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Abstract: The operator of gas stations have an important role in providing services to consumers. Gas station owners have to look at the position as a provider of human resources that need to be considered. However, many gas station operators who feel injustice in terms of remuneration, distribution of working hours, job guarantees, and the treatment gas station owner. This study aimed to determine the effect of distributive injustice and interactional justice on job satisfaction and employee engagement. The object of this study was Pertamina gas station employee who served as an operator in Jakarta. Data were taken from 200 respondents who are gas stations operator of the five areas in Jakarta. The data in this study used the statistical method of SEM with LISREL statistical program. The results showed that perceptions of interactional justice have an influence on a job satisfaction gas stations operator, job satisfaction affects the employee engagement, and there is no relationship between distributive justices on job satisfaction.
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Gas station is a place where vehicles can obtain fuel oil (BBM). In Indonesia, the purchase of fuel at the pump serviced by a dispatcher who helped serve to fill the fuel into the tank of a vehicle and to receive payments. The task of the services provided by the operator of gas stations to customers shows their important role in maintaining the company’s image. Therefore, it should be the owner of the gas station to consider their position. Based on information obtained from the Community Operator Pertamina gas station in one of the social media, in fact, gas station operators do not earn a fair wage. In the forum, the operator of gas stations that work on different retail outlets and come from various regions in Indonesia complained about their wages that are below the minimum wage provincial/city minimum wage. Interestingly, they have admitted to receiving the city minimum wage if asked by the officer Disnakertrans.

Gas station owners provide low wages because they can not raise fuel prices to cover increases in operating costs if the wages of employees increased according to government regulations. Owners of gas stations have to follow the selling price set by Pertamina. Therefore, the gas station owner gives two options to workers that the wages set by the company or resign from the company. This makes the gas station operator has no other choice but to survive and accept whatever wage set by the
company for fear it difficult to find another job. Other injustices perceived by employees of the gas station is a high number of working hours which exceed government regulations. Among the members of the Community Operator Pertamina gas stations, some even up to 12 hours per day, which is almost equivalent to two sessions work schedule. Gas station operating hours is 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Therefore, gas station operators must be ready to be assigned in the early morning and in the days of national holidays.

Another thing that many complaints are still many gas station owners who implement the outsourcing system to its employees. Most of the gas station operator who complained status as outsourced employee is an employee of private gas stations, which are manifold Codo (Company Owned Dealer Operated) and DODO (Dealer Owned Dealer Operated), while operator-owned Pertamina gas stations that manifold COCO status of permanent employees. Although not all private gas stations using outsourcing, but the fact that this system is the system most preferred by the majority of owners of private gas stations. Outsourcing system makes the company owner feel freer to terminate the employee at any time for various reasons. In addition, the owner of the company was not obliged to fulfill the rights of employees as appropriate to outsourced employees. It will lead to complaints from operators because they feel unfairly treated, especially for those who have long worked in the gas station.

If a company or organization does not take action on the above situation, it will have serious consequences for the company. Employees who feel unfairly treated can perform negative actions. The demonstrations as often happen in Indonesia is one form of rebellion employees for the injustice they feel. More than that, they can go on strike, sweeping, and act anarchist. Employees who do not feel any justice in the workplace (organizational justice) would feel dissatisfied with her job. They will not be satisfied (job satisfaction) if their rights are not met. According to Vokie and Hernaus (2015), job satisfaction illustrates how much an employee like or dislike his work influenced on how large the work environment to meet their needs match what is expected. Employees who are satisfied with the job then in him will arise engagement (engagement) to work. Job satisfaction has the potential to increase engagement Work (Vokie and Hernaus, 2015). Low levels of engagement characterized by the level of dedication, loyalty, and employee commitment and a lack of a sense of belonging and a sense of pride in their workplace.

Based on the phenomenon that happened recently regarding the demonstrations by workers demanding justice, researcher interest to study the effect of organizational justice among laborers or workers, which is generally a contract or outsourced employees. Researchers restricted the research on aspects of distributive justice and interactional justice. In this study, procedural justice is not included within the scope of the study as an object of research are workers or workers with a system of human resources is very simple, both in terms of recruitment, contracts, and salaries. There is no procedure or a complex system that needs to be observed and become a concern for the workers at this level. This study was conducted at several gas stations in several areas of Jakarta. The reason for choosing gas station is because researchers wanted to examine perceptions of fairness at the operator level workers who are mostly outsourced personnel. The interest of researchers is because it has not found previous studies on the fairness of the organization, especially regarding distributive justice and interactional justice committed against outsourcing employees at the gas station. In fact, the authors saw a lot of problems in the gas station, which is likely caused by workers’ discontent against the owners of the company as a result of the perception of injustice (unfair perception) among workers. Problems that occur at the gas station risking big name companies or individuals who manage the gas station. It is very important for gas station owners to provide assurance to customers that the retail outlets that they manage not cheating in business. Therefore, the authors are interested in doing research from the standpoint of human resources for finding solutions to problems that arise.

