

Influence of Leader Member Exchange and Role Conflict in Student Organization Performance with Stress as Intervening Variable

Tri Maryati^{1,*} Aditiya Dian Panduwinata²

¹Lecturer of Management Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Alumni of Management Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: tri_maryati@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to analyze the influence of Leader Member Exchange and Role Conflict toward Students Organization Performance. The result of this research is useful for the concerned organization to allow and improve member organization performance in each concerned organization. The subject of this research was 3 Student Associations in Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. The sampling technique at this research used a purposive sampling technique with collecting data by online questionnaire, researcher obtained 47 respondents. Analyzing data used path analysis with SPSS 16 as analytical tool. The results of this research show that LMX significantly influence the organization performance. However, LMX did not significantly influence the stress. Role conflict significantly influenced the stress, but role conflict did not significantly influence the organization performance, and stress did not significantly influence the organization performance. The result also shows that stress was not mediating LMX with organization performance, and also stress was not mediating role conflict with the organization performance.

Keywords: *Leader Member Exchange, Role Conflict, Stress, and Students Organization Performance.*

1. INTRODUCTION

A leader in an organization has a very important role to determine and direct the organization. Therefore, leaders have to coordinate and communicate and build relationships with each member.

The process of communication performed by leaders to members of course does not mean without any obstacles. Relationships or perceptions formed between leaders and members can be seen from the level of trust between the two, and the interest and respect provided by members to the leader. This connection or perception creation is called the Exchange Member Leader.

Differences in relationships which occur between leaders and the members have an influence on the performance of each member. Members who have a stronger relationship with the leader tend to know where and what direction is provided by the leader; clear tasks, responsibilities and also understanding the tasks given will have an impact on the members' performance; the work completed right and quickly, and the relationship and respect for the leader will be stronger.

However, not all relationships built by a leader can be a strong relationship for members who have not too strong relationship will be a separate constraint. The weak relationship between leaders and subordinates causes a

distortion of direction provided to the subordinates, and feeling lack of trust in the leadership. The weak relationship between leaders and members creates confusion about the tasks and responsibilities provided to members. They feel the work provided is unclear, and they do not know the instruction given by the leader. The lack of clarity and confusion of direction given by the leader become the factors of stress.

Robbins (2015) [16] stated that Exchange Member Leaders can be defined as "the creation by the leader of in-group and out-group; subordinate within will status group higher performance ratings, less turnover, and greater job satisfaction." In this case, Robbins concluded that the existence of LMX increases the performance of high members without better turnover and satisfaction. The researcher assumed that the higher and better LMX formed by leaders towards subordinates, the more the organizational performance of members in the organization increases. Thus, the researcher argued that LMX has a positive influence on member performance in organization.

The phenomenon which occurs in the world of student organizations is that there is an influence of Leader Member Exchange on the level of stress experienced by members in student organizations. LMX is a perception of trust relationships formed and occurring between superiors and their subordinates. Researchers observed on the field that

there was a relationship between perceptions with the level of stress that occurred in subordinates. The stronger the perception of the relationship which was successfully created by a boss, the more the level of stress that occurs in subordinates reduces. It happens because of a strong relationship due to the emergence of a sense of trust, respect and the loyalty of subordinates to their superiors. Hence, the existence of a strong relationship reduces feelings of stress because members have direction and trust in what the superiors instruct and do.

Another problem of researchers is the emergence of the role conflict in most members in the organization concerned. Because basically every member in the organization is a student, there will be role conflicts which occur in each member. Pressure and work from the organization which continuously encourages members to perform full attention to the tasks given but on the other hand compulsory academic activities also require each individual to give full attention too, and various other activities that make individuals have more than one role to play.

Previous research was related to the influence of LMX on the performance conducted by [19] and [6]. They concluded that LMX had a positive effect on Performance.

Previous research is related to the influence of role conflict on stress conducted by [7] and [5]. The results implied that role conflict has a positive effect on stress.

Previous research was related to the influence of role conflict on performance performed by [12], [13], [23], and [9] which revealed that role conflict negatively affects performance.

Previous research was related to the influence of stress on the performance conducted by [12], [5], and [23], and it found that stress has a significant negative effect on the performance.

The difference between this research and previous research is that researchers included stress variables that affected LMX relationship to performance. In the view of researchers, LMX has an influence on work stress based on the experience undergone by researchers in student organization.

Based on the above phenomena, the problems can be formulated as follows: 1) Are there LMX influences on the performance of individuals in the organization?; 2) Is there an effect of role conflict on the individual performance in the organization?; 3) Are there LMX influences on individual stress in the organization?; 4) Is there an effect of role conflict on individual stress in the organization ?; 5) Is there an influence on the stress level of individuals' performance in organization?

