

The Influence of Perceived Organizational Support and Leader Member Exchange Against Counter-Productive Work Behaviors on Civil Servants in Organization X

Mochammad Zainuddin Arif¹, Pinky Saptandari Endang Pratiwi² and Dewi Retno Suminar³

¹Postgraduate, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

³Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

Keywords: Perceived Organizational Support, Leader Member Exchange, Counter-Productive Work Behavior.

Abstract: This study aimed to determine the influence between Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) to Counter Productive Behavior on civil servants in Organization X. This study used a quantitative approach. The number of respondents in this study is 271 employees with civil servant status who have the position of executor. Based on the result of the research, the result of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) has negative effect on counterproductive work behavior either simultaneously or partially. In addition, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) had an effect of 84.1% on counter-productive work behaviors. Dimension of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) such as dimension of Perceived Fairness of Treatment, dimension of Perceived Supervisor Support, and dimension of Perceived Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions, Affect dimension, loyalty dimension, and professional respect dimension have a significant effect on counter-productive work behavior. On the other hand, the contribution dimension does not affect the counter-productive work behavior.

1 INTRODUCTION

Negative work behaviors such as frequent truancy, gossip during effective working hours, prolonged rest time, to more often using internet to find information that has nothing to do with work, give negative effects for the organization. Negative work behaviors done by employees that harm the organization is called counter-productive work behavior. Spector and Fox (2005) describe counter-productive work behaviors as a set of voluntary behaviors aimed at harming organizational and organizational stakeholders, such as clients, co-workers, customers and superiors. Ulker (2013, in Octavia, 2016) explained that counter-productive work behavior is influenced by two factors, namely individual factors and organizational factors. One of the organizational factors is Perceived Organizational Support, while individual factor is how the quality of Leader Member Exchange between leader and member.

Perceived organizational support (POS) is to reward employees' contributions, hear employee complaints, feel proud of the performance results or achievements of employees and meet employee needs (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The treatment of organizations to the employees will foster a certain level of trust among them which can be seen from the valuation of employee's contribution and the care about the employee's wellbeing.

Meanwhile, Leader Member Exchange (LMX) is how a leader and member develop a harmonious relationship that creates a positive relationship. When the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) quality are developed better, then the leaders will show positive behaviors so that they will be able to work productively. On the other hand, if the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) quality is worse, it will lead to less productive behavior of the workers (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007).

Based on the explanation of the issues, the authors are interested to conduct a research related

to the influence of Perceived Organizational Support and Leader Member Exchange to Behavior Counter Productive Work in the environment of the organization x. It is important to see which independent variables are more influential on counter-productive work behavior.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Counter-Productive Work Behavior

Counter-productive work behavior is a series of voluntary behaviors which aims to harm organization and organizational stakeholders, such as clients, co-workers, customers and superiors. Spector and Fox (2005) pointed out that counter-productive work behaviors can be in the form of abusive behavior toward others, aggression (verbal or non-verbal), deliberately making mistakes during work, sabotage, theft and withdrawal (absence, coming late and out of organization).

2.2 Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is a support with a global belief about the extent to which the organization assesses contributions, concerns about welfare, listens to complaints, takes care of life and considers objectives to be achieved and can be trusted to treat employees fairly. Perceived Organizational Support (POS) consists of three dimensions, namely Perceived Fairness of Treatment dimension, Perceived Supervisor Support

dimension, and Perceived Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions dimension (Eisenberger, 2001).

2.2 Leader Member Exchange

Sparrowe and Liden (in Palacios Jr., 2010) explained that the Leader Member Exchange consists of three components: the leader who is the boss (supervisor), the member who is the subordinate of the supervisors, and the exchange that describes the number of mutual interaction between both parties, such as sharing suggestions and making friends, as well as the frequency and quality of communication between two parties. According to Dienesch & Liden (in Carlos, 2010 and Palacios Jr, 2010), Leader Member Exchange has four dimensions: affect, loyalty, contribution, professional respect.

3 METHOD

Sampling method used in this study is Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling technique of total population of 897. At the end, there are 271 samples used in this research.

The research instrument to collect data used by writer is the SPOS questionnaire containing 36 items and has a reliability value of 0.936 to measure Perceived Organizational Support (POS), LMX-S questionnaire containing 12 items and has a value reliability of 0.925 to measure Leader Member Exchange (LMX) as well as CWB-C questionnaire containing 32 items and has a reliability value of 0.949 for measuring counter-productive work behavior.

Table 1: Regression table.

