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Abstract

This study wanted to see the role of work stress of three kinds of individual work performance (task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior). Previous researches showed different kind of performance related with different work stresses. The study was conducted on 83 civil servants in one work unit in Jakarta. Data were analyzed by using Lavaan in R program. The results showed that 'control' and 'support colleagues was significantly affected task and contextual performance. While for counterproductive work behavior, 'role' and 'change' had positive impact of the behavior. These results indicate that different work performance is related to different types of work stress. Further result and implication were discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucracy Reform said that around 40% of the 4.7 million Indonesian State Civil Apparatus (ASN) had poor performance (Wasono, 2012). Thus, in order to create a competent civil servant, good human resources are needed, so the organization will also perform well. Conversely, lacking of human resource quality, or even inadequate, will lead to poor organization's performance (Isnaini, 2015). As stated in Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 101 year of 2000, in order to create civil servants who, have these competencies, it is necessary to improve the quality of professionalism, devotion and loyalty to the nation and state, spirit of unity and integrity and civil servant's development insights.
A good performance or a good employee task performance is an important thing for any organization. Task performance can be explained as competencies possessed by employee for doing their jobs (Koopmans et al., 2011). In organization, employee who has good performance is essentially needed for achieving its target, especially for civil servants, both at the central or regional offices. Unfortunately, in practice, expectations of good performance were often hampered by many factors, both internal and external. One of factors inhibited individual performance was work stress (Christy & Amalia, 2018).

Although previous studies showed consistent results regarding work stress and work performance (Ahmad et al., 2018; Bashir & Ramay, 2010; Yani & Dwiyanti, 2017; Yunita & Saputra, 2019), the deepening of what types of stress would relate to the three types of performance had not received enough spotlight. This idea was based on previous research which revealed that individual work performance could have different forms (Hosie & Nankervis, 2016; Koopmans et al., 2012; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). More specifically, the role of work stress to other types of work performance (contextual performance and counterproductive performance) had not been much studied. Thus, this study wanted to see whether different types of work stress would affect different types of performance. In other words, the purpose of this study was to see whether different sources of stress would affect different types of performance.

Koopmans et al., (2011) defined individual work performance as employee behavior or actions that were consistent with organizational goals. A job can be measured by the amount of work (Kallio, Kallio, & Grossi, 2017), work quality (Wijaksono, Hubeis, & Saptono, 2017), work result (Groen, Wouters, & Wilderom, 2017), behavior or attitudes (Etikawati & Udjang, 2016), presence (Simanjuntak & Hamali, 2016), and how they cooperate each other (Fidiyanto, Warso, & Fathoni, 2018). On the other hand, based on Allworth & Hesketh (1999), task performance referred to all behaviors conducted by employees that were determined to achieve the target of organization. Motowidlo & Van Scotter (1994) distinguished individual work performance into two types, task performance and contextual performance. Task performance was related to how an individual’s ability to accomplish his task while contextual performance explained how performance in the context of his work is, for example how he communicates with his supervisor, establishing relationships, actively engage in their self-development or how to help other workers. Meanwhile, Koopmans et al., (2012) divided work performance into three dimensions and argued if these three types of performance were different dimensions. Thus, despite sharing the same large construct of work performance, all three dimensions could have different antecedents. In this study, the definition of Koopmans et al., (2011) would be used because the definition included three types of performance: task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive behavior. Her explanation was also considered to be more comprehensive in describing types of performance.

