2000). Different meta-analyses have confirmed the importance of fairness/unfairness at work (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng. 2001; Colquitt et al., 2013; Robbins, Ford & Tetrick, 2012).
The Relation Between Organizational Justice and CWB

CWB can be studied under the job stressors model (Fox et al., 2001), in which job stressors are “situations that elicit an adaptive response” (Jex & Beehr, 1991, as cited in Fox et al., 2001, p. 294). As this model suggests, certain work-related stressors (like role ambiguity) can elicit a negative emotional response (such as anger or anxiety) and this can lead to strain, which can be manifested psychologically (e.g. dissatisfaction), physically (e.g. headaches) or behaviorally (e.g. CWB). So, in this model, CWB would be an emotion-based response to stressful organizational conditions. Past research, as shown in the previous section, suggests that justice predicts CWB (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). That is, injustice may predict CWB because it acts as a job stressor (Fox et al., 2001; Van Yperen, et al., 2000). Based on this framework and the evidence gathered so far, we hypothesize the following.

Hypothesis 1: Injustice perceptions are positively related to CWB.

Depletion

In this research we address depletion from an ego-depletion perspective. Ego-depletion describes “the condition that arises when the self’s resources have been expended and the self is temporarily operating at less than full power” (Baumeister, 2002, p. 6). As explained by Friese, Loschelder, Gieseler, Frankenbach, and Inzlicht (2018), this construct refers to the strength model of self-control (Baumeister & Vohs, 2016), which suggests that “self-control relies on a limited and domain-independent resource that is partly depleted by any act of self-control, leaving the person more likely to fail in further attempts at self-control” (p. 2).

The effects of depletion can be observed on both physical (e.g. squeezing a handgrip exerciser) and cognitive tasks (e.g. solving a difficult puzzle), in which a depleted subject will perform worse on either task. In other words, as suggested by the strength model of self-control, the reduction of an individual’s resource (physical or mental) seems to play a crucial role in explaining depletion effects. Interestingly, the consequences of depletion are not limited to traditional physical nor cognitive tasks but
can be also observed in ethical situations (Gino, Schweitzer, Mead, & Ariely, 2011). For instance, Gino et al. (2011) found that depleted individuals were more likely to cheat. Then, since cheating is considered a form of CWB, we propose the following.

*Hypothesis 2: Depletion is positively related to CWB.*

**The Moderating Role of Depletion**

Organizations and managers do not have unlimited resources. Moreover, it is not uncommon for organizations and managers to face situations where they must rapidly adapt to the changing ties of the social, political and economic context. In this scenario it is not possible for organizations and managers to act always in a fair manner.

Now imagine a situation where an HR manager must inform an employee that he or she will not get the promotion he or she was aiming for, despite excelling on every criterion set *a priori*. The explanation they provide is simple: they do not have the necessary resources to offer the position at this moment. According to *Hypothesis 1* we expect this to translate into CWB.

Now imagine this employee receives this notice after spending an entire morning in front office dealing with customer complaints. In other words, the employee receives the notification after becoming—at least partially—depleted of his or her self-regulatory resources. How will he or she respond to the experience of unfairness? Not only has he or she experienced a job stressor stimulus in the form of injustice (i.e., not getting the promotion) but also has been depleted of the necessary resources to self-regulate (because he or she has been dealing with customer complaints). That is, he or she has become depleted and, thus, does not have at his or her disposal the self-regulatory coping mechanism to deal with the unfair experience.

Inzlicht and Schmeichel (2012) argue that after making use of self-control (which could be interpreted as becoming more depleted), people experience a shift in motivational orientation, which moves individuals towards acting on impulse; and attentional focus, which moves individuals towards looking for rewards. Following this
logic, we expect depletion to strengthen the positive relation between injustice and CWB.

*Hypothesis 3: Depletion moderates the positive relation between injustice perceptions and CWB, so that high depletion will strengthen this relation.*

**Objectives**

**General objective**
Extending previous research by studying the moderating role of depletion in the relation between injustice and CWB

**Specific objectives**

1) Examine how injustice perceptions are related to CWB.
2) Examine how depletion is related to CWB.
3) Examine how depletion interacts with injustice perceptions on CWB.

