Organizational Culture And Job Stress Through Contra Productive Behavior Of Basic School Teachers

Nuzulurrizqi Arief Wicaksono, Bedjo Sujanto, Matin

State University of Jakarta

nuzulurrizqiariefwicaksono.7616157608@mhs.unj.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to obtain information about the influence of organizational culture and job stress on contra productive behavior of public elementary school teachers in Pulo Gadung sub-district. This research is an Associative quantitative research. The research was conducted using a survey method with the data analysis technique used to answer the hypothesis is the path analysis technique. The population in this study was 688 respondents, and a sample of 253 respondents were selected using random sampling. The research is focused on two aspects that determine contra productive behavior; organizational culture and job stress. The results of the analysis concluded that (1) there is a direct influence of organizational culture on contra productive behavior, (2) there is a direct effect of job stress on contra productive behavior, (3) there is a direct influence of organizational culture on job stress.

Key words: organizational culture, job stress, and contra productive behavior

INTRODUCTION

The world of education and increasingly advanced employment demands all aspects in it to actively develop according to the required competencies. Schools as educational units are tasked with carrying out tasks related to the continuity of education in Indonesia. Teacher productivity at job plays an important role in determining the level of success of an educational unit. Human resources are one of the factors that can be a source of excellence for schools in supporting efficiency, because they have creativity and innovative thoughts. Schools have an important human resource component consisting of the principal, teachers, and staff employees. The principal is a teacher who is given an additional task to lead a school. The teaching and learning process is held or a place for interaction between the teacher who gives the lesson and the student who receives the lesson.

Contra productive behavior is behavior by teachers that can negatively impact the educational unit, in this case, the school. Personality makes it possible to predict individual behavior in certain situations. The world of education is like a competition arena, where each school competes because it wants to be better at the education unit it does. For a school to be able to maintain its survival and still

get continuous improvement, it is very important to have a competitive advantage which is the school's ability to produce better graduates than other schools.

The contra productive behavior of a teacher is due to a number of variables. However, not all of these variables will be examined. The study in this study was limited to three variables: Organizational Culture, Job Stress, and Contra productive Behavior of Primary School Teachers in Pulo Gadung District, East Jakarta.

Colquitt (2009) defined contra productive job behavior defined as employee behavior intentionally hinder organizational accomplishment. A key aspect of this definition is intentional, that is, all forms are intentionally carried out by employees, not those that are not done on purpose. According to (Schermerhorn, 2011) explained that contra productive job behaviors cover a wide range from job avoidance to physical and verbal aggression of others to bad mouthing to outright job sabotage to theft. Contra productive Job Behaviors, Intentionally disrupt relationships or performance at job.". Actions that damage or interfere with job such as by being socially unkind and violating existing rules in the organization. As a result, someone who behaves contra productive will affect the resulting job performance.

Bolton, 2010, said that contra productive job behavior are volitional behaviors that harm or are intended to harm organizational or people in organizations". Contra productive behavior is any deliberate unacceptable behavior that has the potential to have negative consequences for the organization and the staff members in that organization. This behavior includes acts such as theft, calling in sick when you are not sick, fraud, sexual harassment, violence, drug and alcohol use, and improper use of the internet. The another definition based on Stephen P. Robbins, Job dissatisfaction and antagonistic relationship with co-workers predicts a variety of behaviors organizations find undesirable, including unionization attempts, substance abuse, stealing at job, undoes socializing, and tardiness. Researchers argue that these behaviors are indicators of a broader syndrome called deviant behavior in the workplace (or contra productive behavior or employee withdrawal).

Meanwhile, according to Mc Shane and Vol Glinow, 2010 explained that Contra productive job behaviors are voluntary behaviors that have the potential to directly or indirectly harm the organizations. They include abuse of others (e.g, insults and nasty comments), threats (threatening harm), job avoidance (e.g tardiness), job sabotage (doing job incorrectly), and overt acts (theft).

Then, Robinson dan Bennet (2003), states that there are four dimensions of contra productive job behavior, including: 1) Property Deviance (2) Production Deviation (3) Political Deviance (4) personal aggression. In dealing with the problem of contra productive behavior, a conducive culture is needed. According to Edgar H. Schein in Luthans 2011, pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered

developed by a given group as it learn to cope with its problems of external adaption and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valuable and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems.