The purpose of this study was to determine the views of justice were perceived gas stations operators, both in terms of remuneration as well as the relationship with the owner of the company and its relationship with job satisfaction and work attachment at gas stations operator. With this study is expected to gas
stations make the findings of this as a study of its human resources, especially to operators who deal directly in providing services to customers.

RESEARCH METHOD

Hypothesis

Based on previous studies, researchers set the following hypotheses:

H1 : Distributive Justice positive effect on job satisfaction
H2 : Interactional Justice positive effect on job satisfaction
H3 : Job Satisfaction positive effect on Work Engagement

Operationalization of Research Variables

In this study, the variables of distributive justice using indicators Niehoff and Moorman (1993), which consists of five indicators that are work schedule, salary levels, workload, rewards and work responsibilities. Similarly justice interactional use indicators Niehoff and Moorman (1993), which consists of nine indicators, which relates to treatment of boss that is a good treatment, treatment polite and dignified, sensitivity boss, honest attitude boss, considerate boss, be involved in decision making, reasoning about the decision is made, an explanation of the decisions made and a detailed explanation of the decision made. Job satisfaction variables using dimensions Hackman and Oldham (1980), which consists of four dimensions that are job guarantee, compensation, co-workers, and supervision. Work engagement is measured by using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Uwes) built by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), which consists of four dimensions, namely vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Data collection

The data collection is done by distributing questionnaires addressed to 320 operators at some gas stations are spread in Jakarta. But 120 pieces of questionnaires declared invalid for various reasons, bringing the total questionnaires used were as many as 200 pieces.

Techniques Used

This study used descriptive statistics and format uses a quantitative approach. Analysis of the data in this study using statistical methods Statistical Equation Modeling (SEM) with LISREL statistical program. Do some testing, among others validity, reliability test, and fit model test.

RESULTS

Validity and Reliability Test

Validity test results to items the question of the study variables is presented in Table 1. In the table, it can be seen that the measuring instrument used is valid with KMO value > 0.5. Dimensions to be used for each variable in the model studies also have to meet the validity. Reliability test results of measuring instruments used in this study can be seen that each dimension of the variables tested in the research model has been qualified by Cronbach’s Alpha values > 0.6. Therefore, it can be concluded that all indicators every existing variable in the research model is reliable and can be used for further analysis.

Analysis of Measurement Model

From Figure 1 it can be seen that all the observed variables have Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) > 0.50, which means that all the observed variables valid. Similarly, out of the picture can be seen that the RMSEA of 0.044 ≤ 0.08 which shows the overall goodness of fit has been good. Value Goodness of Fit Index (GOFI) on Latent Variable Measurement Model shows that the p-value = 0.13511 and RMSEA = 0.044, which means that the latent variable measurement model has been good. To test the validity and reliability of the measurement of latent variable models, can use the value of SFL and error variances. Based SFL in Figure 1 can be concluded that the validity of all the variables observed the latent variable has been good. The evaluation of the reliability of the measurement model can be calculated by using the composite reliability measure (size reliables composite) and extracted variance measure (extract size variants). In Table 2 it can be seen that the composite reliability (CR) of the four latent variables already meet the standards ≥ 0.70 so it can be said
to be reliable. Another way to measure the reliability is to use variance extracted (VE) with a standard value of suitability should be \( \geq 0.50 \). As shown in Table 2, the value of the variable VE for distributive justice and interactional justice respectively is 0.5, which means the two variables is reliable. However, for variable work engagement and job satisfaction VE values were obtained respectively 0.41 and 0.42 which means below the suitability standard. However, the calculation method using variance extracted (VE) is optional or not required (Hair, et al., 2006), so that researchers simply view of the value of CR as a measure of reliability.