The objective of this study is to analyze: 1) The influence of LMX on individual performance in organization; 2) Effect of role conflict on the individual performance in the organization; 3) Effect of LMX influence on individual stress in organization; 4) Effects of role conflict on individual stress in organization; 5) Effect of the influence of the stress level of individual performance in the organization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Performance

[24] ARGUED that performance is a real behavior which is presented by everyone as work performance produced by employees in accordance with their role in the company. Meanwhile, [8] added that performance (work performance) is the work of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in completing his or her duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. [14] emphasized that performance is the result of work achieved in conducting the tasks and jobs coming from the organization. From some of the definitions, it can be concluded that performance is the result achieved by an employee in performing the work assigned to him in the organization.

To measure the employees' performance, [24] explained that it is seen from work ability, work quality, work creativity, work discipline, honesty level, attitude, loyalty to work, motivation, compensation, work environment, and salary.

2.2. Leader Member Exchange (LMX)

Yukl (2004) in [4] stated that the rationale of LMX theory is that leaders develop superior-subordinate relationships which are different from each subordinate. Hence, it can be implied that LMX requires every employer or leader to be able to adapt, develop and establish good relations with subordinates to create a strong trust between the two.

[16] explained that the Leader Member Exchange can be defined as, "the creation by the leader of in-group and out-group; subordinate within will have status group higher performance ratings, less turnover, and greater job satisfaction. In this case, Robbin concluded that with the exchange of leaders, it may create high member performance without better turnover and satisfaction.

Several dimensions in LMX according to [22] include respect, trust and bonds. These three dimensions can create a strong relationship between leaders and subordinates arising from LMX.

2.3. Conflict

[16] asserted that conflict is divided into two characteristics which are functional conflicts and dysfunctional conflicts. Functional conflict is a constructive conflict within an organization. It denies and breaks the notion that conflict is negative and destructive for the organization. Functional conflict is a conflict consciously created by the leader with the aim of improving performance, cooperation and problem-solving skills in the organization.

Task conflict is a conflict which occurs due to the negative perception of the content and the purpose of the work done. Relationship conflict is a conflict which occurs in the interpersonal sphere due to a problem or issue by two or more individuals in the organization caused by the existence of malfunction, dissent and miss-communication between individuals. Process conflict is a conflict which occurs during

the work or task process completed. The increasing number of obstacles during the settlement process may lead to conflicts experienced by one or more individuals.

Wolfe & Snoke (1962) in [2] stated that role conflict arises because of the existence of two different "orders" that are simultaneously accepted, and the implementation of just one command will result in the neglect of the other commands.

Jehn (1995) in [11] explained that there are seven dimensions of role conflict consisting of task type, conflict norms, satisfaction with the group, liking, intent to remain, goal similarity, and conflict resolution.

2.4. Stress

Stress is a condition usually experienced by every individual. Stress is caused by pressure from outside the human-self and from within the individual. However, almost most of the stress occurs because of influence from outside the individual. Stress may arise from the existence of conflict and frustration of the individual which becomes an emotion that can even take the form of action if the stress cannot be controlled. [10] added that "stress is an unpleasant thing and makes the person feel uncomfortable, confused, irritable, increased blood pressure, faster heart rate, digestive disorders, etc."

Stress causes an impact on the individual's feelings in establishing a job. However, stress will not always cause a negative impact on work. Sometimes, leaders will put pressure on subordinates to work optimally and the pressure causes stress and spur members to work more than the usual effort. Leaders consciously and deliberately provide this feeling of stress to encourage the members' performance who began to decline caused by the existence of repetitive work performed continuously. Thus, with this pressure, it is expected that the performance of subordinates who begin to decline may increase along with the increasing amount of pressure provided.

2.5. The effect of Leader Member Exchange on the individual stress

The phenomenon which occurs in the world of student organization is the influence of Leader Member Exchange on the level of stress undergone by members. LMX is a perception of trust relationship occurring between superiors and their subordinates. Researchers observed that there is a relationship between perception and the level of stress experienced by subordinates. The stronger the perception of the relationship that was successfully created by a leader, the more the level of stress that occurs in subordinates reduce. It happens due to the emergence of a sense of trust, respect and loyalty owned by subordinates to their superiors. Thus, the existence of a strong relationship may reduce feelings of stress because members have direction and trust in what their superiors instruct and perform.

Based on the description above, the hypothesis can be formulated that there is a negative influence between LMX on individual stress which occurs in members of student

organizations.