According to Joanne Martin in Luthans, 2011 : As individual come into contact with organizations, they come into contact with dress norms, stories people tell what goes on, the organizations format rules and procedures, its formal codes of behavior, rituals, task, pay systems, jargon, and jokes only understood by insiders, and so on. These elements are some of manifestations of organizational culture. Culture is transmitted to employees in several ways, most often through such devices as symbols, stories, heroes, rite and rituals. culture is transmitted to employees in a number of ways most often through devices such as symbols, stories, heroes, ceremonies and rituals. A similar definition is put forward by McShane and Von Glinow, (2010) which states that, organizational culture consists of the values and assumptions shared within an organization. It defines what is important and unimportant in the company and consequently, directs everyone in the organization toward the right way of doing things. Jhon R. Schermerhorn, (2010) "organizational culture this is the system of shared belief and values that shapes and guides the behavior of its members". The similar opinion with Livari Juhani and Magda Huisman James L.Gibson' book (2012) explained that definitions of culture describe it as: symbol, language, ideologies, rituals, and myths.

Culture is transmitted to employees in a number of ways most often through devices such as symbols, stories, heroes, ceremonies and rituals. A similar definition is put forward by McShane and Von Glinow, (2010) which states that: Stress is a dynamics conditions in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, demand, or resource related to what the individual desires and for which the outcomes is perceived to be both uncertain and important. Stephen P. Robbins dan Timothy A. Judge (2011) told that stress shows itself in many ways, such as high blood pressure, ulcers, irritability, difficulty making routine decisions, loss of appetite, and accident proneness and the like. These symptoms fit under three general categories : physiological, psychological, and behavioral symptoms.. According to J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, and M.R Frone in Jhon W. Slocum, Jr. and Hon Hellriegel in 2009 revealed, "stress is the excitement, feeling of anxiety, and/or physical tension that occurs when the demands placed on an individual are thought to exceed the person's ability to cope".

According to J. C. Quick et al. In Debra L. Nelson and James Campbell Quick in 2006 states, the stres response, is the unconscious preparation to fight or flee that a person experiences when faced with any demand". T.A Beehr and J.E Newman in Fred Luthan (2011) defined job stress as a condition a rising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning".

According to John W. Newstrom in 2011 argued job overload and time deadlines put employees under pressure and lead to stress. Often these pressures arise from management, and a poor quality of management can cause stress". Often this pressure comes from management, and the poor quality of management can cause stress. According to Carry Cooper in Wibowo (2014) factors that can cause and cause job stress include: (1) working conditions, (2) role conflict, (3) career development. Lestari (2016) analyzed that these results indicate a relationship between organizational culture and contra productive behavior with contra productive behavior. Prasetyanta (2019) states that job stress has a positive effect on contra productive job behavior in operational employees of PT. Indonesian Railways Operational Area 6 Yogyakarta. Cahyana and Jati (2017) the results of this study show that organizational culture, job stress and job satisfaction have a positive effect on employee performance.

Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D (2001) argued that Parallel with the job on social psychology of human aggression, emotion has also been central in a lot of job organization and job place aggression broader concepts of contra productive job behavior (CWB). Injustice and stress conditions specifically associated with both aggression and negative emotions and CWB. Conditions of injustice and stress are specifically associated with negative emotions and both aggression and CWB. According to John M. Ivancevich, Robert Konopske and Michael T. Metteson in 2013 define that organizational culture involves shared expectations, values, and attitudes, it exerts influence on individuals, groups, and organizational processes. For example, members are influenced to be good citizens and to go along.

METHOD

The research was conducted at the State Elementary School, Pulo Gadung District, East Jakarta. In this study, researchers used a quantitative approach. The research method used is a survey method with a quantitative approach, the method commonly called path analysis aims to explain the causal relationship or correlation of several variables, while the variable in question is the influence of (1) organizational culture on teacher contra productive behavior, (2) job stress on teacher contra productive behavior, and (3) organizational culture on job stress. The population reached by all State Elementary School teachers in Pulo Gadung District, as many as 688 teachers from 38 schools. From the calculation of the sample size using the Slovin formula, the total sample size is 253 teachers. As for the research instrument trial, there were 30 teachers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The section's data description describes the research data such as mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation, median, mode. The presentation of the data description starts with X3 (Contra productive Behavior) as the final

endogenous variable, X1 (Organizational Culture) as an exogenous variable and X2 (Job Stress) as an intermediate endogenous variable.