Variable	Counter Productive Work Behavior										B	t	p	F	R ²
	Abuse		Sabotage		Theft		Production Deviance		Withdrawal						
	R	p	R	p	R	p	R	p	R	p					
Constant											125.002	70.347	.000		
Perceived Organizational Support & Leader member Exchange	.765	.000	.566	.000	.732	.000	.556	.000	.626	.000			.000	706.809	.841
Perceived Organizational Support Percvd.	-.868	.000	-.747	.000	-.842	.000	-.737	.000	-.771	.000	-.580	-26.48	.000		.828
Fairness Percvd.	-.821	.000	-.797	.000	-.809	.000	-.694	.000	-.763	.000	-1.019	-10.18	.000	462.854	.771
Supervisor Support Percvd.	-.821	.000	-.660	.162	-.772	.000	-.697	.000	-.682	.109	-.472	-5.760	.000		.712
Reward & Job Condition	-.787	.003	-.650	.507	-.778	.000	-.672	.035	-.719	.001	-.306	-3.661	.000		.684
Leader Member	-.621	.000	-.392	.000	-.639	.000	-.541	.000	-.615	.000	-.280	-4.675	.000		.424

<i>Exchange</i>															
<i>Affect</i>	-.472	.886	-.322	.410	-.497	.619	-.449	.185	-.477	.951	-.580	-2.533	.012	53.502	.255
<i>Loyalty</i>	-.583	.004	-.366	.132	-.607	.000	-.505	.028	-.580	.004	-.808	-2.593	.010		.374
<i>Contribution</i>	-.572	.158	-.342	.980	-.560	.994	-.479	.673	-.575	.052	-.259	-.773	.440		.350
<i>Professional Respect</i>	-.603	.000	-.374	.023	-.625	.000	-.504	.004	-.575	.003	-.778	-2.818	.005		.392

4 RESULT

Based on the calculations performed, a significance value of 0.000 (<0.05) is obtained then H0 rejected. Thus, partially Perceived Organizational Support influences ($R^2=0.828$) on Counter-Productive Work Behaviors (has a negative effect). Perceived Organizational Support (POS) affects the counter-productive work behavior without any other variables. For Leader Member Exchange variables, a significance value of 0.000 (<0.05) is obtained then H0 rejected. Thus partially Leader Member Exchange has an effect ($R^2=0.424$) on Counter-Productive Work Behaviors (have negative effect)

For the simultaneous test, the significance value is 0.00 <0.05 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This indicates that Perceived Organizational Support and Leader Member Exchange simultaneously or together have an effect ($R^2=0.841$) on Counter-Productive Work Behaviors.

5 DISCUSSION

The results of this study support the previous studies such as researches conducted by Fox, et al (2001), Devonish & Greenidge (2010), Mingzheng, et al (2014), Novrianti & Claudius (2014), and Rauf (2015). Abas, et al. (2016) in his research explained that Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Counter Productive Behavior have interaction relations that affect each other. The role of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) means that the low

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) will create a high enough risk or trend towards the emergence of Counter Productive Behavior. The emergence of an unproductive behavior is based on how donations or organizational support are owned by employees. An organization's support will form a positive perception if the support is high, and will instead form a negative perception if the support tends to be low. From the employee's perception then an employee will bring up a certain work behavior. Behavior productive work will be formed from a positive perception and vice versa, Work Behavior Counter Productive will be formed from a negative perception.

Furthermore, results on leader member exchange also support the pre-existing studies such as researches conducted by Bauer, et al (2006); Dunegan, et al (2002); Janssen & Van Yperen, (2004); Kacmar, et al (2003); Liden, et al (1993); Schriesheim, et al (1998); Wang, et al (2005).

The interaction between leaders and employees is not entirely only in the cash and carry, or transactional relationships, *i.e.* restoring the assistance provided. The interaction has done social exchange, an exchange of emotions and mutual influence between individuals. The exchange is evidenced by the presence of help and as well as communication provided and performed not only for the work but also the personal problems of the employees. With the exchange of emotions and mutual influence has been done by distributing the leader's value of working optimally and emphasize the value of discipline so that a negative behavior will be controlled. Negative behaviors that can be controlled are such as high absenteeism, work at will, not responding to work, selfish, problem-solving in case of problems, avoidance of duties, or other unproductive behaviors (Suyani & Remiayasa, 2016).

This study also provides information that the three dimensions possessed by Perceived Organizational Support (POS) has significant influence or contribution to the counter work behavior productive. In addition, the Perceived Fairness of Treatment dimension has the strongest influence in predicting counterproductive work behavior. For the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) dimension, there are three dimensions that have a significant influence on counter-productive work behavior, and the largest contribution was contributed by Professional Respect dimension. However, the contribution dimension has no effect. This is contrary to Liden and Maslyn's (1998) research in which they explained that the four dimensions of Leader Member Exchange (LMX) have an influence on counter-productive work behavior.