**Method**

**Sample**
We recruited 400 participants offering them $0.7 each, using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (“MTurk”), an online labor market where people can be asked to answer surveys, among other tasks (Paolacci & Chandler, 2014). The quality of the data obtained from MTurk is very similar to data collected using traditional routes (Paolocci & Chandler, 2014). Moreover, we took several steps to ensure the gathering of high-quality data. In this line, we followed multiple data contamination recommendations on MTurk (Ryan, 2018; Association for Psychological Science, 2018). To test if the respondents were paying attention, we included items that ended with “please do not
answer this question” along with some reading comprehension items for the justice/injustice vignette (see manipulation checks). To detect random answers, we analyzed response times, GPS coordinates to find duplicates, and verified that text answers were coherent to the question or task. Four-hundred and six participants completed the survey. The final sample after cleaning the data based on the criteria presented above consisted of 279 people: 141 males and 137 females, with a mean age of 42.1 years; and 90% were employed either full or part time and a 73.8% had at least a college degree.

**Design & Procedure**

We conducted a quasi-experimental study where we manipulated injustice and self-control depletion as predictors of CWB. We had four experimental conditions (2 x 2 design): injustice with depletion (N=74), injustice without depletion (N=79), justice with depletion (N=71) and justice without depletion (N=55). Participants were randomly assigned to these four groups.

The manipulation of injustice followed Van Yperen et al. (2000), which described, tested and validated a justice/injustice-vignette, originally designed by Barling and Phillips (1993). The manipulation included information regarding procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. We present the manipulation of justice in Table 1. As shown in this table, the justice condition included procedural, distributive and interactional justice events. In contrast, in the injustice condition, all events (procedural, distributive and interactional) were unfair. To manipulate depletion, we used a task developed and validated by Muraven, Shmueli and Burkley (2006). In the depleted condition, participants were asked to retype a 100-word text as quickly as they could. As originally designed, this task also indicated participants to retype the 100-word text without using the letter “e” or leaving blank spaces between words. In the non-depleted condition, participants weren’t asked to type anything.

A manipulation check was done following the justice/injustice vignette, to confirm whether the participants understood the situation we described. Also, several
control variables were measured: sleep quality, self-regulation, moral disengagement and negative affect.
Table 1

Manipulation of injustice (2 conditions: injustice versus justice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injustice condition</th>
<th>Justice condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Setting the scenario) Imagine yourself as an employee working at Division 1 of Company X, a company which sells telephones and faxes. Company X has to strengthen its market position because there are a lot of competitors in the Business Communications market at the moment. So, if Company X wants to remain on the Business Communications market, something needs to be done. Company X is currently arranging long-term strategies to maintain and strengthen its position on the market.

(Procedural injustice) After a comprehensive discussion among senior management, the company announced during a special meeting for all the employees that there would be an increase of duties for each employee in Division 1. So employees in Division 1 have to perform an additional task in addition to the tasks they are already performing.

(Distributive injustice) The additional task policy doesn't have a lot of consequences for the employees in Division 1. They keep the same salary and their future in the company remains uncertain as there is no guarantee that the additional task policy will strengthen the company's position on the market.

(Interactional injustice) After the announcement of the additional task policy you and your co-workers met briefly with your line manager who repeated the need for the additional task policy. There was no discussion about the need for the additional task policy, and your line manager did not listen to the concerns of you and your co-workers.

(Setting the scenario) Imagine yourself as an employee working at Division 1 of Company X, a company which sells telephones and faxes. Company X has to strengthen its market position because there are a lot of competitors in the Business Communications market at the moment. So, if Company X wants to remain on the Business Communications market, something needs to be done. Company X is currently arranging long-term strategies to maintain and strengthen its position on the market.

(Procedural justice) After negotiations between management and the union, both senior management and union representatives met with all employees and explained the need for some action. They jointly announced that there would be an increase of duties for each employee in Division 1. So employees in Division 1 have to perform an additional task in addition to the tasks they are already performing.

(Distributive justice) The additional task policy does have consequences for the employees in Division 1. Their salaries will rise 10% and their future in the company is safe, as there is a guarantee that the additional task policy will strengthen the company’s position in the market.