1. Contra productive Behavior

The contra productive behavior instrument used in the study obtained 20 valid statements on a scale of 1-5, so that the theoretical score range was between 20 and 100 and the empirical score range was between 54 and 95 so that the score range was 41. The results of data calculations obtained an average of 75.02; standard deviation of 8.53; variance of 72.8; the median is 76 and the mode is 77. The frequency distribution of the contra productive Behavior Score obtained the highest frequency information in the 74-78 interval class as many as 62 respondents (24.51%). In contrast, the 79-83 Interval class was 55 respondents (21.74%), the 69-73 class interval was 49 respondents (19.37%), Interval Class 84-88 as many as 26 respondents (10.28%), Interval Class 64-68 as many as 22 respondents (8.7%), Interval Class 59-63 as many as 19 (7.51%), The 54-58 interval class consisted of 10 respondents (3.95%), the 89-93 interval class consisted of 8 respondents (3.16%). In contrast, the lowest frequency in the 94- 98 interval class were 2 respondents (0.79%).

2. Organizational Culture

The organizational culture instrument used in the study obtained 32 valid statements on a scale of 1-5, so that the theoretical score range was between 32 and 160 and the empirical score range was between 86 and 146 so that the score range was 60. The data calculations results obtained an average of 114.72; standard deviation of 13.19; variance of 173.85; median of 114 and mode of 115.

The frequency distribution of Organizational Culture obtained the highest frequency information in the 107-113 interval class as many as 57 respondents (22.53%), while the 114-120 Interval Class was 55 respondents (21.74%), the 121-127 interval class was 36 respondents (14.23%), Class interval 100-106 as many as 31 respondents (12.25%), Interval class 93-99 as many as 25 respondents (9.88%), Interval class 128-134 as many as 16 (6.32%), Class interval 135-141 as many as 13 respondents (5.14%), Class interval 142-148 as many as 12 respondents (4.74%) while the lowest frequency in Interval Class 86 - 92 were 8 respondents (3.16%).

3. Job Stress

The job stress instrument used in the study obtained 15 valid statements on a scale of 1-5, so that the theoretical score range was between 15 and 75, and the empirical score range was between 36 to 71 so that the score range was 35. amounting to 53.08; standard deviation of 6.55; variance of 42.88; median of 53 and mode of 50. The frequency distribution of Job stress obtained the highest frequency information in the 52-55 interval class as many as 67 respondents (26.48%), while the 48-51 interval class was 47 respondents (18.58%), the 56-59 interval class was 47 respondents (18.58%), interval class 60-63 as many as 28

respondents (11.07%), interval class 44-47 as many as 24 respondents (9.49%), interval class 40-43 as many as 22 (8.7%), class 64-67 interval as many as 11 respondents (4.35%), 68-71 Class Interval as many as 4 respondents (1.58%) while the lowest frequency in the 36-39 interval class is 3 respondents (1.19%).

Illustrations

Analysis Data

The research data obtained in research are classified in parametric statistics, parametric statistics require that the data of each research variable analyzed forms a normal distribution. Testing the research hypothesis using path analysis (path analysis). Path analysis requires that each linear equation / regression equation of the constellation must meet the assumption testing process.

Path analysis requires that the data to be analyzed meets several statistical tests as a prerequisite for analysis. Therefore, before testing the hypothesis the requirements test is conducted first. Several statistical tests that must be met by data in path analysis are (1) Normality Test, (2) Significance Test and Regression Linearity. Normality testing uses the Liliefors formula. The hypotheses presented in the normality test are:

H₀: data comes from populations that are normally distributed;

H₁: data comes from a population that is not normally distributed.

