

Job insecurity to counter productive work behavior moderated leader-member exchange

Yuni Siswanti

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: yuni.siswanti@upnyk.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received : 2022-03-17

Accepted : 2022-03-31

Published: 2022-07-06

JEL Classification Code:

M12, M14, M54

Author's email:

yuni.siswanti@upnyk.ac.id

[DOI: 10.20885/jsb.vol26.iss2.art7](https://doi.org/10.20885/jsb.vol26.iss2.art7)

Abstract

Purpose – This study aims to find out and analyze the influence of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) and test the quality of LMX as a variable moderation in employees in the creative culinary in Sleman Regency Yogyakarta.

Design/Methodology/Approach – The type of research used in this study is explanatory with a quantitative approach. The population of this study is employees in 18 creative industries in the culinary field in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta. One hundred twenty-two respondents took the sample by the purposive method. The instrument Test used validity and reliability. Hypothesis testing uses simple regression and moderated regression.

Findings – Results show that job insecurity significantly affects counterproductive work behavior (CWB). LMX quality moderates the effect of job insecurity on CWB. The results of this study have theoretical and managerial implications and require further research.

Research Limitation/Implications – This study has limitations, namely: population collection is still minimal because SMEs are studied in only one district, the type of SMEs business and limited to culinary, cross-sectional data collection. Further research should be expanded in the scope of the population, not only in one district but expanded in other districts in Yogyakarta. The type of product produced by respondents in this study is the culinary field, so it should be extended to different SMEs types. Second, cross-sectional data collection of this study requires a more longitudinal design in the future to get better study results. Third, the study did not distinguish CWB in workers with permanent employee status and workers with contract employee status.

Practical Implications – Providing understanding to culinary SMEs to maintain good relations with all workers in the form of respecting workers, respect for the work of the men, establishing effective communication with workers under any conditions, trying their best for their men, and increasing the sense of belonging in the men.

Theoretical Implications – Academics and researchers have a perceptual understanding of the contribution of leader-member relationships (LMX) in lowering the influence of job insecurity on CWB (CWB-O) and (CWB-I).

Originality/Value – Authenticity of the study: Previous research that included LMX quality as a moderation variable between job insecurity and CWB is still very minimal. It shows that the theory reinforces the existence of LMX Theory that the high quality of LMX between leader-members has been characterized by an exchange of emotions based on mutual trust and respect. In contrast, the low quality of LMX relationships has the characteristics of economic exchange.

Keywords: Job insecurity, counterproductive work behavior, Leader-Member Exchange

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic has a significant impact on organizational existence and employee behavior. The situation is increasingly difficult, causing the vulnerability of employee behavior that tends to be negative, especially in the millennial generation. Negative employee behavior often called counterproductive work behavior (CWB), becomes one of the essential things that the organization must consider. This behavior can affect the economic, social, and psychological fields (Aubé, 2009; Tziner & Bodankin, 2009). Research Aquino et al. (1999; Demerouti et al. 2015; Jones & Martens 2009) states that negative work behavior is assessed to result in negative consequences for individuals and the organization as a whole.

CWB trigger factors from the situational side consist of three (3) things, namely: (1) sources of stress causes, such as a buildup of work expenses, conflict of roles, and conflict between colleagues (Spector et al., 2006); (2) changes that occur in the workplace, such as technological changes, rearrangement of organizational structures, management changes, salary cuts, inconveniences at work, as well as perceived penalties from the organization (Kickul & Lester, 2001; Marcus & Schuler, 2004; Robinson & Morrison, 2000) and (3) perceptions of injustice and/or justice felt by low employees (Haaland, 2002; Spector, 1975).

Job insecurity is felt to increase in millennial employees during the pandemic due to the substantial job cuts in some organizations. Huang et al. (2017) found that occupational discomfort affects work behavior counterproductively with increasing moral disengagement. Yiwen & Hahn (2021) states that: 1) there is a positive relationship of job discomfort with CWB, 2) moral disengagement mediates the effect of job discomfort with CWB, 3) psychological capital moderates negative the influence of occupational discomfort with moral disengagement, 4) psychological capital moderates negative moral disengagement influence on CWB. This study recommends including other variables that may reduce the influence of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior, namely the relationship of leaders and members (leader-member exchange LMX).