2.6. Effect of Leader Member Exchange on student organizational performance

The existence of a good relationship formed between superiors and subordinates will reduce the obscurity of tasks, directing goals, and increase the sense of trust and respect between superiors and subordinates. The researcher hypothesized that the higher and the better LMX formed by leaders towards subordinates, the more the organizational performance of members increases in the organization. Thus, the researcher assumed that LMX has a positive influence on the member performance in organization.

Previous research was conducted by Donny and Eko (2017) and Nuzulul and Thinni (2012) and James and Tomoki which revealed that LMX had positive effects on the Employee Performance.

Based on the description above, the hypothesis can be formulated that there is a negative influence of LMX on individual stress in members of student organizations.

2.7. Effect conflict on stress

Wolfe & Snoke (1962) in [2] explained that role conflict arises due to the existence of two different "orders" which are simultaneously accepted, and the implementation of one command results in the neglect of the other commands. The increasing role requiring the same attention by members will raise the stress experienced by members of the organization. Previous research conducted by [7] and [5] discovered that the role conflict has a positive effect on stress.

Based on the description above, the hypothesis can be formulated that there is positive influence of conflict on the individual stress in members of student organizations.

2.8. Effect of role conflict on student organizational performance

The more roles that members have to play, the more the things which require equal attention so that members may prioritize one role and ignore the other roles. Hence, it reduces member performance in one role.

Previous research conducted by [13], [23], and [9], [1], [3], and [25] shows that role conflict negatively affects the performance.

Based on the description above, the hypothesis can be formulated that there is a negative influence of role conflict on the performance.

2.9. Effect of stress on student organizational performance

Stress is an internal experience which can cause a physical and psychological imbalance in a person as a result of external environmental factors, organizations or people. [16] explained that stress is an unpleasant psychological process

which occurs in response to the environmental stress.

The stress experienced by members of the organization has an impact on the decline of their performance. Stress experienced by members due to pressure on playing many roles and bad relationships between superiors and subordinates may reduce the performance of members in the organization.

Previous research conducted by [12], [5], and [23], shows that stress has a significant negative effect on the performance.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research Approach

The research approach used by researchers in this study was a quantitative approach. The data needed by researchers to analyze the influence between variables were numerical data through a questionnaire. The data were collected from respondents who were quantified into numerical data.

3.2. Research Object, Research Subject, and Sampling Techniques

The object in this research was Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta with the address Jl. Brawijaya Tamantirto Kasihan Bantul, Yogyakarta. The subjects in this study were all members of the Structural Student Affairs of Faculty of Economics and Business, Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta which included three institutions comprising of HIMAMA FEB-UMY, HIMA FEB-UMY, and HIMIE FEB-UMY. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling which is the criteria of the sample were structural members and had undergone one year of management. The number of samples in this study were 81 people.

3.3. Operational Definition of Variables

Table 1. Operational Definition of Variables

Variable	Indicator
Leader Member Exchange is a perception of the quality of leadership relationships created by leaders to some members The perception is seen from the level of trust, interest and respect given by members to leaders.	1. Respect 2. Contribution 3. Affection 4. Loyalty
Role conflict is a condition in which individuals play two or more different roles in which those roles require the same attention and priority. However, individuals can only run one and ignore the other.	Working in two or more groups which do it differently. Ignoring rules and policies Asked to do several conflicting jobs

Variable	Indicator
	Doing things that cannot be accepted by others Doing things that do not have to be done as usual 6. Material and resource support 7. Support of human resources
Performance is an achievement and the results of actions or processes conducted by an individual on the tasks and responsibilities implemented. Performance is also a benchmark of how much an individual contributes to a job.	Ability to work Quality of work Working creativity Working discipline Honesty level Attitude Loyalty to work Motivation Compensation Working environment Salary
Stress is a pressure which comes from outside the individual. Stress creates feelings of anxiety, discomfort, even depression which is beyond the control of the individual. Stress is not always negative. In some cases, stress is deliberately created to stimulate and increase performance and also to move individuals to perform harder and better.	Workload Pressure/time pressure Authority/responsibility Unhealthy working conditions Inadequate work equipment Rewarding too low Differences in values towards individuals Unjust and fair treatment.

3.4. Instrument Quality Test

In testing the instrument, it was tested using the Construct Validity test and declared valid if it met the specified criteria. Masrun (1979) in [18] asserted that "items which have a positive correlation with the criteria (Total Score) and high correlation indicate that the item has high validity." The minimum requirement to be considered eligible is If $r=0.3$. Thus, if the correlation between items with a total score is less than 0.3, the items in the instrument is declared as invalid.