The test conditions are if the $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$ ($\alpha = 0.05$), then the error data is normally distributed. Conversely, if $L_{count} \geq L_{table}$ ($\alpha = 0.05$), then the data is declared not normally distributed. The results of the estimation error normality test for each regression are as follows:

Table 1. Results of Normality Test for Estimated Regression Error

Estimated Regression Error	N	L_{count}	L_{table}		Notes
			$\alpha = 0,05$	$\alpha = 0,01$	
X ₃ atas X ₁	253	0,039	0,056	0,065	Normal
X ₃ atas X ₂	253	0,034	0,056	0,065	Normal
X ₂ atas X ₁	253	0,032	0,056	0,065	Normal

Based on the L_{count} and L_{table} prices above, it can be concluded that the pairs of all good data on Contra productive Behavior on Organizational Culture, Contra productive Behavior on Work Stress, and Job stress on Organizational Culture come from normally distributed samples.

Equations

The research hypothesis testing was carried out using regression and correlation analysis techniques. Regression analysis is used to predict the relationship model, while correlation analysis is used to determine the influence

between research variables. Determining the regression equation in order to conclude hypothesis testing, the regression model obtained was tested for its significance and linearity using the F test in the ANAVA table. The criteria for testing the significance and linearity of the regression model are as follows:

Significant regression: $F_{\text{count}} \geq F_{\text{table}}$ on the regression line

Linear regression: $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$ on matched tuna lines

The next stage is to conduct a correlational analysis by examining the level and significance of the relationship between the pair of exogenous variables and the endogenous variable. the simple regression equation is $\hat{X}_3 = 126,438 + -0,448 X_1$

and continued by testing the linear equation with regression significance test and regression linearity which can be seen in the ANOVA table. Regression equation $126,438 + -0,448 X_1$ for the significance test obtained F_{count} 231.48 greater than F_{table} (0.01; 1: 251) 6.74 at $\alpha = 0.01$. Because $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$, the regression equation is very significant. For the linearity test, it was obtained that F_{count} was 1.286 smaller than F_{table} (0.05; 55: 196) of 1.40 at $\alpha = 0.05$. Because $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$, the estimated distribution of points forming a linear line is acceptable.

From the test results of the regression equation X_3 over X_1 it can be concluded that the error of the regression estimates is normally distributed and the distribution of the estimated data to form a linear line is acceptable. Visually it can be seen in the following image:

Figure 1. Regression Equation Graph $\hat{X}_3 = 126,438 + -0,448 X_1$

The regression equation = $30.251 + 0.843 X_2$, for the significance test, it is obtained that F_{count} 181.06 is greater than F_{table} (0.01; 1: 251) 6.74 at $\alpha = 0.01$. Because $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$, the regression equation is very significant. For the linearity test, it was obtained that F_{count} was 1.265 which was smaller than F_{table} (0.05; 32: 219) of 1.50 at $\alpha = 0.05$. Because $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$, the estimated distribution of points

forming a linear line is acceptable. From the test results of the regression equation X_3 over X_2 it can be concluded that the error of the regression estimates is normally distributed and the distribution of the estimated data forms a linear line is acceptable. Visually it can be seen in the following image:

Figure 1. Regression Equation Graph $\hat{X}_3 = 30,251 + 0,843 X_2$

From the calculation data for the regression equation model's compilation between Job Stress and Organizational Culture in Appendix 5, the regression constant $a = 83.502$ and the regression coefficient $b = -0.265$ are obtained. Thus the relationship of the simple regression equation model is . The regression equation $\hat{X}_2 = 83,502 + -0,265 X_1$, for the significance test, it is obtained that $F_{count} 100.11$ is greater than $F_{table} (0.01; 1: 251) 6.74$ at $\alpha = 0.01$. Because $F_{count} < F_{table}$, the regression equation is very significant. For the linearity test, it was obtained that F_{count} was 1.199 which was smaller than $F_{table} (0.05: 55: 196)$ of 1.40 at $\alpha = 0.05$. Because $F_{count} < F_{table}$, the estimated distribution of points forming a linear line is acceptable.