The study tested and analyzed the effects of occupational discomfort on CWBs on employees in the creative culinary industry (Small and Medium Enterprises SMEs in the Culinary Field) during the COVID-19 period and included LMX as a moderation. During Covid-19, most culinary SMEs experienced a significant decrease in income. This caused SMEs owners to be forced to expel some employees because they could not afford to pay their compensation. The following result is that the employees feel job insecurity at work. This model is at once a novelty (novelties) of researchers and, at the same time, fills the research gap with reasons:

1. There have been some previous studies on the effect of work discomfort on the CWB, but the representation and reference value are not robust because there are direct, positive influences significantly (Ma et al., 2019; Sahi & Ahmad, 2019; Akanni et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2021; Chirumbolo, 2015; Olugbenga et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2014; Siyavooshi & Esmati, 2019) and there are indirect effects (Cho et al., 2014; Picolly et al., 2017; Yiwen & Hahn, 2021; Zahoor et al., 2019; Olubenga et al., 2020; Van den Broeck et al., 2014). Thus, this research is needed to strengthen scientific studies on the direct influence of work discomfort on the CWB. If it is known that there is a significant direct influence, SMEs leaders can take appropriate policies toward their members so that the CWB can be minimized.
2. Previous studies included moderation variables that are different from this study (Yiwen & Hahn, 2021; Zahoor et al., 2019; Olubenga et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2014; Qin et al., 2021). The studies include employment status, psychological capital, negative emotions, supervisor support, and human capital as moderation variables. This study tried to have LMX as moderation because it was still minimal in previous studies.
3. Research that includes aspects of moderation in SMEs is still very minimal. Previous research has been conducted on large-scale companies both in the goods and services sectors (Ma et al., 2019; Sahi & Ahmad, 2019; Akanni et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2021; Chirumbolo, 2015; Olugbenga et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2014; Siyavooshi & Esmati, 2019; Yiwen & Hahn, 2021; Zahoor et al., 2019; Olubenga et al., 2019; Tian et al., 2014; Qin et al., 2020).
4. Research with SMEs objects, especially batik, is still needed because these SMEs demand extraordinary accuracy from the actors. Not everyone has the talent of the art of pouring his

ideas in the form of batik with patience, detail, and a calm and happy heart. These elements require serious support from SMEs owners/leaders. This support is in building a good and close cooperative relationship with members, called Leader-Member exchange (LMX). The pandemic that hit almost all countries directly impacted the productivity of batik SMEs. This situation has implications for a reduction in employees. Removing employees results in the uncomfortable feelings of batik SME workers, thus affecting workers who tend to drop other workers to look good in front of the owner. In this situation, the owner and leader of batik SMEs are required to find the best solution so that no one feels aggrieved. By maintaining a good LMX (in-group), it is possible to reduce the effect of work discomfort on the CWB (Ma et al., 2019; Sahi & Ahmad, 2019; Akanni et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2021; Chirumbolo, 2015; Olugbenga et al. 2020; Tian et al., 2014; Siyavooshi & Esmati, 2019).

Literature Review

Job Insecurity

Job Insecurity is a feeling of insecurity for employees related to continuing their future work (Sverke et al., 2006). According to Witte (1999), job insecurity is the perception, feelings of helplessness, and anxiety that employees feel facing the possibility of losing their jobs. De Witte (2005) concludes that job insecurity is a subjective perception of the employee. Based on the above understanding of the definition of Job insecurity, researchers concluded that the definition of Job insecurity is the anxiety experienced by employees in the face of the threat of losing their jobs in the future.