One construct that was also known to affect all three types of work performance was work stress (Hosie, Sharma, & Kingshott, 2019; Ramli, 2018). Beehr & Newman (1978) defined work stress as situation where the emergence of psychological and physiological deviation normally functions when a person works. Meanwhile, work stress by Cousins, Mackay, Clarke, Kelly, Lee & MacCaig (2004) was defined as the difference between the skills, abilities, and values possessed by individuals with the demands of
work and organizational goals. Cousins et al. (2004) stated that there were seven dimensions of work stress related to type, namely: demands (problems that occur in individuals such as workloads and work patterns), control (related to how much individuals have autonomy to do their work), support managerial (related to how much superiors provide support to employee related their work), support colleague (related to the extent colleagues provide support to individuals related to their work), relationships (relationships that exist within the organization, the ambiance or the politics in their work environment), role (whether individuals understand their role in the organization and whether the organization ensures that the individual does not have conflicting roles), and change (how the organization manages and communicates the changes (large or small) that occur with its employee). Previous studies of work stress had focused on aspects of work itself, demands and control (Lee, Migliaccio, Lin, & Seto, 2020; Lu, Du, Xu, & Zhang, 2017), meanwhile in this research, Cousins et al. (2004) work stress was used because it was considered more comprehensive and contained seven aspects of the world of work and had proven its application in interventions concerning work stress in the UK (Mackay, Cousins, Kelly, Lee, & McCaig, 2004).

Work stress was known to affect psychological and physiological employee (Akinola, Kapadia, Lu, & Mason, 2019). The psychological symptoms that usually arise in individuals who experience work stress are anxiety, loss of concentration, withdrawal, and decreased self-confidence. While physiological symptoms such as individuals feel an increased heart rate, sleep disturbance, headaches and decreased immune system (Khanam, 2017). Symptoms of work stress also could appear in behavior, such as delaying or avoiding work (Brunner, Igic, Keller, & Wieser, 2019), dietary changes, taking drugs, or tendency to quit his job. In other words, a decrease in work performance could occur if a person was under stress. Previous research revealed consistent results regarding the relationship of work stress and performance, both in Indonesian sample studies (Nur, 2013; Yani & Dwiyanti, 2017) or foreign countries (Bashir & Ramay, 2010; Jamal, 1984; LePine, Zhang, Crawford, & Rich, 2016). Study conducted by Copestake et al., (2020) in Uganda revealed how work stress could also affect one’s achievement at work.

The impact of work stress was undoubtedly diverse. Beehr & Newman (1978) stated that the impact of work stress was divided into three aspects, psychological, physiological and behavior. Those psychological symptoms are anxiety, confusion, loss of concentration, decreased self-confidence, irritability, withdrawal, and depression. Next, there are other physiological symptoms, such as increased heart rate, headaches, sleep disturbance, muscle tension, and lower back pain. Finally, behavioral symptoms that occur in individuals include delaying or even avoiding work, abnormal eating patterns (both increasing and decreasing), consuming alcohol and drugs, and the tendency to commit suicide. As explained earlier, there are three types of work performance discussed in this study, that is task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior (Koopmans et al., 2012). A later explanation would reveal how each dimension of work stress would take a role in every work performance.

Work stress stated by Cousins et al., (2004) consisted of seven dimensions. First two dimensions were control and demands. Both of them closely related to the internal characteristic of its work. Control indicated the extent of autonomy workers had, while demands explained the pressure of the work itself. These two constructs are in line with
the controls and demands referred to in the Job-Control Demands theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014), which argued the higher demands would cause a person more easily engage in work stress, but this stress can be reduced by increasing the person's control of his work.

In various studies, these two constructs were known to affect one's performance. Study conducted by Yana (2014) revealed that stress-related control and demands were two of the stressors that were often complained of by nurses. An excessive work demands, or where individuals were required to do multiple tasks at the same time but did not have enough time to finish it, was a stressor that often makes these nurses complain about their health condition. Sometimes, complaints about stressor could cause symptoms of work stress, such as sleep disturbances, headaches, so this could be an obstacle in civil servants when carrying out their duties (Abdillah & Wajdi, 2011). When someone was trapped in these conditions, it would affect their work performance, such as decreasing their ability in doing their work tasks.