### Analysis of Structural Model

The estimation results of the structural model research model shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3 for the value of \( t \) and for standard solutions. Based on the Value GOFI (Goodness of Fit Indices) to the structural model of the model study concluded that overall structural model has a pretty good match.

### Suitability Analysis of Structural Model

Hypothesis test results showed that two of the three research hypotheses prove their significant relationships pad 95% confidence level with a \( t \)-value > 1.96. Table 3 is the conclusion of the test the hypothesis that accompanied the estimated regression coefficients.

### DISCUSSION

#### Analysis Hypothesis 1: Effect of Distributive Justice on Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis test results showed Hypothesis 1 (H1) was rejected because the \( t \)-value is 1.57, which means <1.96. Rejection H1 showed no significant relationship between the variables of distributive justice and job satisfaction at the gas station operator. Researchers further analyzed based on the information obtained through interviews with some respondents. Investigators arrested that gas station operator was treated unfairly by the owner of the company. Injustice they feel, among others in the distribution of working hours during which at some gas stations only operator team division is divided into two shifts so that they have to work up to 12 hours per day. In addition, the operators complain of low wages and not in accordance with the provisions of the applicable rule. Another thing is the gas station operator complaint is regarding health insurance and overtime pay. Injustice is commonly found in some gas stations that manifold CODO Pertamina and DODO.

#### Analysis Hypothesis 2: Effect of Interactional Justice on Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis test results showed Hypothesis 2 (H2) at accepted because \( t \)-value was 3.99, which means > 1.96. Proved that there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction at the gas station operator. Based on the information we have obtained through interviews with some of the Pertamina gas station operators is that the direct supervisor who oversees their work was considered quite good, attentive and willing to help when they encounter problems, such as a strike from customers. Generally, operators feel comfortable job satisfaction because of the attitude of supervisors who supervise and assess their work. Supervisors often give guidance so that the operator can work better, and never be rude or abusive. Researchers considered that a sense of fairness in terms of relations with superiors (interactional fairness) are perceived by Pertamina gas station operator so important it can lead to complacency in employees themselves to their work. Interactional fairness perception describes feeling appreciated being treated decently and with dignity, paid their rights, are described as well as involved in decisions by their superiors. For some people, relationships and good treatment by superiors who thus make them comfortable with the company. So the flavors can not be measured financially helps raise job satisfaction as proved in a study of Pertamina’s gas stations.

#### Analysis Hypothesis 3: Effect of Job Satisfaction on Job Engagement

Hypothesis test results showed Hypothesis 3 (H3) is accepted as \( t \)-value is 5.38, which means > 1.96. Proved that there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction at the gas
| Variable            | Dimension | Items | Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha | KMO  |
|---------------------|-----------|-------|-------------|------------------|------|
| Distributive Justice|           | D1    | 0.358       | 0.752            | 0.721|
|                     |           | D2    | 0.617       |                  |      |
|                     |           | D3    | 0.513       |                  |      |
|                     |           | D4    | 0.503       |                  |      |
|                     |           | D5    | 0.520       |                  |      |
|                     |           | IJ1   | 0.683       | 0.895            | 0.870|
|                     |           | IJ2   | 0.643       |                  |      |
|                     |           | IJ3   | 0.630       |                  |      |
|                     |           | IJ4   | 0.695       |                  |      |
| Interational Justice|          | IJ5   | 0.673       |                  |      |
|                     |          | IJ6   | 0.689       |                  |      |
|                     |          | IJ7   | 0.688       |                  |      |
|                     |          | IJ8   | 0.657       |                  |      |
|                     |          | IJ9   | 0.576       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SC1   | 0.161       | 0.682            | 0.688|
|                     |          | SC2   | 0.372       |                  |      |
| Security            |          | SC3   | 0.501       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SC4   | 0.362       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SC5   | 0.569       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SC6   | 0.546       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CP1   | 0.836       | 0.926            | 0.858|
|                     |          | CP2   | 0.804       |                  |      |
| Compensation        |          | CP3   | 0.825       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CP4   | 0.803       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CP5   | 0.745       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CP6   | 0.727       |                  |      |
| Job Satisfaction    |          | CW1   | 0.663       | 0.856            | 0.846|
|                     |          | CW2   | 0.756       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CW3   | 0.745       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CW4   | 0.546       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CW5   | 0.656       |                  |      |
|                     |          | CW6   | 0.516       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SV1   | 0.688       | 0.879            | 0.844|
| Supervision         |          | SV2   | 0.718       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SV3   | 0.801       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SV4   | 0.679       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SV5   | 0.676       |                  |      |
|                     |          | SV6   | 0.572       |                  |      |
| Vigor               |          | VG1   | 0.397       | 0.723            | 0.680|
|                     |          | VG2   | 0.531       |                  |      |
|                     |          | VG3   | 0.412       |                  |      |
|                     |          | VG4   | 0.417       |                  |      |
|                     |          | VG5   | 0.576       |                  |      |
|                     |          | VG6   | 0.461       |                  |      |
| Work Engagement     | Dedication| DD1   | 0.345       | 0.631            | 0.663|
|                     |          | DD2   | 0.482       |                  |      |
|                     |          | DD4   | 0.365       |                  |      |
|                     |          | DD5   | 0.483       |                  |      |
|                     |          | AB1   | 0.333       | 0.700            | 0.643|
| Absorption          |          | AB2   | 0.461       |                  |      |
|                     |          | AB3   | 0.522       |                  |      |
|                     |          | AB4   | 0.480       |                  |      |
|                     |          | AB5   | 0.414       |                  |      |
|                     |          | AB6   | 0.426       |                  |      |
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Gambar 1. Diagram Lintasan Basic Model – Standardized Solution