Reliability test used Cronbach Alpha statistical test. The instrument can be tested with criteria; if the variable test results provide alpha Cronbach value > 0.60 , the variable is considered as reliable [17]

3.5. Data Analysis

In this study, the data analysis technique used was path analysis. The steps in analyzing data with path analysis were building a research model, building path diagrams, making regression equations, testing the influence between variables using Multiple Linear Regression test, and comparing direct and indirect effects between variables.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Research Process

Instrument distribution mechanisms by researchers were administered online, with the support of information technology in the form of Google's online application. The

Information	Total
Targeted questionnaire	81
Questionnaire processed	47
Percentage of questionnaires returned	

Based on table 2, the number of responses obtained by researchers amounted to 47 out of 81 target responses set by researchers. Hence, this study only received responses a half of the total questionnaire targeted.

4.2. Descriptive of Respondents' Characteristics

Table 3. Characteristics of Respondents

Classification	Information	Total Respondents	(%)
Gender	Male	19	40%
	Female	28	60%
	Total	47	100%
Length of Management	> 1 Year of Management	47	100%
	<1 Year of Management	0	0%
	Total	47	100%
Origin of the organization	HIMAMA	45	96%
	HIMA	2	4%
	HIMIE	0	0%
	Total	47	100%

Based on table 3, it is presented that the characteristics of respondents in the actual field, on the gender characteristics of the respondents with male gender were 19 people or 40% of the total respondents. This number is less than the female respondents which reached 29 people or 60% of total respondents. Thus, the number of female respondents is more than male respondents.

4.3. Descriptive Analysis

Based on the descriptive analysis administered, the results of each variable are shown in the following tables.

Table 4. Descriptive Analysis of LMX

Item	Mean	SD.
I am very impressed with the knowledge of my supervisor about his work.	3,81	0,92
I admire the professional skills of my boss.	3,94	0,93

researchers compiled pre-defined questionnaire questions and disseminated them through the existing groups in the third Social Media Association. The duration in the questionnaire distribution took one month from December 14, 2018 and closed to January 14, 2018 with the results of the dissemination as follows.

Table 2. Data on Questionnaire Collection

I respect the knowledge of my supervisor and his competence at work	4,30	0,62
My boss will defend me if someone "attacks" me.	3,62	0,95
My boss maintains (defends) my work towards someone who is in higher position even though my boss lacks knowledge about the problem.	3,34	0,94
My boss will defend me against other parties in the organization if I make an honest mistake.	3,68	0,66
My boss has a lot of humor.	3,91	1,07
My boss is among those who are admitted as friends.	3,72	0,95
I am willing to make extra efforts beyond what is required to fulfill the working goals that my boss wants.	3,51	0,74
I do not mind working very hard for my boss.	3,45	0,91
I am willing to work for my boss beyond what is requested in my job description.	3,73	0,83
Total average	3,73	

Based on table 4, it is understood that respondents gave an assessment of the LMX variable. LMX variable shows an average number of 3.73. It indicates that LMX which occurs in the subject field is quite high. The lowest score is on the item which admits that the boss will defend the work of the members from other people who have a higher position even though the boss lacks knowledge of the problem which is with an item score of 3.34. The highest item score is at items which contain members highly respect the knowledge and competence of superiors in the organization with a score of 4.30.

Table 5. Descriptive Analysis of Role Conflicts

Item	Mean	SD.
I do tasks which must be completed outside my habits in completing assignment	3,55	0,75
I need to break the rules or policy to be able to complete an assignment	2,55	1,00
I receive assignments from two or more bosses.	3,09	0,78
I receive assignments of more than 1 boss.	3,15	0,81
I do the assignment. It may be rejected by others because of insufficient knowledge about the work completed.	3,38	0,95
I do work although the truth is in my opinion it is not necessary.	2,89	0,94

Item	Mean	SD.
In conducting the activities, I work with two or more work teams with different ways of working.	3,68	0,96
I accept assignments without adequate human resources support. For instance, members who are less competent/difficult to work together.	3,23	1,24
I receive assignments without sufficient resources such as electronic equipment, transportation, etc. to complete my duties.	3,15	1,23
Average	2,96	

Based on table 5, it is identified that the respondents provided an assessment of the role conflict variable. Role conflict variable shows an average number of 2.96. If referring to the interval table, the role conflict that occurs in the subject field is fairly moderate. The lowest score is located on an item which contains the member will violate a rule to work on a task with an item score of 2.55, and the highest item score is on an item which states that the member feels that he or she does not need to do it with a score of 3.89.