Topcic, Baum, & Kabst (2016) also stated when individuals could not meet work demands within the allotted time (or in this case get high demands), the problem of work pressure arose which could cause work stress and ultimately made their performance decline. Job stress could cause employees to feel very tired, depressed, and suffer physical illness. When employees felt work stress, it could cause the services provided by the civil servants to be ineffective and inefficient. Besides, other studies conducted by Hessels, Rietveld, & van der Zwan (2017) to the self-employed and office workers indicate if self-employed workers who have high control of their work experience relatively have low work stress.

Based on the explanation above, the first hypothesis of this study is: if the stress associated with job demands would reduce the task performance of workers while control would increase task performance.

Meanwhile, contextual performance was often associated with things outside of work (not including KPIs or included in one’s main job), but if done, it will benefit the organization. Contextual performance itself was often associated with many constructs or terms, such as OCB (Grasiaswaty, Ratna, & Setyasih, 2016) or helping behavior (Grasiaswaty, Purba, & Parahyanti, 2019; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). One example of this behaviors helps coworkers even though it was not their obligation or as simple as turning off the lights when not in use.

Although not part of the job-specific performance, previous studies described how the relationship between contextual and task performance is, and how the experts agreed to make contextual performance as one of their performance, even in different domains from task performance (Arthaud-Day, Rode, & Turnley, 2012; Koopmans et al., 2012; Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, De Vet, & Van Der Beek, 2014; Kwon & Farndale, 2018; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Previous research on the relationship between contextual performance and work stress showed some differences with task performance, which indicates that both of these performances could have different antecedents (Toderi & Balducci, 2010). Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, (2005) found that employees who got social support at work did not feel a high level of fatigue when they got excess work, emotional and physical demands, and interference between work and home.
Social support in the workplace could be obtained from direct supervisors, for example, in providing feedback or helping some problematic work. Psychologically, the effect of having functional quality interactions with supervisors could make individuals felt more responsible for their work. They could trust their supervisors to help them solving their work problems (Brooks et al., 2019). Support from supervisors and coworkers as well as relationships established in an organization had a positive impact on individuals. When individuals felt pressure because they were not able to complete their jobs, but they get support from their work environment, they are also less stressed at work (Wood, Daniels, & Ogbonnaya, 2018). However, if the individual did not get excellent support from the surroundings, the individual would experience symptoms of work stress such as feeling anxious, becoming insecure, losing concentration and could affect the contextual performance that he displays in his work (Yang et al., 2015). Workers could do not actively participate in meetings, do not want to help their coworkers and lazy to develop themselves.

Role, or understanding the duty of its work, was also one of the factors triggering individuals to feel stressed at work. When individuals did not understand their role, did not understand their duties and responsibilities, and did not know how to complete their work, they would not be able to understand their organizational goals, and it would impact their performance (June & Mahmood, 2011). Another possibilities on how role would affect performance was proven by Chen & Spector (1992). Their research stated role conflict, and role ambiguity could become a stress trigger, alongside with job demands, conflict interpersonal and harmful situational obstacles. These negative emotions could provoke frustration, anger and anxiety. Malik, Schat, Shahzad, Raziq, & Faiz (2018) stated how stressful employee would give effect to work performance. They tend to do absenteeism, organization and interpersonal aggressiveness. Thus, this negative emotion could lead to counterproductive work behavior (CWB), or the emergence of anti-role behavior, antisocial, maladaptive or deviant that did not align with organizational goals. Another research in Indonesia also showed how counterproductive work behavior could be implemented in some behavior, like corruption or aggression (Tiarapurwa, Indyastuti, & Sari, 2018). These behaviors were considered to interfere with the work performance of organizational tasks, or effectiveness so that it could damage the organization.

Based on those explanations, the researcher argued that if different stress dimensions will be related to different performance. In other words, if the first hypothesis revealing two dimensions of stress (job demands and job control) giving impact to task performance, our second hypothesis that support supervisor, colleague support, relationship, role and change would give more effect in contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviour.