Table 2. Table Test Reliability Measurement Model Research

| Variabel                  | CR    | VE    | Reliability Conclusion |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| Distributive Justice       | 1.00  = 0.70 | 0.50 = 0.50 | Good                  |
| Interactional Justice      | 1.00  = 0.70 | 0.50 = 0.50 | Good                  |
| Work Engagement            | 0.73  = 0.70 | 0.41 = 0.50 | Good                  |
| Job Satisfaction           | 0.80  = 0.70 | 0.42 = 0.50 | Good                  |

Table 3. Conclusion Hypothesis

| hypothesis | Tracks Between Latent Variables | T-count value | Coefficient | Significance Test Results | Conclusion |
|------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|
| H1         | Distributive Justice → Job Satisfaction | 1.57          | 0.11        | Not significant           | rejected   |
| H2         | Interactional Justice → Job Satisfaction | 3.99          | 0.30        | Significant               | accepted   |
| H3         | Job Satisfaction → Work Engagement    | 5.38          | 0.47        | Significant               | accepted   |

$t$-count value is expected $t \geq 1.96$

coefficient obtained from standardized trajectory path diagram solution

station operator. Researchers analyzed that job satisfaction felt by the operator Pertamina gas station in Jakarta, especially those arising from good relationships with colleagues and good treatment from superiors, make them feel tied to the company where they work. In interviews with several operators, they express a sense of excitement when working and enjoy a task that becomes responsibilities. In addition, the operator can assess her work is important because it helps customers who need fuel. They also assess the work fun because it gives the opportunity to meet many people and can banter with coworkers in between
jobs. Things that depicts the carrier expressed a sense of attachment to the job.

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

**Conclusion**

Although many gas stations operators feel the injustice because of low wages, long working time and employment status that does not guarantee its sustainability in the future, but there are other aspects that can lead to complacency in themselves. Other aspects of work that lead to job satisfaction among Pertamina gas station operator is a good relationship with co-workers and supervisor attitudes and behavior that is considered positive and very helpful in the implementation work. Job satisfaction perceived filling station operator can create bonds towards work. The second aspect of job satisfaction (coworkers and supervision) can form Pertamina gas station operator attachment to their workplace. Work engagement is
realized with high morale, a sense of pride to the duties in providing services to customers as well as enjoying the time spent working with colleagues good and supervisors who provide comfort in work.

**Suggestion**

Although satisfaction with the work can arise even though the reward received lower gas station operators and the lack of job security, but it is important for every business owner to pay attention to the rights of employees. If the company does not fulfill the rights of employees, it can lead to a negative perception, especially regarding the sense of justice. In addition, employees’ rights are protected by the government through labor legislation. Any violation in the fulfillment of these rights may be penalized. It is suggested to the boss and supervisors behave well and be fair to subordinates. Moreover, in this study, as well as some previous research, it is evident that the boss who treats his subordinates are polite, dignified and caring can affect employee satisfaction. Bosses who despise his subordinates and did not involve them in decision-making is considered to be fair. This can impact on dissatisfaction the employees themselves. Therefore, it is important for employers to keep their attitudes and behavior and to provide correct information related to the decisions taken.
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