Table 6. Analysis of Stress Descriptive

Item	Mean	SD.
The workload encountered exceeds my work ability, whereas the job must be finished quickly.	3,34	0,79
The work which I handle surpasses the amount of working time for students in general, so that it is frustrating me.	3,02	0,97
Authority or responsibility is not well explained which makes me feel depressed.	3,28	1,10
Conflict between leaders and members often happens, but it can be finished well.	3,28	0,99
Unhealthy situation or situation of work causes the relationship between me and other members to be bad.	2,89	0,99
Working equipment such as Printers, Computers, etc. are inadequate so that it can hinder my work. Hence, it is hard to finish the job on time.	2,94	1,04
Reward in the form of appreciation is too low which makes me less motivated, so that I and many other members complained.	3,00	0,75
Appraisal of supervisors towards members makes me difficult to complete the organizational work.	2,55	1,12
Average	3,06	

Based on table 6, it is shown that respondents gave an assessment of the stress variable. Stress variable shows an average number of 3.06. It indicates that stress which occurs in the subject in the field is moderate, with the lowest score

which is located on items that contain members who are not treated well by superiors so the members feel uncomfortable to work with a score of 2.55. Meanwhile,

The highest item score is on the item which contains the workload encountered by members exceed the work ability of members, whereas the work must be quickly completed with a score of 3.89.

Table 7. Descriptive Performance Analysis

Item	Mean	SD.
The quality of my work is good, because it is always equipped with the internal organization training on an ongoing basis.	3,53	0,75
The quality of my work is very good, so I can be trusted by my supervisor in completing a job.	3,72	0,74
My creativity supports me in completing the organizational tasks given, so as to motivate other members.	3,53	0,65
I am always discipline to come and go home on time in attending organizational activities, so that I have never been sanctioned.	3,34	0,89
I have never lied in completing my organizational tasks, so my boss always believes in my work results.	3,79	0,78
The organizational tasks given by my supervisors are always well completed, so the organizational tasks can be finished properly.	3,79	0,59
I can be admitted as accountable for my loyalty to the organization, because I always work on the instruction.	3,87	0,92
My boss always treats members well so that members are motivated in completing the organizational tasks.	3,77	0,87
Appreciation is granted by the organization to members of the organization in accordance with the tasks assigned.	3,53	0,95
A good organizational environment supports my work, so the organizational tasks can be completed on time.	3,72	0,95
Appreciation given by the organization to members in accordance with the contributions given by members.	3,64	0,99
Average	3,65	

Based on table 7, it can be seen that the respondent's answer related to the performance shows an average number of 3.65. It indicates that the performance of the student association is high. The lowest score is on an item which contains members are always disciplined to come and go home in time to attend each organization's activities, so members are never sanctioned with an item score of 3.34. The highest score is for the loyalty item which stated that the loyalty to the organization is accountable good, because each boss' instruction is always completed by the members with a score of 3.87.

4.4. Quantitative Analysis

4.4.1. Multiple Linear Regression Phase 1

Table 6. Stage 1 Regression Analysis

Model	Standardized Coefficient	t.	Sig.
	Beta		
(Constant)		2.283	.027
Leader Member Exchange	-.150	-1.069	.291
Role Conflict	.350	2.495	.016

Based on the results of testing the standardized coefficient (beta) value for LMX of -0.150 and the significance value of $0.291 > 0.05$ (P Value), it is proven that H1 is rejected or the hypothesis states that there is no effect of the relationship between variable X to variable Y. Hypothesis on role conflict variable on stress, standardized coefficient (beta) for role conflict is 0.350 and significance value is $0.016 < 0.05$ (P Value) which means the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between role conflict and received stress.

4.4.2. Phase 2 Multiple Linear Regression

Table 6. Stage 2 Regression Analysis

Model	Standardized Coefficient	t.	Sig.
	Beta		
(Constant)		1.621	.112
Leader Member Exchange	.719	6.852	.000
Role Conflict	.043	.385	.702
Stress	-.077	-.692	.493

Based on the test results, the standardized coefficient (beta) value for LMX is 0.719 and the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$ (P Value). It means the hypothesis which states that there is a positive relationship between Leader Member Exchange and Performance that is directly accepted.

Meanwhile, the results of hypothesis testing on role conflict variables on performance show that the value of standardized coefficient (beta) for role conflict amounted to 0.043 and a significance value of $0.702 > 0.05$ (P Value). It means that the hypothesis is rejected or the hypothesis states that there is no relationship between conflict variables and the role of performance variables.