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

Researchers use various terms to describe CWB, such: as aggressive behavior (Fox & Spector, 1999), antisocial behavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), behavior violating organizational norms (Neuman & Baron, 2005), non-compliant behavior (Puffer, 1987), deviant work behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), aggression behavior in the workplace (Baron & Neuman, 1996), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), revenge behavior (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), dysfunctional behavior (Griffin et al., 1998), and counterproductive work behavior (Fox et al., 2001). The term refers to almost the same meaning: a hostile work behavior of employees that can harm the organization and other organization members. In this study, researchers used the term counterproductive work behavior. CWB, in the context of work in organizations, is often used and is one of the essential components of employee performance assessment (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). CWB can occur across all organization sectors (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). However, some previous research has noted that CWBs are more common in public sector organizations than in private organizations (Anjum & Parvez, 2013). The high level of CWB is feared to harm organizations and other members, and even break the country.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

LMX theory was formerly known as vertical dyad linkage theory (VDL Theory). According to Dansereau et al. (1975), VDL theory focuses on the leader-members relationship and development process. Liden & Graen (1980) states that VDL assumes there are opportunities for members will be selected and trusted by the leadership because of their competence and skills, the conditions that allow them to be trusted by the leadership, and greater motivation in their work units. The premise of the VDL theory is that the administration exercises limited control over members (Liden & Graen, 1980). The VDL approach provides a specific way for leadership research to study the dyadic leader-member relationship (Graen et al., 2006).

Since the 1980s, Graen and his colleagues have maintained the importance of the quality of member-leader exchanges and called the exchange relationship the name of the leader-member exchange relationship or LMX (Graen et al., 1982). Graen, & Scandura (1987) first defined LMX as a system consisting of components involving members in a paired relationship (members leaders). There is a pattern of dependence in behaving, sharing results, and generating understanding of its

environment, planning, and values LMX prioritizes member-leader reciprocation contributions instead of negotiation processes within the VDL (Dienesch & Liden, 1986).

LMX was built a relationship based on profit-sharing in the work units of Schriesheim et al. (1992; Dienesch & Liden, 1986), refers to efforts in the relationship as "currencies of exchange" The differences in exchange relationships developed between member leaders are based on aspects of leadership, capability, and reliability Members trusted by the leadership will be selected in a closed working relationship (closer to the leadership) (Erdogan et al., 2006) High exchange relationships are characterized by: trust, liking, and high respect (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The basic principle of LMX theory is that leaders form unique relationships with members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The high quality of LMX relationships between leaders-members is characterized by emotional exchanges based on mutual trust and respect, while low LMX relationships have an economic exchange (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX theory assumes that the leader's willingness to establish an exchange relationship within the group with members is due to an element of dependence, mutual support, loyalty, contribution, and greater responsibility. In contrast, leaders in normal relations with outgroup members engage informal rules and are limited to achieving appropriate standard profits (Erdogan et al., 2006).

Graen & Scandura (1987) argued about LMX in the role theory, stating that LMX has two dimensions: approaches to building good relationships with employees, consisting of loyalty, support, trust. The second dimension on which LMX is based on the coupling that focuses on the attitude of superiors towards the men, including the direction of communication (addressing), influence, allocation (allocation), freedom in expression (latitude), and innovation (innovation).

Those dimensions form the LMX (Leader Member Exchange) theory as one of the leadership theories for measuring the relationship of superiors with subordinates in an organization (Rasouli & Haghtaali, 2006). Liden & Masly'n research (1998), explained that LMX is multidimensional and has four dimensions: contribution, loyalty, affection, and respect for the profession.

Regarding LMX theory, according to Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995), there are three (3) things that are the basis in building a member exchange leader relationship: respect, trust, and obligation. It can form the relationship between leader and members because of mutual respect for the abilities of others. This theory is the basic theory behind the concept of reciprocal exchange relationships between superiors and members The interaction between leaders and members in the LMX concept also presents an element of obligation between the two parties In reality, the type of interchange that occurs between leader and member can differ because the obligation to retaliate is not equal According to Blau (1964), In economic transactions, it takes a formal contract to establish the responsibilities of both parties in the form of precise quantities to be exchanged In this context, the obligations of actors interacting in a social exchange are not predetermined, although such social exchanges involve and produce elements of trust Vidyarthi et al., (2010) state that basic assumptions in social exchange theory impact on the dichotomy of exchange relationships between leaders and members, namely high-quality in group groups or LMX that experience social exchange and low-quality out-groups or LMX that experience economic exchange.