(Interactional justice) After the announcement of the additional task policy you and your co-workers met with your line manager who repeated the need for the additional task policy. After this, you and your co-workers had an open and honest discussion for an hour about the need for the additional task policy, during which your line manager listened to your concerns.
Measures

**Manipulation checks.** After reading the justice/injustice vignette, the participants were asked reading-comprehension questions replicated from Van Yperen et al. (2000), that served as manipulation checks for the three dimensions of justice considered in the vignette. Procedural justice: the respondents were asked if the decision to adopt task enlargement was made after (1) discussion among senior management, or (2) negotiation between senior management and union. Distributive justice: participants were asked if the consequences of task enlargement for the employees were (1) the same salary and an uncertain future in the company, or (2) a salary increase and a safe future in the company. Interactional justice: the participants had to indicate whether, in the meeting with the supervisor, (1) he or she only insisted on the need for task enlargement, not listening to workers’ concerns, or (2) he or she repeated the need for task enlargement but took the time to listen to workers’ concern. For the three questions above, participants in the injustice condition were expected to select the first answer to each item. Conversely, participants in the justice condition had to pick the second answers.

**Counterproductive Work Behavior.** To measure CWB, we used a destructive response scale (Hagedoorn et al., 1999) and asked participants how likely they would react to the situation described in the vignette. For instance, if they would intend to leave the organization, or start a fight with their supervisor. For the Exit, Neglect and Aggressive Voice subscales, Cronbach’s alphas were .94, .91 and .80, respectively.

**Control variables.** We controlled for several variables which have shown to be significantly related to the variables included in the proposed model.

**Sleep Quality.** To measure the participants’ sleep quality, we used two items, (1) “How well did you sleep last night?”, rated from 1 (“Very bad”) to 7 (“Very well”), and (2) “Last night, was your sleep restless or calm?”, with options ranging from 1 (“Very restless”) to 7 (“Very calm”). Cronbach’s alpha was .89.

**Moral Disengagement.** To assess the propensity to morally disengage, we used an 8-item scale developed and validated by Moore et al. (2012). Moral disengagement
can be defined as “an individual difference in the way that people cognitively process decisions and behavior with ethical import that allows those inclined to morally disengage to behave unethically without feeling distress.” (Bandura, 1990a, 1990b, 1999, 2002, as cited in Moore et al., 2012, p. 2) The response scale ranged from 1 to 7 and contained items like, “It is okay to spread rumors to defend those you care about.” The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .84.

*Self-Control.* This personality trait was measured using initiatory self-control items ($\alpha = .73$) (Riddler, de Boer, Lugtig, Bakker, & Van Hooft, 2011). An example item was “I am able to work effectively toward long-term goals.”

*Negative affect.* This was assessed by using the Negative Affect Schedule Scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1998), that asked participants to indicate to what extent they were feeling several emotions (e.g. distressed, upset, guilty) after reading the injustice/justice vignette. The response categories ranged from (1) *not at all* to (5) *extremely*. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .91.

**Results**

**Manipulation checks**

Cross-tabulation revealed that 37 participants responded incorrectly to more than one out of three manipulation checks. However, after removing participants due to criteria that suggested randomness answering (e.g. extremely short response time, incoherent answers to items that required participants to type), the number of observations removed due to incorrect responses to the comprehension check reduced to only eight.

**Hypotheses test**

Table 2 contains the means, standard deviations, and correlation among the variables examined in this study.
Table 2

**Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of all the Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sleep quality</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moral disengagement</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-38*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-47*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CWB - Exit</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CWB - Aggressive voice</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CWB - Neglect</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01.

Hypothesis 1 posited that injustice perceptions are positively related to CWB, which is the same as to say that justice perceptions are negatively related to CWB. The results provide preliminary support for this hypothesis since justice was negatively related to exit CWB (r = -.57, p < .01), aggressive voice CWB (r = -.27, p < .01), and neglect CWB (r = -.34, p < .01). The correlation between depletion and CWB was insignificant for exit (p = .87), aggressive voice (p = .46), and neglect (p = .23).

Table 3 presents the results of the multivariate regression models. As shown on this table, justice was significantly and negatively related to exit (B = -.89, p < .01) and neglect (B = -.34, p < .01), but was not significantly related to aggressive voice (B = -.19, p = .13). Thus, taken altogether, these results provide partial support for Hypothesis 1. Moreover, as also shown in Table 3, depletion was not related to exit (B = -.05, p = .7), nor to aggressive voice (B = .2, p = .87), nor to neglect (B = .11, p = .38), thus Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Finally, Hypothesis 3 stated that depletion moderates the positive relation between injustice perceptions and CWB. As shown in Table 3, none of the CWBs were
significantly related to the interaction between injustice and depletion (the \( p \) value for exit was .69, aggressive voice, .83, and for neglect, .66). Hence \textit{Hypothesis 3} was not supported.