Meanwhile, the results of hypothesis testing on stress variables on performance, standardized coefficient reveal stress of -0.077 and a significance value of $0.493 > 0.05$ (P Value). It means that H1 is rejected or the hypothesis states that there is no relationship between stress variables and performance variables.

4.4.3. Path Analysis

Based on the standardized coefficient (beta) value of the

regression test results, the LMX standardized coefficient (beta) is directly 0.719 (P1), while the LMX standardized coefficient (beta) is indirectly which is found through the multiplication of the independent standardized variable coefficient and mediation variables. The calculation is as follows:

$P2 = \text{Standardized Coefficient (beta) of LMX} \times \text{Standardized Coefficient (beta) Stress}$

$$P2 = 0.150 \times 0.077$$

$$P2 = 0.012$$

Based on the results of the multiplication above, it is found that the Standardized Coefficient value was not directly LMX of 0.012 (P2). From the comparison between direct and indirect effects, it was revealed that $P1 > P2$ meaning that the direct effect of LMX is greater than the indirect effect of LMX. It can be concluded that stress variables do not mediate LMX on performance.

Meanwhile, in the Role Conflict Variable, the results of the Standardized Coefficient (beta) Role Conflict were obtained directly by 0.043 (P3), while the Standardized Coefficient (beta) Role Conflict did not directly conduct the same multiplication as the previous variable using the following calculations:

$P4 = \text{Standardized Coefficient (beta) Role Conflict} \times \text{Standardized Coefficient (beta) Stress}$

$$P4 = 0.350 \times 0.077$$

$$P4 = 0.027$$

Based on the above calculation, the value for Standardized Coefficient (Beta) role conflict is 0.027 (P4). Due to this comparison, it can be indicated that $P3 > P4$, or direct influence is greater than the indirect effect. It means that stress does not mediate the role conflict variable on Performance.

4.5. Discussion

4.5.1. Effect of Leader Member Exchange on stress

Based on the results of the research hypothesis testing, it is stated that the Leader Member Exchange does not have negative influence on stress. It is evidenced by the significance value which is greater than the standard p value = 0.05. Based on the results of this test, the hypothesis which states LMX has a negative effect on stress is rejected.

It is supported by the data collected in the field. It was obtained information that the researchers concluded that there is indeed no negative relationship between LMX and stress. The previous researchers assumed that the presence of LMX has a negative impact on stress experienced by members with higher LMX which decreases member stress level, or vice versa. However, based on the reality in the field, it indicates that what the researcher has assumed is not in accordance with the field.

The facts in the field reveal that with LMX height, it does

not always reduce the level of stress experienced by members. This is due to the intentions of the leaders to perform stress space creation within the organization. This action is intentionally implemented by the leadership with specific goals and objectives.

The objective is to arise and awaken the members to find and create solutions for every problem. The aim of this deliberation is to encourage problems that have their own urgency, and the necessity for members to solve the problems will spur and train their abilities in solving problems. Hence, in the future, members can encounter problems which are almost the same or they can resemble those problems. They also will be ready and know what things they should do.

Although LMX does not negative influence on stress, LMX has a positive relationship to performance. It is evidenced by the results of hypotheses testing which show a smaller significance value than the value of $p = 0.05$ and the standardized coefficient which shows a number of 0.719 or 72%. It means that there is a positive relationship between LMX on the organization member performance.

This study is in line with the research conducted by [19], [6], and [20] which finds that LMX has a positive relationship to the employee's performance. It is also supported based on the data which researchers successfully collected in the field. Most respondents stated that LMX or good relations between leaders and members may improve their performance.

4.5.2. Effect of Leader Member Exchange on Performance

Although LMX is declared not to have a negative effect on stress, LMX has a positive relationship to performance. It is proved by the results of hypothesis testing showing a significance value which is smaller than the value of $p = 0.05$ and the standardized coefficient value which shows 0.719 or 72%. It indicates that there is a positive relationship between LMX on the organization member performance.

It is in line with the research conducted by [19], [6], and [21] which explains that LMX has a positive relationship to the employees' performance. It is also supported by the data that researchers successfully collected in the field, where most respondents stated that LMX or good relations between leaders and members can enhance their performance.

This assumption is reinforced by the facts in the field which show that leaders are not those who have ambitions or dictatorships, but those who always work together, guide and direct them well. The clarity of direction and personal communication by superiors towards members may trigger the members' performance because they know where the direction and objective they want. Moreover, the protection provided by the leader and joint problem solving implemented by leaders and members further strengthens the relationship between superiors and members.