Job Insecurity and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

Employees who feel insecure at work will increase their desire to do things that the organization does not want. LMX theory assumes that a leader's willingness to establish a group-in-group exchange relationship with members is due to dependence, mutual support, loyalty, contribution, and greater responsibility. LMX theory assumes that the leader's willingness to establish an exchange relationship within the group with members is due to an element of dependence, mutual support, loyalty, contribution, and greater responsibility. In contrast, leaders in normal relations with outgroup members engage informal rules and are limited to achieving appropriate standard profits (Erdogan et al., 2006). as a result of the covid-19 pandemic that causes high job cuts. These behaviors include: increased absenteeism, decreased morale, using work time for unproductive activities. All of these behaviors fall into the CWB category. Research Ma et al. (2019; Sahi & Ahmad, 2019; Akanni et al. 2018; Lawrence et al. 2021; Zahoor et al. 2019; Chirumbolo, 2015;

Olugbenga et al. 2020; Tian et al. 2014; Siyavooshi & Esmati, 2019) showed that job insecurity had a significant positive effect on CWB in 212 employees of air transport companies in China. Van den Broeck et al. (2014) found that qualitative job insecurity significantly affected CWB-O.

H1: Job insecurity positively affects counterproductive work behavior (CWB)

Job Insecurity – LMX - Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

Employees who feel discomfort at work will increase their unwillingness to behave counterproductive work, such as increased absenteeism, using work time to talk more with colleagues, and working with no enthusiasm (Ma et al., 2019; Sahi & Ahmad, 2019; Akanni et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2021; Zahoor et al., 2019; Chirumbolo, 2015; Olugbenga et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2014). This condition can be minimized if there is an excellent cooperative relationship between the leadership and its members. According to Blau (1964), individuals and groups strive to maintain a balance between inputs and outputs in social interaction. About LMX, members who receive emotional or physical support will feel obligated to reciprocate with the attitude and behavior that the leader values (Vidyarthi et al., 2010). According to Dansereau et al. (1975), within the high-quality LMX group, when leaders offer responsibility, communication, and support, members respond instead with higher time, energy, responsibility, and commitment.

H2: The higher the quality of LMX, the lower the effect of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior (CW)

Research Methods

Measurement Development

Job Insecurity is measured by the Job Insecurity Scale (JIS) instrument developed by Ashford et al. (1989). Questionnaire statements such as: "You are likely to be housed for a while" The LMX questionnaire adopted the instrument Liden et al. (1993) Questionnaire statements such as: "My immediate superior always defend me if I am cornered by someone" CWB instrument adopted Bennet & Robinson (2000). The questionnaire statement is like: "Arrive late without permission" Each item of the report is answered using measurements of 6 (six) types of Likert scale with categories: SSS (Strongly Agree), SS (Strongly Agree); S (Agree), AS (Somewhat Agree), TS (Disagree), and STS (Strongly Disagree).

Validity and Reliability

There is still a validity test (Confirmatory Factor Analysis CFA method), and a reliability test (by looking at Cronbach's Alpha coefficient). Researchers set the Alpha level coefficient: 5%.

According to Hair et al. (2017), an instrument is declared valid if it has a loading factor score of ≥ 0.5 . It tested the validity of research instruments using the exploratory factor analysis method with principal component analysis and varimax rotation techniques. The loading factor score expressed the using validity score.

The validity test results showed that all instrument items of the three variables tested were valid, as shown from the effects of each instrument clustered into their respective variables, with a loading factor coefficient above 0.05. The face validity test is followed by reliability analysis to measure internal consistency over various statement items across job insecurity, LMX, and CWB indicator. The criteria used for reliability testing is alpha Cronbach's. Alpha Cronbach's score should not be less than 0.7 (Hair et al., 2017). Reliability test results showed all three variables tested had an alpha Cronbach's above 0.7.

Data Collection Methods

The subject of this research is the SME actors of culinary creative business in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta. The method of collecting data in this study through interviews and questionnaires. The selection of respondents using purposive sampling, with the criteria selected by workers who have worked in culinary SMEs for at least 3 (three) years.