Table 3
\textit{Multivariate regression of depletion and justice on three CWBs outcomes}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Exit</th>
<th>Aggressive Voice</th>
<th>Neglect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B ) ( (SE) )</td>
<td>( B ) ( (SE) )</td>
<td>( B ) ( (SE) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>-.89* (.15)</td>
<td>-.19 (.12)</td>
<td>-.34* (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>-.05 (.13)</td>
<td>.02 (.10)</td>
<td>.11 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep quality (cv)</td>
<td>.01 (.04)</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>.00 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral disengagement (cv)</td>
<td>.02 (.07)</td>
<td>.25* (.05)</td>
<td>.29* (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control (cv)</td>
<td>-.02 (.05)</td>
<td>.03 (.04)</td>
<td>-.03 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect (cv)</td>
<td>.46* (.08)</td>
<td>.33* (.06)</td>
<td>.34* (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice x depletion</td>
<td>.10 (.20)</td>
<td>.03 (.15)</td>
<td>-.06 (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \) | .43* | .31* | .36* |

\( n = 279; R^2 = \text{explained variance}; B = \text{unstandardized beta}; SE = \text{standard error}; cv = \text{control variable}; * p < 0.01. \)

\textbf{Complementary analysis}

Since evidence suggests that the effect of justice on CWB is mediated by negative affect (Fox et al., 2001; Van Yperen, et al., 2000), we tested an additional model with negative affect as the dependent variable (rather than a control variable). Noteworthy, as reported in Table 4, depletion was positively and significantly related to negative affect (\( B = .29, p < 0.05 \)), justice was negatively and significantly related to negative affect (\( B = -.66, p < 0.01 \)), and the effect of the interaction between depletion and justice on negative affect was marginally significant (\( B = -.27, p < 0.1 \)).
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>-.66*** (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>.29** (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep quality</td>
<td>-.03 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral disengagement (cv)</td>
<td>.10 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control (cv)</td>
<td>-.18*** (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice x depletion</td>
<td>-.27* (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .34*** \]

\( n = 279; R^2 = \text{explained variance}; B = \text{unstandardized beta}; SE = \text{standard error}; * p < 0.1; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01. \)

As presented on Figure 2, participants displaying the highest levels of negative affect were those assigned to both injustice and depleted conditions. On the other hand, the lowest levels of negative affect were experienced by those assigned to the justice condition, with no differences between the depleted and non-depleted conditions. In other words, depletion moderated the negative relation between justice perceptions and negative affect, and depleted participants presented a stronger negative relation than non-depleted participants.
Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, the main goal was to extend previous research by studying the moderating role of depletion in the relation between injustice and CWB. To do that, we conducted a quasi-experiment where we manipulated justice and depletion, using a sample collected via MTurk.

Hypothesis 1 suggested that injustice perceptions are positively related to CWB. The data supported this hypothesis, which was coherent to previous research (e.g. Van Yperen et al., 2000).

Regarding Hypothesis 2, we expected a positive relation between depletion and CWB. This hypothesis was not supported. The same was the case for Hypothesis 3: depletion did not strengthen nor weaken the relation between injustice perceptions and CWB.

Interestingly, complementary analyses using negative affect as the dependent variable (rather than a control variable) revealed that depletion moderates the negative relation between justice perceptions and negative affect, so that depleted participants presented a stronger relation. Note that this interaction between depletion and negative affect.

Figure 2. Interaction between justice and depletion on negative affect.
affect is only significant when an employee perceives to be treated unfairly. These later analyses are consistent with the justice literature, which suggest that the relation between injustice and CWB is mediated by negative affect (Fox et al., 2001; Van Yperen, et al., 2000). In other words, using negative affect as control variable of CWB may have been too stringent.