From the test results on the regression equation X_2 over X_1 , the error of the regression estimates is normally distributed and the distribution of the estimated data forms a linear line is acceptable. Visually it can be seen in the following image:

Figure 3. Graphic Regression Equation $\hat{X}_2 = 83,502 + -0,265 X_1$

Organizational culture has a negative direct effect on contra productive behavior. $H_0: \beta_{31} \geq 0$ $H_1: \beta_{31} < 0$ H_0 is rejected, if $-t_{count} > -t_{table}$. From the path analysis calculation results, the direct influence of Organizational Culture on Contra productive Behavior, the path coefficient value is -0.485 and the t_{count} coefficient value is -10.103. The t_{table} coefficient value for $\alpha = 0.01$ is 2.60. Because the coefficient-count value is greater than the -table value, thus H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, namely that Organizational Culture has a direct effect on contra productive behavior can be accepted.

The results of the analysis of the first hypothesis provide the finding that organizational culture has a negative direct effect on contra productive behavior. Thus, it can be concluded that Contra productive Behavior is directly negatively influenced by Organizational Culture. Increasing Organizational Culture results in decreased contra productive behavior. Job stress has a positive direct effect on contra productive behavior. $H_0: \beta_{32} < 0$, $H_1: \beta_{32} > 0$, H_0 is rejected, if $t_{count} > t_{table}$. From the calculation of path analysis, the direct effect of Job Stress on Contra productive Behavior, the path coefficient value is 0.388 and the t_{count} coefficient value is 8.080. The value of the t_{table} coefficient for $\alpha = 0.01$ is 2.60. Because the t_{count} coefficient value is greater than the t_{table} coefficient value, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, thus Job Stress has a direct effect on contra productive behavior can be accepted.

The results of the second hypothesis analysis resulted in the finding that Job Stress has a positive direct effect on contra productive behavior. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that contra productive behavior is positively influenced by Job Stress. Accuracy of Job Stress leads to increased Contra productive Behavior.

Organizational Culture has a positive direct effect on Job Stress. $H_0: \beta_{21} \geq 0$ $H_1: \beta_{21} < 0$ H_0 is rejected, if $-t_{count} < -t_{table}$. From the path analysis calculation, the direct effect of Organizational Culture on Job Stress, the path coefficient value is -0.534 and the t_{count} coefficient value is -10.005. the value of the t_{table} coefficient for $\alpha = 0.01$ is -2.60. because the coefficient of t count is smaller than the value of t table, thus h_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, namely that Organizational Culture has a direct effect on Job Stress can be accepted.

Table 2. Summary of Proposed Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Statistic Hypothesis	Statistic Test		Decision	Conclusion
		t_{count}	t_{table} $\alpha = 0,01$		
Organizational Culture has a negative direct effect on contra productive behavior	$H_0: \beta_{31} \geq 0$ $H_1: \beta_{31} < 0$	-10,103**	-2,60	H_0 is rejected	Negative direct effect
Job stress has a positive direct effect on contra productive behavior	$H_0: \beta_{32} \leq 0$ $H_1: \beta_{32} > 0$	8,080**	2,60	H_0 is rejected	Positive direct effect
Organizational Culture has a positive direct effect on Job Stress	$H_0: \beta_{21} \geq 0$ $H_1: \beta_{21} < 0$	-10,005**	-2,60	H_0 is rejected	Negative direct effect

A summary of the path analysis model can be seen in the following figure:

Figure 4. Empirical Model Between Variables

Discussions

1. The Impact of Organizational Culture toward Contra productive Behavior

From the results of testing the first hypothesis it can be concluded that there is a positive direct influence of Organizational Culture on Contra productive Behavior with a correlation coefficient value of -0.485 and a path coefficient value of -0.693. This means that Organizational Culture has a direct effect on contra productive behavior. Teachers who have an innovative attitude and dare to take risks, collaborate with other work unit members to improve the best results for the

company and are supported by the Principal who provides clear and detailed directions and communication regarding the work done by the teacher will create a good work environment so that contra productive behavior will decrease. According to Jason Colquitt Lepine and Michael J Wesson in 2009 defines it as contra productive work behavior defined as employee behavior intentionally hinder organizational accomplishment. In line with the above, according to John R. Schermerhorn in 2011 stated, counterproductive Work Behaviors cover a wide from things like work avoidance to physical and verbal aggression of other to bad mouthing to outright work sabotage to theft. Contra productive Work Behaviors, Unintentionally disrupt relationships or performance at work.