There are 28 culinary SMEs still active before and after the Covid-19 pandemic in Sleman Regency, 122 workers were obtained as hospitals. This type of data in this research includes secondary data (data on the number of culinary SMEs in Sleman Yogyakarta Regency) and primary data (research questionnaires and interview results with several culinary SME managers in Sleman Regency). Data retrieval through online using wats app media and google form. Data collection offline is done by going directly to culinary SMEs with permission from SME owners. Research variables include job insecurity (free variable), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) (moderation variable), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB) (dependent variable).

Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis test in this case researchers use simple regression analysis (H1 test) and hierarchical regression analysis (H2 test).

Results and Discussions

Respondent Profile

Table I shows more female respondents than men (in culinary SMEs in Kalasan District) numbered 62%, the age of the most respondents was between 32 to 38 years (34%), the last education was at the highest level of High School (68%), and the working period mainly was for 3 to 6 years (58%).

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Category	Sum	Percentage
Gender	Male	47	38%
	Female	75	62%
Age	18-24 years old	21	17%
	25-31 years old	32	26%
	32-38 years old	41	34%
	39-45 years old	28	23%
	Total	122	100,00%
Education	Primary School	5	4%
	Junior High School	26	21%
	High School	83	68%
	Diploma	5	4%
	Bachelor	3	3%
	Total	122	100,00%
Work Experience	3-6 years	71	58%
	7-8 years	32	26%
	>8 years	19	16%
	Total	122	100,0o%

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

Descriptive Statistics

The three variables tested were perceived as high averages by respondents, with their respective values being: job insecurity (5.30), LMX (4.84), and CWB (5.26).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

No.	Variable	Mean	Average Score Perception	Standard Deviation	1	2	3
1	Job Insecurity	5.30	High	.92142			.593**
2	LMX	4.84	High	1.12190	.325*		
3	CWB	5.26	High	.85738		.482**	

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

Hypothesis Testing

Table 2. The Impact of Job Insecurity on CWB

		Coefficients ^a				t	Sig.
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	.052	.672			.184	.610
	Job Insecurity (X)	.481	.231	.373		3.622	.041

a. Dependent Variable: Counter Productive Work Behavior (CWB) (Y)

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

The simple regression test research shows that job insecurity has a positive and significant effect on counterproductive work behavior because the significant coefficient is 0.041 (< 0.05), so H1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 Test Results

Table 3. Moderation Regression Test

		R Square	B	S.E	t	P	Hypotheses
Jl	→ CWB	.056	.481	.0583	3.622	.041	H1: supported
Jl, LMX, Interaction	→ CWB	.063	.624	4.271	4.563	.020	H2: supported

Source: primary data, 2022

The phase 2 regression test is 0.063, and the R Square regression stage 1 value is 0.056. These results show an increase in the influence of job insecurity on CWB when accompanied by the rise in LMX quality. Thus, H2 is supported, meaning that the higher the quality of LMX, the more it can reduce the influence of job insecurity on CWB. In other words, the quality of LMX can be a variable moderation.

Discussion

The results of the hypothesis 1 test showed job insecurity had a positive and significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. The results of this research support the research of Ma et al. (2019); Sahi & Ahmad (2019); Akanni et al. (2018); Lawrence et al. (2021); Zahoor et al. (2019); Chirumbolo (2015); Olugbenga et al. (2020); Tian et al. (2014); Siyavooshi & Esmati (2019); Van den Broeck et al. (2014). Job insecurity felt by workers in culinary SMEs is relatively high and impacts counterproductive work behavior. High job insecurity due to the Covid-19 pandemic reduced most employees working in the creative culinary industry. The SMEs leadership forced the reduction of employees in SMEs because of the low purchasing power, so SME income decreased dramatically. This decrease in revenue resulted in SMEs having difficulty paying compensation for their men, so they have to make job cuts. Some SMEs still retain employees, but employee income has decreased because the production level in the Covid-19 pandemic is down. On the other hand, the cost of living is increasing. That causes discomfort in work because of workers' concerns if issued by SME owners at any time, worry about not getting another job if excluded from the organization, and worry about the ability to meet household needs due to inadequate income.