METHOD

The sample in this study are all employees at one of DKI Jakarta Provincial Offices who are still actively working. Of all 105 active employees and research questionnaires distributed, 83 returned questionnaires which could be further processed. The selection of samples that were still in one division was intended to uniform the perception of
performance. The selection of one of the employment agencies in the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government was the easiness of access.

Individual Work Stress was measured by Health Safety and Executive (HSE), an measurement arranged by Cousins et al., (2004). This scale consisted of 35 items with seven dimensions: demands, control, support managerial, support colleague, relationship, role, and change. HSE measurement using a Likert-like scale with options never-always and strongly disagree-strongly agree. Meanwhile, individual work performance was measured by scores obtained from the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) compiled by Koopmans et., (2012, 2014). It consisted of 18 items with three dimensions (task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior) and using a Likert-like scale with option rarely-always and never-often. Both scales had already been gotten through an adaptation process based on recommendations of Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin, & Ferraz (2000). This adaptation, including synthesis, back-translates, and gets a recommendation from the expert. The results showed that the reliability of the measurement instrument was in the range .666 to .846, which indicated that the measuring instrument was quite reliable (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 2008).

Reliability and validity test of the HSE measuring instrument were tested on 37 respondents. In each dimension, the reliability test was carried out; the reliability results obtained were in the range of .666 to .846. The results obtained from the value of corrected item correlation of each dimension was in the range of -.005 to .755. The researcher decided to continue to include three items contained in the dimensions of demands with item numbers 4 and 5, and control dimensions with item number 14 because the value of the overall HSE scale reliability was relatively good even though there were items that had total item correlations less than .20. Thus, all 35 items can be used as research instruments for the data collection process.

Meanwhile, the IWPQ measurement tool had also been tested on 37 respondents to obtain the results of the dimension reliability coefficient. The task performance dimension had a reliability coefficient of .915. Also, task performance had a critical value (corrected item correlation) value in the range of .694 to .828. Thus, the IWPQ measurement tool can also be used for the next step.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Several steps were taken to process the data from this study. First, the reliability value for each measuring instrument was rechecked. For task performance, the reliability value was .825, with critical values in the range of .432 to .735, while for the contextual performance dimension had a reliability coefficient of .818 with a critical range of values .403 to .711. Next, for counterproductive work behavior had a reliability coefficient of .717 with a critical value range of .197 to .753. For complete results, see Table 1.

| Scale and Items       | Critical value |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Task performance      | α = .825       |
| Item 1                | .589           |

Table 1
Reliability and Corrected Item Correlation for Individual Work Performances
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| Scale and Items                       | Critical value |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Item 2                                | .432           |
| Item 3                                | .627           |
| Item 4                                | .735           |
| Item 5                                | .716           |
| Contextual performance                | α = .820       |
| Item 6                                | .403           |
| Item 7                                | .497           |
| Item 8                                | .539           |
| Item 9                                | .583           |
| Item 10                               | .711           |
| Item 11                               | .402           |
| Item 12                               | .631           |
| Item 13                               | .553           |
| Counterproductive work behavior       | α = .717       |
| Item 14                               | .718           |
| Item 15                               | .408           |
| Item 16                               | .441           |
| Item 17                               | .753           |
| Item 18                               | .197           |

Source: data processed

Meanwhile, for measuring work stress, it is known that the Demands dimension has a reliability coefficient value α = .801 with a critical value between .155 to .766 while the control has a value of α = .667 with a critical value between .268 to .562. For support managers and support colleagues each has a reliability coefficient of .467 and .620, respectively, while relationship, role and change respectively have a reliability coefficient of .638, .766, and .635. Complete results can be seen in Table 2.