2. The Impact of Job Stress Toward Contra productive Behavior

From the results of testing the second hypothesis it can be concluded that there is a positive direct effect of Job Stress on Contra productive Behavior with a correlation coefficient value of 0.647 and a path coefficient value of 0.388. This means that Job Stress has a direct effect on contra productive behavior. Poor working conditions, unclear career development systems and job performance appraisals, a culture of nepotism in school management will cause teachers to take negative actions at work so as to endanger the achievement of organizational goals, thus it can be concluded that Increased Teacher Job stress will cause an increase in teacher contra productive behavior.

The results of this study are in line with the opinions of several experts according to Richard M. Steers in 1991, It is useful from a managerial standpoint to consider several forms of contra productive behavior that are known to result from prolonged stress. These contra productive behaviors include turnover and absenteeism, alcoholism and drug abuse, and aggression and sabotage. In the journal vocational behavior, Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D 2001 :Parallel with the work on social psychology of human aggression, emotion has also been central in a lot of work organization and workplace aggression broader concepts of contra productive work behavior (CWB). Injustice and stress conditions specifically associated with both aggression and negative emotions and CWB.

Parallel to social psychology's work on human aggression, emotion has also been central to much of the organizational work of workplace aggression and the broader concept of contra productive behavior (CWB). Conditions of injustice and stress are specifically associated with negative emotions and both aggression and CWB. According to Penny's opinion in 2005 in journal organizational behavior, most research in this area has focused attention on identifying environment antecedents of CWB such as job stressors and identifying personality traits such as effectivity *may increase an individuals propensity to engage in CWB.*

3. The Impact of Organizational Culture Toward Job Stress

From the results of testing the first hypothesis it can be concluded that

there is a positive direct effect of Organizational Culture on Job stress with a correlation coefficient value of -0.534 and a path coefficient value of -0.534. This gives the meaning that Organizational Culture has a direct effect on Job Stress.

A strong organizational culture involves shared expectations, values, and attitudes so it affects individuals, groups and organizational processes, applying a strong organizational culture will create good working conditions, teachers have clarity of roles, clarity of career development and job performance appraisals. so that teacher job stress will decrease, thus it can be concluded that the increase in teacher organizational culture will cause a decrease in teacher work stress. According to John M. Ivancevich, Robert Konopske and Michael T. Metteson in 2013, *organizational culture involves shared expectations, values, and attitudes, it exerts influence on individual, groups, and organizational processes. For example, members are influenced to be good citizens and to go along.*

Organizational culture involves shared expectations, values, and attitudes, so it affects individuals, groups and organizational processes. For example, members of the organization are influenced to become good employees and follow.

Organizational structure and culture determine how effectively managers are able to coordinate and motivate employees. Robbins and Judge defines Organizational culture barriers to diversity. Hiring new employees who differ from the majority in race, age, gender, disability, or other characteristics creates a paradox. Management wants to demonstrate support for differences these employees' different bring to the workplace, but newcomers who wish to fit in must accept the organization's core cultural values. Because diverse behaviors and unique strengths are likely to diminish as people attempt to assimilate, strong cultures can become liabilities when they effectively eliminate these advantages. Based on the above descriptions theoretically and empirically, Organizational Culture has a negative direct effect on Job Stress.

CONCLUSION

Organizational culture has a negative direct effect on contra productive behavior. This means that a poor organizational culture has increased the contra productive behavior of state elementary school teachers in Pulogadung District. Job stress has a positive direct effect on contra productive behavior. This means that uncontrolled work stress results in an increase in the contra productive behavior of elementary school teachers in Pulogadung District. Organizational culture has a negative direct effect on job stress. This means that a poor organizational culture results in work stress on public elementary school teachers in Pulo Gadung District.

Contra productive behavior is the behavior of individuals who tend to take

negative actions at work so that it endangers the achievement of school goals, given that the danger of contra productive behavior is even more so in educational organizations, namely schools. The principal must have a firm attitude towards teachers who make mistakes.

