

Are There Relationship among Stressor, Behavior, and Employee Performance? A Case of Civil Servants in Bantul, DIY, Indonesia

Muafi^{a,*}, Ninik Probosari^a and Anis Siti Hartati^a

^aManagement Department, Economics and Business Faculty, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

High stressors can be experienced by employees, both by civil servants and private sector employees. This could have an impact on the positive and negative behaviors of employees and could eventually affect employee performance. The purpose of this study is to examine and analyze the effect of stressors on deviant behavior (negative and positive) and work performance of civil servants in Bantul, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. This research is a survey research using questionnaires given in private to civil servants as respondents, with a purposive sampling technique. Research results concluded that; (1) stressor of individual and task demands has a significant positive effect on negative behavior, (2) stressor of role demand has no significant effect on negative behavior, (3) stressor of individual demand has a significant negative effect on positive behavior, (5) stressor of task demand has no significant effect on positive behavior, (6) stressor of role demand has no significant effect on positive behavior, (7) negative attitudes have a significant negative effect on employee performance, and (8) positive behaviors have a significant positive effect on employee performance.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Stressor, behavior, employee performance

**Corresponding author:*

muafi2013@gmail.com
(Kenneth Högholm)

Article History

Received 22 03 2016

Revised 25 04 2016

Accepted 27 7 2016

**Previously Published in EJEM, 2016, Volume 3 number 2

1. INTRODUCTION

Stress is a condition that can be created by an environmental change which was accepted as a challenge, threaten, or breaking the balance of a person's life. Stress is mostly defined by just observing the stimulus or response experienced by someone (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). According to Robbins (2005) stress is "a dynamical condition in which the individual face the opportunities, obstacles, or demands that are related to what is very broad and the results are perceived as something uncertain but important". Stress can hit anyone either a private employee or a government employee. The condition that caused stress is called a stressor (Handoko, 1995). There are two kinds of stressor according to Barney and Griffin (1992), the stressor which is related with work (organizational stressor) and the stressor which is not related with work (non work stressor).

This research was carried out in Bantul Regency where was chosen as the object of the research because according to the survey results, this regency has a score value of performance management civil servants 52 (low) whereas the highest score is 80. This indicates that the performances of civil servants of Bantul was still far behind, compared with the performances of the civil servants of Sleman Regency (score 61) and Kulon Progo Regency (score 61) (Pusat Kajian Otonomi Daerah, 2012). This condition could have been caused the presence of stressor that is experienced by the employee. High stressor can cause employees to have an increase in positive and negative behavior either in the work surroundings or outside and in the end it could have an impact on the employees' performance.

2. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Stressor Relationship Patterns, Behavior, and Individual Performances

Stress can be defined through three different ways, as a stimulus, response, and interaction. As a stimulus, if there is a focus on the environment, for example when someone says stress while he is on a depressed conditions, "I feel stress when I have to give a speech. As an interaction, one's relationship with the stimulus' environment, someone here is the active agent who can affect the result of the stressor through behavior, cognition, and emotional strategy (Brannon and Feist, 2007)

In general, stress is a negative condition, that is, a condition which leads to the indication of physical or mental illness or leads to unreasonable behavior (Robbins, 2005). In differentiate between distress, the destructive one, and eustress, the positive. Distress has an impact on mood, skeletal muscle, and vital organs in the body (Robbins, 2005; Munandar, 2008; Luthans, 1998). The condition that caused stress is called a stressor (Handoko, 1995). There are two kinds of stressor according to Barney and Griffin (1992), the stressor which is related with work (organizational stressor) and the stressor which is not related with work (non work stressor).