If workers consider their jobs unsafe, they are more likely to treat colleagues with counterproductive behavior than against the organization. According to stress theory, occupational discomfort acts as a stressor, resulting in negative behaviors such as counterproductive work behavior toward the organization (CWB-O) and counterproductive work behavior toward the individual (CWB-I). Workers who consider their jobs to be high risk will engage in actions that are likely to harm organizations and individuals (Shoss, 2017).

The results of the study Ma et al. (2019) showed that CWB-I is higher than CWB-O. To maintain their jobs, workers will act carefully and minimize counterproductive behavior towards

the organization (Probst et al., 2007; Shoss, 2017). Instead, workers will always go to great lengths to prove that they are ideally suited to be employees, hold on to the organization's values and work very hard. At the same time, they will regard coworkers as rivals who will defeat their position within the organization. Employees who do not have enough work experience will feel surprised by employees who are already senior. They worry that they defeated senior because the organization was in a complex financial condition, indicating high job insecurity. Employees who experience high job discomfort are more likely to engage in CWB-I, such as acting abusively toward other employees withholding critical information from coworkers (Shoss, 2017). Due to competitors' more attractive prices and services to customers, culinary businesses have difficulty surviving in difficult situations. This condition can occur where the organization's minimal opportunity for employees to be maintained in the state of the covid-19 pandemic.

The results of the H2 test showed that the better quality of the leader-member relationship (LMX) would be able to reduce the influence of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Leader-member exchange quality (LMX quality) describes the superior's relationship with his subordinates (Masterson et al., 2000). The results of the H2 test showed that a better quality of the leader-member relationship (LMX) would be able to reduce the influence of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Restubog et al. (2005) explained that leaders have the potential to create an ingroup or an outgroup exchange. Members with inner group status will obtain higher performance ratings, lower turnover rates, and greater job satisfaction with superiors than members of outside group status. They get less attention, and superior support may even perceive being mistreated by superiors. The basic principle of LMX theory is that leaders form unique relationships with members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The high quality of LMX relationships between leaders-members is characterized by emotional exchanges based on mutual trust and respect, while low LMX relationships had economic exchange characteristics (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Graen & Scandura (1987) argued about LMX in the role theory, stating that LMX has two (2) dimensions consisting of approaches to building good relationships with employees: loyalty, support, and trust. The second dimension on which LMX is based is coupling that focuses on the attitude of superiors towards the men, including: the direction of communication, influence, allocation, freedom in expression, and innovation. Those dimensions form the LMX (Leader-Member Exchange) theory, as one of the leadership theories for measuring the relationship of superiors with subordinates in an organization (Rasouli & Haghtaali, 2006). Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) states that a number of previous studies showed that the results of the leader-member exchange relationship will result in a variety of benefits. The high quality of LMX relationships will be able to help reduce the effect of individual work discomfort on the desire to behave counterproductive work. This can happen because the main foundation in building a leader-member exchange relationship (LMX) is respect, trust, and obligation. The higher the respect, trust and sense of leadership towards members, the more members feel treated very well by the leadership. This condition allows workers in the culinary creative business to control acting badly towards the organization or to other workers, despite feeling discomfort in the work. Members will maintain good relationships with leaders, co-workers and organizations.

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

The theoretical implications of these research results are: (1) academics and researchers have a perceptual understanding of the contribution of leader-member relationships (LMX) in lowering the influence of job insecurity on CWB (CWB-O) and (CWB-I). The results of this research reinforce the existence of social exchange theory which believes that this theory is a theory that uses rational assumptions from the discipline of economics. According to this theory, in social relationships, there are elements of reward, sacrifice (cost), and reciprocity that affect each other. Previous research that included the quality of LMX as a moderation variable between job insecurity and CWB is still very minimally done. Most studies examine the effect of job insecurity on CWB moderated by psychological contract, work-family conflict (Zahoor et al., 2019), psychological capital, and negative emotions (Yiwen et al., 2021); occupational self-efficacy (Olugbenga et al.,