This can be due to the leadership style used. With the leadership model, a pattern of relationships developed will be different. Leaders who have a transformational style will further develop an intense relationship than those who have the transactional style. The concept discusses that leadership

orientation cannot only be seen on the job-only basis (task-oriented), but also interpersonally (employee-oriented). However, it is possible that an employee tends to prioritize or build relationships in a work / professional value. This is because they are more comfortable with a relationship that is not too deep and does not interfere with their personal affairs so that they can work productively and consider the relationship too deeply will have a negative impact on their work, although they also need a positive affective relationship between employers and employees (Hutama & Goenawan, 2017).

6 CONCLUSION

There is a negative influence between Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) on counter-productive work behavior of civil servants in Organization X, both partially and simultaneously. Also, there are influences from the three dimensions of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) on counter-productive work behavior, where Perceived Fairness of Treatment has the greatest contribution to the emergence of counter-productive work behavior.

In addition, in Leader Member Exchange (LMX) dimension there is influence of the three dimension to Counter-Productive Work Behaviors. However, the Contribution dimension does not give effect to Counter-Productive Work Behaviors. As well as of the three influential dimensions, the Professional Respect dimension has the greatest contribution to the emergence of counter-productive work behavior.

REFERENCES

- Abas, C., Omar, F., Halim, F.W., Hafidz, Sarah W.M. (2016). The role of Emotional Tiredness and Self-Esteemed Vote of the Organization in Relation between Organizational Support and Non-Productive Work Behavior. *Journal of Constitution* 48 (2016) 73 - 88. Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, University Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Bauer, T.N., & Erdogan, B. (2015). Leader-member exchange (lmx) theory. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 13 (2), 641-647.
- Carlos, J. (2010). The relationship of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leader member exchange in predicting turnover intentions of front line retail managers in the auto parts industry. Dissertation of Argosy University. ProQuest database.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86.
- 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, 291-309.
- Hutama, Patrick., Gunawan, Rocky. (2017). Effect of Leader Member Exchange on Employee Performance at Hotel X Surabaya. Faculty of Economics, Petra Christian University. Vol 05. No. 2.
- Kacmar, K.M., Witt, L.A., Zivnuska, S., Gully, S.M. (2003). The Interactive Effect of Leader Member Exchange and Communication Frequency on Performance Ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 764-772.
- Kreitner, R. Kinicki, A. (2007) *Organizational Behavior* (7 ed). New York: McGraw-hill. Dialed by Erly Suandy. Jakarta. Publisher Salemba Four.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S.J., & Stiwell, D. (1993). A Longitudinal Study on The Early Development of Leader-Member Exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78: 662-674.
- Liden, R.C., & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of Leader-Member Exchange: An Empirical Assessment through Scale Development. *Journal of Management*, 24 (1), 43-72.
- Mingzheng, Wu, Sun Xiaoling, Fu Xubo, Liu Youshan. (2014). Moral Identity as a Moderator of the Effects of Organizational Injustice on Counterproductive Work Behavior among Chinese Public Servants. *Public Personnel Management*.
- Novrianti, D., Claudius, B.S. (2014). The Role of Transformational Leadership as a Moderating Variable for the Relationship of Justices and Counter-Productive Work Behavior at the Public Organization. Tokyo Business Research Conference, Tokyo.
- Palacios Jr, J.A. (2010). Job role ambiguity as a mediator between workplace communication and positive work outcome. Thesis. California State University. ProQuest database.
- Rauf, F.H. Abdul. (2015). Behind Emotion: Organizational Injustice Practices As a Key Antecedent of Counterproductive Work Behaviors. 5th International Symposium 2015.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L., Cogliser, C.C. (1999). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Research: A Comprehensive Review of Theory, Measurement, and Data AnalyticPractices. *Leadership Quarterly*.
- Spector, P.E., Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. In S. Fox & P.E. Spector (Eds), *Counterproductive work behavior. Investigation of actors and targets*. Washington DC.
- Suyani, Y.E., Remiasa, M. (2016). Descriptive Analysis Implement Leader Member Exchange at Lippo Plaza

Batu. Journal of Business Management Program.
AGORA Vol. 4, No. 2.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., Chen, Z.
X. (2005). Leader-Member Exchange as a Mediator of
the Relationship between Transformational Leadership
and Followers' Performance and Organizational
Citizenship Behavior. Academy of Management
Journal.