4.5.3. Effect of role conflict on stress

Testing the hypothesis about role conflict on stress also

shows a smaller significance value compared with p value = 0.05, and the Standardized Coefficient value shows the relationship number which is 0.350 or 35%. It can be interpreted that role conflict has a positive relationship to stress. This result is in line with the research conducted by [7], [5], and [15] which shows that role conflict has a positive effect on stress.

This assumption is also supported by the information gathered by researchers in the field where a member must have more than one responsibility at the same time and requires the same handling as something which is often encountered by members. It is due to the organization and the world of recovery. With the existence of two interests which shares the same interests and handling, many members feel stressed about this.

4.5.4. Effects of role conflict on performance

Role conflict does not affect the members' performance. It is proven by the results of hypothesis testing which shows a greater significance value than the value of $p = 0.05$ and the Standardized Coefficient value which shows the relationship number of 0.043 or 4%. It indicates that there is no negative influence between role conflict and performance. It is also supported by data in the field where many of the members experience the condition, but they do not feel any influence on their performance. Although many members have multiple organizations, they can delegate that responsibility to others who can replace it. The organizational systems should be flexible and based on a sense of family, so that they can help each other in terms of responsibility and handling.

The results of this study are not in line with by [3] and [25] research which states that there is a significant influence between role conflict and performance

4.5.5. Effects of Stress on Performance

The results of testing the effect of stress on performance indicated a greater significance value than the value of $p = 0.05$, and the Standardized Coefficient value shows the relationship number which was 0.077 or 8%. It indicates that stress does not have a negative influence on performance.

It is in line with the previous research conducted by [12] and [26] which shows that work stress does not have a negative influence on performance. This assumption is also supported by the fact that the field which causes it to happen according to several respondents is because they can overcome the sense of pressure or stress they experience. It is also because they are supported by the flexibility of the organization. Most respondents also do self-time to reduce their sense of pressure.

Furthermore, according to several respondents, it was also recognized that the stress they felt did not originate from the work and responsibilities they held. It was more likely to occur because of differences of opinion and conflicts that happen among members so that the problems created stress. However, it does not make members leave and ignore the responsibilities instructed, which indicates that high stress

levels do not reduce the members' performance.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded as follows.

Leader Member Exchange has a positive influence on the organizational performance of students in the Department of Student Association. It means that the leader has a positive influence for guide and direct member in completing the work. Role conflict does not have a negative influence on the organizational performance of student members of the Department of Student Association. It may happen because almost all members who have more than one organization withdraw themselves for the other organization, and the flexibility of the organization make them possible to assign the task to other member who have more free time.

On the one hand, Leader Member Exchange does not have a negative influence on the stress experienced by student members of the Department of Student Association. It is because LMX height does not always reduce the level of stress experienced by members. It is due to the intentions of the leaders to handle stress within the organization. It is intentionally performed by the leaders with specific goals and objectives.

Meanwhile, role conflict has a positive influence on stress experienced by students in the Department of Student Association. It means that the researcher assumption is approved. However, stress does not have a negative influence on the performance of the organization members of the Department of Student Association. In the result of path analysis, it shows that Stress cannot mediate the influence of Leader Member Exchange in organizing performance of members of the Department of Student Association, and stress cannot mediate the influence of role conflict on the performance of the student members of the Department of Student Association.