| Item      | Critical value |
|-----------|----------------|
| Demands   | α = .801       |
| Item 1    | .614           |
| Item 2    | .644           |
| Item 3    | .647           |
| Item 4    | .155           |
| Item 5    | .227           |
| Item 6    | .766           |
| Item 7    | .707           |
| Item 8    | .422           |
| Control   | α = .667       |
| Item 9    | .395           |
| Item 10   | .268           |
| Item 11   | .457           |
| Item 12   | .562           |
| Item 13   | .359           |
| Item 14   | .348           |
| Item          | Critical value |
|--------------|----------------|
| Support Manager | $\alpha = .467$ |
| Item 15      | .449           |
| Item 16      | .305           |
| Item 17      | .255           |
| Item 18      | .081           |
| Item 19      | .072           |
| Support Collogues | $\alpha = .620$ |
| Item 20      | .535           |
| Item 21      | .514           |
| Item 22      | .300           |
| Item 23      | .292           |
| Relationship | $\alpha = .638$ |
| Item 24      | .384           |
| Item 25      | .490           |
| Item 26      | .380           |
| Item 27      | .417           |
| Role         | $\alpha = .766$ |
| Item 28      | .675           |
| Item 29      | .696           |
| Item 30      | .467           |
| Item 31      | .342           |
| Item 32      | .597           |
| Change       | $\alpha = .635$ |
| Item 33      | .404           |
| Item 34      | .555           |
| Item 35      | .414           |

Source: data processed

Data was processed by using multiple regression techniques using the R program with Lavaan packages (Rosseel, 2012) to see the role of each dimension of work stress with different types of work performance. The results showed that the control dimension had a significant role both in task performance ($\beta = .254; p < .05$) and contextual performance ($\beta = .328; p < .01$). This result indicated that the more employees feel they have control over their work, then more they will have higher task performance and contextual performance. The opposite happened to colleague support which also had a significant role in task performance ($\beta = -.314; p < .01$) and with contextual performance ($\beta = -.275; p < .05$). However, the role of the two types of performance was negative, which indicated that the higher the role of support colleagues, the lower the performance. Meanwhile, for counterproductive work behavior, the role is relationship dimension ($\beta = .220; p < .05$) and role ($\beta = .427; p < .01$), where the higher the three dimensions are, the more tendency people will not engage in counterproductive behavior.
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Table 3
Hypothesis Testing

| Work Stress Dimension | Task Performance | Contextual Performance | Contreproductive Work Behavior |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Demands               | .215             | .118                   | .076                          |
| Control               | .254*            | .328*                  | .006                          |
| Support               | -.021            | -.092                  | .142                          |
| Managerial Support    | -.314**          | -.275**                | .073                          |
| Colleagues            | -.073            | -.020                  | .220*                         |
| Relationship          | .177             | .037                   | .427**                        |
| Role                  | .082             | .035                   | -.170                         |
| Change                |                  |                        |                               |

Data processing with significant value * = p <0.05; ** = p < 0.01

DISCUSSION

The result of this research showed that in civil servants, task performance and contextual performance had similar stress antecedents that was control and support colleagues, whereas, in counterproductive behavior, antecedents that influenced this behavior were different. The results of this study also revealed that demands, change and managerial support did not significantly affect the three types of performance. While college control and support affected only two types of performance (task and contextual performance), relationships and roles affected only one type of performance (counterproductive work behavior) and did not affect the other two performances.

These results were aligned with other studies which suggested that if an individual had control over his work, it could improve his performance (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Day, Crown, & Ivany, 2017). Moreover, another study conducted by Cotti, Haley, & Miller (2017) also revealed how flexibility which was identical to work control affects stress and performance. Hessels et al., (2017) did another study that revealed comparisons between workers who did self-employment and those who had a supervisor. Those who tied to their work showed a higher level of stress compared to self-employed individuals. This result indicated that when someone had control over his or her work, he or she will be less stressed. When the employee was not easily stressed, the physiological response would also get better. An excellent physiological response was known to increase a person's confidence in completing his task (Brooks et al., 2019), thus helping to improve the performance of his tasks. Individuals who had control over their work also tended to be more active in learning their work (Bond & Flaxman, 2006), so they have more ability to complete their task.