These findings contribute to Work and Organizational Psychology in different ways. On the one hand, we provide evidence supporting previous studies asserting the interplay between justice, negative affect and destructive responses (Fox et al., 2001; Van Yperen, et al., 2000). On the other hand, we call the attention of practitioners by providing evidence that shows that perceptions like injustice, tiredness and negative emotions can unleash behaviors detrimental to organizations. This is crucial since it is not always possible to avoid situations where employees will feel unfairly treated. In situations like this, where one can –sadly– estimate that employees will perceive unfair treatment, managers should be particularly cautious about the levels of depletion of their employees. If managers do not pay attention to this, they may promote increased negative emotional responses (e.g., anger) which could then translate into CWB (e.g., wanting to leave the organization).

This study presents several strengths. For instance, it used a quasi-experimental design, included several control variables, and the sample consisted of employees of all ages and backgrounds, which allowed us to have a more accurate representation of the workforce than previous studies. As every other, however, this research also presented some limitations.

For instance, a larger sample could have been useful to increase the statistical power of the analyses. Also, we used a vignette strategy to manipulate justice, which means that the study was conducted under a hypothetical nature. We suggest future research should include a more proximal indicator of CWB, such as a test where participants are actually able to cheat. This would increase the external validity of the findings. Further research should also include time of the day as an additional control variable; as employees are more tired, they seem to be more prone to engage in unethical
behaviors (Kouchaki & Smith, 2014). Another limitation lies in the use of “depletion”, since we address this concept from an ego-depletion perspective (Baumeister, 2002), and the available evidence regarding the existence of this effect is inconclusive (Friese et al., 2018). Nevertheless, this research contributes to this dilemma by demonstrating that depletion does play a role, at least, in the study of CWB.

Leaving the abovementioned limitations and suggestions aside, this study contributes to the strategical handling of counterproductive work behaviors. We hope this study helps practitioners and managers design and implement better interventions that consider employees’ experience and perceptions.
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Appendices

A. Online survey

Q199 Social Interactions At Work In this study, a team of work and organisational psychologists are interested in understanding the experience of work, the attitudes employees form, and reactions to various forms of social interactions in the workplace. The Research Team The team comprises a team of work and organisational psychologists: Mr. Javier Carrasco, M.Sc. in Work and Organisational Psychology student, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

Dr. Agustin Molina, Assistant Professor in Work and Organisational Psychology, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

Dr. Deirdre O’Shea, Chartered Psychologist and Lecturer in Work and Organisational Psychology, University of Limerick.

What’s involved in taking part? Taking part involves the following: Complete this online survey (approx. 15 minutes to complete survey) Contact Details: If you have questions about this study, please contact any of the following:

Mr. Javier Carrasco: jcarrasco@uc.cl  Dr. Agustín Molina: agustin.molina@uc.cl Informed and voluntary consent It is up to you whether to take part or not to take part. At the end of this page, you will be asked to consent to participate; however you can change your mind at any time and withdraw from the
Confidentiality All personal information will be anonymised in order to safeguard confidentiality. Personal information and electronic data will be held securely in line with the Data Protection Act (1998). Only the chief investigators will see any personal information and the other members of the research team will only be able to access anonymised data. What will happen to the results of the study? When the study is complete the key findings will be made available to all participants in a summary document. It is envisaged that the study will be submitted for publication in academic journals subsequently. However, all results will be presented in an aggregated format in order to adhere to the ethical considerations outlined above. Please indicate your consent to take part in this study.

○ I consent to take part in this research

○ I do not consent to take part in this research

End of Block: Informed consent

Start of Block: Descriptives
Q161
Please fill out the following demographic questions. Gender

○ Male

○ Female

○ Other (please specify)

__________________________________________________________________

○ Choose not to identify

Q162 Age

______________________________________________________________
Q164 Education Level

- Less than high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- 2 year degree
- 3 year degree
- 4 year degree
- Professional degree
- Masters degree
- Doctorate
Q165 Employment

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Unemployed looking for work
- Unemployed not looking for work
- Working from home
- Retired
- Student
- Disabled
- Other (please specify)

_____________________________________

Q166 Years of work experience

_____________________________________
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Q168 Sector of current or most recent employment

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting
- Mining
- Utilities
- Construction
- Computer and Electronics Manufacturing
- Other Manufacturing
- Wholesale
- Retail
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Publishing
- Software
- Telecommunications
- Broadcasting
Information Services and Data Processing
Other Information Industry
Finance and Insurance
Real Estate, Rental and Leasing
College, University, and Adult Education
Primary/Secondary (K-12) Education
Other Education Industry
Health Care and Social Assistance
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
Hotel and Food Services
Government and Public Administration
Legal Services
Scientific or Technical Services
Homemaker
Military