Robbins (2005) states that, the cause of the stress of work on an employee at least comes from three source, which are: (1) Task demand, i.e. work stress is directly related to the work environment and work directly with the function. The task include these following factors: a night work, workload, and a total comprehension of the risks and dangers. (2) Role demand, i.e. a work stress which is related with the pressure that is given to someone as a function of a particular role. Any labor work as his role in the organization, it means that every labor has a workforce that has to be done, along with the existing rules and in accordance with his superior's expectation. (3) Individual demand, i.e. a work stress that is associated with the pressure created by other employees (Susilo, 2000; Sutherland & Cooper, 2000; Luthans, 1998). Deviant behavior at work places can be caused by the presence of *stressor* which will eventually affect the performance of the employees (Muafi, 2011; Penny dan Spector, 2005; Chen dan Spector; 1992; Fox dan Spector, 1999). A contra productive behavior includes role ambiguity, conflict of roles, workload, organizational limitation, and interpersonal conflict. Based on several previous studies on theory and research, can be found the hypothesis of the research.

- H1. Individual stressor affects significantly positive to negative behavior,
- H2. Task demand stressor affect significantly positive to negative behavior,
- H3. Role demand stressor affect significantly positive to negative behavior,
- H4. Individual stressor affects significantly positive to positive behavior,
- H5. Task demand stressor affect significantly positive to positive behavior,
- H6. Role demand stressor affect significantly positive to positive behavior,
- H7. A negative behavior affects significantly positive to individual performance, and

H8. A positive behavior affects significantly positive to individual performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

This kind of this research is survey. It is done on the Civil Servants in Bantul Regency based on the reason that this regency has a score value of performance management civil servants 52 (low) whereas the highest score is 80. Therefore, the samples and the respondents in this study is some part of all of the Civil Servants in Bantul Regency and it was take as a purposive sampling. The questionnaire was distributed to 150 respondents, and the result that was return decently to be used in the research was 92 questionnaires. Statistic technique was using Partial Least Square. The result of the validity test of all the questionnaire items has a lower significant value than 0,05 so it can be said that the questionnaire item in this research has a good convergent validity. Also, the *cronbach's alpha* value and *composite reliability's* result has a higher value than 0,7. This show that the variable of this research can be said is a reliable one.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Respondents Characteristics

The respondents' characteristics can be viewed through the respondent demography that include year of birth, age, work period, level of education, and gender.

Table 1
Respondents Characteristics

Year of Birth	Frequency	Percentage
1943 – 1960	8	8,7
1961 – 1981	60	65,2
1982 – 2001	24	26,1
Age		
49 – 66 year old	33	35,9
28 – 48 year old	51	55,4
< 28 year old	8	8,7
Work Period		
1 – 3 years	1	1,1
4 – 6 years	13	14,1
7 – 9 years	6	6,5
10 – 12 years	14	15,2
≥ 13 years	58	63,1
Level of Education		
Senior High School	25	27,2
D3/(Scholar)	54	58,7
S2 (Master)	12	13,0
S3 (Doctor)	1	1,1
Gender		
Male	57	62,0
Female	35	38,0
Total	92	100,0

Based on Table 1 can be viewed that the most likely respondents was born between the years 1961 - 1981 which reached 60 people or about 65,2%; the it is followed with respondents who were born between the years 1982 – 2000 as many as 24 people or around 26,1%, and the least was respondents who were born between the years 1943 – 1960, only 8 people or about 8,7%. Most respondents are in the age between 28 – 48 years which reached 51 people or about 55,4%; followed by the respondents between age 49 – 66 years, around 33 people or about 35,9%; and the least likely is respondents which is less than 28 years, of only 8 people or about 8,7%. Most respondents that have worked more than 13 years reaches 58 people or about 63,1%; followed in a row, respondents who have worked for 10 – 12 years as many as 14 people or about 15,2%; respondents who have worked for 4 – 6 years as many as 13 people or about 14,1%; respondents who have worked for 7 – 9 years are 6 people or about 6,5%; and the least was respondents who recently worked for 1 – 3 years, only 1 person or around 1,1%. Latest education of most respondents was scholar, namely reach 54 people or about 58,7%; followed by respondents whose latest education was in senior high school graduation as many as 25 people or about 27,2% respondents; respondents whose latest education was master as many as 12 people or about 13,0%; and the least is respondents whose latest education was a doctoral, only 1 person or about 1,1%. Male respondents are more than female, reaching 57 people or about 62,0%, whereas female respondents are only 35 people or about 38,0%.