REFERENCES

- [1] Afifah, U., Sari, R.N., Anugerah R. & Sanusi Z.M. . 2015. The Effect of Role Conflict, Self-efficacy, Professional Ethical Sensitivity on Auditor Performance with Emotional Quotient as Moderating Variable. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 31 (2015) 206 – 212
- [2] Agustina, L. (2009). Pengaruh Konflik Peran, Ketidakjelasan Peran, dan Kelebihan Peran terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan Kinerja Auditor (Penelitian pada Kantor Akuntan Publik yang Bermitra Dengan Kantor Akuntan Publik Big Four di Wilayah DKI Jakarta), *Jurnal Akuntansi*, Vol.1 No.1 Mei 2009: 40-69
- [3] Ahmed, K. , Shahzad, F. , Fareed, Z., Zulfiqar B. & Naveed T. 2014. Impact of Relationship, Task & Role Conflict on Teaching Performance in Educational Institutes. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*. Vol. 1, No. 2, September, 2014.pp. 101-112. (Pengaruh role conflict thd kinerja)
- [4] Anggreani, E. & Sutanto E. (2013). Pengaruh Leader Member Exchange terhadap Kepuasan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, dan Komitmen Organisasional Karyawan Departemen Penjualan Pada PT. X., *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*. AGORA Vol. 1, No. 1, (2013)
- [5] Burhanuddin, T. D, Sjaruddin, H., & Mus. A. M. (2018). Pengaruh Konflik Peran Ganda terhadap Kinerja Melalui Stres Kerja. *Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen Issue 1* (Agustus, 2018). <https://dx.doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/qjky>
- [6] Burton, J. P, Sablinski, C. J, & Sekiguchi, T. (2008). Linking Justice, Performance, and Citizenship via Leader-Member Exchange , *Jurnal Business Psychology* . Vol.23 No.1/2 (Sept.2008) pp 51-61.
- [7] Juwita, K. & Arintika, D. (2018). Dampak Konflik Peran Terhadap Stres dan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. Jombang Intermedia Pers (Jawa Pos Radar Jombang), *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia* (Vol. 18(2), pp. 105-115, 2018)
- [8] Mangkunegara. A. P. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (2013) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan* : Penerbit Rosda
- [9] Muallifah.M & Astuty, I. (2016). Peran Konflik Peran terhadap Kinerja dengan Self Efficacy sebagai Variabel Moderasi, *Jurnal Management*. Vol 7, No 2 September 2016.pp.210-225
- [10] Mulyadi, D. (2015). *Perilaku Organisasi dan Kepemimpinan Pelayanan*. Jakarta: Alfabeta.
- [11] Nugraha, A. H. (2006) Pengaruh Konflik Peran dan Perilaku Anggota Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Kerja Pegawai pada Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Wilayah Kota Besar Semarang, *Jurnal Management*.
- [12] Giovanni, T. M, Kojo, C. & Lengkon, V. P. K. (2015). Pengaruh Konflik Peran, Konflik Kerja, dan Stres Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Air Manado. *Jurnal EMBA* Vol.3 No.3 Sept. 2015, Hal. 90-98
- [13] Patria, R. (2016). Pengaruh Konflik Peran dan Ambiguitas Peran terhadap Kinerja Auditor dengan Kecerdasan Emosional sebagai VariabelModersi (Studi Empiris pada KAP Di pekanbaru Padang dan Batam), *Jurnal of Management Fekon* Vol. 3 No. 1 (Februari) 2016 pp.881-895
- [14] Priansa, Doni Juni (2014). *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan SDM* : Penerbit Alfabeta, 270.
- [15] Restu Sepdiningtyas & Claudius Budi Santoso . 2017. The Influence of Leader-Member Exchange on Individual Performance: The Roles of Work Engagement as a Mediating Variable and Co-Workers Support as a Moderating Variable. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, Vol. 6, Issue 4 pp.285-305. (LMX THD KINERJA)
- [16] Robbins.S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2015). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta Selatan: Penerbit Salemba Empat
- [17] Sekaran.U & Bougie, R. (2015). *Reasearch Methode For Business*. Chennai, India: Wiley.

- [18] Sugiyono. (2015). Metode Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. In Sugiyono, Metode Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [19] Tan, D. S. & Susanto, E. H. (2017). Pengaruh LMX dan Teamwork Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di PT.XYZ , Jurnal Managemen Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan ,10.
- [20] Hunter, L. W.& Thatcher,S.M.B. (2007). Feeling the Heat: Effect of Stress, Commitment, and Job Experience on Job Performance. Academy of Management Journal 2007, Vol. 50, No. 4, 953-968
- [21] Wang.C.J. 2016. Does leader-member exchange enhance performance in the hospitality industry? The mediating roles of task motivation and creativity. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management Vol. 28 No. 5, 2016 pp. 969-987 (LMX THD KINERJA)
- [22] Wibowo, N. (2013). Pengaruh Kualitas Leader Member Exchange (LMX) terhadap Produktivitas Kerja melalui Kepuasan Kerja dan Komitmen Organisasional PAda PT. Nutrifood Surabaya. AGORA Vol. 1 No. 1 (2013):
- [23] Yuliawan, E. (2011). Pengaruh Stres dan Konflik terhadap Kinerja pada PT. PINDAD Bandung, Jurnal Wira Ekonomi Mikroskil Volume 2, Nomor 01, April 2012: 11-21
- [24] Zainal, V. R. (2014). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan : Penerbit Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [25] Zhang L & Huo X. 2015.The impact of interpersonal conflict on construction project performance A moderated mediation study from China. International Journal of Conflict Management Vol. 26 No. 4, 2015 pp. 479-498.
- [26] Rafieea, M., Kazemib, H., and Alimiric, M. 2013. Investigating the effect of job stress and emotional intelligence on job performance. Management Science Letters 3 (2013) 2417–2424