Contra productive behavior is the behavior of individuals who tend to take negative actions at work so that it endangers the achievement of school goals, given that the danger of contra productive behavior is even more so in educational organizations, namely schools. The principal can help control good job stress. Among other things, by increasing the work situation that is conducive to conditions. When the situation at school is met, it can facilitate the work of the teacher. This will have an impact on teacher contra productive behavior in order to maximize the achievement of goals. The principal must also provide a good example for teachers in the school environment, especially for problems with the communication system for teachers in schools. In order to create a conducive and comfortable work environment.

REFERENCES

- Colquitt, Jason A., Jeffery A. LePine, and Michael J. Wesson. (2009) *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, (2003). Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003, Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., dan 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.
- Gordon, Judith R. (1996). *Organization Behavior. A Diagnostic Approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Gruys, Melissa I., Paul R, Sackett. (2003) *Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior*. Washington State University University of Minnesota
- <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1468-2389.00224>
- Ivancevich, John M., Robert Konopaske; Michael T Matteson. (2008) *Organizational behavior and management*. Seven edition. New york : McGraw-Hill.
- Kinicki, Angelo. Dan Williams, Brian K. (2011). *Management : A Practical introduction*. 5th Edition. McGraw-Hill.
- Kreitner, Kinicki. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. New York : McGraw-Hill
- Latief. (2011). Berdasarkan Indeks Perkembangan Pendidikan (Education Development Index, EDI). Indonesia berada pada peringkat ke 69 dari 127 negara pada tahun 2011. Kompas.com.
- <https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2011/03/02/18555569/indeks.pendidikan.indonesia.menurun>

- Lestarin Milna Ayu. (2003). *Hubungan Budaya Organisasi Dengan Perilaku Kontraproduktif Pada Pegawai Badan Pertanahan Nasional Tingkat II Samarinda*. Psikoborneo, 2016. Ejournal.Psikologi.Fisip-Unmul.Ac.Id
- Luthans, Fred. (2011). *International Management Culture Strategy and Behavior*. New York; Mc Graw Hill Book.
- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2010). *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Knowledge and Practice for The Real World (5th ed.)*. New York : The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Mullins, Laurie J. (2005) *Management and Organization* : Seventh Editor. England : Prentice Hall Financial Times.
- Murdaningsih, Dwi. (2019). Rendahnya Kompetensi Guru Jadi Masalah Pendidikan Indonesia. <https://republika.co.id/berita/pq53k5368/rendahnya-kompetensi-guru-jadi-masalah-pendidikan-indonesia>
- Nelson, Debra L. & Quick, James Campbell. (2006). *Organizational Behavior*. USA : South – Westren, The Thomson Corporation.
- Newtstrom, Jhon W. (2011). *Organizational Behavior : Human Behavior at Work*. New York-America : McGraw-Hill Education.
- Nydegger, Rudi. *Occupational Stress And Job Satisfaction In White- And Blue-Collar Workers*. Union College. International Business & Economics Research Journal Volume 1, Number 12. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/268107402.pdf>
- Prasetyanta, Nindya Putra. (2019). *Pengaruh Stres Kerja terhadap perilaku kerja kontraproduktif dengan Employee Personality sebagai Variabel Moderating pada Karyawan Operasional PT. Kereta Api Indonesia Daerah Operasi 6 Yogyakarta*. Universitas Islam Indonesia Prasetyanta@gmail.com. <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/14172/12.%20JURNAL%20NINDYA%20PUTRA%20ANGK%2042.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y>
- Richard L. Hughes, Robert C. Ginnett, and Gordon J. Curphy. (2012). *Leadership. Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*, Alih Bahasa : Putri Izzali. Jakarta : Salemba Humanika.
- Robbins, Stephen P. & Timothy A. Judge. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*. 13 Three Edition, USA : Pearson International Edition, Prentice-Hall.
- Schermerhon Jr., J. R., Uhl-Bien, M., Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G. (2011) *Organizational Behavior*. Twelveth Edition. United State of America: Jhon Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Tahun 1945 Pasal 31
- Werther William B, and Keith Davis, (1996) *Human Resources and Personel Management, Third Edition*, Singapore, McGraw Hill Inc.
- Wibowo. (2014). *Perilaku dalam organisasi*. Edisi 1-2. Jakarta : Rajawali Pers.