4.2. Hypothesis Testing

The result for hypothesis testing can be viewed on Figure 1 and Table 2.




Figure 1. Result of Coefficient Path

Table 2
Coefficient of the Variable Path Research

Path	Path Coefficient	t-statistic	Significance
H _{1a} : SI → PN	0,490	5,037	0,000* (Sign)
H _{1b} : STT → PN	0,295	2,803	0,006*(Sign)

H _{1c} : STP → PN	0,022	0,276	0,783 (ns)
H _{2a} : SI → PP	-0,358	3,051	0,003*(Sign)
H _{2b} : STT → PP	-0,012	0,106	0,916 (ns)
H _{2c} : STP → PP	-0,076	0,670	0,505 (ns)
H ₃ : PN → KP	-0,540	4,253	0,000*(Sign)
H ₄ : PP → KP	0,289	2,215	0,029*(Sign)

Note= * Sign (significant); ns = non significant

5. DISCUSSION

The analysis result influence of the individual stressor that affects towards negative behavior has been earned the t statistic number, 5,037 with the significance level 0,000 which is less than 0,05. This shows that individual stressor affect significantly to negative behavior. The higher the level of individual demand, push an increase of negative behavior.

The analysis result influence of the task demand stressor towards negative behavior has been earned the t statistic number, 2,803 with the significance level 0,006 which is less than 0,05. This shows that task demand stressor affect significantly to negative behavior. The higher the level of task demand, push an increase of negative behavior.

The analysis result influence of the role demand stressor towards negative behavior has been earned t statistic number 0,276 with the significance level 0,783 which is higher than 0,05. This shows that the role demand stressor does not affect significantly towards negative behavior. The changing of the role demand stressor does not affect significantly towards negative behavior changing.

The analysis result influence of the individual stressor towards positive behavior has been earned t statistic number as many as 3,051 which is higher than the t table 1,960 or with the significance level 0,003 which is less than 0,05. This shows that individual stressor affects significantly towards positive behavior. The higher the level of individual demand, push a decrease of the positive behavior.

The variable influence of analysis result of the task demands stressor towards positive behavior has been earned t statistic number 0,106 that is less than the t table 1,960 or with significance level 0,916 that is higher than 0,05. This shows that the stressor variable of the task demand does not affects significantly towards positive behavior. The changing of task demand stressor does not affect towards positive behavior changing.

The variable influence of analysis result of the role demand stressor toward positive behavior has been earned t statistic number 0,670 that is less than t table 1,960 or with significance level 0,505 that is higher than 0,05. This shows that the stressor variable of the role demand does not affect significantly towards positive behavior. The changing of the role demand does not affect towards positive behavior changing.

The analysis result influence of negative behavior towards employee performance has been earned t statistic number 4,253 that is higher than the t table 1,960 or with significance level 0,000 that is less than 0,05. This shows that the variable of negative behavior is significantly affect towards performance of employee. Employees who behave negatively are more likely decrease the employee's performance.

The variable influence of analysis result of positive behavior toward employee performance has been earned t statistic number 2,215 that is higher than the t table 1,960 or with significance level 0,029 which is less than 0,05. This shows that the variable of positive behavior is significantly affects towards the performance of employee. Employees who act a

positive behavior are more likely increase the employee's performance. The whole results also prove a findings that stressor can have impact to deviant behavior in the work place that eventually will affect towards performance (Penny dan Spector, 2005). Chen dan Spector (1992; Fox dan Spector, 1999; Fox *et al.*, 2001) also added that work stressor has a tight relation with the performance of the contra productive behavior which are role ambiguity, role conflict, workload, organizational limitation, and interpersonal conflict

Related to the stressor of task demand, role demand, and individual demand, someone who can manage it will give a positive impact to the increase of positive behavior. It can be an innovation behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, creativity, whistleblowing—in a good way, and corporate social responsibility (Muafi, 2011; Spreitzer and Sonenshein, 2004; Appelbaum, et al., 2007). On the contrary, it will give negative impact, tend to behave negatively, and will also affect the performance of the employee. If a high task demand does not addressed with positive behavior can be harmful either for the individual employee as well as the organization. Employees should be fully aware about the task that is their responsibility so they will give the best result towards organization. Siswanti (2006) added that work stress that is caused by high stressor can be affect directly to aggressive deviant behavior.