Religious

Other Industry (please specify)

Q197 What is your Mturk ID

End of Block: Descriptives

Start of Block: Self-Control

End of Block: Self-Control
Q216 For each of the following statements please select the answer that best describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am good at resisting temptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a hard time breaking bad habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do certain things that are bad for me, if they are fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refuse things that are bad for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I can’t stop myself from doing something, even if I know it is wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure and fun sometimes keep me from getting work done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have trouble concentrating

I am able to work effectively toward long-term goals

I often act without thinking through all the alternatives

I say inappropriate things

People would say that I have iron self-discipline

I wish I had more self-discipline

End of Block: Self-Control

Start of Block: Moral Disengagement
Q218 For each of the following questions please select the answer that best describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to spread rumors to defend those you care about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking something without the owner's permission is okay as long as you're just borrowing it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the ways people grossly misrepresent themselves, it's hardly a sin to inflate your own credentials a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People shouldn't be held accountable for doing questionable things when they were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just doing what an authority figure told them to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can't be blamed for doing things that are technically wrong when all their friends are doing it too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking personal credit for ideas that were not your own is not a big deal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers are more concerned with profitability than journalism. (please do not answer this item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are mistreated have usually done something to bring it on themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people have to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
treated roughly because they lack feelings that can be hurt

End of Block: Moral Disengagement

Start of Block: Time

Time What time is it? (for example, 11:30)

Time-am/pm Morning or afternoon?

○ AM

○ PM

End of Block: Time

Start of Block: Sleep Quality
sq_1 How many hours did you sleep last night?

________________________________________________________________

sq_2 How well did you sleep last night?

○ Very bad 1

○ 2

○ 3

○ 4

○ 5

○ 6

○ Very well 7
sq_3 Last night, was your sleep restless or calm?

- Very restless 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Very calm 7

End of Block: Sleep Quality

Start of Block: Depleting exercise

dxtime Timing
First Click
Last Click
Page Submit
Click Count
"The successor of Maximilian Frederick as the Elector of Bonn was Maximilian Francis, the youngest son of Empress Maria Theresa of Austria, and he brought notable changes to Bonn..."

"... Echoing changes made in Vienna by his brother Joseph, he introduced reforms based on Enlightenment philosophy, with increased support for education and the arts..."
...The teenage Beethoven was almost certainly influenced by these changes...

...He may also have been influenced at this time by ideas prominent in freemasonry, as Neefe and others around Beethoven were members of the local chapter of the Order of the Illuminati."
Q211

Please answer the following questions regarding the previous exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Slightly or Not All</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How unpleasant was that task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frustrating was that task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much were you fighting against an urge on that task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you have to control yourself on that task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How difficult was task in terms of the effort it required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q172 The remaining questions deal with the following scenario:

Imagine yourself as an employee working at Division 1 of Company X, a company which sells telephones and faxes. Company X has to strengthen its market position because there are a lot of competitors in the Business Communications market at the moment. So, if Company X wants to remain on the Business Communications market, something needs to be done. Company X is currently arranging long-term strategies to maintain and strengthen its position on the market.

After a comprehensive discussion among senior management, the company announced during a special meeting for all the employees that there would be an increase of duties for each employee in Division 1. So employees in Division 1 have to perform an additional task in addition to the tasks they are already performing. The additional task policy doesn’t have a lot of consequences for the employees in Division 1. They keep the same salary and their future in the company remains uncertain as there is no guarantee that the additional task policy will strengthen the company’s position on the market.