This study also revealed that controls also affected contextual performance but not counterproductive work behavior. One of the things that could explain this result was the research conducted by Muldoon, Kisamore, Liguori, Jawahar, & Bendickson (2016). The research revealed how having autonomy towards his work contributes to someone in doing a contextual performance. The feeling of having autonomy includes a person having control over his work (Boxall & Macky, 2014), starting from what can be done first to determine the end time of work. This autonomy was in line with the stated job control Cousins et al., (2004) used in this study. The role of job control in contextual performance
could also be mediated by workplace wellbeing (Sattar, Khaliq, & Butt, 2018). The feeling of having control and autonomy about one's work made a person's workplace wellbeing better (Davis, 2019). This wellbeing ultimately made a worker engage more in his contextual performance.

There was no correlation between job control or autonomy and counterproductive work behavior in this study in line with previous research (Rehman & Shahnawaz, 2018). One reason was that sometimes job control did not directly affect performance like job demands, but previous studies showed that job control would affect more as a moderator (Baka, 2018). Therefore, for further research, it would be better to see how job control acts as a moderator to influence employee work performance. The differences of antecedents between contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior also indicated that these two dimensions were two different constructs, and support the research proposed by Spector, Bauer, & Fox, (2010).

Demands were known to have no role in any performance. This result was not supported by other studies, especially those based on Job-Demands Control theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Bakker et al., 2005) finding that job demands affected someone's performance. One that could explain why this hypothesis was a meta-analysis was conducted by Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper (2013) which revealed how the relationship between demands-performance could be influenced by other moderator variables, which caused the results to be unstable between one study and another.

The unpredictable result was how support from colleagues had a significant negative effect on task performance and contextual performance. These results indicated that if a person felt that he was receiving support from his colleague, he/she would decrease his work standards. This result was not in line with previous research stated that colleague support was highly related to task performance (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). One explanation that might explain this is because the individual did not feel pressure from his coworkers and felt relying on his coworkers. Thus, it made him more relax about his/her job. Another study also explained the why support of colleagues could cause a decrease in work performance done by Şeşen, Soran, & Caymaz (2014) to teachers in Turkey. The results of the study revealed teachers help with each other improved social loafing, or the tendency to hang their work on co-workers.

Role was also known not to have a significant role in task performance and contextual performance, but it had a role in counterproductive work behavior. These results were in line with Ling & Bhatti (2014) who found that the role did not have any effect on task performance. The research was conducted on admin staff and the academic sector, which had a job profile similar to civil servants, which had clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The role dimension of work stress emphasized that work stress would occur when individuals did not have or not know their role in their work. This stress might not occur in a sample of civil servants who already had a clear main task so that it did not affect their performance at work.

Meanwhile, change was a dimension of work stress that emphasized how organizations communicate any change to their employees (Cousins et al., 2004). Employee stress would not be high when they could contribute to organizational change. Since the sample was civil servants, according to regulations, civil servants in Indonesia did not have the authority to make policy. They only followed the policies that had been
determined. This reason could be one of the reasons why the change had no impact on any performances.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that not all hypotheses mentioned by researcher are supported. There was a significant influence of work stress on the dimensions of control and support colleagues on task performance and contextual performance. Meanwhile, work stress in the relationship and role dimensions had a significant influence on counterproductive work behavior. Two dimensions of work stress that do not influence the three types of performance were managerial support and change.

For further researches, it was suggested to examine more other work stress factors, like personality type and self-assessment, so that it could help researchers to see the individual factors causing work stress and to measure whether it should use multidimensional in order to get more specific results. For civil servants, it was essential to have a good quality relationship with supervisors and to have control, so that they can overcome the demands of the job. They also need to understand their role in the organization. The supervisor can give them more training related to managing stress because it can help reducing the effects of work stress, so it does not affect work performance.
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