2020). The result of this theory reinforces the existence of LMX Theory that high LMX quality between leader-members is characterized by an exchange of emotions based on mutual trust and respect, while the low quality of LMX relationships has the characteristics of economic exchange (Dienesch & Liden, 1998; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The managerial implications of this research are: providing understanding to culinary SMEs to maintain good relations with all workers in the form of respect for workers, respect for the results of the work of the men, establishing effective communication with workers under any conditions, striving for the best for the men and increase the sense of belonging in the men. In this way, it is expected that the quality of LMX is improved (the achievement of in-group), and the men who respect superiors can avoid the desire to perform CWB. A small CWB can lower an organization's unnecessary costs. The high quality of LMX affects the decline in counterproductive work behavior (Erdogan & Liden, 2006; Seo, 2016; Vidyarthi et al., 2010). Thus, LMX can be one of the essential media in lowering the perception of job insecurity that employees feel towards the desire to behave in counterproductive work.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The results of the hypothesis 1 test showed job insecurity had a positive and significant effect on CWB. The results of the H2 test showed that more LMX quality increases would reduce the impact of job insecurity on CWB.

This study has several limitations, including: first, population uptake is still minimal because SMEs are studied in only one district. Further research should be expanded in the scope of the population, not only in one section but expanded in one province or more comprehensive to abroad. Second, the type of product produced by respondents in this study is the culinary field and should extend further research to other SMEs, such as Agrobusiness and digital SMEs. Third, cross-sectional data collection of this study requires a more longitudinal design in the future to get better and more generalized study results. Fourth, the focus of the study was on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in culinary workers, not distinguishing CWB by workers with permanent employee status and workers with contract employee status, so it has not been able to see whether the effects of job insecurity on CWB on both worker statuses are the same or different. Follow-up research should distinguish the group of workers: permanent or non-permanent.

References

- Akanni, A. A., Oladejo, O. E., & Oduaran, C. A. (2018). Work-life Balance, Job Insecurity and Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Brewery Workers. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 289 -300.
- Anjum, M. A., & Parvez, A. (2013). Counterproductive behavior at work: A comparison of blue collar and white-collar workers. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 7(3), 417-434.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(7), 1073-1091.
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes and consequences of job insecurity: A theory- based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803-829.
- Aubé, C. et al. (2009). Counterproductive behaviors and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(3), 351–361.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 22(3), 161–173.
- Bennett, R.J. and Robinson, S.L. (2000), “Development of a measure of workplace deviance”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.

- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Chirumbolo, A. (2015). The impact of job insecurity on counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of honesty–humility personality trait. *The Journal of psychology*, 149(6), 554–569.
- Cho, Y. H., Moon, M., & Jung, J. C. (2014). The effects of perceived job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior (CWB): Organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) as a mediator. *Korean Journal of Business Administration*, 27(11), 1883–1902.
- Dansereau Jr, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13(1), 46–78.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 457–469.
- De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 1–6.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618–634.
- Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management journal*, 49(2), 395–406.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration–aggression. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 20(6), 915–931.
- 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(3), 291–309.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Sage.
- Graen, G., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader—member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30(1), 109–131.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9(175–208).
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Graen, George B, Hui, C., & Taylor, E. A. (2006). Experience-based learning about LMX leadership and fairness in project teams: A dyadic directional approach. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(4), 448–460.
- Griffin, R. W., O’Leary-Kelly, A., & Collins, J. (1998). *Dysfunctional Work Behaviors in Organizations*. (Monographs in Organizational Behavior & Industrial Relations) (1986–1998).
- Haaland, S. A. (2002). *Understanding organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors: Examining interactions utilizing an organizational versus interpersonal categorization strategy*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, Central Michigan University.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Gudergan, S. P. (2017). *Advanced issues in partial least squares structural equation modeling*. saGe publications.
- Huang, G. H., Wellman, N., Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Wang, L. (2017). Deviance and exit: The organizational costs of job insecurity and moral disengagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,

102(1), 26.