However, employees are not always able to play their role and tasks without causing problems. Less well functioning of tasks and role is also able to cause stress. Task and role conflict arise if employees experience a conflict between the task and role that has to be done and the responsibility. Stress arises because of his inability to fulfill the task and role demands while there is lot of expectation towards him. Usually, the reason is lack of work goals, an unclear responsibility, and lack of work procedures. Related to individual demand, psychological reaction, physiology, and in the form of many behavior toward stress is the result's situation with individual employee. Usually it is influenced by behavior patterns based on the attitudes, needs, values, past experiences, life circumstances, and competence. This aspects also needs to be taken care by the organization.

6. CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this research are: (1) individual demand stressor affects significantly positive towards negative behavior; (2) task demand stressor affects significantly positive towards negative behavior; (3) Role demand does not affect significantly towards negative behavior; (4) individual stressor affects significantly negative towards positive behavior; (5) task demand stressor does not affects significantly towards positive behavior; (6) role demand stressor does not affect significantly towards positive behavior; (7) negative behavior affects significantly negative towards the performance of the employee; and, (8) positive behavior affects significantly positive towards the performance of the employee. As for suggestion that could be proposed is: (1) organization requires ways or strategies for stress management. Prevention needs to be done by; time management, relaxation, meditation, the presence of the social support, physical exercises either done individually or organizationally, (2) provide training to employees in accordance with their competencies so that employees who have a high job stress can distribute it to positive behavior, and, (3) performance improvements can be done with the employee is directed to have a positive behavior like innovation, organizational

citizenship behavior, creativity, whistleblowing—in a good way, and corporate social responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Appelbaum, S.H., Iaconi, G.D. and Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impact, and solutions, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 7, No. 5, p. 586-598.
- Barney, J.B. and Griffin, R.W (1992). *The Management of Organization: Strategy, Structure and Behaviour*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Brannon, L. and Feist, J. (1997). *Health Psychology : An Introduction to Behavior and Health*. California : Brooks/Cole Publishing
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: an exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 177–184.
- Fox, S., and Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration—aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 915–931
- Handoko, T. Han (1995). *Manajemen personalia dan sumber daya manusia*. Yogyakarta :BPFE
- Lazarus RS, Folkman S. (1984) *Stress Appraisal and Coping*. Springer Publishing Company. New York
- Luthans, F. (1998), *Organizational Behavior*, Singapore: McGraw Hill Companies International Edition
- Muafi (2011), Causes and Consequences Deviant Workplace Behavior, *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 2, April, p. 123-126.
- Munandar, A. S . (2008) . *Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi* . Jakarta : UI Press
- Penney, L.M and Spector, P.E (2005), Job stress, incivility and counterproductive work behavior (CWB); the moderating role negative affectively, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 777–796.
- Pusat Kajian Otonomi Daerah (2012), Pengukuran dan Evaluasi Kinerja Manajemen PNS di Daerah, <http://www.pkkod.lan.go.id/index.php?mod=6&d=82>, 23 Maret 2012.
- Robbins, S.P. (2005), *Organization behaviour*, Eleven Edition, (2005) Mc Graw Hill New York
- Siswanti, Y. (2006), Analisis pengaruh stres kerja dalam memediasi hubungan antara politik organisasional dengan perilaku agresif (studi kasus pada RS PKU muhammadiyah dan DKT di Yogyakarta), *Siasat Bisnis*, hal. 165-180
- Spreitzer, G.M and Sonenshein, S. (2004), Toward the construct definition of positive deviance, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 2004, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 828-47
- Susilo, M. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi 4, BPFE Yogyakarta
- Sutherland, V. & Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Strategic Stress management*. London : Macmillan
<http://bappeda.bantulkab.go.id/>