After the announcement of the additional task policy you and your co-workers met briefly with your line manager who repeated the need for the additional task policy. There was no discussion about the need for the additional task policy, and your line manager did not listen to the concerns of you and your co-workers.
Q175 With the scenario written above in mind, please answer the following questions: In the meeting with your supervisor

- [ ] your supervisor only repeated the need for an additional task. Your supervisor did not listen to your and your coworkers’ concerns

- [ ] your supervisor repeated the need for an additional task and took the time to listen to your and your coworkers’ concern

Q177 The consequences of an additional task for the employees personally are

- [ ] The same salary and their future in the company remains as unsure as it was

- [ ] A salary increase and their future in the company will be safe

Q179 The decision to adopt task enlargement was made after

- [ ] A comprehensive discussion among senior management

- [ ] Negotiation between senior management and union
Q173   The remaining questions deal with the following scenario: Imagine yourself as an employee working at Division 1 of Company X, a company which sells telephones and faxes. Company X has to strengthen its market position because there are a lot of competitors in the Business Communications market at the moment. So, if Company X wants to remain on the Business Communications market, something needs to be done. Company X is currently arranging long-term strategies to maintain and strengthen its position on the market. After negotiations between management and the union, both senior management and union representatives met with all employees and explained the need for some action. They jointly announced that there would be an increase of duties for each employee in Division 1. So employees in Division 1 have to perform an additional task in addition to the tasks they are already performing. The additional task policy does have consequences for the employees in Division 1. Their salaries will rise 10% and their future in the company is safe, as there is a guarantee that the additional task policy will strengthen the company’s position in the market. After the announcement of the additional task policy you and your co-workers met with your line manager who repeated the need for the additional task policy. After this, you and your co-workers had an open and honest discussion for an hour about the need for the additional task policy, during which your line manager listened to your concerns.
Q181 With the scenario written above in mind, please answer the following questions: In the meeting with your supervisor

- your supervisor only repeated the need for an additional task. Your supervisor did not listen to your and your coworkers’ concerns

- your supervisor repeated the need for an additional task and took the time to listen to your and your coworkers’ concern

Q183 The consequences of an additional task for the employees personally are

- The same salary and their future in the company remains as unsure as it was

- A salary increase and their future in the company will be safe
Q185 The decision to adopt an additional task was made after

☐ A comprehensive discussion among senior management

☐ Negotiation between senior management and union

End of Block: High Justice

Start of Block: Positive and negative Affect
Q205 By way of reminder imagine yourself working in Company X, the company that has just been described above. The company wants to strengthen their market position and therefore they have made the decision to enlarge the tasks of you and your co-workers.

Indicate to what extent you would feel each of the emotions stated below if you experienced the task enlargement decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Slightly or Not All</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored (Please, do not answer this item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: Positive and negative Affect

Start of Block: Destructive responses
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Q219 Imagine that you are in the situation in Company X and that task enlargement has been implemented in the way described in the scenario. Listed below are several statements. Indicate on the scales next to the statements how likely it is that you would react in the ways described?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Might or might not</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would consider the possibility of changing jobs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would actively look for a job outside the field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would intend to change employers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would actively look for a job within the field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would try to work out an ideal solution in collaboration with my supervisor</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would look for job advertisements to which I could apply</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would intend to change my field of work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would try to come to an understanding with my supervisor.

In collaboration with my supervisor, I would try to find a solution that is satisfactory to everybody.

Together with my supervisor, I would explore each other’s opinion’s until the problem is solved.

I would try to compromise with my supervisor.

I would talk with my supervisor about the problem until we reach a total agreement.

I would suggest solutions to my supervisor.

I would consider quitting my job. (Please do not)
answer this item)

I would immediately report the problem to my supervisor.

I would immediately try to find a solution.

I would try to think of different solutions to the problem.

I would ask my supervisor for a compromise.

I would trust the decision-making process of the organization without interference.

I would trust the organization to solve the problem without my help.

I would have faith that something like this would be taken care of by the organization without my contribution to
the problem-solving process

I would assume that in the end everything would work out

I would optimistically wait for better times

I would describe the problem as negatively as possible to my supervisor

I would try to win the case

I would deliberately try to make the problem sound more problematic than it is

I would be persistent with my supervisor in order to get what I want

I would start a 'fight' with my supervisor

I would try to prove in all possible ways to my supervisor that I am right
By definition, I would blame the organization for the problem.

I would report sick because I do not feel like working.

I would come in late because I do not feel like working.

I would put less effort into my work than may be expected of me.

Now and then, I would not put enough effort into my work.

I would miss out on meetings because I do not feel like attending.
Q38 Below are a number of statements that describe different feelings that you may feel right now. Please indicate to what extent you feel each of the following feelings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To the fullest extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My thinking process is slow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty concentrating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I'm not thinking clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I'm not focused in my thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty thinking about complex things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: Depletion scale