- Jones, D. A., & Martens, M. L. (2009). The mediating role of overall fairness and the moderating role of trust certainty in justice–criteria relationships: The formation and use of fairness heuristics in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(8), 1025-1051.
- Kickul, J., & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: Equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of business and psychology*, 16(2), 191-217.
- Lawrence, B., Fildes, B., Cairney, P., Davy, S., & Sobhani, A. (2021). Evaluation of raised safety platforms (RSP) on-road safety performance. *Sustainability*, 14(1), 138.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 451–465.
- 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.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 662-674.
- Ma, B., Liu, S., Lassleben, H., & Ma, G. (2019). The relationships between job insecurity, psychological contract breach and counterproductive workplace behavior: Does employment status matter?. *Personnel Review*, 48(2), 595-610.
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: a general perspective. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(4), 647.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2005). *Aggression in the Workplace: A Social-Psychological Perspective*.
- Olugbenga Joseph, O., Omonona, S., & Mjoli, T. Q. (2020). Perceived Job Insecurity and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Occupational Self-Efficacy. *African Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 15(3), 185-202.
- Probst, T. M., Stewart, S. M., Gruys, M. L., & Tierney, B. W. (2007). Productivity, counterproductivity and creativity: The ups and downs of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(3), 479-497.
- Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of applied psychology*, 72(4), 615.
- Qin, C., Wu, K., Liu, X., Liu, S., & Lu, W. (2021). The Effect of Job Security on Deviant Behaviors in Diverse Employment Workplaces: From the Social Identity Perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(14), 7374.
- Rasouli, R., & Haghtaali, M. (2009). Impact of leader-member exchange on job satisfaction in Tehran social security branches. *Turkish Public Administration Annual*, 32(35), 55-70.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., Krebs, S. A., & Tang, R. L. (2005). The Role Of Leader-Member Exchange In The Psychological Contract Breach--Subordinates'performance Relationship. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2005(1), I1--I6.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 525-546.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Sahi, Q. B., & Ahmad, M. (2019). Impact of job insecurity and moral disengagement on

- counterproductive work behavior. *City University Research Journal*, 9(2), 279-294.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., Scandura, T. A., & Tepper, B. J. (1992). Development and preliminary validation of a new scale (LMX-6) to measure leader-member exchange in organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 135-147.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434.
- Seo, J. J. (2016). *The Effects of Leader-member Exchange (LMX) Social Comparisons on Employees Work Behaviors*. Arizona State University.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2006). *Job insecurity: A literature review*. Stockholm: Arbetslivsinstitutet.
- Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of management*, 43(6), 1911-1939.
- Siyavooshi, M., & Esmati Moghadam, M. R. (2019). Investigating the role of Quantitative and Qualitative job insecurity in the occurrence of the counterproductive work Behaviors in Military Organizations. *Journal of Sustainable Human Resource Management*, 1(1), 93-75.
- Spector, P. E. (1975). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(5), 635-645.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.
- Tian, Q., Zhang, L., & Zou, W. (2014). Job insecurity and counterproductive behavior of casino dealers—the mediating role of affective commitment and moderating role of supervisor support. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 40, 29-36.
- Tziner, A., & Bodankin, M. (2009). Constructive Deviance, Destructive Deviance and Personality: How Do They Interrelate? *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, 26, 549-564.
- Van den Broeck, A., Sulea, C., Vander Elst, T., Fischmann, G., Iliescu, D., & De Witte, H. (2014). The mediating role of psychological needs in the relation between qualitative job insecurity and counterproductive work behavior. *Career Development International*, 19(5), 526-547.
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization science*, 7(2), 151-165.
- Vidarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader-member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 849.
- Witte, H. D. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of work and Organizational psychology*, 8(2), 155-177.
- Yiwen, F., & Hahn, J. (2021). Job Insecurity in the COVID-19 Pandemic on Counterproductive Work Behavior of Millennials: A Time-Lagged Mediated and Moderated Model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(16), 8354.
- Zahoor, I., Malik, N. I., & Atta, M. (2019). Relationship between job insecurity, workplace incivility and counterproductive work Behaviors among employees: Role of work family conflict. *Foundation university journal of psychology*, 3(2), 133-162.